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.

Contents

Abstract

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

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
:	Divides the number of the folio and the number of the line in the text
□	A letter in the text cannot be reproduced by the font, or it is unclear if the letter is еръ or ерь
*	Reconstructed, not directly attested form
⬚	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 = *Menaeum 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 Menaeum*

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

SUP = *Codex Suprasliensis (menaeum)*

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 (ѧ) has been transliterated by the symbol -ę-, and jus bolʹ šoj (ѫ) 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 сꙑнъ 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 доньдеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да сꙑни с̄тоу бѫдете and on leaf 14v is доньдеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да сꙑнове свѣтоу бѫдете ·. 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 Евангеліе 1056-1057 года* that for the substantive грѣхъ both the case endings of the ŭ- and o-declensions were used in the G.pl., but in different syntactic constructions: грѣховъ with the ŭ-declension case ending when following a substantive and грѣхъ 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 грѣховъ be an example of a re-use of the case endings of the ŭ-declension after the alleged demise[2] 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, Nandriş 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, врьхъ *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 ŭ-stem substantives and the o-stem substantives, having taken into consideration the development of -ъ- into -o- 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 Tetravangelia and 11 aprakos Gospels. In the remaining five sources (three menaea 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. Nandriş in "Common Slavonic (Proto-Slavonic)" (Nandriş 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 spam 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 Russian[4] 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 Preslav[5]. Characteristic features are the almost correct use and spelling of the nasal vowels, the development of the letters ѣ and ы, 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 ы 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 сонъ, corresponding to the сънъ (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 ѫ and ѧ are written y and e; of the two *jers* only ь is used; ы 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 вь and оу 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 -оѭ into -вь in I.sg. (водовь *vodov'* 'water', женовь *ženov'* 'wife'), and the 1st pl. ending in the present tense of verbs into -мо (есмо, *esmo* 'we are', видимо *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 оу/ү and ıа/ѧ, and this this particular way of reproduction of nasal vowels is not found in Serbian, Macedonian or Bulgarian manuscripts. The OCS -ра, -ла corresponds to the Russian CS -оро, -оло, i.e. градъ *grad"* 'town' corresponds to городъ *gorod"*, and глава *glava* 'head' corresponds to голова *golova* (Vinokur 2007:32-34). The PS -tj- and -dj- are reproduced as -ч- and -ж-, e.g. свѣча *svĕča* 'candle' instead of свѣща *svĕšča*, and вижоу

---

[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 вижджꙑ *viždǫ*; the initial ѥ- is sometimes reproduced as о-, e.g. одинъ *odin″* 'one', оѕєро *ozero* 'lake' instead of ѥдинъ *jedin″* , ѥзєро *jezero* etc. There were also changes in the morphology, e.g. the ending of verb 3rd sg. in the present tense, -ть instead of -тъ 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 ŭ-declension in OCS

The ŭ-declension was inherited into OCS from PIE via PS and ComS. In PIE the substantives belonging to the ŭ-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 ŭ-stem substantives of all genders spread into various IE languages e.g. Latin, where there are examples of the ŭ-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 ŭ-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 ŭ-declension paradigms in PIE, firstly the *-ŭs, G.sg. *-ous, and secondly the *-ŭs, G.sg. *- ѡes, *-ѡos. They became contaminated and developed into one ŭ-declension paradigm and a consonant stem. The G.sg. *-ѡes is visible in the derivative мєдвинъ *medvin″* 'of honey' (Vaillant 1958:114-115).

The universally accepted opinion is that the ŭ-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 ŭ-stems do not – as the i-stems do – fit into clear groups (Arumaa 1985:56). The influence the ŭ- and o- declensions had on each other makes it difficult to establish whether a particular substantive in OCS belonged to the ŭ-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 ŭ-declension, and is therefore found with the case endings of the ŭ-declension in OCS sources.

19 (131)

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 -овє, in comparison to the PIE ŭ-declension case ending, which was -ŏu-ĕs. The case ending of the o-declension in OCS was -и in comparison to the PIE -ŏ-es> -ōs, -ŏi. 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	-ŏu-ĕs	-ŏ-es>-ōs, -ŏi
Late PS	-ove	-i
OCS	-овє	-и

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

This case ending -овє 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 -овє, 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. грекове *grekove* 'Greeks', жидове *židove* 'Jews', or profession, i.e. попове *popove* 'priests', врачеве *vračeve* 'healers, doctors', some animals and birds, i.e. воробьеве *vorob'eve* 'sparrows', дятлове *djatlove* 'woodpeckers' but it was still in use for the substantives that originally belonged to the ŭ-declension, i.e. съınове, домове (Kolesov 2009:171). According to G. Nandriş, the "N. pl. -ове appears as -ови, by contamination with the -и of the o-declension: N.pl. съınови, волови" (Nandriş 1965:65).

The case ending of the ŭ-declension in the genitive plural in OCS was -овъ, in comparison to the PIE ŭ-declension case ending, which was -ŏu-ŏm. According to A.M. Schenker, the case ending of the o-declension in OCS was -ъ, in comparison to the PIE -ŏ-ŏm>-ōm (Schenker 1996:124). See table 2.

Table 2. The genitive case plural

	ŭ-declension	o-declension
PIE	- ŏu-ŏm	-ŏ-ŏm > ōm
Late PS	-ovъ	-ъ
OCS	**-овъ**	**-ъ**

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. Krys′ko holds the opinion that a considerable number of examples of the influence of the ŭ-declension's case ending -овъ on the o-declension is found in the OCS sources (Krys′ko 2000:27). H. Lunt[6] expresses the view that the o-declension substantives may originally have had the ending -овъ/-евъ beside the normal ending -ъ/-ь "although such forms are rare", thus claiming that the ending -овъ/-евъ was not the expected ending. A.I. Izotov states that the ending -овъ penetrated the o-declension and the original case ending for masculine substantives type рабъ *rab″* 'slave' and доухъ *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 -овъ in the genitive plural: when the fall of the *jers* took place the original ending -ъ

---

[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. –ъ/-ь) bisyllabic desinences, nom *-ove/-eve*, gen. –ъ/-ь. Examples are attested for: *synъ* 'son', *domъ* 'house'…".

was "turned to a zero" and the ending -овъ was used instead (Gasparov 2001:84). It is also true that even before the fall of the *jers*, 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 длъгъ in the accusative singular or in the genitive plural, or could it be an adjective? …хоштеши бо се на пѫть отити длъгъ (558:01)[7]. There are other illustrative sentences in the *Codex Suprasliensis*, showing the interaction between the two declensions. For example, отъ цвѣтовъ въ цвѣты прѣходѧшта·отъ плодовъ въ плоды прѣходѧшта·(429:29-30)[8]. These substantives belong to the o-declension, and the genitive forms цвѣтовъ and плодовъ 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″* -ъ- in the case ending -ъмъ 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

	ŭ-declension	o-declension
PIE	-ŭ-mŭs	-ŏ-mŭs
Late PS	-ъmъ	-omъ
OCS	-ъмъ	-омъ

Table 4. The accusative case plural

	ŭ-declension	o-declension
PIE	-ŭ-ns	-ŏ-ns
Late PS	-y	-y
OCS	-ы	-ы

---

[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 ŭ-declension in OCS was -ъми, in comparison to the PIE ŭ-declension case ending, which was -ŭ-mīs. The case ending of the o-declension in OCS was -ы in comparison to the PIE -ŏ-ŏis>ōis, see table 5 (Schenker 1996:124). The ending -ъми 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

	ŭ-declension	o-declension
PIE	-ŭ-mīs	-ŏ-ŏis>ōis
Late PS	-ъmi	-y
OCS	**-ъми**	**-ы**

The case ending of the ŭ-declension in the locative plural in OCS was -ъхъ, in comparison to the PIE ŭ-declension case ending, which was –ŭ-sŭ. The case ending of the o-declension in OCS was -ѣхъ in comparison to the PIE -ŏi-sŭ, 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

	ŭ-declension	o-declension
PIE	-ŭ-sŭ	-ŏi-sŭ
Late PS	-ъ-хъ	-ě-хъ
OCS	-ъхъ	-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 ŭ-declension in OCS[10]

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 ŭ-stem substantives in OCS and CS, but only two of them did definitely belong to the old ŭ-declension, namely съінъ *syn″* 'son' and домъ *dom″* 'house' (Thorndahl 1974:14-15). A. L. Janda gives four lists of words in connection with the ŭ-declension; six substantives considered to be certain ŭ-stem substantives, additional six likely ŭ-stem substantives, 11 possible ŭ-stem substantives and over 40 substantives that are questionable ŭ-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 ŭ-stem class[11]. All specialists claimed that the following substantives belonged to the ŭ-declension: връхъ *vr′ch″* 'top', съінъ *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 ŭ-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 ŭ-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 ŭ-stem class or are found with some of the case endings of the ŭ-declension as a result of their connection to the myth: полъ since heaven and earth are the two halves of the Thunderer's world; връхъ since the Thunderer lives at the top of the tree of the world; волъ because it was the Thunderer who released the cattle; змьи *zm′i* 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; долоу *dolu* 'down' and низоу *nizu* 'bottom' because they show the case ending of the ŭ-declension in the L.sg. and are related to the myth; миръ *mir″* 'world', чинъ *čin″* 'rank' and рждъ *rĕd″* '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 гадъ *jad″* 'poison' since the most important means for the serpent of the world, and important symbols of death and chaos, are ice and poison; съінъ 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 ŭ-stems: джбъ *dõb″* 'oak', богъ, *bog″* 'god', небо *nebo″* 'heaven', джждь *d″žd′* 'rain', and зной *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. Možejko, G. Nandriş, 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 волъ *vol″* 'ox'

Various opinions are voiced about the origin of волъ. R. Eckert (1959:100) claims that волъ belonged to a group of originally Slavic words. M. Vasmer states that волъ is an old ŭ-stem substantive, but according to him the link between волъ and the Polish *wołać* '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 волохъ, валахъ, волухъ, *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-Altaic language. волъ 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 врьхъ *vr′ch″* (вьрхъ, връхъ) 'top'

According to M. Vasmer, **врьхъ** is of the same origin as the Lithuanian *viršùs* 'upper part, height, hill', the Latvian *virsus* 'upper part', the Sanskrit *várṣma* 'top, peak', *várṣiṣthas* 'highest, uppermost', the Latin *verrūca* 'height, hill' (Vasmer 1953:190). A. Preobraženskij writes that **врьхъ** is one of the five substantives that without discussion belonged to the ŭ-declension and he claims the root is *ụers- 'rise' from IE ụer- (Preobraženskij 1958:78, 821). R. Eckert says that **врьхъ** 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 **врьхъ** in e.g. *Vukan Gospel Lectionary,* but **вьрхъ** in e.g. *Typograph Gospel Lectionary* and *Mstitslav's Gospel Lectionary,* and **връхъ** 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. Nandriş (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. Pokorny[12] 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 *dŏmŏs, and thus passed into PS with the thematic vowel -ŏ, 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:

> "Чьто бо приобретоша преже братия отьца моего или отьць мои? Къде бо ихъ жития и слава мира сего, и багряница и брячины, сребро и золото, вина и медове, брашьна чьястьная 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'ε* 'side, separation, part' from **polnā* (Vasmer 1955:390).

---

[13] *Съказание и страсть и похвала Святюю Мученику Бориса и Глеба*, http://ppf.asf.ru/drl/bg.html

3.4.6 съінъ *syn″* 'son'

According to A.M. Schenker and R. Eckert, **съінъ** existed in PIE as *sŭn-ŭ-s* in N.sg., was inherited by PS, ComS and finally by OCS as **съінъ** (Schenker 1996:123-124 and Eckert 1959:100-102). N.A. Kondrašov writes that the form **съінъ** is the result of the loss of the labialisation of the PIE root vowel -ŭ-, changing it into the Slavonic 'ъı', 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 **съінъ** belonged to the ŭ-declension (Eckert 1959:06, Chaburgaev 1974:176, Vasmer 1958:57). It should be noted that the word **съінъ** 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 '**съінъ**' 'tower'. However, according to T.A. Lysaght, the homonymy **съінъ** 'tower' belonged to the o-declension, not the ŭ-declension, as did the word **съінъ** 'son' (Lysaght 1987:402). The interpretation of **съінъ** in St. John XII:36 is "someone having a close connection with something" (Sreznevskij 1903:872-874).

3.4.7 грѣхъ *grěch″* 'sin'

The scholars do not agree on the PIE origin of the word **грѣхъ**. O.N. Trubačev writes that the word **грѣхъ** 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 **грѣхъ** (Trubačev 1980:114-115). A. Preobraženskij argues that the root of the word **грѣхъ** is *ghro-so (Preobraženskij 1958:202). J. Pokorny [14] mentions the possible link with the PIE word *gʷhrē- as in the OCS word grěti, 'to warm'. M. Vasmer also mentions this link to the word grěti. He states that **грѣхъ** in OCS shows traces of the ŭ-declension but does not state which they are (Vasmer 1953:307). The scholars also disagree to which declension **грѣхъ** belonged. G. Nandriş states that **грѣхъ** is a probable ŭ-declension substantive (Nandriş 1965:65). T.A. Ivanova is certain that **грѣхъ** belonged to the ŭ-declension (Ivanova 2005:130). But several scholars express the view that **грѣхъ** 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 *dъlgъ* 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 длъгъ, -ыи 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 sources[15]

The present chapter aims at presenting the researchers' findings on the substantives волъ, врѣхъ/ върхъ/врьхъ, 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 ŭ-declension case endings. Nothing was found regarding studies on the ŭ-declension or its case endings regarding the chosen substantives in the *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*, *Dobromir's Gospel*, *Kochno Gospel Lectionary*, *Menaeum of Dubrovskij*, *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary*, *Putjatin Menaeum*, *Typograph Gospel*, *Vatican Gospel Lectionary* or *Vukan Gospel Lectionary*.

3.5.1 волъ

S.M. Kuljbakin classifies волъ among the ŭ-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 ŭ-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 wordlist[16] 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 ŭ-declension, but find no ocurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl. (Kuljbakin 1925:50-51, Lieli 1991:14). L. Moszyński and M.M. Kozlovskij also claim that врьхъ belonged to the ŭ-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 вьрхъ is found with the case endings of the ŭ-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). връхъ 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 връхъ. No wordlist[17] 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), грѣховь (137b:23) and грѣхоховь (28c:18). Footnote 47 gives the explanation that грѣхоховь is composed of грѣхо-ховь. 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 грѣсѣхъ 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 грѣсѣхъ 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 wordlists[18] 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 дл\u044aгъ (дългъ)

According to C. Koch, there are no occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl. of дл\u044aгъ in *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary*, and to what declension the substantive belongs is not discussed (Koch 2000:162). L. Moszyński classifies дл\u044aгъ 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 дл\u044aгъ among the substantives found with the case endings of the ŭ-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 дл\u044aгъ 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 дл\u044aгъ. None of the wordlists[19] shows occurrences in the plural N., G., I. or L., only in A.

3.5.5 домъ

C. Koch finds one occurrence домохъ 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 домохъ 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 ŭ-stem substantives and finds two occurrences of домовь in the G.pl. (128a:16, 136b:17), and one occurrence of домохь 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 ŭ-stem substantives, and claims that the spelling домохъ in L. (St. Matthew XI:08) in *Marianus Gospel* is the only form that "deviated from the norm of the ŭ-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 ŭ-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 ŭ- and o-declensions (Marguliés 1927:191). L. Moszyński also considers домъ to belong to the ŭ-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 домохъ 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-Żebrowski classifies домъ among the ŭ-stem class substantives, but finds no occurrences in the plural in *1076 Miscellany* (Rott-Żebrowski 1972:149-150). домъ is not one of the substantives studied by U. Sill. All four wordlists[20] 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 домы (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 ŭ-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-Żebrowski in *1076 Miscellany* (Rott-Żebrowski 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. Marguliés 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 ŭ-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-Żebrowski writes that полъ is one of the substantives found with case endings of the ŭ-declension in *1076 Miscellany* but finds no occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl. (Rott-Żebrowski 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 полъ in the singular is given as illustration of the contamination between the ŭ- and o-declensions (Papazisovska 1970:311). полъ 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 съінъ

The occurrences of съінъ 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 съінъ 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 съіновє 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 съіновъ 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 съінъ belongs to the ŭ-stem substantives, and that съіновє is used in the N.pl. and съіновъ 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 съінъ belongs to the ŭ-stem substantives, finding ten occurrences of съіновє 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 съіновъ 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 съінъ as the "most important and most frequently occurring substantive with an ŭ-stem", stating that съіновє occurs 17 times in the N.pl., and съіновъ occurs three times in the G.pl. and съінъ once in *Marianus Gospel* (no information is given about where) (Lieli 1991:12-14). A. Marguliés uses съіновъ as illustration of the remaining ŭ-

declension in *1073 Miscellany* (246 and 438), but he does not state the total number of occurrences (Marguliés 1927:178, 191). L. Moszyński also agrees that съінъ belongs to the ŭ-stem substantives, and finds that in the N.pl. there are fourteen occurrences of съіновє (not stating where) and one of съіни (St. John XII:36) in *Zograph Gospel*. In the G.pl. there are three occurrences of съіновъ (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 съінъ in relation to *1073 Miscellany*, nor does V. Papazisovska in relation to *Sava's Book*. T. Rott-Żebrowski also classifies съінъ among the ŭ-stem substantives, finding four occurrences of съіновє in the N.pl. (14:11, 49:06, 225:11-12, 251:09), one occurrence of съінъі (17:11) in the I.pl., one occurrence of съінъхъ (168:06) in the L.pl. in *1076 Miscellany* (Rott-Żebrowski 1972:150). U. Sill studies ways of abbreviating съінъ 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 съіновє and one of съіни in *Zograph Gospel*, 16 occurrences of съіновє in *Marianus Gospel*, 19 occurrences of съіновє in *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary*, no occurrences in *Codex Suprasliensis* or *Undol'skij's Fragments* but four occurrences of съіновє in *Sava's Book*, six occurrences of съіновє in *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*, one occurrence of съіновє in *Turov Gospel Lectionary*, 16 occurrences of съіновє in *1073 Miscellany* and one occurrence of съіновє in *1076 Miscellany*. The findings in the G.pl. are: one occurrence of съіновъ in *Zograph Gospel*, three occurrences of съіновъ and one съінъ in *Marianus Gospel*, and three occurrences of съіновъ 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 съіновъ in *Sava's Book*. There are four occurrences of съіновъ in *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* and four occurrences of съіновъ 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 съінѣхъ 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 съіновє 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 съіновъ in G (37r:14, 106r:10, 116v:09). In *Marianus Gospel* there are 18 occurrences of съіновє 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 съіновъ (60:18, 190:24, 272:01) and one of съінъ (105:23). In

Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057 four occurrences of съıнове in the N.pl. were found (30c, 43a, 58b, 266c) and one in the G.pl. of съıновъ (278c). In *1073 Miscellany* there are 28 occurrences of съıнове 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 съıновъ (50b:10, 137c:01, 189d:24, 103a:24) and one of съıнѣхъ 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 Menaeum *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 centres[21], 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 оу or ы or omission of passages with summarizing endings.

4)   Errors due to problems when reading or understanding words, e.g. mistaking боудеть *budet'* 'will, will be' for болѫть *bolęt'* 'to ache' and вол *vol* 'ox' for болє *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 demise[22] 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 ŭ-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 ŭ- 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 грѣхъ in the genitive plural, that грѣховъ from the ŭ-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 ŭ- 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 ŭ- 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 -ъмъ 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 -ъ >-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 -ове 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. съннови and волови (Nandriş 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. Nandriş, the diphthong -au- developed into -ou- when the PIE short -a- became Slavonic -o- (Nandriş 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. съннове, 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 -овє 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 ŭ- and o-declensions. It is not impossible that the -ови instead is created by exaptation of the ŭ-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 -овъ for the ŭ-declension, and -ъ 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 -ъ is a zero-ending, which is not sufficient as a case marker. Therefore, -овъ 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. грѣховъ (Vaillant 1958:127). However, this does not explain the parallel occurrences of both грѣховъ and грѣхъ in the G.pl. in one and the same source. A. Ch. Vostokov's thoughts are that грѣхъ is used after prepositions and грѣховъ 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 -овъ 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. съıновъ *synov″*, 'son's'. Also this morpheme -ov- comes from the ŭ-declension. R. Matasović argues that the origin of the suffix -ov- is unclear, but that it probably originated in thematic adjectives, built from ŭ-stems, on the model of, e.g. OCS съıновъ, '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. съıновъ is a possessive adjective or the substantive in the G.pl. The occurrences of the G.pl. with the ending -овъ instead of the o-declension case ending -ъ 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 ŭ-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 >-ьи >-ы and he gives examples of o-stem substantives found with the ŭ-declension case ending: грѣхъми, плодъми, and others (Chodzko 1869:53), and V.B. Krys′ko gives the examples апостолъми, съпостатъми (Krys′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 ŭ-declension, and -ѣхъ for the o-declension. The PIE -*sŭ in the L.pl. had changed into -хъ for substantives belonging to the ŭ-, i- and o-stem classes (Seliščev 1951:185, 187). G.A. Chaburgaev gives the example съинѣхъ < *sūn-ŭ-sŭ 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 ŭ- 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 ŭ-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: врьхъ *vr'ch″* 'top', съінъ *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. воловє / воли), G.pl. воловъ / волъ = folios and lines (I.pl. волъми / волы, L.pl. волъхъ /волѣхъ)
N.pl. грѣховє / 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 Manuskript[23] , Titus Corpus[24], the Sofia Trondheim Corpus[25]. These portals were also used to find information on the sources, together with the following portals: Biblioteka Frontistesa[26], 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)

воловє, воловъ/воловь, волъми, волъхъ/волъхь
воли, волъ/воль (G.pl.), волы (I.pl.), волѣхъ/волѣхь
връхъ/ върхъ/ врьхъ/ вьрхъ/: връховє, връховъ/връховь, връхъми, връхъхъ/връхъхь
връси, връхъ/връсь (G.pl.), връхы (I.pl.), връсѣхъ/връсѣхь
грѣховє, грѣховъ/грѣховь, грѣхъми, грѣхъхъ/грѣхъхь
грѣси, грѣхъ/грѣсь (G.pl.), грѣхы (I.pl.), грѣсѣхь/ грѣсѣхь
длъгъ/ дългъ: длъговє, 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/длъзѣхь

домове, домовъ/домовь, домъми, домъхъ/домъхь

доми, домъ/домь (G.pl.), домы (I.pl.), домѣхъ/домѣхь

медове, медовъ/медовь, медъми, медъхъ/медъхь

меди, медъ/медь (G.pl.), меды (I.pl.), медѣхъ/медѣхь

полове, половъ/половь, полъми, полъхъ/полъхь

поли, полъ/поль (G.pl.), полы (I.pl.), полѣхъ/полѣхь

съынове, съыновъ/съыновь, съынъми, съынъхъ/съынъхь

съыни, съынъ/съынь (G.pl.), съыны (I.pl.), съынѣхъ/съынѣхь

+ сн҃ове, сн҃ве, сн҃овъ/сн҃овь, сн҃въ/сн҃вь, сн҃ъми, сн҃ъхъ, сн҃ъхь, сн҃и, сн҃ъ (G.pl.), сн҃ы, сн҃ѣхъ, сн҃ѣхь

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 н in the manuscripts, but written only as и in the reproduced excerpts,
- [n] is written н and н in the manuscripts, but written only as н in the reproduced excerpts,

- the letter ⱜ is used also for щ,
- 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 ъı 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 (мѣсѧцесловъ). 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 year [29]. Two Miscellanies are also used as sources, containing Encomium or compendia of articles [30].

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 Палеографія* (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 *Menaeum 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 CS[31]. 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* (Lĕvočkin 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. Veder[32], 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 aprakos Gospel, and partly from a long aprakos 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 possible[33]:

---

[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	э	ⱳ	э	·ә	ⱷ	ⱬ	Ⰿ	Ⰰ	ⱑ	ⱓ
Cyrillic letters	о	в	є	ъ, ь	м	и	ы	ѣ	χ (loan-words from Greek)	χ (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 Ⰰ is retained instead of the Cyrillic ѣ.

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 в and о, which frequently occur in the case endings. в has the numerical value of 2 in Glagolitic, but 3 in Cyrillic, and о 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, х 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 х or х with г or к.

The confusion of vowels is also a risk in the study as occurrences could be missed. The letters о, є, ы and ѣ occur in the chosen eight substantives. The scribe could confuse о with є, оу and ъ/ь, or є with а, or ы with а and ѣ, or ѣ with а and ы. The scribes' dialects could lead to the confusion of є with и and о with а. Furthermore, ъ/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 ŭ- 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 ѣ in the L.pl. case ending -охъ for the ŭ-declension, after the development of -ъхъ into -охъ in Macedonia (but not in East Bulgaria where -ъхъ was retained) in the 10th century, and the L.pl. -ѣхъ for the o-declension. According to Kuljbakin, this change of -ъхъ into -охъ 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 ŭ-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 грѣхохові 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 9[35]

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

ARC/131v: 01	рече же ки ѿпоүщаютъ тї сѧ грѣси твои.
ASS/120r:16	рече же еи ·ѡтпоүштаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои ·
DOB/57b:07	рече же ки · оставлѣѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои...
KOH/102r:19	рече же еи ·ѡпоүщаѫт сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои ·
MAR/94v	рече же еи отъпоүщаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси
MIR/160a:09	рече же ди ѡпюѭють се тебѣ грѣси
MST/77b:23	рече же ки отъпоүщают сѧ тебе грѣси ·
MST/169b:02	рече же ки отъпȢщают сѧ тебѣ грѣси ·
OST/223d:13	рече же ки отъпоүщаѭть сѧ тебѣ грѣси
SAV/130v:17	рече же еі отъпоүщаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси
VAT/52r:23	рече же еи отъпоүщаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси
VUK/85c:20	рече же ки ѡпоүщають се тебѣ грѣси твои:
ZOG/157v:19	рече же еі отъпоүштаѭть 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 отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ, the pronoun ти, тебѣ, тебе = MAR, MIR, MST (bis), OST, SAV, VAT and ZOG

2) The verb отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ, the pronouns тебѣ and твои = ASS, KOH, VUK

3) The verb отъпоущаѭть сѧ, the pronouns ти and твои = ARC

4) The verb оставлѣѭть сѧ, 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 (Knjazevskaja 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 приꙗти сторицеѭ нꙑнѣ.

въ врѣмѧ се домовь.и братиѭ и сестрь.и ѿца и матере.

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 домовь, 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 visible[36]. 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:24-34[37].

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.

6.3.1 *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*

Occurrences in	The *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*
Source	Mironova 1997
Language	Cyrillic; Russian CS
Period	11th 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 *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary* (or the *Vatican,* not to be confused with the *Vatican Gospel Lectionary Gr.2502*)
Source	The e-corpus at the portal Manuskript
Language	Glagolitic; OCS, written in Macedonia
Period	End of 10th or beginning of 11th 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, webpages[38]

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, webpage[39]

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 *Marianus Gospel.*
Source	Jagič 1883, downloaded PDF
Alphabet	Glagolitic, OCS with influences from the Serbian, written in Macedonia
Period	10th-11th 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 *Zograph Gospel*
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, *Staroslavjanskij slovarʹ* 1999: 14-15

6.3.6 *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*

Occurrences in	the *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*
Source	Online facsimile version, downloaded PDF[40]
Language	Cyrillic, one of the oldest Cyrillic manuscript in the Serbian CS
Period	the end of the 12th 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 *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary*
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 *jery* in the e-corpus
Information	Alekseev 1999:16, webpage[42]

6.3.8 *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*

Occurrences in	The *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*
Source	Vostokov 2007
Language	Cyrillic, Russian CS; the misuse of the nasal vowels shows that the manuscript is excluded from OCS
Period	11th 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 *Sava's Book*
Source	Knjazevskaja et al. 1999 and the portal Manuskript
Language	Cyrillic, Bulgarian CS/East Bulgaria; morphologically there are features in the manuscript that are earlier than *Marianus* and *Zograph Gospels*

---

[42] http://www.manuscripts.ru.

Period	It is the earliest Cyrillic text, written sometime during the period end of the 10th century to the middle of the 11th 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 13th or beginning of the 14th 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 11th century in Bulgaria, and folios 154-165 were written at the end of the 11th or beginning of 12th century in Russia
Folios	164 folios, of which the OCS folios are 25-153. The manuscript is incomplete
Information	Ivanova 2005:15, Knjazevskaja et al 1999:07, Kurz 1966:LXII-LXIII, Papazisovska 1970:317, Schenker 1996:189, *Staroslavjanskij slovar'* 1999:15-16, and Sill 1972:23-24, 33

6.3.10 *Turov Gospel Lectionary*

Occurrences in	The *Turov Gospel Lectionary*
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 11th 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 *Typograph Gospel*
Source	The corpus at the portal Manuskript
Language	Cyrillic, Russian CS

---

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

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

6.3.12 *Undol'skij's Fragments*

Occurrences in	The *Undol'skij's Fragments*
Source	the PDF edition at Biblioteka Frontistesa
Language	Cyrillic, Bulgarian CS
Period	11th 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; *Staroslavjanskij slovar'* 1999:16; Sill 1972:27, webpage[45]

6.3.13 *Vatican Gospel Lectionary*

Occurrences in	The *Vatican Gospel Lectionary (Gr. 2502) /not to be confused with the Assemanian Gospel Lectionary, which is called Vatican/*
Source	Krăstanov et al. 1996
Language	Cyrillic, OCS
Period	It is one of the earliest Bulgarian Cyrillic manuscripts, from the end of the 10th or beginning of the 11th 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 *Vukan Gospel Lectionary*
Source	Vrana 1967
Language	Cyrillic, Serbian CS
Period	It is one of the earliest Serbian Gospels. T. A. Ivanova states the period to 13th 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 *Zograph Gospel*
Source	Jagić 1954 (1879), downloaded PDF
Language	Glagolitic, OCS from Macedonia
Period	The end of 10th to the end of 11th 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, *Staroslavjanskij slovar'* 1999:15-16

6.3.16 *Menaeum of Dubrovskij*

Occurrences in	The *Menaeum of Dubrovskij*
Source	the PDF version at Sofia Trondheim Corpus
Language	Cyrillic, Russian CS
Period	11th century; some claim that it was written in the 12th 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 *Putjatin Menaeum*
Source	the electronic corpus at the portal Manuskript
Language	Cyrillic, Russian CS
Period	11th 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 *Codex Suprasliensis (Retkov Sbornik)*
Source	Zaimov and Kapaldo 1983
Language	Cyrillic, OCS, probably from Preslav, Bulgaria
Period	10th 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, *Staroslavjanskij slovar'* 1999:22-24, Zaimov and Kapaldo 1983:02, webpage[50]

6.3.19 *1073 Miscellany*

Occurrences in	The *1073 Miscellany*

---

[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	11th 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 *1076 Miscellany*
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	11th 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. съꙑнове has been abbreviated as сн҃ове or сн҃ве 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, is 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. 636[53] 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 врьхъ/врѣхъ, вьрхъ 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	∑	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
∑	374	262	636	p<0.001

Since there were no occurrences in the plural N., G., I. or L. of the substantives врьхъ (врѣхъ, вьрхъ), 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 съꙑнъ, домъ, волъ and грѣхъ will be discussed; съꙑнъ 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.

	-ĭ-	-o-	∑	%
волъ	6	0	6	0.9%
грѣхъ	79	251	330	51.9%
домъ	23	1	24	3.8%
полъ	0	5	5	0.8%
съінъ	266	5	271	42.6%
∑	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	съінъ	∑
The Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092	0	14	1	0	13	28
The Assemanian Gospel	0	13	1	1	13	28
The Dobromir's Gospel	0	10	1	0	9	20
The Kochno Gospel Lectionary	1	12	0	0	10	23
The Marianus Gospel	0	14	2	1	20	37
The Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary	1	18	2	0	25	46
The Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary	1	16	2	0	31	50
The Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057	0	14	1	1	16	32
The Sava's Book (Gospel Lectionary)	0	11	0	0	6	17
The Turov Gospel Lectionary	0	2	0	0	1	3
The Typograph Gospel	0	14	2	0	21	37
The Undol'skij's Fragments	0	0	0	0	2	2

The Vatican Gospel Lectionary (Gr. 2502)	0	10	1	1	8	20
The Vukan Gospel Lectionary	0	13	2	0	25	40
The Zograph Gospel	0	14	1	1	19	35
∑ Biblical texts	3	175	16	5	219	418
The Menaeum of Dubrovskij	0	2	0	0	0	2
The Putjatin Menaeum	0	20	0	0	2	22
The Codex Suprasliensis (Retkov Sbornik)	2	19	3	0	9	33
The 1073 Miscellany	1	73	5	0	35	114
The 1076 Miscellany	0	41	0	0	6	47
∑ Non-biblical texts	3	155	8	0	52	218
∑	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 ŭ-stem substantives съınъ, followed by домъ, волъ and грѣхъ.

7.1.1 съınъ

There were 271 occurrences of съınъ in the plural N., G., I. or L. found in the manuscripts, see Appendix 1. In 266 of these, the endings belong to the ŭ-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 съınъ

Case:	ŭ-declension case endings	o-declension case endings	∑	*Statistical significance*
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.
∑	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 сꙑновє 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 сꙑновъ 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 сꙑновє was used in the N.pl. and сꙑновъ 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 сꙑновє 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 сꙑновъ 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 сꙑновє occurs 17 times in the N.pl. in MAR. In my study 16 were excerpted, and in the G.pl. сꙑновъ occurs three times and сꙑнъ 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 сꙑновє. 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 сꙑновъ and one сꙑнъ 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) (Marguliés 1927:178, 191). L. Moszyński (1975:186-189) finds 14 occurrences of сꙑновє in the N.pl. in ZOG (without stating where) and one of сꙑни in St. John XII:36, three occurrences of сꙑновъ 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 сꙑновє in the N.pl. (14:11, 49:06, 225:11-12, 251:09), one occurrence of сꙑнъі (17:11) in the I.pl., and one occurrence of сꙑнъхъ (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 сꙑнъ 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 сꙑновє and one of сꙑни in ZOG, 16 occurrences of сꙑновє in MAR, 19 occurrences of сꙑновє in ASS, no occurrences in SUP or UND; four occurrences of сꙑновє in SAV, six occurrences of сꙑновє in OST, one occurrence of сꙑновє in TUR, 16 occurrences of сꙑновє in 1073, one occurrence of сꙑновє 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 сꙑнѣхъ 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 сꙑновъ 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 ŭ-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:	ŭ-declension case endings	o-declension case endings	∑	*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
∑	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 ŭ- and o-declension case endings. All these occurrences had been found and included in my study. S.M. Kuljbakin finds two occurrences of домовь in the G.pl. (128a:16, 136b:17), and one occurrence of домохь 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 шьдши 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 ŭ-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. Marguliés writes that the ŭ-stem class is remains in SUP, giving

the example домовъ in the G.pl., but he writes nothing about the total number of occurrences (Marguliés 1927:191). L. Moszyński finds only one occurrence of домохъ 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-Żebrowski finds no occurrences in the plural in 1076 (Rott-Żebrowski 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 воловь 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 ŭ-declension case endings, see table 15.

Table 15. Occurrences of волъ

Case:	ŭ-declension case endings	o-declension case endings	∑	*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	--
∑	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 воловь 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 ŭ- 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 ŭ-declension case endings, and 251 to the o-declension case endings. All of the 79 ŭ-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:	ŭ-declension case endings	o-declension case endings	∑	
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
∑	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-corpus[54], all three different occurrences in the G.pl. грѣхъ (131b:05), грѣховь (137b:23) and грѣхоховь (28c:18) were included; (footnote 47 gives the explanation that грѣхоховь is composed of грѣхо-ховь.) (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 hade 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 he portal Manuskript by email with an enclosed photograph of the folio with the spelling гръси 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 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), five грѣхꙑ (44c:16, 171d:10-11, 193c:21 with the spelling грѣховꙑ, 200b:28, 211a:15) and 20 грѣсѣхъ (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 грѣсѣхъ 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 грѣхꙑ but there seems to be none in this case. The 12 occurrences of грѣховъ had been found and included in the research, as well as 12 грѣхъ (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 грѣсѣхъ mentioned by T. Rott-Żebrowski (Rott-Żebrowski 1972:147-149). S.M. Kuljbakin does not discuss грѣхъ in the plural but in MIR nine occurrences of грѣси were found (92a:05, 92a:12, 112a:04, 152b:20, 153a:12, 160a:04, 160a:09, 219b:04, 219b:18-19), four of грѣховъ (46b:04, 253a:02-03, 326a:22, 327a:23), two of грѣхъ (316a:22-23, 342a:13) and three of грѣсѣхъ (28a:17, 28a:20, 41b:21). грѣхъ 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 грѣси (32r:08, 32v:14, 47r:07, 49r:18, 79r:16, 79v:06, 131r:18, 131v:01), four occurrences of грѣховъ (14r:12, 94v:19, 150r:15, 151r:06), and one occurrence of грѣхъ (174v:18), no occurrence of I.pl., but one грѣсѣхъ (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 врьхъ (връхъ, вьрхъ), длъгъ, (дългъ) or медъ, 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 съінъ are, despite the few occurrences, interesting, because they are found in very early manuscripts. In N.pl. there were 211 occurrences of съіновє, and only two of съіни, 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 съіновъ were found and only one of съінъ 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 грѣхъ and грѣховъ. 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 грѣхъ and in *Codex Suprasliensis* two substantives with the form грѣхъ. 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 persued 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 грѣхъ and грѣховъ in the G.pl. in the OCS and later CS manuscripts could be evidence that the ŭ-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 ŭ- and o-declensions with different syntactic roles?

Despite the 636 occurrences found of both the ŭ- and o-declensions case endings, the problem is that 96.4% of the occurrences case endings of the six ŭ-stem substantives belong to the ŭ-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 грѣхъ), 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 ŭ-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 ŭ-declension, and only 52 to the o-declension This means that there were more occurrences of ŭ-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 грѣхъ and грѣховъ, realising that it is not the re-use of the entire ŭ-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 грѣховы in I.pl. (nr. 273). But unfortunately the results did not show anything certain for the ŭ-declension substantives and their possible re-use of the ŭ-declension case endings.

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

case endings found with ŭ-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 ŭ-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 ŭ-stem substantives at this time had already come back to the ŭ-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 ŭ-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 ŭ- 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 ŭ-declension had disappeared already in the pre-writing period, and that the ŭ-declension case endings were being reused in the OCS period when the o-declension case endings were standard?

4) Why could the ŭ-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 references[55]

10.1 Source material

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

Bogdanova, S. E-corpus of *Menaeum 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 Frontistesa, http://ksana-k.ru. Downloaded PDF.

Jagić, I.V. 1883. Ягич, И.В. *Маріинское четвероевангеліе съ примѣчаніями и приложеніями.* In *Памятникъ глаголическая письменности.* Санктпетербургъ: Императорская Академия Наукъ, accessed July 23, 2012 at Biblioteka Frontistesa, 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.manuscript.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: Издалельство Болгарской Академии наук. Printed facsimile edition and downloaded DJVU, accessed November 13, 2016 at Biblioteka Frontistesa http://ksana-k.ru.

Krăstanov, T. et al. 1996. Кръстанов, Т., А.-М. Тотоманова, & И. Добрев. *Ватиканско Евангелие. Старобългарски кирилски апракос от X в. в палимпсестен кодекс Vat.Gr. 2502* = *Evangile de Vatican. Évangéliaire paléobulgare cyrillique du Xe siecle 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 Manuskript, 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 Frontistesa http://ksana-k.ru.

Rjabova, E.V. E-corpus of *Typograph Gospel* at the portal Manuskript, 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 Manuskript, 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 Frontistesa http://ksana-k.ru/cfl/05_und/und-karinsk.pdf accessed August 11, 2014. Downloaded PDF.

Velčeva, B. 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 Евангеліе 1056-1057 года.* Санктпетербургъ: Императорская Академія наукъ.

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

Zaimov, J. and M. Kapaldo. 1982-1983. Заимов, Й., 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 Philogie 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. Козловскій, М.М. "Изслѣдованіе о языкѣ Остромирова Евангелія". *Изслѣдованія по русскому языку. Томъ 1.* Санктпетербургъ: Императорская Академия Наукъ, accessed July 18, 2016 at Google Books. Downloaded PDF.

Krys′ko, V.B. (red). 2000. Крысько, В.Б. (ред). *Историческая грамматика древнерусского языка. Том 1. Множественное число именного склонения.* Москва: «Азбуковник».

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

Kuljbakin, S.M. 2008. S.M., Куљбакинъ, 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 Scentiarum Bohemoslovacae.

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 altbulgarischen (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 ŭ-stems and Their Contamination with the ŏ-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, Warzawa: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

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

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

Nandriş, 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.

Papazisovska, 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. "Източнославянски 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: государствнное издательство иностранных и национальных словарей.

Rodić, N. and G. Jovanović. 1986. Родић, Н., Г. Јовановић. *Мирослављево јеванђље (критичко издање) = L'évangéliaire de Miroslav. Édition critique.* Веоград: 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 второя. Тексты. Словарь. Очерки морфологии.* Москва: государственное учебно педагогическое издательство. Accessed at April 23, 2016 at at Biblioteka Frontistesa, 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 Frontistesa 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. *Матеріалы для словаря древне-русского языка по письменнымъ памятникамъ. Том третій 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 Святюю 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 редацкция 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/~tragott/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 Bibliotek.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

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

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

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

Vrana, J. 1961. *L' Évangéliaire 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 ѥ аште не бѫдеть ·нъ аште не пьхаѭ хвалимъ ѥ ·волове же аште не бѫдоуть кротъкы хвалимъ ·
G.pl.		
002	KOH/46v:06-07	·и дроугыи рече емоу ·сѫпрѧгъ воловь коупихъ пѧть ·и градѫ и искоусити ихь ·
003	MIR/199a:19	·и дроуги ре̄ ѥмю ·сюпругъ воловь кюпихь ·е̄·
004	MST/97b:02-03	·и дроугыи рече ѥмоу сѫпроугъ воловъ коупихъ ·е̄· и градоу и искоуситъ ихъ ·
005	SUP/19:01	абиѥ же приде стадо воловъ из горы ·
006	SUP/42:29	·и скотоу иже пригонѧтъ и приносѧтъ отъ лѣта на ст̄жѭ и славьнѫѭ памѧть · стада различь воловъ ·

1.2 Occurrences of връхъ/вьрхъ/врьхъ

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

1.3 Occurrences of грѣхъ

N.pl.		
007	ARC/32v:08	дьрзаи чадо ѿпоущаютъ ти сѧ грѣси твои
008	ARC/32v:14	чьто бо ѥстъ оудобеѥ рещи. ѿпоущаютьсѧ грѣси твои. ли рещи въстани и ходи.
009	ARC/49r:07	чл̄вче ѿпѫщаютъ ти сѧ грѣси твои
010	ARC/49r:18	чьто ѥсть оудобѣѥ рещи ослабленомоу. ѿпоущаютъ ти сѧ грѣси твои. или рещи въстани и ходи.
011	ARC/79r:16	чадо. ѿпоущаютьсѧ тобѣ грѣси твои
012	ARC/79v:06	что ѥсть оудобиѥ рещи. ослаблѥноуоумоу. ѿпоущають ти сѧ грѣси. или рещи въстани възьми одръ свои. и ходи.
013	ARC/131r:18	ѥго же ради гл̄ю ти.ѿпоущаютьсѧ грѣси ѥи мнози.
014	ARC/131v: 01	рече же ѥи ѿпоущають тӥ сѧ грѣси твои
015	ASS/39b:17	·дрьзаи чадо ·ѡтпоуштаѭтъ тӥ сѧ грѣсι твои ·
016	ASS/39c:03	чьто бо естъ оудобѣ рѣшти ·отъпоуштаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣсι ·ли рѣшти въстани и ходι ·
017	ASS/51b:12	·чл̄че отпоуштаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣсι твои ·
018	ASS/76a:01	чадо ·ѡтпоуштаѭтъ сѧ грѣси твои ·
019	ASS/76a:22-23	·чьто естъ оудобьнѣе рѣшти ослаюленомоу ·ѡтпоуштаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣсι ·ли рѣшти въстанι и възьми одръ твои и ходи ·
020	ASS/120r:12	ѡтъпоуштаѭтъ сѧ еи мнозии грѣсι ·
021	ASS/120r:16	ѡтпоуштаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои ·
022	DOB/47r:08	чл̄вче отъпоуща̄ютъ ти сѧ грѣси твои.

023	DOB/47r:19	чьто єсть оудобѣє реци.оставлѣѭть ти сѧ грѣси твои.ли реци вьстани и ходи.
024	DOB/57v:03	єгоже ради г҃лѭ ти.оставлѣѭть сѧ єи грѣси мнѻѕи.
025	DOB/57v:07	·рече же ки. оставлѣѭть ти сѧ грѣси твои.
026	DOB/01rC:08-09	чьто єсть оудобѣє реци ослаблен(..)мѻу отъпоущаѭть ти сѧ грѣси.ли реци вьстани.и в(ѻ)зьми ѻдрь свои и ходи.
027	DOB/06rC:14	·єда кѻдьга ѻбратѧть сѧ.и отъпоустѧть сѧ имь грѣси.
028	KOH/24v:17	·дрьзаи чадо ѿпоущаѭть ти сѧ грѣси твои·
029	KOH/25r:01	·что єсть оудобѣє реци ѿпоущаѭть ти сѧ грѣси твои·или реци вьстани и ходи·
030	KOH/42r:03	·ч҃лвѣче ѿпоущаѭт сѧ грѣси твои·
031	KOH/42r:12-13	что єсть оудобь реци ѡслабеномоу ·ѿпоущаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои ·или реци вьстани и иди·
032	KOH/54v:15	·чадо ѡтъпоущаѭть сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои ·бѣахѫ же...
033	KOH/55r:04	○...щаѭт сѧ грѣси твои·
034	KOH/102r:15	·ѿпоущаѭт сѧ грѣси єи мнѻзи·
035	KOH/102r:19	·рече же єи ·ѿпоущаѭт сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои·
036	MAR/04v	дрьзаи чадо отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ грѣси твои.
037	MAR/05r	чьто бо єстъ оудобѣє решти. отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ грѣси твои.ли реци вьставъ ходи.
038	MAR/46v	видѣвъ же и҃съ вѣрѫ ихъ. г҃ла ѡслабеноумоу. чадо отъпоуштаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои.
039	MAR/46v	что єстъ оудобѣє решти ѡслабеноумоу. отъпоуштаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси. ли реци вьстани и вьзьми ѻдръ твои и ходи.
040	MAR/49v	єда когда ѻбратѧтъ сѧ и отъпоустѧтъ сѧ имъ грѣси.
041	MAR/88v	і видѣвъ вѣрѫ (ихъ) рече ємоу. ч҃лвче отъпоуштаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои.
042	MAR/88v	что єсть оудо...бѣє решти. отъпоуштаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои. ли решти вьстани и ходи.
043	MAR/94v	єгоже ради г҃лѭ ти. отъпоуштаѭтъ сѧ єи грѣси мьнози. ѣко вьзлюби мъного.
044	MAR/94v	рече же єи отъпоущаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси.
045	MIR/92a:05	дрьзаи чедо ·ѿпущають се грѣси твои·
046	MIR/92a:12	·что асть удобѣє реци · ѿпуцають се грѣси твои ·или реци вьстани и ходи ·
047	MIR/112a:04	·єда когда ѻбратеть се и ѿпюстеть се имь грѣси ·
048	MIR/152b:20	чл҃че ѿпющають се тебѣ грѣси твои·
049	MIR/153a:12	что єсть оудобѣє реци ѡслаленумю ѿпющають се грѣси твои ·или реци вьстани и ходи ·
050	MIR/160a:04	ѿпющають сѧ єи грѣси мнози·
051	MIR/160a:09	рече же ди ѿпющають се тебѣ грѣси·
052	MIR/219b:04	чедо ѿпющають се тебѣ грѣсı твои·
053	MIR/219b:18-19	что єсть оудобѣє реци ѡслаленомю· ѿпющають ти се грѣси· или реци вьстани вьзми ѻдрь свои и ходи·
054	MST/41b:05-06	дьрзаи чадо ·отъпоущают сѧ грѣси твои·
055	MST/41b:13	·что бо єсть оудобѣѥ реци· отъпоущают сѧ грѣси твои· или реци вьставъ ходи.

056	MST/125c:13	·что бо ѥсть оудобѣѥ рещи ославлѥноуоумоу отъпоущають ти сѧ грѣси твои ·или рещи въстани възми одрь свои и ходи
057	MST/58c:19	·єда къгда обратѧт сѧ и оставѧть сѧ имъ грѣси
058	MST/74a:19-20	чловѣче ·отъпоущають ти сѧ грѣси твои ·
059	MST/74b:06	·что ѥсть оудобѣѥ рещи ославлѥноуноумѫ отъпоущають ти сѧ грѣси твои ·или рещи въстани и ходи ·
060	MST/77b:19	·кⷢго же ради глю ти отъпоущают сѧ ки грѣси мнози ꙗко…
061	MST/168d:22	·кⷢго же ради глю ти отъпоущают сѧ грѣси кꙗ мнозии…
062	MST/77b:23	·рече же ки отъпоущают сѧ тебе грѣси ·
063	MST/169:02	·рече же ки отъпꙋщают сѧ тебѣ грѣси ·
064	OST/67a:03	дьрзаи чадо отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ грѣси твои и…
065	OST/67a:18	чьто бо ѥсть оудобѣѥ рещи ·ославлѥноуоумоу отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ грѣси твои ·или рещи ·въстани и ходи ·
066	OST/130b:07	·чадо отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои
067	OST/130c:16	чьто ѥсть оудобѣѥ рещи ославлѥноуоумоу отъпоущаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси или рещи ·въстани възьми одръ твои и ходи
068	OST/91a:09	чловѣче· отъпоущаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои…
069	OST/91b:11	чьто ѥсть оудобѣѥ рещи ославлѥноуоумоу · отъпоущаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои· или рещи въстани и ходи
070	OST/223d:04	отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ ки грѣси мънози·
071	OST/223d:13	отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси и начашѧ…
072	SAV/38v:12	чадо ·отъдадатъ ти сѧ грѣси ·
073	SAV/38v:18	·что бо ꙋдобѣе речеши ·отдаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси ·или рещи въстани и ходи ·
074	SAV/49v:07	…рече емоу чл҃че ·отъпоущаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твоï ·
075	SAV/49v:15	·что естъ оудобѣе рещи ослабенꙋмоу · отъпоущаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твоï ·нъ…
076	SAV/77v:10	·чадо ·отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои ·
077	SAV/78v:01	·что естъ ꙋдобѣе рещи ·ослабеꙋмоу · отъпоущаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси ·ли рещи…
078	SAV/130v:15	·егоже ради гл҃ѭ ти отъпꙋщаѭтъ сѧ еі грѣси мнози ·
079	SAV/130v:17	·рече же еі отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси ·и начашѧ…
080	TUR/09r:01	·и видѣвъ вѣрѫ ихъ р҃е ѥмоу ·чловⷱче ѿпоущаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои ·
081	TUR/09r:11	·чьто ѥсть оудобѣѥ рещи ·ославлѥноуоумоу ѿпоущаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои ·ли рещи ·въстани и ходи ·
082	TYP/16b:13	·дьрзаи чадо ·ѿпоущають ти сѧ грѣси твои ·
083	TYP/16c:01	·что бо ѥсть оудобѣѥ рещи ославленꙗмꙋ · ѿпꙗщають ти сіа грѣси твои ·ли рещи въставъ ходи
084	TYP/62b:21	·гл҃а ославленоуоумоу ·чадо ѿпоущають сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои ·бꙗхоу же…
085	TYP/62c:14	·что ѥсть оудобѣѥ рещи ославленоуꙋмоу · ѿпꙗщають ти сѧ грѣси ·ли рещи въстани і възьми одрь твои ·
086	TYP/65c:24	·єда къгда обратать сѧ и ѿпꙗстать сѧ имъ грѣси ·и гл҃а…
087	TYP/104b:13	· і видѣвъ вѣроу ихъ рече ѥмоу. чл҃че ѿпоущають ти сѧ грѣси твои ·
088	TYP/104c:02	·что к оудобѣѥ рещи ѿпоуштають ти сѧ грѣси твоі ·ли рещи въстани и ходи ·
089	VAT/08v:04	·гл҃а ославеноуоумоу · чадо отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ грѣси твои ·

090	VAT/08v:15	чьто естъ оудобѣѥ реци ослабѥноумоу ·отъпоущаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси ·ли реци въстани и възьми одръ твои и ходи·
091	VAT/52r:19-20	·егоже ради глаголѭ ти ·отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ еи грѣси мъноѕи·
092	VAT/52r:23	·рече же еи отъпоущаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси ·и начашѧ ...
093	VUK/42a:16	дрьзаи чедо ·ѿпоуштають ти се грѣси твои·
094	VUK/42a:24	чьто бо ѥсть реци оудобѣѥ: ѿпоуштають ти се грѣси твои:или реци въставь ходи
095	VUK/62a:14	ѥда когда ѡбратеть се и ѿпоустеть се имь грѣси:
096	VUK/142b:13	чедо ѿпоуштають ти се тебѣ грѣси твои:
097	VUK/142c:03	что ѥсть оудобѣе реци: ѡслабленомоу ѿпоуштають ти се грѣси:или реци въстани ·вьзми ѡдрь свои ходи
098	VUK/85c:14	ѥгоже ради глю ти ѿпоуштають се еи грѣси мнози
099	VUK/85c:20	рече же ѥи ѿпоуштають се тебѣ грѣси твои
100	VUK/81c:15	чловѣче ѿпоущають ти се грѣси твои
101	VUK/81d:04-05	чьто ѥсть оудобѣе реци ѡслабленомоу:ѿпоущають ти се грѣси твои:или реци въстани ходи
102	ZOG/17r:11	·дръзаи чѧдо отъпоуштаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои·
103	ZOG/17r:20	чьто бо естъ оудобѣе решти ·отъпоуштаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои ·ли решти въставъ ходи·
104	ZOG/80 (74)v:15	·чѧдо отъпоуштаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои·
105	ZOG/81(75)r:06	чьто естъ оудобѣе решти ослабленоуемоу ·отъпоуштаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси ·ли решти ·въстани ·ı възьми одръ твои ·ı ходи
106	ZOG/85 (79)r:05	·егда обратѧтъ сѧ ·ı отъпоустѧтъ сѧ імъ грѣси·
107	ZOG/147r:07	·члче отъпоуштаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твоı·
108	ZOG/147r:20	чьто естъ оудобѣе решти ослабленоуемоу ·отъпоуштаѭтъ ти сѧ грѣси твоı· ли решти въстани ı ходи·
109	ZOG/157v:14	егоже ради глѭ ти ·отъпоуштаѭтъ сѧ еı грѣси мнозиı·
110	ZOG/157v:19	рече же еı отъпоуштаѭтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси·
111	SUP/108:11	и акы агньци посрѣдоу влъкъ расхыштени быхомъ ·съключишѧ бо насъ грѣси свои·
112	SUP/127:04	нъ толико оуне ѥлико вольнии грѣси неповольнъиимъ·
113	SUP/135:19	·нъ грѣси ваши растоѧтъ посрѣдоу насъ и ба·
114	SUP/211:12	·и гласъ из него бъістъ ·въстанѣ та глагола и покаита сѧ ·и грѣси ваю оставьаѭтъ сѧ·
115	SUP/395:16	отъпоуштаѭтъ сѧ грѣси ѥи мнозии·
116	SUP/484:25	·дашѧ же и трьсть вь рѫцѣ ѥго ·да въпишѫтъ сѧ грѣси ихъ·
117	1073/28c:02	·и милостьми и вѣрами ·оучиштаѭтъ сѧ грѣси·
118	1073/44d:08	·да не и обличатъ сѧ грѣси ихъ·
119	1073/44c:24	·дроугъиихъ члкъ грѣси прѣдиавлѥни соутъ ведоуште на соудъ·
120	1073/86c:15	·милостынѣми рече и вѣрами оцѣштаѭтъ сѧ грѣси милостынѭ же не ѣже...
121	1073/99c:27	·нъ грѣси ваши растоіатъ межѫ вами и бѣмь·
122	1073/101c:09	·оумножиша сѧ нъ грѣси ихъ велици соутъ ѕѣло·
123	1073/103b:24	·охоуждаѥтъ же пламена грѣси ·соутъ же доуси иже...

124	1073/106d:13	·не бо кште рече исплъниша сѧ грѣси аморѣисции доселѣ ·
125	1073/123a:29-123b:01	въпросъ ·ции грѣси праштаѭть сѧ по съмрьти ·
126	1073/139d:17-18	·кште не наплъниша сѧ грѣси ·аморѣисции ·
127	1073/141c:05	·бечисла же грѣси соуть твои ·
128	1073/193d:24	·нъ исходѧштии грѣси отъ чл҃ка ·то сквьрьнить чл҃ка ·
129	1076/157r:08	ꙗко оугь на /мразъ /тако растають сѧ грѣси твои:
130	1076/189r:05	наводѧть ли сѧ оубо и доселѣ ·грѣси оц҃ь на чѧда ·
131	1076/189v:04	наидоуть грѣси оц҃ь вашихъ на въі ·
132	1076/189v:13	ꙗко нехрьштенъіихъ наводѧть сѧ грѣси оц҃ь нечьстивъіихъ на сн҃ъі зълъіꙗ:
133	1076/200v:08	тако грѣси и отирають сѧ
134	1076/242r:09	тако и грѣси таимии ·и д҃шѫ и тѣло оумарѭть ·
G.pl.		
135	ARC/14r:12	и проповѣдати сѧ въ имѧ кго. покаание въ ѿпоущеник грѣховъ.въ вьсѣхъ ꙗзъіцѣхъ.
136	ARC/94v:19	се бо ксть крьвь моꙗ. новааго завѣта. ꙗже за многъі проливакма. въ оставлкник грѣховъ.
137	ARC/150r:15	бъі(с) іѡ҃нъ крьститель въ поустъіни. проповѣдаꙗ крьщеник . покаꙗнню въ ѿпоущеник грѣховъ.
138	ARC/151r:06	и приде въ всю страноу иоудеискоу. проповѣдаꙗ кр҃щеник на покаꙗник грѣховъ и въ ѿпоущеник.
139	ARC/142v:18	тъ сп҃сеть люди своꙗ ѿ грѣхъ ихъ.
140	ASS/28c:18	·и проповѣдаті сѧ въ имѧ его ·покаанию и отъпоуштению грѣхоховъ въ ·всѣхь ꙗзъіцѣхъ ·
141	ASS/137b:23-24	·бъі иоанъ кр҃стѧ въ поустъіни ·проповѣдаѩ кр҃штение въ оставление грѣховъ исхождааше же кь немоу ·
142	ASS/131b:05	·тъ бо сп҃сеть люді своѭ оть грѣхъ ихъ ·
143	DOB/34v:03	дати разоумь сп҃сениѣ людемь его.вь оставение грѣхъ нашихь
144	KOH/9r:04	·и проповѣдати сѧ вь имѧ его ·покаание вь ѡставление грѣховъ ·вь въсѣхъ ѧзъіцѣхь ·
145	KOH/70v:09	·се есть крьвь моа новааго завѣта ·и проливаема за многъі ·вь ѡставление грѣховь ·
146	KOH/113v:02	·ть бо сп҃сеть люди своѧ ѿ грѣхь ихь
147	MAR/81r	дати разоумъ сп҃сниѣ людемъ его въ отъпоуштение грѣховъ іхъ.
148	MAR/132v	въ имѧ его покаанию. і отъпоуштению грѣховъ въ вьсѣхъ ꙗзъіцѣхъ.
149	MIR/316a:22-23	·и ть спасеть люди свое ѿ грѣхь ихь ·
150	MIR/46b:04	·и проповѣдати се вь име его ·покаѣние ѿпющение грѣховь ·вь всѣхь езъіцѣхь...
151	MIR/253a:02-03	се дсть крьвь моѣ новаго завѣта ·проливаема за въі за многие ·вь ѿпющение грѣховь ·
152	MIR/326a:22	бъі иоань кр҃стеи вь пюстъіни ·и проповѣдае кр҃щение покаѣниѣ ·вь оставление грѣховь ·
153	MIR/327a:23	и приде вь всю страноу ердань-скоую ·проповѣдае кр҃щение на покаѣние ·вь оставление грѣховь ·ѣкоже...

154	MIR/342a:13	·дати разюмь спсениѣ людемь его ·вь оставление грѣхь ихь ·
155	MST/209c:07	·и проповѣдати сѧ въ има кго покаанию въ оставлкник грѣховъ ·
156	MST/142d:04	се ксть крьвь моіа новааго завѣта іаже за многы проливаю ма въ оставлкник грѣховъ ·
157	MST/185a:24	проповѣдаіа крьщеник на покаіаник въ оставлкник грѣховъ ·
158	MST/180a:22	·тъ бо спсеть люди слоіа отъ грѣхъ ихъ ·
159	OST/159a:01	се ксть крьвь моіа ·новааго завѣта проливакмаіа за мъногы ·въ оставлкник грѣховъ·
160	OST/255c:14	бысть иоанъ крьста въ поустыни· и проповѣдаіа крьщеник покаанию· въ отъпоущеник грѣховъ исхождааше…
161	OST/258a:16	·проповѣдаіа крьщеник на покааник·въ отъпоущеник грѣховъ·іако…
162	OST/248a:03	тъ бо спсетъ люди своіа отъ грѣхъ ихъ
163	SAV/146r:07	проповѣдаіа крьщеник на покаане въ отъпоущеник грѣховъ ·
164	SAV/159r:03	·и проповѣдати сѧ въ има кго покааник въ отъпоущеник грѣховъ ·въ вьсѣхъ іазыцѣхъ ·
165	SAV/137v:09	·тъ бо спетъ люди своіа отъ грѣхъ ихъ се же все бысть ·
166	TYP/100a:02	·проповѣдаіа крще (folio 99 is without text in the e-corpus) …ѱнькпокааниіа въ ѿпѫщенькь грѣховъ ·
167	TYP/136d:18	·и проповѣдати сіа въ има кго покаанию ·въ ѿп8щеник грѣховъ ·
168	TYP/04a:18	·тъ бо спсеть люди своіа ѿ грѣхъ ихъ ·
169	TYP/96b:08	·дати разоумъ спсниіа людемъ кго въ оставлекник грѣхъ нашихъ ·
170	VAT/178v:11	·се естъ крьвь моіа новааго завѣта · проливаемаіа за мъногы ·въ отъданик грѣховъ ·
171	VAT/46v:07	·тъ бо спсеть люди слоіа отъ грѣхъ ихъ ·
172	VAT/99r:16	·дати разоумъ съпасеиіа людемъ его въ отъпоуштеник грѣхъ нашихъ ·
173	VUK/161a:10	се ксть крьвь моіа новаго завѣта:проливакмаіа за вы и за многик вь ѿпоущеник грѣховь :
174	ZOG/136r:02-03	дати разоумъ спсеньѣ людемъ его въ оставленье въ отъпоуштенье грѣхъ нашихъ
175	ZOG/141r:02	…крьштение на покаанье·въ отъпоуштенье грѣховъ ·ѣко…
176	DUB/03r:21	·моли ха бга грѣховъ оставление подати чьтоуиимъ любъвью память твою:
177	DUB/06v:20	·іакоже дроуга тѧ присна ·исва тѧ блажимъ ·варфаломѣе въпиюште ти ·грѣховъ оставление подати
178	PUT/08v:11	·молите сѧ оставлкник дровати грѣховъ ·и велиіа млсти:
179	PUT/10v:08	·боурю помышлкниіа наитиіа грѣховъ ·и искѫшение боурьнок ·
180	PUT/12r:15-16	·стрпца хва доблаіа ·грѣховъ оставлкник испросита всѣхъ ·
181	PUT/57r:03	·и отъ жени мракъ грѣховъ нашихъ ·мольбами ти прчстьнаго…
182	PUT/60v:09	·просѧште приимати оставлкник грѣховъ ·твоіа страсти…
183	PUT/82r:05	·дсь праздьноующемъ ·грѣховъ раздрѣшениіа просимъ ·
184	PUT/95v:07	·прославлкнааго настѣиго оумрьщеник грѣховъ ·прѣжде съмрѣти съвлече сѧ…

185	PUT/100v:17	·исповѣдажщимъ ти прⷱ҇та ·грѣховъ просимъ раздрѣшение оулоучити ·
186	PUT/120v:07	·прѣдъ стоиши х҃ви женихоу свокмоу ·моли отъ грѣховъ нъı избавити сѧ ·
187	PUT/122r:13	·въпикмъ кмоу стрⷪ҇пче великъıмⷱ҇че ·проси вьсѣмъ грѣховъ очищеник:
188	PUT/134v:16	·стрⷪ҇пче великъıи ·моли г҃а грѣховъ оставлкник подати ·
189	PUT/59v:05	…молити сѧ о насъ ·да избоудемъ отъ грѣхъ ·инъıвъ вѣкъ всѧ: ·
190	PUT/59v:12	·просимъ проштениıа отъ грѣхъ ·прилѣжьно молıаште сѧ ·
191	PUT/64v:08	… отъ искоушениıа и боурıа же искрьби ·и отъ грѣхъ избавити сѧ ·праздьноуıжштимъ…
192	PUT/77r:05	·рождьшиıа свѣтъ ·и оставлкник грѣхъ ·и дш҃амъ сп҃сеник ·
193	PUT/78r:05	·присно праздьноуıжщимъ трьжьство ·и отъ грѣхъ избавите ·
194	PUT/85r:02	·поточıаште отъ гроба вашихъ ·и отъ грѣхъ избавлıажще ·вашими мл҃твами ·
195	SUP/353:09	·се кстъ плъть моıа за въıломимаıа въ оставькник грѣховъ ·
196	SUP/390:25	·и възъмати отъ него непогоненик грѣховъ нашихъ ·
197	SUP/493:25	·то оубо въсталъ жзъı съмрьтьнъııа растрьгнжвъ ·ни же въскрѣсилъ ·пленица нашихъ грѣховъ раздрѣшивъ ·
198	SUP/05:30	· недостоиномъ сжштем грѣхъ ради нашихъ ·
199	SUP/394:05	·приходѫштиихъ покаıаник строıа ·и сихъ грѣхъ праштал ·
200	SUP/108:20	·своими кръвьми очистите сѧ отъ грѣхъ и кже плътиж побѣждени бъıсте ·
201	SUP/235:11	·и моли сѧ за мѧ да избѫдѫ грѣхъ моихъ ·
202	SUP/436:24	·тъ же ıазвьнъ бъıстъ грѣхъ ради нашихъ ·
203	SUP/469:12	·да разметаıж твоихъ грѣхъ врѣмѧ ·
204	SUP/483:05	·истече бо крьвь и вода из дребръ хрьстовъ ·да и рѫкоѳаньк грѣхъ нашхъ загладитъ ·
205	SUP/524:28	·прости мѧ брате ·каıати себе и плакати велилъıих моихъ грѣхъ ·
206	1073/30a:22-23	нарицаıаи бо оц҃а б҃а ·и оставлкник грѣховъ ·
207	1073/37a:06	·такоже и чл҃къ алъча отъ грѣховъ своихъ и пакъı…
208	1073/37d:26-27	·ıако аште и горькъ соудъ приимемъ ·отъ пьрвъıихъ грѣховъ ·
209	1073/45a:11	·имьже подобоврѣдьни сжть кдинъ бо б҃ъ можеть ·прашати грѣховъ ·
210	1073/50d:02	·и обличати несамохотьнъıихъ бьратии грѣховь нь прѣдаıати земли…
211	1073/53a:22	·и четъıре десѧти дьнъ мниши на очиштеник грѣховъ вьсего лѣта ·
212	1073/63b:22	·оставленъ бъı и лазарь и раслабленъıи нъ въ оставление грѣховъ ·
213	1073/63d:07	·или еже хоулити себе ·или прѣдьниихъ ради грѣховъ ·
214	1073/69b:29	·а такоже своихъ грѣховъ сжть плоди своıа зълı ·
215	1073/70b:04-05	·тоже не грѣховъ оуто ради · ї҃wвъ бо женож…

216	1073/70b:08-09	·и тъ же не грѣховъ ради ·
217	1073/70b:10	·нъ имьже е чл҃къ боле грѣховъ ради своꙗ ратьникъ...
218	1073/70b:15	·многашьды же и дроузии въ враждю соу съвраштають сѧ грѣховъ ради ·
219	1073/70a:25-26	·пытаꙗ кыихъ бѫдоу грѣховъ ради братиꙗ ратьници не имьже...
220	1073/70a:28	...ратьници не имьже вьси грѣховъ дѣла отъ братиꙗ рать имоуть ·
221	1073/70d:11	·ельмаже грѣховъ ради многашьды б҃ъ ꙗ въставлꙗеть на ны ·
222	1073/107a:14	·ꙗвѣ есте обаче же не вси злоѭ съмрьтиѭ оумираѭштии грѣховъ дѣлѧ ·
223	1073/144d:04	·иже кго зълаꙗ пооуштениꙗ самовольныхъ грѣховъ ·
224	1073/156a:06	·дасть намъ ꙗсти и пити ·въ оставлкник грѣховъ ·
225	1073/176b:08-09	·ино же ксть грѣхоу оставлкник да къжьдо оубо своихъ грѣховъ приобрѣтактъ оставлкник ·
226	1073/176c:15	...грѣха не могоуть творити ·въ оставлкник грѣховъ по истинѣ крьстꙗть сѧ ·
227	1073/188b:23-24	·и въ мечь и не оправьди неправьдъ ихъ ·и грѣховъ ихъ отъ лица свокго не заглади ·
228	1073/193b:08	·б҃ъ бо вѣсть иже хоштеть пытати грѣховъ ·
229	1073/247d:25	проповѣдати о имени свокмь покаꙗзни ·и оставлкниѭ грѣховъ ·
230	1073/28c:12	·ни рьци штедроты б҃жи многы да множьство грѣхъ моихъ оцѣстить ·
231	1073/33c:14	·ꙗкоже да очистить сѧ ·чловѣкъ отъ грѣхъ своихъ ·
232	1073/44c:19	·по съмьрти и вреждаюмꙑихъ ·грѣхъ и погꙑбаѭштиихъ д҃шь отъ зълааго своего оучениꙗ тации ·
233	1073/46a:06	·мѫжь или жена ·иже аште сътворить отъ грѣхъ чл҃вчьскꙑихъ ·
234	1073/48b:18	не обиди исповѣдати своихъ грѣхъ ·
235	1073/54a:09	·ти ꙗкоже всѣхъ грѣхъ всꙗкъ иже аште сътворить чловѣкъ кромѣ... ·
236	1073/59d:03	·мѧтежь мнить отъ грѣхъ бываѭштии ·
237	1073/99b:29	·намъ же лѣпо к вѣдѣти ·ꙗко грѣхъ нашихъ дѣла ·
238	1073/99c:29-99d:01	·и грѣхъ вашихъ ради обрати лице свок отъ васъ ·
239	1073/99d:29	·и разоумѣѭть всꙗ страны ·ꙗко грѣхъ своихъ дѣльма ·
240	1073/103a:17	·и поражѫ вы азъ седмишьды ·въ грѣхъ вашихъ место ·
241	1073/147b:21-22	·нъ пленицами своихъ грѣхъ къжьдо въплитактъ сѧ ·
242	1076/26v:03-04	·проштениꙗ трѣбоуꙗ грѣховъ ·
243	1076/98v:01	·больша себѣ врѣмена грѣховъ събираꙗ не чюꙗши ·
244	1076/197r:06	·и ꙗкоже бескврьньнаꙗ жрьтва въ проштеник грѣховъ нашимъ приносить сѧ господоу б҃оу: ·
245	1076/207r:01	ꙗко оубо вьсꙗка жрьтва б҃оу приносима въ отъпоуштеник грѣховъ отъ б҃а чл҃вкмъ...

246	1076/210v:01	·дарова намъ б̄г̄ различьнꙑ жрьтвꙑ въ отъпоуштение грѣховъ ·
247	1076/212r:07-08	·не тъкмо отъпоуштение грѣховъ не дасть сꙗ имъ:
248	1076/221r:12	паче инѣхъ прочиихъ грѣховъ ксть:
249	1076/223v:07	·ꙗко простилъ и ксть б̄ъ грѣховъ кго:
250	1076/226r:02-03	·не бꙑсть оубо свободьнъ своихъ грѣховъ ·
251	1076/226v:01	·ꙗко истистиньнок знамение прощение грѣховъ хрьстꙑаноу се ксть:
252	1076/241r:05	:злат̄: ѡ исповѣдани грѣховъ:
253	1076/242r:13	·велико бо добро исповѣдание грѣховъ ·
254	1076/37v:07	·и мошꙑшлꙗꙗ въиноу ѡ мъножьствѣ грѣхъ своихъ ·
255	1076/178v:05	·и въ врѣмꙗ грѣхъ ѡбрати сꙗ къ г̄оу ·
256	1076/142r:13-142v:01	бл̄гословление г̄не:кже отъстоупити отъ грѣхъ ·
257	1076/172v:05	·ако крꙑю сꙗ грѣхъ ради моихъ ·
258	1076/134v:04	·и мъножьство грѣхъ моихъ оцѣстить милость бо и гнѣвъ оу него ксть ·
259	1076/104r:01	·ни же поносити ѡбраштꙗюштꙗ сꙗ отъ грѣхъ:
260	1076/118r:10-11	·о чл̄вче сего дѣлꙗ бꙑваꙗть да сꙗ очистити чл̄вкъ отъ грѣхъ своихъ ·
261	1076/126r:06	·да некꙑли скꙑрби ради оцѣштше сꙗ отъ грѣхъ своихъ
262	1076/128v:13	·да бꙑ вь семь мирѣ казнь приꙗлъ и моук8 грѣхъ своихъ дѣльма ·
263	1076/188r:02	кꙑи ксть грѣхъ тꙗжии вьсѣхъ грѣхъ:
264	1076/217v:03	: и прочек не съдѣю древльнихъ моихъ грѣхъ ·
265	1076/251v:12	·не мозѣмъ небрещи малꙑихъ грѣхъ да не въ великꙑꙗ въпадемъ ·
I.pl.		
266	PUT/02r:01	·милости мꙗ съподоби ·неначакмаго многꙑми грѣхꙑ
267	PUT/59v:06	·просвѣти влч̄це ·омрачено многꙑми грѣхꙑ ср̄це мок ·
268	PUT/60r:03	·просвѣти мл̄стве ·омраченокми грѣхꙑ ср̄це твоꙗ ст̄ꙑс̄ъ писаюшѣте…
269	SUP/390:11	·оудовь перꙗть къ творцоу и владꙑцѣ ·и своими грѣхꙑ сами сꙗ оувѣштаваꙗть ·
270	SUP/525:06	·и инѣми осквьрнивъ сꙗ большиими того грѣхꙑ ·
271	1073/44c:16	·а ꙗкоже съ своими грѣхꙑ имоуть въслѣдъ градоущь ·
272	1073/171d:10-11	·и женꙑ събьранꙑ грѣхꙑ ·водимꙑ похотьми различьнꙑими ·
273	1073/193c:21	·и ѡг̄ла и нехоудѣ ·нъ великꙑми хоулами и грѣховꙑ ·
274	1073/200b:28	·и въ злохꙑтроу дш̄ѫ не вълѣзеть моудрость ·ни въселить сꙗ въ тѣло оусквьрнено грѣхꙑ ·
275	1073/211a:15	·невѣддоуште ꙗко своими грѣхꙑ болии собѣ събираꙗть огнь ·
L.pl.		
276	ARC/10r:16	въ грѣсѣхъ тꙑ родилъсꙗ кси вьсь.
277	ASS/18a:06 x)	·рѣхъ оубо вамъ ѣко оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ
278	ASS/18a:10 x)	ѣко азъ есмь ·оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ

279	ASS/25d:21	·въ грѣсѣхъ тъи родилъ са еси весь ·
280	DOB/148r:17-18	ѣко оумрете вь грѣсѣхь вашихь:
281	DOB/148r:19-148v:01	аще бо вѣры не емлете ѣко азь есмь:оумрете вь грѣсѣхь вашихь:
282	DOB/153r:18	вь грѣсѣхъ ты родиль са еси весь.
283	KOH/5v:06	·въ грѣсѣхъ ты родил са еси весь ·
284	MAR/149v	рѣхъ оубо вамъ ѣко оумьрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ.
285	MAR/149v	аште бо вѣры не емлете ѣко азъ есмъ. оумьрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ.
286	MAR/152v	отъвѣшташа и рѣша емоу. въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъ са еси весь.
287	MIR/28a:17	рѣхь бо вамь ѣко вьмьрете вь грѣсѣхь вашихь.
288	MIR/28a:20	аще оубо вѣры не имете ѣко азь есмь·и оумрете вь грѣсѣхь вашихь.
289	MIR/41b:21-22	вь грѣсѣхь ты родиль се дси вьсь.
290	MST/14b:07	·рекохъ оубо вамъ ·ιако оумьрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
291	MST/20a:03	·отъвѣщаша и рекоша кмоу ·въ грѣсѣхъ родилъ са кси вьси...
292	OST/28c:01	рекохъ оубо вамъ ιако оумьрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ
293	OST/40d:02	въ грѣсѣхъ родилъ са кси вьсь ·
294	TYP/152a:17	·ιако ȣмьрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
295	TYP/152a:19-20	·ȣмьрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
296	TYP/155a:01-02	...и рекоша кмоу ·въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъ сιа кси вьсь ·
297	VAT/66v:17	·рѣхъ оубо вамъ ако оумьрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·аще бо вѣры не емлете ·ако азь ксмь ·
298	VAT/66v:18-19	... азъ ксмь ·оумьрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
299	VAT/44v:20	...рѣша кмоу · въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъ са кси вьсь ·
300	VUK/15d:21-22	рѣхь оубо вамь ιако оумрете вь грѣсѣхь вашихь ·
301	VUK/15d:24-25	ιако азь ксмь ·оумрете вь грѣсѣхь вашихь.
302	VUK/21d:02	Ѿвѣщаше и рѣше кмоу ·вь грѣсѣхь ти родиль се кси весь ·
303	ZOG/251r:14	рѣхъ оубо ѣко оумьрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
304	ZOG/251r:16-17	...не емлете азъ ксмь ·оумьрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
305	ZOG/256v:15	отъвѣшташа ι рѣша емоу ·въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъ са еси вьсь ·
306	1073/29a:03-04	·ни калιажштоуȣмоу са въ грѣсѣхъ страстьныихъ ·
307	1073/32b:08	иже бо въ грѣсѣхъ быъше ти не покаιавъше са ·
308	1073/36b:13	и въ грѣсѣхъ кго ιаже съгрѣши въ тѣхъ оумьре ·
309	1073/42b:04-05	·смокъве обычаи кстъ писанию нарицати ·соуштоую о грѣсѣхъ дш͡ȣ ·
310	1073/44a:22	·и не оустыди са исповѣдати о грѣсѣхъ своихъ ·

311	1073/48a:01	·овомоу въ грѣсѣхъ живѫштоу кльмаже и велиꙑи…
312	1073/48c:04	къ тъчьнꙑимъ о своихъ грѣсѣхъ чл҃комъ не срамлꙗи сѧ·
313	1073/50a:29	·такоже оубо и намъ о грѣсѣхъ кажштаꙗ сѧ отълоучати подоба·
314	1073/50d:15-16	·ꙗко соуште нѣ въ кꙑихъ грѣсѣхъ·
315	1073/56c:12	·и до съмьрти обꙑчаꙗ ради зъла ·въ грѣсѣхъ прѣбꙑвъша·
316	1073/56d:13	въ грѣсѣхъ бо не видѣ пꙑтакмъ ксть тъчьѭ грѣховьнꙑи·
317	1073/56c:28-29	·кже бо съ оусьрдиемъ жити въ грѣсѣхъ нравъ нѣкакъ зълочьстивъ дш҃амъ вътварꙗкть·
318	1073/70d:22	·хоштеши ли видѣти падение борѭштиихъ сѧ съ тобоѭ покаи сѧ о грѣсѣхъ и врази твои падоуть·
319	1073/83a:22-23	·ꙗко не послоушаѭ тебе ·еште же и въ грѣсѣхъ бꙑвъшеи·
320	1073/91c:29-91d:01	·иже такꙑꙗ винꙑ виноуѭть въ грѣсѣхъ своихъ·
321	1073/99d:07-08	·и прьсти ваши въ грѣсѣхъ·
322	1073/102d:16	·ранами седмишьдꙑ ·о грѣсѣхъ вашихъ и съкроушѫ роукъ величиꙗ вашего·
323	1073/146d:08	·нъ къжьдо въ грѣсѣхъ своихъ да оумроуть·
324	1073/159c:06	·жрьтвꙑ и приноса не въсхотѣхъ вьсесъжигакмꙑхъ и иже о грѣсѣхъ не възиска·
325	1073/182c:18	·такоже пристоупаѭштааго къ мѫжѫ грѣшьноу ·и примѣшаѭштааго сѧ въ грѣсѣхъ кго·
326	1076/12r:13	·скорби о грѣсѣхъ·
327	1076/51v:09	·иже бо по вьсꙗ часꙑ отъвѣтъ дати о своихъ грѣсѣхъ чл҃кти·
328	1076/154v:05	·и о грѣсѣхъ своихъ помоли сѧ·
329	1076/87v:02	·нъ живоуштааго въ грѣсѣхъ и въ нечаꙗнии:
330	1076/87v:04	ꙗко аште о грѣсѣхъ болимъ и печалоукмъ сѧ:
331	1076/87v:09	·да о грѣсѣхъ тъчьѭ болимъ·
332	1076/87v:13	ꙗко аште наоукъ имѣкши о грѣсѣхъ·
333	1076/196v:04	аште въ грѣсѣхъ въпадъ къто състарѣкть сѧ·
334	1076/210r:09	·да понеже чл҃вци соуште плътꙗни и немоштьни въ мнозѣхъ грѣсѣхъ соуште:
335	1076/217r:10	аште въ грѣсѣхъ състарѣвь сѧ чл҃вкъ·
336	1076/241v:05	·и мꙑ и къ тои тъчъно о своихъ грѣсѣхъ не срамлꙗкмъ сѧ къ чловекомъ·

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

1.4 Occurrences of дългъ

		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 бꙑша ·
339	1073/134d:03	·б҃а распꙑтаютъ ·домꙑ и храмъ бꙑваютъ бж҃ии и причастьникъ того цр҃сьства ∴
G.pl.		
340	DOB/05r:06	·аще не имать приꙗти сторицеж нꙑнѣ.вь врѣмѧ се домовь.и братиж и сестрь.и о҃ца и матере.
341	MAR/63r	аште не иматъ приꙗти съторицеж въ врѣмѧ се нꙑнѣ домовъ и братрꙗ и сестръ. і о҃тца и матеръ и чадъ и селъ.
342	MIR/136b:17	·аще не имать приетı сторицею ·нн҃ѣ вь врѣме се домовь и брате и сестрь ·
343	TYP/79a:24	·аще не имать приꙗти съторцею нꙑнѣ въ врѣмѧ се ·домовъ и братьꙗ и сестръ ·
344	VUK/119b:16	аще не имать прикти съторицею:нн҃ѣ вь врѣме се домовь и братиꙗ и сестрꙑ и ѿце и матере:
345	SUP/35:08	·сь свѣштами исходѧште из домовь своихъ ·
346	SUP/267:24	·то оуже к том꙼ не помьнѧтъ ни домовь ни чада ·
347	SUP/432:24	·то имѣниꙗ ли въсхотѣ небрѣгꙑи имѣниꙗ ·домовь ли штоуждиихъ ·
L.pl.		
348	ARC/158r:13	иже мѧкъка носѧть. въ домѣхъ ц(с)рихъ соуть.
349	ASS/143r:13	·се іже мѧкькаѣ носѧтъ ·въ домохъ цр҃иихъ сѫтъ ·
350	MAR/08v	се иже мѧкъка носѧтъ. въ домохъ ц(с)рихъ сѫть.
351	MIR/71b:12	·се кже мекька носеть ·вь домохь цр҃хь сють ·
352	MST/34d:15	·се кже мѧкъка носѧть въ домѣхъ цѣсариихъ соуть ·
353	MST/192b:25	·се кже мѧкъкаꙗ носѧще въ домѣхъ ц҃срихъ соуть ·
354	OST/267b:02	се иже мѧкъкаꙗ носѧть ·въ домѣхъ цр҃ихъ сѫть…
355	TYP/20d:22	·се иже мѧкъкаꙗ носѧть · въ домѣхъ цр҃ихъ соуть ·
356	VAT/67v:25	се иже мѧкъкаꙗ носѧтъ · въ домохъ цр҃ихъ сѫтъ ∴
357	VUK/36b:17-18	се иже мекькаꙗ носеть вь домохь цр҃ихь соуть:
358	ZOG/23r:23	·се іже мѧкка носѧтъ · въ домохъ цр҃ихъ сѫть ·
359	1073/69b:08	·мнози оубо въ домѣхъ рати имоуть ·
360	1073/84c:07-08	·и бѫдеть грабленик въ домѣхъ вашихъ ·

1.6 Occurrences of медъ

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

1.7 Occurrences of полъ

G.pl.		
361	ASS/153r:13	и клѧтъ сѧ еи ·ѣко егоже просиши дамъ ти ·до полъ цр҃сьства моего ·
362	MAR/54r	егоже аште просиши дамь ти. до полъ цр҃ствиѣ моего.
363	OST/287d:03	егоже аще просиши дамь ти ·до полъ цр҃ьства мокго…
364	VAT/18v:10	∴ꙗко кгоже аще просиши ·дамь ти ·до полъ цр҃ствиꙗ мокго ∴

| 365 | ZOG/92r:13 | …ѣко егоже аште просиши и дамь ти до полъ цр҃сиѣ моего · |

1.6 Occurrences of сынъ

N.pl.		
366	ARC/01v:03	и тъ иж него пиктъ. и сн҃ове кго. и скоти кго.
367	ARC/12v:03	доидеже свѣтъ имате. вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да сн҃ове свѣтоу боудете
368	ARC/12v:08	доидеже свѣтъ имате. вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да сн҃ове свѣтоу боудете.
369	ARC/25r:07	да боудете сн҃ове оц҃а вашего иже кстъ на нб҃сьхъ.
370	ARC/30v:10	а сн҃ове цр(с)твиа изгънани боудоуть. въ тьмоу кромѣшинюю.
371	ARC/37r:17	рече кмоу іс҃ъ.ибо свободьни ли соуть сн҃ове.
372	ARC/50r:09	и боудеть мьзда ваша мънога. и боудете сн҃ове вышьнлаго.
373	ARC/87v:21	дондеже свѣтъ имате. вѣроуите въ свѣтъ. да сн҃ове свѣта боудете.
374	ARC/178r:21	а доброк сѣма си соуть сн҃ве цр҃ства
375	ARC/178r:22	плевели соуть сн҃ове неприазни[н]ии.
376	ASS/19b:18	·и ть из него питъ ·и сн҃ве егшо и скоті его ·
377	ASS/27b:24	·дондеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтѣ ·да сн҃ве свѣта бѫдете∵
378	ASS/27c:03	·доньдеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтѣ ·да сн҃ве свѣта бѫдете∵
379	ASS/33d:21	·и изгонлштлꙗ вꙑ ·да бѫдете сн҃ве оц҃а вашего іже естъ на нс҃хъ ·
380	ASS/37d:20	·а сн҃ве свѣта изгьнани бѫдѫтъ въ тъмѫ кромѣштьнжиѫ ·
381	ASS/42c:28	·рече емоу іс҃ъ ·оубо свободъ сѫть сн҃ве ·
382	ASS/52a:18-19	·и бѫдетъ мьзда ваша мънога ·и бѫдете сн҃ове вышънѣаго ·
383	ASS/113d:05	·блажени смирѣꙗштеи ѣко ти сн҃ве бж҃и нарекѫт сѧ ·
384	ASS/126v:15	·доброе же сѣма си сѫтъ сн҃ве цр҃ствиѣ ·
385	ASS/126b:16	·а плѣвели сѫтъ сн҃ве непріѣзнини ·
386	DOB/02rC:04	еда могоуть сн҃ове брачни постити се
387	DOB/51v:18	·и бѫдеть мьзда ваша многа ·и бѫдете сн҃ове вышьнѣаго.
388	DOB/73v:07	аще же азь о вельзевоулѣ і зьгона вѣсꙑ.сн҃ове ваши о комь изьгонлть
389	DOB/92r:06	ѣко мѫдрѣ сьтвори.ѣко сн҃ове вѣка сего. мѫдрѣиши паче…:
390	DOB/105v:09	равьни сѫть аньгломь:и сн҃ове сѫть бж҃ии:
391	DOB/132r:01	і ть из него пить и сн҃ве его.и скоти его
392	DOB/162v:20	·до колѣ свѣть имате (.в)ѣроуите вь свѣть.да сн҃ве свѣто(у бѫд)е(т)е.
393	KOH/18v:07	·и изгонлщжл вꙑ да бѫдете сн҃ове щ҃ца вашего ·
394	KOH/42v:21	и бѫдеть мьзда ваша многа ·и бѫдете сн҃ове вышнѣаго ·
395	KOH/95r:21	·бл҃жени смирѣлции ꙗко ти сн҃ове би҃и нарекжт сѧ ·
396	KOH/108v:05	·доброе сѣма си сѫть сн҃ове цр҃твиа
397	KOH/108v:06	а плѣвели сѫть сн҃ове неприлзнини ·
398	KOH/29r:04	·рече емоу іс҃ь ·оубо свободь сѫть сн҃ове ·

399	KOH/7v:06	·дондеже свѣть имате вѣроуите въ свѣть ·да сн̅ове свѣтоу бѫдете ·
400	KOH/7v:12	·дондеже свѣтъ имате вѣроуите въ свѣтъ ·да сн̅ове свѣтоу бѫдете ·
401	MAR/03v	а сн̅ве [ве] ц̅ствиѣ изгънани бѫдѫть. въ тъмѫ кромѣштьнѭѭ.
402	MAR/05v	еда могѫтъ сн̅ве брачьнии плакати сѧ.
403	MAR/10v	і аште азъ о велъзѣволъ изгонѭ вѣсы. сн̅ве ваши о комь изгоиѧтъ.
404	MAR/13v	а село есть весь миръ. доброе же сѣмѧ се сѫтъ. сн̅ве ц̅рствиѣ. (а плѣвелъ сѫть сн̅ве неприѣзнини.)
405	MAR/13v	(а село есть весь миръ. доброе же сѣмѧ се сѫтъ. сн̅ве ц̅рствиѣ.) а плѣвелъ сѫть сн̅ве неприѣзнини.
406	MAR/20r	рече емоу і̅с. оубо свободьни сѫтъ сн̅ве.
407	MAR/31r	тѣмъ же сами съвѣдѣтельствоуете себѣ. ѣко сн̅ове есте избивъшихъ п̅ркъ.
408	MAR/47r	рече имъ іс̅ъ. еда могѫтъ сн̅ве брачьнии постити сѧ.
409	MAR/91v	и бѫдетъ мъзда ваша мънога. и бѫдете сн̅ове вышьнѣего.
410	MAR/104r	аште же азъ о вельзѣвоулѣ изгонѭ вѣсы. сн̅ве ваши о комь изгоиѧтъ.
411	MAR/114v	и похвали г̅ь иконома неправедънааго. ѣко и мѫдрѣ сътвори. ѣко сн̅ве вѣка сего мѫдрѣише (паче сн̅въ свѣта въ родѣ своемь сѫтъ ∴)
412	MAR/123r	и отъвѣштавъ и̅съ рече имъ. сн̅ове вѣка сего женѧтъ сѧ и посагаѭтъ.
413	MAR/123r	ни оумьрѣти бо по томь могѫтъ. равьни бо сѫтъ ан̅ѓлмъ і сн̅ве сѫтъ бж̅ии. (въскрѣшению сн̅ове сѫще.)
414	MAR/123r	(ни оумьрѣти бо по томь могѫтъ. равьни бо сѫтъ ан̅ѓлмъ і сн̅ве сѫтъ бж̅ии.) въскрѣшению сн̅ове сѫще.
415	MAR/139r	і тъ из него питъ и сн̅ве его и скоти его.
416	MAR/158v	доньдеже свѣтъ имате. вѣроуите въ свѣта. да сн̅ве свѣтоу бѫдете ∴
417	MIR/30b:13-14	и ть из него пить ·и сн̅ова его и скоти его
418	MIR/44b:03	доньдѣже свѣть имате ·вѣрюите вь свѣть ·да сн̅ове свѣтю бѫдете
419	MIR/44b:09	дондѣже свѣть имате ·вѣрюите вь свѣть.да сн̅ове свѣта бѫдете ·
420	MIR/60a:15	бл̅жени сьмирѣюцеи ѣко то сн̅ове бж̅и нарекють се ·
421	MIR/64a:11	да бюдете сн̅ове оц̅а вашего иже дсть на нб̅схь ·
422	MIR/66b:02	а да могють сн̅ове брачьни плакати се ·
423	MIR/77a:16	и азь вельзѣуломь изгоню бѣсы ·сн̅ове ваши w комь изгонеть
424	MIR/82b:13	·а сн̅ове ц̅рства изгнани бюдуть вь тмю
425	MIR/83a:20	·доброе же сѣме си сють сн̅ове ц̅рствиѣ
426	MIR/83a:21	а плѣвель суть сн̅ове неприѣзниньни ·
427	MIR/107b:12	рече дмю і̅сь убо свободни сють сн̅ове · нь...
428	MIR/106b:23	·и рече имь і̅сь ·еда могуть сн̅ове брачни ·постити се ·
429	MIR/154a:06	и бюдеть мьзда ваша многа ·и бюдете сн̅ове вышнѣго ·ѣко

430	MIR/170b:09	.аще же азь о вельзаволѣ изгоню бѣсы ·сн҃ове ваши о комь изгонеть
431	MIR/187a:07	ѣко сн҃ове вѣка сего мюдрѣише ·
432	MIR/187a:08-09	·паче сн҃ове свѣта
433	MIR/195b:08	·сн҃ове вѣка сего женеть се и посагають ·
434	MIR/195b:16	·и сн҃ове сють вжи ·
435	MIR/195b:17	и вьскрⷭ҇ению сн҃ове.ѣкоже вьстають мрьтви ·
436	MIR/238a:02	·ѣко сн҃ове ⷭ҇сте ізбившихь прⷪ҇рки
437	MIR/245b:07	дондеже свѣть имате вѣрюите вь свѣть ·да сн҃ове свѣтю бюдете ·
438	MIR/301b:10	дондѣже свѣть имате · вѣроуите вь свѣть ·да сн҃ове свѣтоу бюдете ·
439	MST/15b:05	·и тъ из нкго пии сн҃ове кго и скоти кго ·
440	MST/21a:19	·донъдеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ ·да сн҃ове свѣта боудете:
441	MST/21b:02	·донъдеже свѣтъ имаате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да сн҃ове свѣта боудете ·
442	MST/139a:05	…донъдеже свѣтъ имате вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да сн҃ове свѣта б҃дете ·си гла ӣсъ
443	MST/167b:22	·донъдеже свѣтъ имате вѣроуите въ свѣтъ ·да сн҃ове свѣта б҃дете ·
442	MST/191c:19	·дондеже свѣтъ имате вѣроуите въ свѣтъ ·да сн҃ове свѣта б҃дете:
445	MST/29c:25	·да боудете сн҃ове оц҃а нашего иже кⷭ҇ть на нб҃ⷭ҇ѣхь ·
446	MST/36c:19	·и сынове цр҃ⷭ҇тва иженоуть са въ тьмоу кромѣшьнюю ·
447	MST/50b:11	·рече км҃8 ӣсъ свободь соуть оубо сн҃ове нъ…
448	MST/31b:11	·и рече ӣсъ ·еда могоуть сн҃ове чрьтожьника желѣти ·
449	MST/28b:17	·бл҃жни съмѣраюции ѣко ти сн҃ове б҃жии нарек8т са ·
450	MST/188c:05	·блажени съмѣраюции ѣко ти сн҃ове б҃жии нарекоуⷮ са ·
451	MST/37b:01	·и аще азъ вельзовжлъмь изгоню бѣсы ·сн҃ове ваши чимь изгона ·
452	MST/74c:17	·и боудеть мьзда ваша многа и боудете сн҃ове вышьнаго ·
453	MST/51d:16	·тѣмь же послⷤшьствоуюте себѣ ѣко сн҃ове юсте избившиихъ прорⷪ҇къı ·
454	MST/135b:14	·тѣмь же послоушьствоуюте себѣ ѣко сн҃ове юсте избивъшиихъ прорⷪ҇къı ·
455	MST/165c:20	·тѣмь же послоушьствоуюте себѣ ѣко сн҃ове юсте избівъшиихъ прорⷪ҇къı ·
456	MST/80c:24	·и аще б҃дⷤть сн҃ове мира почиють на нихъ миръ вашь
457	MST/55c:03	·и рече имъ и ӣсъ ·еда могоуть сн҃ове брачьнии алкати ·
458	MST/40b:03	·доброк же сѣма се соуть сн҃ове цр҃ⷭ҇тва ·
459	MST/40b:04	·плевели же соуть сн҃ове неприѣзнини ·
456	MST/83a:17	·изгоню бѣсы ·сн҃ове ваши о комь изгонаⷮ сего дѣлати вамъ боудоуть соудиѩ ·
461	MST/91c:09	…ѣко моудрѣ сътвори ·ѣко сн҃ове вѣка сего моудрѣише
462	MST/97d:11	·и сн҃ове соуть б҃жии
463	MST/97d:11	и въскрьсениѩ сн҃ве соуть ·
464	OST/212b:15	блажени съмирѩюцеи ·ѣко ти сн҃ове б҃жіи нарекⷤть са

465	OST/58b:11	·да бѫдете сынове оц͡а вашего· иже ксть на н͡бсехъ
466	OST/64c:09-10	а сынове ц͡рствиа изгънани бѫдѫть въ тьмѫ…
467	OST/241c:15	доброк же сѣмѧ ·сии сѫть сынове ц͡рствиа·
468	OST/241c:17	а плѣвели сѫть сынове неприıазнини·
469	OST/72c:08	·рече кмоу и͡с ибо свободъ ли сѫть с͡нове·
470	OST/215b:10	тѣмиже съвѣдѣтельствоуıте о себѣ· ıако с͡нове ксте·
471	OST/92b:02	·и бѫдеть мьзда ваша мънога и бѫдете с͡нове вышьнıааго·
472	OST/30c:06	·ı тъ из нıего пи и сынове кго и скоти кго…
473	OST/43a:17	доньдеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ· да сынове свѣтоу бѫдете ∴
474	OST/43b:07	доньдеже свѣтъ имаате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ· да сынове свѣтоу бѫдете ∴
475	OST/266c:08-09	доньдеже свѣтъ имаате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ· да сынове свѣтоу бѫдете ∴
476	SAV/32r:15-16	…она пастьствȣıѫщихъ вамъ ·ıако да бѫдете с͡нове оц͡ю вашемоу ·н͡бсноумоу·
477	SAV/37r:01	…вь ц͡рствиı н͡бснѣемь ·с͡нове же ц͡рьствиа ижденѫть сѧ·
478	SAV/125v:15	·бл͡жени ıс͡ъ мираѭщеı ·ıако ти с͡нове б͡жиı нарекѫть сѧ бл͡жени изгнаниı правьдъı ради·
479	SAV/128v:14	·ходите доньдеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите вь свѣтъ да с͡нове свѣта бѫдете·
480	TUR/10r:05	·и бѫдеть мьзда ваша мънога ·и бѫдете с͡нве вышьнлааго·
481	TYP/08b:17	·блажени съмирıаюшии ıако ти с͡нве б͡жиı нарекоуть сѧ·
482	TYP/10c:14	·иизгонѧщаıа въı ·да бѫдете с͡нве оц͡а вашего·
483	TYP/15a:11	·а с͡нве ц͡ствиа изгънани боудѫть въ тьмѫ кромѣшьнюю·
484	TYP/17a:07	·еда могѫть с͡нве брачьниı постити сѧ·
485	TYP/23b:10	·с͡нве ваши о комь изгонѧть·
486	TYP/26d:10	·доброк же сѣмıа се соуть с͡нве ц͡ерствиа·
487	TYP/26d:11	·а плѣвели соуть сынове неприıаз҃нини·
488	TYP/34b:13	·рече емѫ і͡с ·оубо свободьни с҃ть с͡нове·
489	TYP/63a:18	·и рече имъ і͡с ·еда могѫть с͡нве брачніи постити сѧ·
490	TYP/106d:20	…многа ·и боудете с͡нове вышьнıааго·
491	TYP/110c:23-24	…изгоню вѣсъı ·с͡нове ваши о комь изгонѧть·
492	TYP/120b:16	·ıако с͡нве вѣка сего моудрѣише
493	TYP/127d:16	·и ѿвѣштавъ и͡с рече имъ ·с͡нве вѣка сего женѧть сѧ ı посагають·
494	TYP/128a:01-02	·равьни бо соуть анг͡лмъ ·і сынове с҃ть б͡жиı·
495	TYP/128a:03	·въскрѣшенью с͡нве сѫще·
496	TYP/142d:08	·и тъ из него пить ·и с͡нве кго и скоті кго·
497	TYP/160a:14	·ходіте дондеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да с͡нове свѣта б҃дете·
498	UND/01r:19	·доброе же сѣмѧ си сѫтъ с͡нове ц͡рствиѣ·
499	UND/01r:20	а плѣвели сѫтъ с͡нове неприѣзнини·
500	VAT/30r:25	·блажени съмѣрѣѭщеı ·ıако ти сынове б͡жиı нарекѫть сѧ·
501	VAT/09r:13	·и изгонıащлѧ въı ·да бѫдете с͡нове оц͡а вашего ·иже естъ на н͡бсехъ.

502	VAT/91r:09	·и тъı из него пи☐ и сн̄ове кго ·и скоти кго ·
503	VAT/14v:02	доньдеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите в☐ свѣт☐ да съıнове свѣтоу бѫдете ·
504	VAT/67v:02	доидеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ · да сн̄ове свѣтоу бѫдете ·
505	VAT/14r:24	доньдеже свѣтъ имате · вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да сн̄и ст̄оу бѫдете ·
506	VUK/17a:01	и тъ изь него пить и сн̄ове кго и скоти его
507	VUK/22d:20	доньдѣже свѣть имате ·вѣроуите вь свѣть да сн̄ове свѣтоу боудете ·:
508	VUK/23a:02	☉те вѣроуите вь свѣть да сн̄ове свѣтоу боудете ·
509	VUK/29b:13	☉сьм...рѣющеи се ıако ти сн̄ове бж̄и нарекоуть се:
510	VUK/30c:24	да боудете сн̄ове Ѿц̄а вашего иже ксть на нб̄сѣхь.
511	VUK/32c:04	рече имь іс̄ь ·кда могоуть сн̄ове брачьни постити се:
512	VUK/92d:15	аще же азь ѡ вельзавоулѣ изьгоноу бѣсъı: сн̄ове ваши ѡ комь изьгонеть
513	VUK/37d:28	а сн̄ове цр̄ьствиıа изгнани боудоуть вь тьмоу...
514	VUK/41b:01	доброе же сѣме си соуть сн̄ове цр̄ьствиıа ·
515	VUK/41b:03	·а плѣвели соуть сн̄ове неприıазнинъı
516	VUK/179c:11	доброе же сѣме си соуть сн̄ове цр̄ьствиıа ·
517	VUK/179:12	·а плѣвели соуть сн̄ове неприıазнини
518	VUK/52b:24	рече кмоу іс̄ь свободьли оубо соуть сн̄ове
519	VUK/38c:02	...ѡ вельзавоулѣ изьгонıа бѣсъı: сн̄ове ваши ѡ комь изьгонеть ·
520	VUK/103d:19	ѣко моудрѣ сьтвори:ѣко сн̄ове вѣка сего моудрѣиши (паче сн̄овь свѣта:вь родѣ своıемь соуть)
521	VUK/111b:19	сн̄ове вѣка сего женеть се и посагають
522	VUK/111c:04	сн̄ове соуть вж̄и:
523	VUK/111c:06	въскрѣсениıа сн̄ове соуть:
524	VUK/54b:02	·ıако сн̄ове ксте избивьшихь пр̄рк̄ъı
525	VUK/153b:01	·ıако сн̄ове ксте избивъшихь пр̄рк̄ь
526	VUK/58c:08	·кда могоуть сн̄ове брачьни постити се
527	VUK/82a:24	.☉..и боудете сн̄ове въ...☉.
528	ZOG/4v:21	блажени съ мираѭщтии ·ѣко ти сн̄ове бж̄ии нарекѭтъ сѧ:
529	ZOG/8r:17	да бѫдете сн̄ове оц̄а вашего ·иѭь естъ на небесехъ.
530	ZOG/15r:08	а сн̄ове цр̄ствиѣ ızгнани бѫдѫтъ ·въ тъмѫ кромѣшьнѭѭж ·
531	ZOG/27r:11	ı аште азъ ·о вельзѣволѣ ızгонѭ бѣсъı ·сн̄ове вашѧ о комь изгоиѧтъ.
532	ZOG/32v:07	доброе же сѣмѧ естъ сн̄ове цр̄ствиѣ · (а плѣвелъ сѫтъ сн̄ове неприѣзнини ·)
533	ZOG/32v:08	(доброе же сѣмѧ естъ сн̄ове цр̄ствиѣ) ·а плѣвелъ сѫтъ сн̄ове неприѣзнини ·
534	ZOG/42r:11	·рече емоу іс̄ъ оубо свободъни сѫтъ сн̄ове
535	ZOG/82 (76):02	ı рече имъ іс̄ ·еда могѫтъ сн̄ове брачьнıи постити сѧ ·
536	ZOG/152r:04	ı бѫдетъ мъзда ваша многа ı бѫдете сн̄ове въшьнѣаго.
537	ZOG/192v:09	и похвали г̄нъ домоу ıконома ·неправьдънааго ·ѣко мѫдрѣ створи ·ѣко сн̄ове вѣка сего ·
538	ZOG/207v:06	·сн̄ове вѣка сего женѧтъ сѧ ·ı посагаѭтъ.

539	ZOG/207v:14	ни оумрѣти бо по томь могѫтъ ·равьни бо сѫтъ аћлѡмъ ·і сн̄ове сѫтъ бж̄і ·
540	ZOG/207v:15-16	·въскрѣшеньію сн̄ове сѫтъ
541	ZOG/232v:22	·і тъ іж него питъ і сн̄ове іего і скоти іего ·
542	ZOG/267r:06	доньдеже свѣтъ імате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ · да сн̄и свѣтоу бѫдете
543	PUT/79r:17	…ѿ ветъхаго длъга раздрѣшивъше сѧ ·сынове блг̄дьти ꙗвихомъ сѧ ·
544	PUT/86v:03	·и огнь моучениіѫ прѣтрьпѣсте ·инꙑна сн̄ве вьчьноу мѫцрьствоу бъ̄сте ·
545	SUP/94:21	сии сѫтъ обьмъшии нашѫ странѫ ·ꙗкоже се сынове чѧсти ·
546	SUP/253:19	·сынове мои бога имѫтъ ꙗкоже и азъ ·
547	SUP/262:21-22	·имже трѣбѹіемъ іего вьси сынове чловѣчьстии ·тъ бо іестъ кръмѧи вьсѫ населенѫіѫ ·
548	SUP/262:25-26	·се же трѣбоуіетъ отъ насъ да вѣмъ имѧ господа нашего вьси сынове чловѣчьстии ·
549	SUP/324:23	·аште да іесте сынове сиꙗни ·
550	SUP/423:12-13	·блажени бо рече съмироіѫштии ·ꙗко то сынове божии нарекѫтъ сѧ ·
551	1073/30b:10	·ти соуть сн̄ове божии ·
552	1073/14c:14	·ꙗзꙑкомъ на разлоучениіе словѫ грѧдꙑи течеть въ же цр̄квнии сн̄ове ·
553	1073/51d:28-29	·къ ст̄ꙑимъ іеликоже аште освѧщаꙗтъ сн̄ове иизраилеви г̄ви ·
554	1073/56b:11	сн̄ове безоумьни сѫтъ а не съмꙑсльни ·
555	1073/67c:27-28	·камо ли поклонениіе се дѣѫще мнѣти ·іеже іем обѣштаваахѫ сн̄ове ·
556	1073/80a:04	·ихъже сн̄ове ихъ акꙑ новꙑ отърасли ·
557	1073/103d:06	·аште или сынове ихъ и дъштери гонезноуть ·
558	1073/107a:16-17	·се подъіемлють ·небонъ иовови сн̄ове правьдьни соуще ·
559	1073/123c:06	·како іе разоумѣти видѣвъше же сн̄ове бж̄ии и дъштери чл̄чскꙑꙗ ·
560	1073/134d:08	·:·видѣвъше же сн̄ове ·:·бж̄ии дъштери человѣчьскꙑ ·
561	1073/135a:02	·къ имоуштааго бж̄ии сн̄ове видѣвъше человѣчьскꙑ дъштери рекъше… ·
562	1073/209d:16	·да оуже васнь свободь соуть сн̄ове ·
563	1073/135a:15	·ꙗко видѣвъше же сн̄ве бж̄ии дъштери чл̄вчьскꙑ ·
564	1073/135b:05	·видѣвъше сн̄ве бж̄ии дъштери чл̄чьскꙑ ·
565	1073/138a:09	·отъ негоже еврѣи ·симови оубо соуть сынове
566	1073/138a:10	и сыновьни сынове ·
567	1073/138c:02	·коулатъ ·отъ негоже гетоулу ·хамоу же въторомоу сн̄ове и
568	1073/138c:03	и сыновьнии сынове ·
569	1073/139a:10-11	·отъ негоже рамене ·иафефу же третиіемоу сынове и
570	1073/139a:11-12	и сыновьни сынове ·
571	1073/147a:20	·и въ корабли ноіевѣ и сн̄ове іего бѣахоу ·

572	1073/147а:26	·да аще о̃ци за дѣти не мо́учать сѧ ·ни сн̃ове за о̃цѧ ·
573	1073/184а:09-10	·и сынове безоумьливи со́уть ꙗкоже зло сътворити ·
574	1073/202d:14-15	…ꙗже сынове съплескаѭть и моудрость не ꙗже…
575	1073/206c:20	·и иѡанъ бо и ꙗковъ сынове зеведеини прѣбъвъшеи въ дѣвьствѣ ·
576	1073/216d:06	…отъ неꙗже роди сѧ кмоу шестеро дѣтии ·четъıре сынове ·дъвѣ же дъщери ·
577	1076/14r:11	…къ нимь и обеселиши сѧ ·сн̃ове бо бес со́уть ·
578	1076/49r:06	·не бъıша ·сн̃ве мира сего распѧли г̃а славъı ·
579	1076/225r:11-12	·азъ бо рѣхъ бози ксте и сынове въıшьнꙗаго вьси хотѧштеи:
580	1076/251r:09	·тою бо любъвью сн̃ове б̃оу наречемъ сѧ ·
G.pl.		
581	ARC/37r:14	Ѿ къıхъ приꙺмлють дани. или кꙑнозъ. Ѿ своихъ сн̃овъ или Ѿ тоуждихъ.
582	ARC/106r:10	·л̃· сребрьиикъ. цѣноу цѣнкнааго.кго же цѣнꙑша Ѿ сн̃(о)въ изѣлъ.
583	ARC/116v: 09	·л̃· сребрьникъ. цѣноу цѣикиааго. кго же цѣииша. Ѿ сн̃въ изѣлъ.
584	ASS/42c:22	приемлѧтъ дани ли кꙑнос ·ѿтъ своихъ ли сн̃овъ ·ли от̃ тоуждиихъ ·
585	ASS/107b:20	ꙗ҃ сьребрьиикꙑ̃ :цѣнѫ цѣненааго ·егоже цѣниша ѿтъ сн̃овъ изѣлвь ·
586	ASS/148r:28	·мног̃ъı сн̃овъ изѣлвъ обратитъ къ г̃ю б̃оу ихъ ·
587	DOB/92r:07	сего. мѫдрѣиши паче сн̃вь свѣта сѫть.
588	DOB/105v:03	и отьвѣщавь і̃сь рече имь:сн̃вь вѣка сего женѧть сѧ и посагаѭть:
589	KOH/74v:21	·л̃·сребрьиикь ·цѣнѫ цѣненаго ·егоже цѣнишѫ Ѿ сн̃овъ изѣлевъ ·
590	KOH/29r:01	приемлѧтъ дани ·или кꙑнись ·Ѿ сн̃вь ли своихъ ·или Ѿ тоуждиихь
591	MAR/20r	ц̃ри земьсции отъ къıхъ приемлѭтъ дани. ли кꙑнсь. отъ своихъ ли сн̃въ. ли отъ тоуждихъ
592	MAR/178v	ι мъногъı сн̃въ издрлвъ обратитъ къ г̃и б̃оу ихъ.
593	MAR/114v	паче сн̃въ свѣта въ родѣ своемь сѫтъ ∵
594	MAR/39v	и приѧсѧ три десѧти съребрьиикъ цѣнѫ цѣненааго. егоже цѣниша отъ сн̃ изѣлъ.
595	MIR/107b:09	приемлють дани или кꙑносъ · Ѿ сн̃вь ли своихь или Ѿ тоуждихь…
596	MIR/286a:18	·л̃· сребрьникь ·цѣню ·цѣненаго ·егоже цѣнише Ѿ сн̃вь изѣлевь ·
597	MIR/340a:05	·и многι сн̃вь изѣлевь обратить кь г̃оу б̃оу ихь ·
598	MST/91c:10	паче сн̃овъ свѣта въ родѣ своꙺмь со́уть ·
599	MST/50b:08	·или кꙑнсъ ·отъ своихъ ли сн̃овъ или отъ щюждиихъ ·
600	MST/152d:18	·л̃· те сребрьиикъ цѣноу цѣненааго кгоже цѣниша отъ сн̃овъ изѣлевъ ·

601	MST/157a:12	·л҃· сребрьникъ цѣноу цѣненааго югоже цѣниша отъ сн҃овъ изл҃квъ ·
602	MST/160b:22	·л҃· сребрьникъ цѣноу цѣнюнааго югоже цѣниша отъ сн҃овъ изл҃квъ ·
603	MST/199b:08	·и многꙑ сн҃овъ изл҃въ обратить къ г҃оу б҃оу ихъ ·
604	OST/72c:01	отъ кꙑихъ приюмлютъ дани или кинсъ отъ сн҃овъ ли своихъ ·
605	OST/196d:05	·л҃· сребрьникъ ·цѣнѫ цѣнюнааго· югоже цѣнишѧ отъ сн҃овъ изл҃квъ ·
606	OST/185b:15	·и приѧшѧ три десѧте съребрьникъ цѣнѫ цѣнюнааго· югоже цѣниша отъ сн҃овъ изл҃квъ...
607	OST/278c:09	...мт҃ре своюѧ и мъногꙑ ·сн҃овъ изл҃квꙑ обратить къ г҃оу б҃оу ихъ и тъ ·
608	SAV/43r:03	въземлѭтъ дань ·ли оброкꙑ ·отъ своихъ ли сн҃овъ ·ли отъ тоуждихъ ·
609	SAV/117v:02	·л҃· сребрьникъ цѣнѫ цѣненаго ·егоже цѣниша отъ сн҃овъ нзл҃въ ·
610	TYP/34b:08	·ли кинсъ ·ѿ своихъ ли сн҃овъ ·
611	TYP/55d:14	·цѣноу цѣнюнааго ·егоже цѣниша ѿ сн҃въ изл҃евъ ·
612	TYP/93d:20	·и мъногꙑ сн҃овъ изл҃евъ ·обратить къ г҃и б҃оу ихъ ·
613	TYP/120b:17	паче сн҃въ свѣта въ родѣ своюмь с8тъ ·
614	VAT/79v:03	·и приѧшѧ три десѧти съребрьникъ цѣнѫ цѣненаего · егоже цѣниша отъ сн҃овъ ил҃евъ ·
615	VAT/19r:06	·и мъногꙑ сн҃овъ изл҃евъ обратитъ къ г҃ю б҃оу ихъ ·
616	VUK/103d:20	паче сн҃овь свѣта: вь родѣ своюмб соуть
617	VUK/52b:19	ц҃рик земльни: ѿ кꙑхь приюмлоуть дани: или киносъ ·ѿ сн҃овь ли своихь или ѿ чоуждихь ·
618	VUK/175c:06	·л҃· сребрьникь цѣноу цѣненаго: югоже цѣнише ѿ сн҃овь нзл҃евь:и даше...
619	ZOG/42r:08	...приемлѭтъ дани ли кінъсъ ·отъ сн҃овъ ли своихъ ли от тоуждіхъ
620	ZOG/132r:14	і многꙑ сн҃овъ іл҃евъ ·обратитъ къ г҃ю б8 іхъ
621	ZOG/192v:10	·мѫдрѣише паче сн҃овъ свѣта ·въ родѣ своемь сѫтъ
622	ZOG/70v:10	і приѧшѧ Б҃ ·съребрьиикъ ·цѣнѫ цѣненаего ·егоже цѣниша отъ сн҃овъ іл҃евъ ·
623	SUP/246:20	·тѣмь оубо пришедъ на проповѣдь паулъ апостолъ · и юдного отъ сꙑновъ семоу обрѣтъ пишетъ ·
624	SUP/436:07	·и не имѣаше вида ·ни добротꙑ ·нъ видъ юго вечьстьнъ ·изчазаѧ паче сꙑновъ чловѣчъ ·
625	1073/50b:10	чл҃вкъ чл҃вкъ рече отъ сн҃овъ иизраилевъ ·
626	1073/103a:24	·и послю съмрьть на вꙑ ·и ѣсте плъть сн҃овъ и дъштерии вашихъ ·
627	1073/135a:08-09	·въ сꙑновъ мѣста б҃жиѧ сꙑнꙑ божьскꙑ и властельскꙑ оуказа ·
628	1073/137c:01	·рече бо моусись ·вселению же сн҃овъ издраилевъ ·
629	1073/139b:29	·симъ оубо ѩзꙑкомъ сице отъ трии сꙑновъ ·
630	1073/163c:21	·нъ видъ юго ·бечьстьнъ ·и погꙑбаѩ ·паче сꙑновъ чл҃чьскъ ·
631	1073/182b:16	·неже тобѣ зьрѣти въ роуцѣ сꙑновъ твоихъ ·
632	1073/189d:24	рѫпъташе же вьсь съборъ сн҃овъ издраилевъ на мооусиѭ ·
I.pl.		

633	SUP/562:11, Z)	·доиде же мастира чловѣка бжьꙗ ·сь женоѭ евоеѭ и сн҃ъми дъштерьми ·
634	1076/17r:11	·сн҃ъ въноукъ правъноукъ дъштерьми ·
L.pl.		
635	1073/94a:05	·да не боудеть бо блоудꙗштааго въ сн҃ѣхъ ил҃евѣихъ ·
636	1076/168r:06	·и не весели сѧ о снъхъ ненаказанъиихъ ·

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*

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

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

N.pl. полове / поли (0), G.pl. половъ /полъ (0) = St. Mark VI:23 = the substantive полъцр͆ства is used

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

N.pl. съынове / съыни (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. съыновъ /съынъ (3)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 37r:14, XXVII:9 = 106r:10 + 116v:09
St. Luke I:16 =A.pl., XVI:8 = —

I.pl. съынъми / съыны (0), L.pl. съынъхъ /съынѣхъ (0)

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. домове / доми (0), G.pl. домовъ /домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = —,
I.pl. домъми / домы (0), L.pl. домъхъ /домѣхъ (1) St. Matthew XI:8 = 143r:13

N.pl. полове / поли (0), G.pl. половъ /полъ (1) = St. Mark VI:23 = 153r:13,
I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ /полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. съınове / съıни (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. съıновъ /съıнъ (3)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 42c:21, XXVII:9 = 107b:20,
St. Luke I:16 =148r:28, XVI:8 = —

I.pl. съınъми / съıны (0), L.pl. съınъхъ /съınѣхъ (0)

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 / доми (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. съınове / съıни (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. съıновъ /съınъ (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. съınъми / съıны (0), L.pl. съınъхъ /съınѣхъ (0)

N.pl. воловє / 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. грѣховє / 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. домовє / доми (0), G.pl. домовъ /домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = missing,

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

N.pl. съıновє / съıни (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. съıновъ /съıнъ (2) = St. Matthew XVII:25 = 29r:01, XXVII:9 = 74v:21,
St. Luke I:16 = missing, XVI:8 missing

I.pl. съıнъми / съıны (0), L.pl. съıнъхъ /съıнѣхъ (0)

N.pl. грѣховє / 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. домовє / доми (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. половє / поли (0), G.pl. половъ /полъ (1) = St. Mark VI:23 = 54r,
I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ /полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. съыновє / съыни (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. съыновъ /съынъ (4)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 20r, XXVII:9 = 39v,
St. Luke I:16 =178v, XVI:8 = 114v

I.pl. съынъми / съыны (0), L.pl. съынъхъ /съынѣхъ (0)

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 / доми (0), G.pl. домовъ /домъ (1) St. Mark X:30 = 136b:17,
I.pl. домъми / домы (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. съıнове / съıни (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. съıновъ /съıнъ (3)

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

I.pl. съıнъми / съıны (0), L.pl. съıнъхъ /съıнѣхъ (0)

N.pl. воlove / 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 / доми (0), G.pl. домовъ /домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = — ,
I.pl. домъми / домы (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. съынове / съыни (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. съыновъ /съынъ (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. съынъми / съыны (0), L.pl. съынъхъ /съынѣхъ (0)

N.pl. грѣховє / 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. домовє / доми (0), G.pl. домовъ /домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = —,
I.pl. домъми / домы (0), L.pl. домъхъ /домѣхъ (1) St. Matthew XI:8 = 267b:02

N.pl. половє / 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. съновє / съни (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. съновъ /съмъ (4)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 72c:01, XXVII:9 = 196d:05 + 185b:15
St. Luke I:16 =278c:09, XVI:8 = —

I.pl. съмъми / съмы (0),

L.pl. съмъхъ /съмѣхъ (0)

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

I.pl. домъми / домы (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. съınове / съıни (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. съıновъ /съınъ (2)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 43r:03, XXVII:9 = 117v:02,
St. Luke I:16 =—, XVI:8 = —

I.pl. съınъми / съıны (0), L.pl. съınъхъ /съınѣхъ (0)

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

I.pl. домъми / домы (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. съынове / съыни (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. съыновъ /съынъ (0)

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

I.pl. съынъми / съыны (0),

L.pl. съынъхъ /съынѣхъ (0)

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

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

N.pl. съиновє / съини (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. съиновъ /съинъ (4)

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

I.pl. съинъми / съины (0), L.pl. съинъхъ /съинѣхъ (0)

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 / доми (0), G.pl. домовъ /домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = — ,
I.pl. домъми / домы (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 (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)

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. домове / доми (0), G.pl. домовъ /домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = —,
I.pl. домъми / домы (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. съинове / съини (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. съиновъ /съинъ (2)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = —, XXVII:9 = 79v:03 (184),
St. Luke I:16 =19r:06 (161), XVI:8 = —

I.pl. съинъми / съины (0), L.pl. съинъхъ /съинѣхъ (0)

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. домове / доми (0), G.pl. домовъ /домъ (1) St. Mark X:30 = 119b:16,
I.pl. домъми / домы (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)

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 / доми (0), G.pl. домовъ /домъ (1) St. Mark X:30 = A.pl.,
I.pl. домъми / домы (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
дѣліа, дѣлѧ, 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
врѣма	2 (nr. 203, 255)	1 (nr. 243)	3
исповѣданик	0	2 (nr. 252, 253)	2
место	1 (nr. 240)	0	1
мракъ	0	1 (n. 181)	1
мъножьство	3 (nr. 230, 254, 258)	0	3
непогоненик	0	1 (nr. 196)	1
оставлкник	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
отъпоущеник	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
покаганиѥ	0	1 (nr. 138)	1
поущеник	0	1 (nr. 223)	1
прощеник	0	2 (nr. 244, 251)	2
раздрѣшеник	0	2 (nr. 183, 185)	2
рѫкописаник	1 (nr. 204)	0	1
оумрьщеник	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) съінъ 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) съінъ in N.pl. on 127v:18, 3) съінъ in N.pl. on 158r:15	1) the spelling грѫси 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) съінъ in N.pl. on p. 10:13 3) съінъ 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) съінъ in N.pl. on 137d:27, 2) съінъ in N.pl. on 138b:10, 3) съінъ in N.pl. on 138d:15, 4) съінъ 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)