



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Verbal aspect in Old Church Slavonic

Kamphuis, J.

Citation

Kamphuis, J. (2016, December 7). *Verbal aspect in Old Church Slavonic*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/44706>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/44706>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/44706> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Kamphuis, J.

Title: Verbal aspect in Old Church Slavonic

Issue Date: 2016-12-07

1 OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC

1.0 Introduction

Old Church Slavonic is directly tied to the rise of Slavic literacy. At the end of the tenth century, the monk Khrabr writes the following in his treatise *O pismenexb* ‘On the letters’, which is dedicated to the Slavic writing system:¹

“Earlier the Slavs did not have books but by strokes and notches read and divined, being heathen. And when they were baptized, they had to write their Slavic speech with Roman and Greek letters without design. Because how could one adequately write with Greek letters *bogb* ‘God’, or *životb* ‘stomach’ or *dzělo* ‘very much’ or *crvky* ‘church’ or *čajanie* ‘expectation’ or *širota* ‘width’ or *ědb* ‘poison’ or *řdu* ‘where’ or *junostb* ‘youth’ or *ęzykb* ‘tongue’ or other similar words? And so it was for many years. (*The monk Khrabr*, Džambeluka-Kossova 1980)”

The situation described in this quote, in which the Slavs did not ‘have books’, i.e. did not have a writing system of their own, came to an end in 862/63 when the Macedonian brothers Cyril (Constantine) and Methodius, the ‘Apostles to the Slaves’, went on a religious mission to Moravia and devised an alphabet to translate the Bible and other religious texts into Slavic.

Since Old Church Slavonic, the language that is the subject of this study, is so closely connected to this Moravian mission, I will first briefly sketch the historical events that led to the creation of a Slavic alphabet and the following events. These historical events form the framework within which the language found in the OCS manuscripts is defined both temporally and geographically. In section 1.3.2 I will consider the linguistic characteristics demarcating OCS.

As basis for the description I have mainly used two monographs: *The dawn of Slavic* by Alexander M. Schenker (1995) and *Die altkirchenslavische Schriftkultur* by Jos Schaeken & Henrik Birnbaum (1999). Furthermore, I

¹The text of this treatise is probably from the end of the tenth century (Schenker 1995: 227), written by a monk that is only known by his epithet *Khrabr* ‘Brave’. It is in defence of the Slavic alphabet, which is compared to the Greek alphabet for the use of writing Slavic. The examples Khrabr mentions in this quote all contain sounds for which the Greek alphabet does not have letters.

Schenker (1995: 227) argues that it is likely that Khrabr was a disciple of Clement or Naum, themselves disciples of Methodius, because of the fact that the protograph of the treatise was Glagolitic, which connects it to the Ohrid school. Moreover, some codices mention that Khrabr’s contemporaries still remembered Cyril and Methodius (Schenker 1995: 227 fn. 283).

used the two most important primary sources for the Moravian mission: the so-called *Pannonian Legends*,² i.e. the Saints' Lives of Constantine and Methodius: *Vita Constantini* (VC) and *Vita Methodii* (VM).³ The following sketch is far from complete and the reader is referred to the above-mentioned monographs and the *Pannonian Legends* for a more comprehensive treatment.

1.1 *The Moravian mission*

In the VC and VM the story of the Moravian mission starts with a request from Rastislav (Rostislav), the ruler of Moravia made to the Byzantine emperor, Michael III, probably in the year 862 AD:

“Though our people have rejected paganism and observe Christian law, we do not have a teacher who can explain to us in our language the true Christian faith, so that other countries which look to us might emulate us. Therefore, O lord, send us a bishop and teacher; for from you good law issues to all countries.” (*Vita Constantini*, 14)⁴

Emperor Michael III and the patriarch of Constantinople, Photius, believe Constantine to be the right person for this mission. Constantine had been a pupil of Photius and had successfully carried out religious missions for the emperor before. But it is not just his good reputation that makes him the right person to carry out this mission. Michael III phrases his main reason as follows:

“None other than you can do this. Here then are many gifts. Take your brother, the Hegumen Methodius, and go. For you are both Thessalonians and *all Thessalonians speak pure Slavic* [my emphasis].” (*Vita Methodii*, 5)

The brothers Constantine and Methodius were born in Thessaloniki (*Solunŭ* in OCS) and they were bilingual, speaking Greek and Slavic. This made them the ideal persons to translate Greek Christian texts into Slavic. I will get back to the importance of the Greek original for this study in section 2.3.

VC (14) describes that Constantine gives himself up to prayer and that God reveals to him the Slavic script. Constantine then composes an alphabet,

² I use the edition and translation by Kantor (1983). Although the term ‘legends’ for these Saint’s Lives may give the impression that these are works of fiction, the texts actually contain data that can be used to reconstruct historical events. Kantor (1983: 2-3) therefore calls these sources ‘semi-secular biographies’ because they contain a mix of hagiographic and biographic writing.

³ For other sources of the events surrounding the Moravian mission see Schenker (1995: 26-28).

⁴ The number indicates the section numbers as given in Kantor (1983).

which is now known as *Glagolitic*.⁵ With the alphabet ready he starts translating the first verse of the Gospel of John, which in the codex *Assemanianus* looks like this (cf. example (1) in Chapter 0):



Figure 1.1 *Glagolitic fragment, codex Assemanianus (John 1:1)*

After Constantine and Methodius have translated a number of texts, they leave for Moravia. Here they keep on translating religious texts, the language of which might have been influenced by the West-Slavic dialects of that region. The mix between South Slavic and West Slavic features found in the Kiev Folios is probably linked to this period (cf. Schaeken 1987, see also 1.3.2).

Constantine dies in 867 during a visit to Rome where the Slavic translations are blessed by the Pope and the disciples of Constantine and Methodius are ordained. Before his death, Constantine takes his monastic vows and takes on the name Cyril, which is the name most people know him by. Methodius continues work in Moravia until his death in 885. Soon after the death of Methodius, however, the mission comes to an end. The remaining disciples are imprisoned, expelled or sold as slaves.

1.2 *The Ohrid and Preslav schools*

Some of the disciples of Methodius reach Bulgaria, where they are received by the Bulgarian khan Boris, who converted to Christianity in 865 (taking on the name Michael). The disciples set up two literary centres, one in the west, in *Ohrid*, Macedonia, and one in eastern Bulgaria, *Preslav*. In these two centres

⁵ Not much is known about the origin of Glagolitic. There is no clear source for most letters in another alphabet. Uspenskij (2013) discusses a possible ideographic origin for a number of the letters.

the disciples continue the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition by translating religious texts into Slavic and copying already existing translations. The best-known figures among these disciples are Clement and Naum (possibly the composer of the VM), who end up in Ohrid, Macedonia, and Constantine the Presbyter, who is the main figure in the literary centre in Preslav.

In 893, when Boris' son Symeon assumes the Bulgarian throne, Preslav becomes the capital of Bulgaria and Bulgarian becomes the official language. It is likely that this historical event leads to the creation of the *Cyrillic* alphabet, which is based on the Greek majuscule alphabet, with a number of additional letters for Slavic sounds. The similarities between the Greek alphabet and Cyrillic must have made it easier to learn for the people who already knew the Greek alphabet, whereas the entirely new Glagolitic letters must have been much more difficult to master. Hence, the introduction of Cyrillic may have facilitated the introduction of Bulgarian as the official language.

The rise of a Cyrillic tradition in Preslav and the continued tradition of Glagolitic in Ohrid, results in a corpus of manuscripts that is treated as a linguistic unity, with two different orthographic systems (but see section 1.3.3). Manuscripts from these two scriptoria form the Old Church Slavonic canon, the oldest corpus of Slavic texts, which are the basic material for this study into the oldest stages of verbal aspect in Slavic.

1.3 What is OCS?

Not all Medieval Slavic manuscripts dealing with religious matters are considered to be a part of the OCS canon. There are several geographical and temporal demarcation lines that separate this canon from other traditions. Moreover, there is also periodization within OCS. First, I will discuss the periodization based on historical data. Then I will pay attention to the linguistic features that are used to categorize manuscripts into one of these periods. And finally I will dedicate a few words to variation within OCS.

1.3.1 Periodization

OCS is the first attested Slavic language and it is often regarded as closely resembling Late Common Slavic (LCS), the latest common variant of Proto-Slavic.⁶ The fact that Constantine and Methodius were able to use their own

⁶ Birnbaum (1970) discusses the difference between Proto-Slavic as a language reconstructed based on comparative data from other Indo-European languages and LCS as the later period of Proto-Slavic in which the last common Slavic phonological innovations took place. He argues that it is impossible to draw a clear border between LCS as the last Common Slavic period and

South Macedonian dialect of Slavic to carry out a mission in Moravia also indicates that the differences between the local variants could not have been much more than dialectal. Moreover, the OCS translations form the basis for the Bible translation of all orthodox Slavs, including those in Kiev Rus', which shows that the variants were at least mutually intelligible.⁷

Even though OCS is presumed to closely resemble LCS, OCS is an East South Slavic variant of Slavic, as the historical data (and linguistic characteristics, cf. section 1.3.2) demonstrate. Constantine and Methodius were from Macedonia and the two first Slavic scriptoria from which manuscripts have survived were in Ohrid and Preslav, today Macedonia and Bulgaria. OCS thus is the ancestor of the modern East South Slavic languages Bulgarian and Macedonian, not the common ancestor of all Slavic languages.

OCS is often divided into three or four periods. The periods, limited in both time and in geographical area, are also referred to as *Heimat* 'homeland' (Diels 1963: 2, Schenker 1995: 187-188, Schaeken & Birnbaum 1999: 13-15).

The **first homeland** is the short period in Constantinople, 862/63, where Constantine started translating into Slavic. It is possible that Constantine had already started his translation work before Rastislav made his request. However, his argument about the unavailability of an alphabet makes that improbable. No matter the exact moment at which the translating started, the linguistic features of this 'Proto-Church Slavonic' ('Urkirchenslavisch' as Trubetzkoy (1968: 23) calls it) must have reflected the Macedonian dialect that the brothers knew from their hometown, Thessaloniki. There are no extant manuscripts from this period.

The **second homeland** of OCS is the period of the Moravian mission, 863-885. During this period, the local dialect in Moravia must have had its influence on the translations. Although we have no manuscripts from the second period either, there is one manuscript, the *Kiev Folios* (also *Kiev Fragments*, or *Kiev Missal*), which, because of its age, the fact that it is written in Glagolitic, the fact that it is a translation of a Roman rite, and most importantly because of its mix of South Slavic and West Slavic phonological features can be linked to this period (Schaeken 1987: 117-118).⁸

the beginning of the various regional variants of Slavic (such as East Slavic or West Slavic). In this view, OCS can be seen as (partly) overlapping with LCS.

⁷Notwithstanding the fact that there must have been dialects that strongly deviated, like the language on the Novgorod birchbark letters that shows, among other things, a deviating verbal system, without aorist and imperfect (cf. Zaliznjak 2004, Darden 2004).

⁸This is not the place to go into the question whether the language of the Kiev Folios contains a mix of two dialects, or a transitional dialect as Schaeken (1987: 104-121) argues. The fact remains that the manuscript contains both South Slavic features and West Slavic features. The manuscript is considered older than the other manuscripts in the OCS canon (the Kiev Folios is thought to

The *third homeland* of OCS is the Bulgarian/Macedonian period after 885. This period can be split up in a period from which no manuscripts survive, i.e. from 885 until the end of the tenth century and one from which the OCS canon stems, from the end of the tenth to the end of the eleventh century. I will present the individual manuscripts that together form the OCS canon in section 1.4. The linguistic features of the language in these manuscripts are South Slavic, with some minor differences between the Macedonian Glagolitic tradition in Ohrid and the Bulgarian Cyrillic tradition in Preslav, which I will address in section 1.3.3.

Manuscripts that originate from the Bulgarian and Macedonian area from the twelfth century onwards belong to the Bulgarian and Macedonian Church Slavonic recensions and are not considered part of the OCS canon. However, Schaeken & Birnbaum (1999: 17-18, 24) point out that there is no strict dividing line between the OCS canon and the early manuscripts of the Bulgarian and Macedonian recension. Some manuscripts, like the *Enina Apostol*, are considered to be part of the OCS canon based on the general linguistic and graphic features, but also show some features of a later period (one-*jer* orthography, restricted use of jotted letters and confusion of the original nasal vowels, see also section 1.3.2). Schaeken & Birnbaum (1999: 17) use the term *Late Old Church Slavonic* (*Spätaltkirchenslavisch*) to refer to these manuscripts.

Based on linguistic features three main Church Slavonic recensions can be discerned next to the Bulgarian and Macedonian recension: the *Czech recension*, the *Serbian and Croatian* recension, and the *Russian* recension (Schenker 1995: 190-193. Manuscripts from these recensions are not necessarily of more recent provenance. For example, part of the oldest manuscript in the Czech recension, the *Prague Fragments*, in Glagolitic, dates from before the end of the eleventh century (Lysaght 1982: 87, Schaeken & Birnbaum 1999: 132) and the oldest manuscript showing Slovene linguistics features, the *Freising fragments*, written in Latin script, is even dated late tenth or early eleventh century, which makes it as old as the oldest OCS manuscript, the Kiev Folios (Lysaght 1982: 103, Schaeken & Birnbaum 1999: 131). Compared to the various local recensions of Church Slavonic, the OCS recension contains only a relatively small number of manuscripts.

originate from the late ninth, or at latest the beginning of the tenth century) and its West Slavic features give it a special position within OCS canon. Another feature that sets it apart from the other OCS manuscripts is the etymological use of the reduced vowels (ibidem: 93-94), which is almost flawless and which could underpin its high age (cf. section 1.3.2).

1.3.2 Linguistic features

As already mentioned, OCS is a South Slavic language, or more precisely an East South Slavic language. This can be based on historical reconstruction, as I have shown above. However, the only way to establish whether a manuscript belongs to this specific East South Slavic tradition of the third homeland and does not originate from another period or geographic area, is by its linguistic features.

The only exclusively East South Slavic feature is the reflex *št* and *žd* for Proto-Slavic **tj* and **dj* (cf. OCS *svěšta* and Bg *svešt* ‘candle’, with Cz *svíce*, Ru *sveča* and BCS *sveća*). Hence, a manuscript exhibiting different reflexes for Proto-Slavic **tj* and **dj* is not considered to be part of the OCS canon (the only exception being the Kiev Folios that shows a mix of South Slavic and West Slavic features).

There are other features that help to identify OCS as a South Slavic language, but these are not exclusive, meaning that they are shared with either West Slavic or East Slavic languages. An example is the reflex *l* for Proto-Slavic **tl* and **dl* (OCS *moliti* vs Cz *modlit* ‘pray’, shared with East Slavic), or the reflex *RaC* from Proto-Slavic *ôRC* (OCS *rastъ* vs. Ru *rost* ‘growth’, shared with central Slovak).

The temporal demarcation line between OCS and the younger Bulgarian and Macedonian Church Slavonic recensions, is drawn at the time when the nasal vowels *ę* and *ǫ* (Schenker 1995: 190, Schaeken & Birnbaum 1999: 24) became denasalized and the spelling of the nasal vowels was no longer in accordance with etymology. As already mentioned above, there is no clear border between the etymologically correct use of nasal vowels and complete denasalization. In manuscripts that belong to so-called Late Old Church Slavonic, manuscripts from late eleventh or early twelfth century, original nasal vowel occur as denasalized, or they are still written as a nasal vowels, but their spelling is no longer dependent on etymology. This shows the denasalization process in progress. Another feature of these younger manuscripts that deserves mention, is the so-called one-jer orthography, showing the results of a phonological development that is known as the ‘fall of the jers’ in which the two reduced vowels, the front jer *ь* and the back jer *ъ*, merged with other vowels, or were lost, depending on their distribution (see also below in section 1.3.3).

1.3.3 Variation within OCS

The manuscripts written in Glagolitic are usually linked to the scriptorium in Ohrid (western Bulgaria/Macedonia) and the Cyrillic manuscripts to that in Preslav (eastern Bulgaria). The two schools show mainly lexical differences. An example is the Ohrid school’s preference for native Slavic words, while

the Preslav school uses more Graecisms (cf. Thomson 2006: 34-35 for a discussion and references to comparative terminology lists). However, such differences are merely trends, and manuscripts often contain terminology from both schools.

There is also a phonological difference between manuscripts from the two schools, which pertains to the development of the back jer (*ъ*) in strong position:⁹ in the Glagolitic manuscripts, from Ohrid, the strong back *jer* in some cases merges with *o*, as in modern Macedonian, while in the Cyrillic manuscripts from Preslav the sound is still written as *ъ*, probably indicating a *schwa*, which is the reflex of the back *jer* (*ъ*) in strong position in modern Bulgarian. However, in the older Glagolitic manuscripts, like the *Codex Zographensis*, the absence of the merger of *ъ* with *o* can be attributed to old age; the language simply reflects the period before the fall of the jers, not a geographically defined feature.

The differences between the Ohrid and Preslav schools are relatively minor and a lot of mixing occurs within manuscripts (Cyrillic documents with some typical Ohrid features and vice versa). One of the reasons for this is that all OCS manuscripts are copies, probably copies of copies. Specific linguistic features can therefore be attributed to either the original, to an earlier copy, or to the language of the scribe. This means that one document may contain characteristics from different periods and geographical areas, depending on the number of times it was copied. A good example forms the *Savvina Kniga*, a Cyrillic manuscript that shows traces of a Glagolitic exemplar (cf. Schaecken & Birnbaum 1999: 100-101, with references).

Although the manuscripts cover a relatively long period of time (almost 200 years) and come from two different literary centres, there is also no indication that there is a systematic difference between the various OCS manuscripts with regard to verbal aspect. For this reason, I will treat the OCS corpus as a homogeneous corpus of texts with regard to verbal aspect. The database, which I will describe in the following sections, contains 80,000 verb forms from manuscripts from both centres and from both the tenth and the eleventh century. In a number of cases different manuscripts give a different rendering of the same text. This is most apparent in the Gospel texts, of which there are four OCS versions. These variant renderings can provide

⁹ When counting from the last jer in a word to the beginning of a word, the first jer is in a weak position and the following jer is in a strong position, the next jer is weak again etc. This alternating pattern continues until a full vowel is reached. Counting from a full vowel, the following jer is weak, the next one strong etc. This pattern is known as Havlík's law (cf. Schenker 1995: 97), which was formulated in 1889 by the Czech scholar Antonín Havlík.

insight into linguistic developments concerning aspect, which is why I have compiled a parallel corpus of OCS Gospel texts (cf. section 1.5.3).

1.4 OCS canon

The OCS canon consists of a relatively modest number of manuscripts. The total number of folios is about 1825; 1270 in Glagolitic and the remainder in Cyrillic (Schaeken & Birnbaum 1999: 89). The texts are all of a religious nature, hence the name Old *Church* Slavonic, and they are almost all translations of Greek originals.

The database of OCS verbs that I use in this study is based on part of the canon; I gathered the data for the database from the *Belegstellenverzeichnis der altkirchenslavischen Verbalformen*, by Aitzetmüller (1977), which does not contain all texts that are regarded as part of the OCS canon today (cf. section 1.5).

Below I will describe the major manuscripts (10 folios or more) that are part of my database. Manuscripts from which no data have been used and minor manuscripts are merely mentioned, but not described. For a more extensive description of the various manuscripts see Schenker (1995: 203-213) and Schaeken & Birnbaum (1999: 93-135). Lysaght (1982) provides a collection and description of smaller manuscripts.

The manuscripts discussed below are categorized by content: Biblical texts (divided into Fourfold Gospels, Evangeliaries, Apostols and Psalters) and other religious texts (divided into Liturgical texts and Homiletic texts).¹⁰

After the description of manuscripts, I will present the database that I compiled based on these manuscripts, as well as the parallel corpus of OCS Gospel texts.

1.4.1 Fourfold Gospels

Fourfold Gospels, or tetra Gospels contain the text of all four Gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. The two OCS fourfold Gospels that are part of my database are:

Codex Zographensis (Z),¹¹ a Glagolitic fourfold Gospel of 270 folios,¹² containing the text of all four Gospels from Matthew 3:11 on, with some gaps

¹⁰ I use the categorization as given by Schaeken & Birnbaum (1999: 87-88).

¹¹ Between brackets the letter I use in examples to indicate from which codex the example originates (cf. 0.4).

¹² The codex contains a total of 304 folios. However, there are a number of folios that contain later insertions, including some in Cyrillic, and that do not belong to the OCS canon (cf. Schaeken & Birnbaum 1999: 95-96, with references).

in between. The codex dates from the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century. It is named after the place where it was found: the Monastery of St. Zographos on Mount Athos, in 1843. For this study I have used the diplomatic edition from 1879, edited by Vatroslav Jagić.

Codex Marianus (M), a Glagolitic fourfold Gospel of 173 folios, containing the text of all four Gospels from Matthew 5:23 to John 21:17, with some gaps. The codex dates from the early eleventh century and is called after the Monastery of the Holy Mother of God on Mount Athos where it was found in 1845. For this study I have used the diplomatic edition from 1883, by Jagić.

In addition to two fourfold Gospels that are part of my database, there is the *Codex Zographensis Palimpsest*, part of the codex *Zographensis* (folio 41-57), a Glagolitic on Glagolitic palimpsest, one of the later additions to the codex *Zographensis*.

1.4.2 *Evangelaries*

Evangelaries, also referred to as lectionaries or *aparakos* Gospels contain excerpts from all four Gospels. The OCS evangelaries are all short evangelaries, containing the texts to be read during the eight weeks from Palm Sunday to Pentecost, both on Sundays and weekdays, and texts for Saturday and Sunday for the remainder of the liturgical year. Evangelaries normally contain two parts, a synaxarion (Gospel readings for the Easter cycle) and a menology (offices for feasts honouring saints and other important dates in the ecclesiastic year). The following two evangelaries are part of my database:

Codex Assemanianus (A), a short Glagolitic evangelary of 158 folios, dating from the early eleventh century. The codex bears the name of its finder, Josef S. Assemani, who found it in 1736, in a monastery in Jerusalem. The diplomatic edition I use in this study is the 1955 edition, by Josef Kurz.

Savvina Kniga (Sk), a short Cyrillic evangelary containing 130 folios, copied from a Glagolitic source.¹³ It dates from the early eleventh century and owes its name to the scribe, the priest Sava, who wrote his name on two folios. The manuscript was discovered in 1866, in Moscow. For this study I have used the diplomatic edition by Vjačeslav Nikolaevič Ščepkin from 1903.

Other OCS manuscripts that fall within this category are the *Vatican Palimpsest*, *Bojana Evangelary*, *Ohrid Folios*, *Undol'skij's Fragments*, and the *Sinai Fragment*.

¹³ There is a total of 166 folios, 130 of which belong to the OCS canon. The remainder of the codex consists of later additions of Russian Church Slavonic recension.

1.4.3 *Apostols*

Apostols contain readings from the Acts and the Epistles of the Apostles.

The only OCS Apostol is the *Enina Apostol* (not included in the database, since it is absent from the *Belegstellenverzeichnis*).

1.4.4 *Psalters*

Psalters contain the text of the Book of Psalms.

Psalterium Sinaiticum (*Ps*), a Glagolitic manuscript of 209 folios, containing 151 psalms, 14 Biblical hymns, the Lord's Prayer and some other liturgical texts. The two parts of the manuscript were both found in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. The first part (Psalms 1-137, 177 folios) was found in 1850, the second part (the remainder of the Book of Psalms and other texts, 32 folios) in 1975.¹⁴ The manuscript dates from the eleventh century. The diplomatic edition that I have used for this study is the 1922 edition by Sergej Sever'janov for the first part of the manuscript. For the second there is a diplomatic edition by František Mareš (1997).

There is one other OCS Psalter, the *Psalter Dimitrijs*.

1.4.5 *Liturgical texts*

Liturgical texts contain texts used during church services, such as prayers, blessings, hymns, creed etc. The following OCS codices contain liturgical texts:

Euchologium Sinaiticum (*Es*), a Glagolitic manuscript of 134 folios, the largest service book in OCS. It was found in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, in 1880, and contains parts of the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. Not all 134 folios were found at the same time. In 1850, 3 folios were found in the monastery of St. Catherine. Another 103 folios were discovered there in 1880, and yet another 28 folios in 1975.¹⁵ The *Euchologium Sinaiticum* shares many linguistic characteristics with the *Psalterium Sinaiticum* and probably also dates from the eleventh century. The diplomatic edition I have used for this study is the edition by Rajko Nahtigal (1941).

¹⁴ The remainder of the *Psalterium Sinaiticum*, which was found in 1975, is not part of my database, since it was not included in the *Belegstellenverzeichnis* by Aitzetmüller, which was issued in 1977.

¹⁵ These latter 28 folios are not part of my database, since they are not included in the *Belegstellenverzeichnis* by Aitzetmüller.

Other manuscripts in this category are the *Sinai Missal*, *Kiev Folios*, *St. Petersburg Octoechos*, *Menaeum Sinaiticum* and *Folio 1r of the Kiev Folios* (containing the Marian prayer).

1.4.6 Homiletic texts

Homiletic texts contain Christian devotional literature, meant for edification. The following two codices are part of my database:

***Codex Suprasliensis* (S)**, the largest OCS manuscript, consisting of 285 folios, in Cyrillic, which among other things contains twenty-four lives of saints and twenty-four homilies. It owes its name to the monastery of Supraśl (near Białystok, Poland) where it was found in 1823. The manuscript dates from the eleventh century. The diplomatic edition used for the study is the edition by Zaimov & Capaldo (1982-83).




Figure 1.2 Fragment from the codex Suprasliensis (containing Romans 5:14)

***Glagolita Clozianus* (C)**, a Glagolitic manuscript containing 12 folios of homilies. The name of the manuscript refers to Count Paris Cloz (1777-1856), who acquired it and donated it to the City library of Trent. It dates from the eleventh century. I have used the 1959 diplomatic edition by Antonín Dostál for this study.

Other OCS liturgical texts are the *Rila Folios*, *Hilendar Folios*, *Zograph Folios*, *Cyrillic Macedonian (Hilferding's) folio*, *Grigorovič fragment*.

In addition to the manuscripts there are a number of *inscriptions* that are also considered to be part the OCS canon. The largest, best known are the ***Tsar Samuil's inscription*** (31 words) and the ***Mostič inscription*** (30 words). A good overview of inscriptions with transcription can be found in Lysaght (1982). Because of their limited content these inscriptions play only a minor role in this study, as do the smaller manuscripts; their small size means that they only have very limited influence in the statistical analysis in Chapter 7.

Table 1.1 contains an overview of the major manuscripts used for this study, a total of 1348 folios:

<i>Glagolitic</i>	<i>Cyrillic</i>
<i>Codex Zographensis</i> , 270 folios	<i>Savvina Kniga</i> , 130 folios
<i>Codex Marianus</i> , 173 folios	<i>Codex Suprasliensis</i> , 285 folios
<i>Codex Assemanianus</i> , 158 folios	
<i>Psalterium Sinaiticum</i> , 209 folios	
<i>Euchologium Sinaiticum</i> , 109 folios	
<i>Glagolita Clozianus</i> , 14 folios	

Table 1.1 Major OCS manuscripts used in the database

Of these, the Gospel codices (*Zographensis*, *Marianus*, *Assemanianus* and *Savvina Kniga*) play a key role in the analysis of aspect usage in this study, because these manuscripts allow for a comparison of up to four versions of the same text (cf. section 1.5.3), depending on the questions in how many the Gospel codices the particular passage is attested.

1.5 Database and Parallel Corpus of OCS Gospel texts

Data from the manuscripts described above form the basis of my database, on which, in turn, the morphological categorization of verbs in Chapter 5 and the statistical analysis in Chapter 7 are based. I will first give a short introduction of the database. In Chapter 5 I discuss the various parameters that are included in the database in more detail.

In section 1.5.3 I will introduce the Parallel Corpus of OCS Gospel.

1.5.1 Database

For this study of verbal aspect in OCS, I have compiled a database of attestations of OCS verbs. The first phase of the compilation of the database consisted of putting together a list of all attested OCS verbs from the retrograde part of the *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen texten* by L. Sadnik & R. Aitzetmüller (1955). Subsequently Aitzetmüller's *Belegstellenverzeichnis der altkirchenslavischen Verbalformen* (1977) was used to count the attestations for each individual verb. Differences between the verbs mentioned in the *Handwörterbuch* and those in the *Belegstellenverzeichnis* were straightened out in the process.¹⁶ In a number of cases I corrected obvious mistakes in the *Belegstellenverzeichnis*.¹⁷ This resulted in a database of 2,883 verbs with a total of almost 80,000 attestations.

¹⁶ For example, the *Handwörterbuch* had both *grěti* and *grějati* 'heat', while the *Belegstellenverzeichnis* has only one lemma *grěti* (*grějati*). In such cases I chose the way the lemma was listed in the *Staroslavjanskij slovar'* by Cejtin, Večerka, & Blagova (1994), in this case *grějati*.

¹⁷ For example, for the verb *rozbrěti* 'recover one's sight' 5 attestations of the present active participle are entered, which upon examination of the attestations turned out to be past active

When the list of verbs with their attestations was complete, other parameters were added to the database. This concerned mainly aspectually relevant characteristics, e.g. the absence or presence of a prefix or a suffix and derivational relations between verbs. These additions make it possible to group verbs based on shared (morphological) characteristics and compare the relative distribution of the verb forms in groups of verbs thus selected. Some other characteristics that I included are, for example, the Leskien verb class¹⁸ and the meaning of the verb in Dutch and English. I will go into the database and its use for this study more extensively in Chapter 5, where I will discuss the various relevant aspectual characteristics of OCS verbs. The figure below shows an example of the entry for the verb *sǫbǫrati* ‘gather’ in the database:

Verb from S&A		Number of attestations of verb in Belegstellenverzeichnis	
Verb			
Verb	сѡбѡрати		
Leskien cat.	Class 1		
Derivational Category	Prefixed verb		
Means of derivation	N/A		
Prefix	сѡ		
Present form			
Verb of motion	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No		
Simplex			
Simplex	ѡрати		
Simplex Leskien cat.	Class 1		
Derived verbs			
Suffixed simplex	N/A		
Prefixed verb	сѡбѡрати		
Suffixed prefixed verb	сѡбѡрати		
Secondary suffixed	N/A		
Meaning			
Meaning	gather (refl. meet)		
Betekenis	verzamenen (refl. bijeenkomen)		
Other			
Problematic	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No		
Remarks			

Verb from S&A		Number of attestations of verb in Belegstellenverzeichnis	
Verb			
сѡбѡрати			
Present	40	20.30%	
Imperfect			
Aorist	79	40.10%	Aorist I
Imperative	15	7.61%	Aorist II
Infinitive	10	5.08%	Aorist III
Supin			Aorist IV
Prs.A.P.			Aorist V
Prs.P.P.			
PstA.P. I	28	14.21%	
PstA.P. II	5	2.54%	
PstLP.P.	20	10.15%	Pst.P.P. I
Future			Pst.P.P. II
Conditional			Cond. I
			Cond. II
Total	197		
Total Imperfect and Present Ptc			
Total Aorist and Past Ptc	132	67.01%	
Remark			

Figure 1.3 Screenshot of a database entry of the verb *sǫbǫrati* ‘gather’

1.5.2 Limitations of the data

The attestations in the *Belegstellenverzeichnis* give a good overview over the verbal system in OCS. Some of the newer manuscripts, e.g. the ones found in

participles. Another example are the two aorist attestations of *nenaviděti* ‘hate’ which turned out to be one imperfect attestation and one aorist attestation of the verb *vbznenaviděti* ‘start hating’.

¹⁸ Refers to the classification of the OCS verbs into five groups based on the present tense suffix, by the German linguist August Leskien (1969: 138-168).

1975 on Mount Sinai, like the second part of the *Psalterium Sinaiticum* and 28 folios of the *Euchologium Sinaiticum*, or manuscripts of which no diplomatic edition is available, like the Bojana evangeliary, are not included in the count. The following two minor manuscripts that are not regarded as part of the OCS canon, are included in the database because of their inclusion in the *Belegstellenverzeichnis*:

Novgorod Fragments, two folios from a Cyrillic gospel that shows some characteristics of the Russian recension of Church Slavonic. The transcription that can be found in Lysaght (1982: 29-37) does not indicate different use of verb forms compared to the Gospels texts in OCS manuscripts.

Sluck Psalter, five folios of a Cyrillic psalter (part of Psalm 118), with Russian characteristics. The manuscript itself is now lost, but the transcription of the manuscript by Sreznevskij (1868: 155-165) does not reveal different use of verb forms compared to the OCS codex *Psalterium Sinaiticum*.

The **Kiev Folios** are also included in the database. This codex is often mentioned as part of the OCS canon, but with some caution because its characteristics indicate a link to the second homeland, while all other OCS codices are from the third homeland, as discussed above. Unlike the other OCS manuscripts, which are translated from Greek, this is a translation from a Latin source. Furthermore, the West Slavic reflex of Proto-Slavic **tj* and **dj* could be seen as a valid reason to treat the Kiev Folios as a separate tradition (cf. also Schaecken 1987: 120-121). The description of the attested verb forms by Schaecken (1987: 87-89), though, does not show any deviating verb forms in comparison to the rest of the OCS canon.

The verb forms from this limited number of folios are vastly outnumbered by the verb forms harvested in the manuscripts that are regarded as belonging to the OCS canon. Moreover, since these manuscripts do not show any specific deviations on the area of the verbal system with regard to the OCS manuscripts they do not distort the overall picture of the verbal system. The database is therefore a reliable tool for studying verbal aspect in OCS.

1.5.3 *Parallel corpus of OCS Gospel texts*

Since this study of verbal aspect is in part a question of the scope of use of particular verbs and verb forms, as I will show in the following chapters, the four major Gospel manuscripts, providing up to four possible OCS versions of one and the same text, proved very useful in this study. This is mainly because variation between the manuscripts gives an impression of the range of verbs and verb forms that can be used in a particular context. Moreover, the Greek original of the Gospel texts is so well known and well analysed that it is easier to get an idea of what the Slavic translation tries to express than it

often is with texts from, for example, codex *Suprasliensis*, for parts of which the source text is not even known. Finally, in many instances, two, three, or all four of the codices have the same verb form. If this is the case, it is strong support for the assumption that the form is not simply a copying mistake, or an idiosyncratic system based on the dialect of the copier, but that it reflects systematic usage of the form throughout OCS.

I therefore compiled a parallel corpus of the four OCS Gospel codices of which a digital edition was already available: *Zographensis*, *Marianus*, *Assemanianus* and *Savvina Kniga*.¹⁹ The parallel corpus makes it possible to spot differences and similarities between these four codices at a glance, giving an impression of the range of uses and translation choices the OCS translators had.

Compare the following two OCS translations of the same Greek original, which give an indication of how this study can benefit from the comparison of the various Gospel codices:

- (2) slyšavъ že jako arxilai c[ěsar]rǫstvuetъ vъ ijudei . vъ iroda město
o[tъ]ca svoego . **boja**^{or} **sę** tamo iti [Sk]
slyšavъ že . ěko arxilai c[ěsar]rstvuetъ vъ ijudei . vъ iroda město
o[tъ]ca svoego . **uboja**^{or} **sę** tamo iti [A]
but when he heard that Archelaus was reigning over Judea in place of
his father Herod, he *was afraid* to go there (Matthew 2:22)

The difference between the codex *Assemanianus* and the *Savvina Kniga* is interesting here because it shows that in OCS apparently simplex verbs like *bojati sę* 'be afraid' were in competition with prefixed verbs like *ubojati sę* in this particular inchoative context in which 'was afraid' can be paraphrased as 'became afraid'. This reveals something about the state of the verbal aspect system in OCS and the various means available to translate the Greek original, which has an indicative aorist form ἐφοβήθη. Moreover, if there are arguments for the anteriority of one reading over the other, it also holds information on the direction in which the verbal aspect system developed.

In Chapter 8 I will address the issue of simplex versus prefixed verbs in the verbal aspect system in OCS more extensively, as well as other interesting variations between the extant OCS translations, but for now example (2) suffices to show that comparing codices provides more information

¹⁹ The parallel corpus can be downloaded from my personal website: www.jaapkamphuis.nl. The digital texts on which this parallel corpus is based, originate from the Corpus Cyrillo-Methodianum Helsingiense which can be found on <http://www.helsinki.fi/slaavilaiset/ccmh/> and on the website of the Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien (TITUS), <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/indexe.htm>.

regarding the aspect system than considering only a single codex. Of course, variation within one codex can also reveal such information, but the parallel texts all stem from a single source, i.e. the original translation by Constantine and Methodius, and can therefore reveal more about the direction of development.²⁰

Thus, while the database of OCS verbs, which is the basis for the morphological categorization of verbs in Chapter 5 and the statistical analysis in Chapter 7, is based on a large part of the OCS canon, I often found the most illustrative examples in the parallel corpus of Gospel texts. It is important to note here that the Gospel manuscripts, as well as many other OCS manuscripts contain narratives.²¹ In Chapter 8 (section 8.2.1) I will show that the functions of the aspects also depend on the question whether they occur in a narrative or in so-called 'retrospective' mode, in which a past event is not presented as part of a narrative, but as directly related to the moment of speech. The fact that most of the OCS manuscripts contain narratives, means that it is more difficult to reach firm conclusions regarding typical functions of aspect in retrospective mode, such as the general factual use of imperfective verbs (cf. section 2.2.1).

²⁰ Unless one assumes that the Gospel texts have been translated more than once and the OCS gospel codices stem from different OCS translations, for which to my knowledge exist no compelling arguments.

²¹ An important deviation from this rule are the psalters, which contain monologues and dialogues.

