

# 4 Old Church Slavonic

*David Huntley*

## 1 Introduction

Old Church Slavonic is the language extrapolated from a small corpus of probably late tenth-century copies, mainly of translations made about a century earlier of Greek ecclesiastical texts. These Slavonic texts, containing mainly Balkan dialectal features, have an admixture of Moravianisms, since the first translations were used for missionary activity in Greater Moravia, where further translations and copies were made, beginning from about 863. The earliest texts were written in Glagolitic, a script devised by Constantine and Methodius, whereas the misnamed Cyrillic script was devised in the Balkans after the expulsion of the Moravian mission in about 885 (see chapter 2). In this chapter examples will be cited from the following major texts:

Gospel lectionaries (books of lessons from the Gospels to be read at church services):

*Codex Assemanianus* (*Evangeliarium Assemani*) (edited by J. Kurz, Prague, 1955), Glagolitic, 158 folia;

*Savvina kniga* (edited by V. Ščepkin, St Petersburg, 1903), Cyrillic, 129 folia;

Tetraevangelia (texts of the four Gospels):

*Codex Zographensis* (edited by V. Jagić, Berlin, 1879), Glagolitic, 288 folia with lacunae, and including some folia in a younger hand;

*Codex Marianus* (edited by V. Jagić, Berlin, 1883), Glagolitic, 174 folia, with fewer lacunae than *Zographensis*;

Psalter (book of psalms):

*Psalterium Sinaiticum* (*Sinajskaja psaltyr'*, edited by S. Sever'janov, Petrograd, 1922), Glagolitic, 177 folia, containing Psalms 1–137;

Euchologion (prayer book):

*Euchologium Sinaiticum* (edited by R. Nahtigal, Ljubljana, 1942), Glagolitic, 109 folia.

Menologion for the month of May (lives of saints and sermons arranged by day):

*Codex Suprasliensis* (*Supraslski ili retkov sbornik*, edited by J. Zaimov

and M. Capaldo, 2 volumes, Sofia, 1982–3), Cyrillic, 570 folia;  
Homiliary (collection of sermons):

*Glagolita Clozianus (Clozianus)*, edited by A. Dostál, Prague, 1959),  
Glagolitic, 14 folia.

No data will be cited here from shorter texts, or from the later recensions, which together with Old Church Slavonic are known as ‘Church Slavonic’, comprising later copies of texts, copies of texts not extant earlier and new translations of various kinds in copies of Bulgarian, Macedonian, East Slavonic, Serbian, Croatian and Czech–Slovak provenance.

Examples from the texts will be cited in italics, without any normalization in the direction of our reconstruction of the phonemic system of Old Church Slavonic. Phonemic and phonetic reconstructions (of both older and younger forms) will be cited in slanted and square brackets respectively. Unless specified otherwise, these reconstructions will cite infinitives for verbs and nominative singular for nominals, with the masculine cited for nominals inflected for gender. Forms in tables, cited without brackets, are phonemic. The Gospel texts are those of the first witness cited.

## 2 Phonology

### 2.1 Segmental phoneme inventory

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show the segmental phonemes of Old Church Slavonic. In addition, the orthography indicates the following in Greek words: /ü/, /o:/, /ǵ/, /f/, /θ/. For the relation between phonemes and Glagolitic and Cyrillic graphemes, reference should be made to chapter 2.

The symbols ь and ъ represent reduced vowels, phonetically mid. In Eastern (Bulgarian) dialects, these reduced vowels had high allophones contiguous with /j/, that is /ьjь/ is [ij̥i], /ъj/ is [j̥j]. Western (Macedonian) dialects did not have this variation, but here, unlike in the

**Table 4.1 Old Church Slavonic vowels**

Front unrounded		Back unrounded		Back rounded	
<i>Oral</i>	<i>Nasal</i>	<i>Oral</i>		<i>Oral</i>	<i>Nasal</i>
i		y		u	
ь		ъ			
e	ѣ			o	ѡ
ě		a			

*Note:* In Western dialects, ъ was rounded.

**Table 4.2 Old Church Slavonic consonants**

	<i>Labial</i>		<i>Dental</i>		<i>Palatal</i>		<i>Velar</i>	
Plosive	p	b	t	d			k	g
Affricate			c	dz	č			
Fricative		v	s	z	š	ž	x	
Nasal		m		n		ň		
Lateral				l		ḷ		
Trill				r		ř		
Semi-vowel						j		

east, /ʙ/ was phonetically labialized. Glagolitic orthography provides evidence for fronted allophones of the phonemically labialized /u/, /o/. Nasalized and oral vowels are contrasted in word-final position: /duše/ ‘soul (VOC SG)’, /dušę/ (GEN SG), /ženq/ ‘woman (ACC SG)’, /ženo/ (VOC SG).

The dental affricates /c/, /dz/, post-alveolar /š/, /ž/, /č/, /ř/, pre-palatal /ḷ/, /ň/, /j/, and stops in the sequences /št/, /žd/ were phonetically palatalized. In Eastern dialects, labials, and dentals other than /c/, /dz/ were palatalized phonetically only before front vowels, whereas no such allophonic variation occurred in Western dialects. Younger spellings, as in *prędame i* (Matthew 26.15; *Marianus*) ‘I will betray him’ are evidence for a morpheme /j/. Such spellings arose after the loss of the reduced vowels in the tenth century, and can be explained only as a Western reflex of /prędamь jь/ as /prędame j/, proving that /j/ must have been the stem of the third-person pronoun. The sonorants /l/, /r/ could form syllabic nuclei. Orthographically, and in transliteration in this chapter, the syllabic sonorants are not distinguished from sequences of sonorant followed by reduced vowel. In phonemic and phonetic representation, the sequences will be shown by writing the *yers*, the reduced vowel letters, on the line, and the syllabic sonorants with the *jer* above the line.

With respect to constraints on phoneme distribution, only the most conservative system, prior to the loss of the reduced vowels, will be discussed here. The consonant clusters described in table 4.3 do not include sequences containing syllabic sonorants. Apart from the constraint evident from table 4.3, namely that two adjacent consonants tend not to share identical features of manner of articulation, no syllable ends in a consonant, an obstruent other than /v/ agrees in voicing with an immediately following obstruent, velars do not occur before front vowels, and phonetically palatalized consonants do not occur before certain back vowels. Constraints on sequences of consonant and vowel are summarized in table 4.4. The back vowels /y/, /ʙ/, and front vowels other than /i/ did

**Table 4.3 Old Church Slavonic consonant clusters**

Initials	Finals																
	p	b	t	d	k	g	m	n	v	l	r	x	ń	í	ř	c	
s	+		+		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	J				J
z		J		I		I	+	+	+	+	+						
g				(I)				+	+	+	+			(I)			
d							(I)		+	+	+						
t, k, x									+	+	+						
p, b								(J)		+	+					+	
ž				I						+	+			+			
m, v										+	+						J
č										+	+						
š			+							+				J	J		
c, dz									+								
n												+					
sp											J	J					
st									I	J	+						
sk									+	+	+						
sm, sv											+						
sx, zg										J	J	J					
zb, zm										J	J						
zd										J	J						
zv										J	J						
št									J								J
žd																	J
tv											J						

*Note:* + no constraints; I word-medial and at morpheme boundary only; J at morpheme boundary only; ( ) restricted to one or a few lexical items.

not occur initially, where the two back vowels took prothetic /v/, and the front vowels prothetic /j/. A vowel sequence is attested in only one native lexical morpheme, namely the root of /pačina/ 'spider's web', and in the suffixes /aa/, /ěa/ of the imperfect tense. At morpheme boundaries, the following vowel sequences occur: /ai/, /au/, /ao/, /oi/, /ou/, /oo/, /ěi/, /ěo/.

Most of the variant spellings resulted from changes occurring between the time of the translations and the actual extant copies, while a few variants are the result of prehistoric changes.

Nasal vowels are regular prehistoric reflexes, with a vowel–nasal sequence before a consonant or a long vowel–nasal sequence word-finally giving rise to the nasal vowels /ǫ/ and /ǣ/. There are attested a few examples of younger reflexes of these nasal vowels, arising probably from historical denasalizations, with /ǫ/ giving /u/ or /o/ and /ǣ/ giving /e/ or /ě/. In Glagolitic, spellings with *o* for *ǫ* and *e* for *ǣ* could have arisen as the result of the omission of the second element of the digraphs for the

**Table 4.4 Constraints on consonant–vowel sequences**

	y	ъ	o	o	u	a	ě	ę	e	ь	i
Velar	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–
j	–	–	–	+	+	C	G	+	+	+	+
š, ž, č	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	+
ń, l, f	–	–	–	+	+	S	+	+	+	+	+
c, dz	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

*Note:* + no constraints; C Cyrillic; G Glagolitic; S Suprasliensis. There are no constraints for labials or for dentals other than /c/, /dz/. š, ž, č + ě are attested in spellings that are possibly Moravian.

nasal vowels. In other contexts there was dialectal sporadic nasalization of a vowel in contact with a nasal consonant giving rise to doublets such as /gnusiti sę/, /gnositi sę/ ‘be disgusted’, arising probably prehistorically.

Scribal inconsistency indicates that the reduced vowels were lost in Balkan dialects by the end of the tenth century in weak position (/sъna/ > /sna/ ‘sleep (GEN SG)’, /dъne/ > /dne/ ‘day (GEN SG)’), but were transformed in strong position (nominative singular /sъnъ/ > Western /son/, elsewhere /sən/, /dъnъ/ > /den/, /dən/). The reduced vowels were in weak position when not immediately followed by a syllable containing another reduced vowel in weak position, but were in strong position when immediately followed by such a syllable. Thus all utterance-final reduced vowels were weak, but a word-final reduced vowel could be in strong position when followed by an enclitic, as in /prědamъ jь/, later /prědame j/ ‘I will betray him’ cited above or in /dъnъ sь/, later /dnes/, ‘day this (ACC SG)’, ‘today’.

In dialects with high allophones of the reduced vowels contiguous with /j/, strong reduced vowels in such a context had high-vowel reflexes, instead of the mid-vowel reflexes occurring in other contexts, as in sътворѣи (*Zographensis*, *Savvina kniga*), sъtvorii (*Marianus*), sъtvorei (*Assemanianus*) (Luke 10.37) ‘do (PAST ACT PART NOM SG M DEF)’. The variants all represent reflexes of /sъtvorѣjь/. *Zographensis* and *Savvina kniga* represent either this form or a younger /stvorəj/ in a dialect without the high allophones, whereas *Marianus* represents either the older form with high allophones [sъtvorij] or its reflex /stvorij/. Only *Assemanianus* is unambiguous, representing a Western reflex /stvorej/. All four witnesses typically write the *jer* in the first syllable, even though the vowel had disappeared in this context.

Prehistorically there were back syllabic sonorants and front syllabic sonorants followed by a back and front vocalic glide, respectively. Although this etymological distinction will be observed in phonological

representations in this study, the distinction is not observed in the orthography, so that the front and back syllabic sonorants may have merged prehistorically, as in *črъвь* (*Zographensis*), *črъвь* (*Marianus*) (Mark 9.44) 'worm (NOM SG)'. From the palatal initial consonant one may reconstruct etymological /čr<sup>b</sup>ъv/. The *jer* letters used to indicate syllabic sonorants are never replaced by *e* or *o* letters, whereas such younger spellings are attested for the sonorants followed by a phonemic reduced vowel, as in *skrъžьšterъ* (*Zographensis*, *Marianus*, *Assemanianus*; Mark 9.18), *skrežьšterъ* (*Euchologium Sinaiticum* 88a.10) 'gnash (3 SG PRS)'. In this example, a velar, /k/, precedes the sequence of /r/ plus front reduced vowel, whereas a velar could not precede any front segment, including a front syllabic sonorant.

Similarly, the shift of /ъ/ to /o/ is attested in prepositions immediately followed by a syllable containing a sequence /r/ plus reduced vowel in weak position, but such a shift is not attested when the syllable contains a syllabic sonorant; thus *vo krъvi* (*Psalterium Sinaiticum* 57.11) 'in blood (LOC SG)' represents the reflex of an older /ъvъ krъve/.

Low vowels followed by /r/ or /l/ plus a consonant prehistorically metathesized and lengthened, as is attested by some alternations in the manuscripts: *borę sę* (*Suprasliensis* 56.22) 'fight (PRS ACT PART NOM SG M INDEF)', *sę brati* (*Suprasliensis* 73.9) 'fight (INF)', *meljaaše* (*Suprasliensis* 565.10) 'grind (3 SG IMPF)' (for /melaaše/), *mьlěrъ* (*Suprasliensis* 565.4) 'grind (SUPINE)' (for /mlěrъ/). Here, /a/ and /ě/ are metathesized reflexes of /o/ and /e/, respectively. There is attested one example which is possibly evidence for a dialect in which this metathesis had not taken place: *zоlъta* (*Psalterium Sinaiticum* 71.15) 'gold (GEN SG)'; the normal spelling is *zlata*.

Word-initially, the absence of the metathesis seems more widespread, since there are attested for two roots a number of examples with or without the metathesis, as in *ladii* (*Marianus*), *aldii* (*Zographensis*) (Mark 1.19) 'boat (LOC SG)', *lačqšta* (*Zographensis*), *alčqšta* (*Marianus*, *Assemanianus*), *aлъčqšta* (*Savvina kniga*) (Matthew 25.37) 'hunger (PRS ACT PART ACC SG M)'. One root and one prefix are attested with initial *ra* and *ro*: *rabъ* (*Suprasliensis* 106.1), *robъ* (*Suprasliensis* 106.5) 'slave', *razboinici* (*Suprasliensis* 557.24) 'robber (NOM PL)', *rozboinikъ* (*Suprasliensis* 558.9) (NOM SG). Most likely, the forms with *a* are Balkan, and those with *o* Moravian.

Whereas the dental sonorants followed by front vowels may be preceded by dental obstruents, the palatal sonorants are preceded by palatal obstruents, and therefore must have been articulated further back than were the dentals: *blaznirъ* (*Zographensis*; John 6.61) 'offend (3 SG PRS)', *blazněaxp sę* (*Zographensis*; Matthew 13.57) 'be offended (3 PL IMPF)', *myslite* (*Zographensis*; Matthew 9.4) 'think (2 PL PRS)', *myslěaše* (*Zographensis*; Luke 12.17) (3 SG IMPF). The palatal alternants /ž/, /š/ are attested regularly when immediately preceding the sonorants /ń/, /í/. The sonorant

/f/, or its reflex, is attested with immediately preceding dentals as well as palatals: *сѣmotriši* (*Suprasliensis* 241.16) 'observe (2 SG PRES)', *сѣmoštraaxp* (*Suprasliensis* 184.8) (3 PL IMPF), *сѣmotraaše* (*Suprasliensis* 92.17) (3 SG IMPF) (for /сѣmoštraaše/); *mođriši se* (*Suprasliensis* 49.15) 'dispute (2 SG PRS)', *premoždrati se* (*Suprasliensis* 21.24) 'philosophize (INF)', *umoždreje* (*Psalterium Sinaiticum* 18.8) 'make wise (PRS ACT PART NOM SG N)' (for /umožďraje/). The first member of each triple of examples has the dental stop /t/ or /d/ because the immediately following sonorant is also dental, whereas the second example has the palatal alternant /št/ or /žd/ before the reflexes of palatal /f/. In the third example of each triple, not only has the palatal sonorant merged with dental /r/, but also the dental:palatal alternation has been suppressed analogically. There is attested further orthographical evidence to show that /ń/, /l/ behave more conservatively than /f/. In the most conservative spellings, the palatal sonorants are indicated by a diacritic on the consonant letter, by the use of the letters for the front allophones of /u/, /o/ and by indicating /a/ by the letter *ě* after the palatal sonorants in both Glagolitic and Cyrillic. The diacritic is attested at all regularly only in the Glagolitic *Zographensis* and the Cyrillic *Suprasliensis*. In *Zographensis* the diacritic is used much more consistently for /l/ and /ń/ than for /f/. In *Suprasliensis* the diacritic is used for /l/ and /ń/ even more consistently than in *Zographensis*, but the diacritic is almost never used for /f/. Indeed, in *Suprasliensis* etymological /f/ is frequently not indicated by the following vowel letter, as for instance in *ra* for /fa/ in the examples just cited. The reason for this is that /f/ merged with /r/ when /l/ and /ń/ were still distinct from the dentals. Whereas on typological grounds it is most likely that /ń/ and /l/ were prepalatal, articulated in the position of /j/, a palatalized vibrant cannot be articulated in this position, so that /f/ must have been post-alveolar, articulated in the position of /ž/, and therefore phonetically closer to the dentals than were /ń/ and /l/.

In some Eastern dialects, labials and dentals were phonetically palatalized before front vowels. When the reduced vowels were lost in weak position, palatalized labials and dentals became distinct from their non-palatalized counterparts, for instance: [kap'ъ] > /kap'/ 'image', versus /popъ/ > /pop/ 'priest', [dan'ъ] > /dan'/ 'tribute', versus /danъ/ > /dan/ 'give (PAST PASS PART)'. There is some indication that in some dialects palatal /l/ and /ń/ remained distinct from the dentals after the loss of the reduced vowels, as in *ďneš'ňęgo* (*Suprasliensis* 35.4), *ďneš'ňęgo* (*Suprasliensis* 53.10) (for /ďneš'ňęgo/ from /ďňp'sňajęgo/) 'today's [date] (GEN SG N)'. For such dialects one may also posit, for instance, /koňъ/ > /koň/, but since Balkan Slavic dialects which retain the palatal /l/, /ń/ do not have palatalized labials and dentals, it cannot be shown that a ternary opposition of laterals and nasals, such as /n/, /n'/, /ň/, arose anywhere in the Balkans.

Within a morpheme, sequences of a labial and palatal /j/ are attested regularly, without any textual variants, apart from the presence or absence of the diacritic: *plъvati* (*Zographensis*), *plъvati* (*Marianus*) (Mark 14.65) 'spit (INF)', *съблјуде* (*Marianus*) (John 12.7) 'preserve (3 SG AOR)', *съблјудеть* (*Zographensis*, *Savvina kniga*), *съблјудет* (*Assemanianus*) (3 SG PRS). At the end of a morpheme, there are attested forms with and without the lateral before /i/ and /ь/: *zemli* (*Zographensis*), *zemi* (*Marianus*, *Assemanianus*, *Savvina kniga*) (Matthew 6.10) 'earth (LOC SG)', *korablъ* (*Zographensis*), *korablъ* (*Marianus*), *korablъ* (*Assemanianus*, *Savvina kniga*) (Matthew 8.23) 'boat (ACC SG)'. In *Assemanianus*, *Savvina kniga*, *Psalterium Sinaiticum*, *Euchologium Sinaiticum* and *Suprasliensis* the lateral is often omitted before other vowels, often with a *jer* written after the labial: *zemlě* (*Suprasliensis* 97.2), *земља* (*Suprasliensis* 322.10) 'earth (NOM SG)'. The second of these spellings may denote a shift of /j/ to /j/.

Loss of intervocalic /j/, sometimes with vowel assimilation and sometimes further with vowel contraction, is frequently attested for high vowels, low vowels and /o/: *ništiiмъ* (*Marianus*, *Savvina kniga*), *ništiiм* (*Assemanianus*) (for /ništijimъ/ or /ništiiмъ/), *ništiiмъ* (*Zographensis*) (John 12.5) 'poor (DAT PL DEF)'; *malyixъ* (*Assemanianus*) (for /malyjixъ/ or /malyixъ/), *malyxъ* (*Zographensis*) (Matthew 5.19) 'small (GEN PL DEF)'; *sěxъ* (*Zographensis*) (for /sějaxъ/), *sěaxъ* (*Marianus*), *sěxъ* (*Savvina kniga*) (Matthew 25.26) 'sow (1 SG AOR)'; *blagaja* (*Savvina kniga* 123r), *blagaa* (*Savvina kniga* 67r), *blaga* (*Marianus*) (Luke 11.13) 'good (ACC PL N DEF)'; *drugojъ* (*Marianus*) (Matthew 5.39), *drugoo* (*Suprasliensis* 120.14), 'other (ACC SG F)'. When the first vowel is /a/, /u/ or /ě/, and the second is /e/, the assimilation of the second vowel to the first is attested after the drop of /j/, while still younger forms show contraction: *novaego* (*Zographensis*) (for /novajego/ or /novaego/), *novaago* (*Marianus*, *Assemanianus*), *novago* (*Savvina kniga*) (Matthew 26.28) 'new (GEN SG M DEF)'; *slěpuemu* (*Zographensis*), *slěpumu* (*Assemanianus*) (John 11.37) 'blind (DAT SG M DEF)'; *novuumu* (*Marianus*; Luke 5.39) 'new (DAT SG M DEF)'; *věčъněmъ* (*Marianus*), *věčněamъ* (*Assemanianus*), *věčněmъ* (*Zographensis*), *věčъněm* (*Suprasliensis* 367.4) (John 6.27) 'eternal (LOC SG M)'. After a vowel letter, Glagolitic *ě* corresponds to etymological /ja/ and /jě/, whereas the corresponding letter in Cyrillic never denotes /j/ plus low vowel, hence the spelling difference between *Assemanianus* and *Suprasliensis* in the last example.

Similar contractions, and in Cyrillic an assimilation, are attested in the suffix of the imperfect tense, where no /j/ is involved: *xoždaaše* (*Zographensis*, *Assemanianus*), *xoždaše* (*Marianus*, *Savvina kniga*) (Matthew 14.29) 'walk (3 SG IMPF)'; *iděaše* (*Zographensis*, *Marianus*, *Assemanianus*), *iděše* (*Savvina kniga*) (Luke 7.6) 'go (3 SG IMPF)'; *běaše*, *běše* (*Suprasliensis* 46.30) 'be (3 SG IMPF)'.



The affricate /dz/ merged with /z/, both forms being attested in Glagolitic, whereas Cyrillic has only /z/.

For the etymological sequences /jě/, /ja/, Glagolitic has *ě* and Cyrillic has *ja*. Word-initial etymological /ja/, but not /ě/, is attested with these spellings and also, in both Glagolitic and Cyrillic, *a*: *ěvlenie* (*Marianus, Assemanianus*), *javenie* (*Savvina kniga*), *avlenъe* (*Zographensis*) (Luke 8.17) 'revelation (NOM SG)', *avlenijemъ* (*Suprasliensis* 186.24) (INST SG). Similar variants are attested for /ju/, /u/ 'already' and /jutro/, /utro/ 'morning'.

There are attested a few examples of *i* written for *y*. This could be evidence for a genuine sound shift, but might also result from the omission of the first part of the digraph ѣ /y/.

**2.2 Morphophonemic alternations**

As a result of the second (and third) and first palatalizations, velars alternate with dentals and palatals, respectively, as shown in table 4.5.

**Table 4.5 Consonant alternations resulting from the Proto-Slavonic palatalizations**

Velar	k	g	x	sk	zg	sx
Dental	c	dz	s	sc/st	zd	sc
Palatal	č	ž	š	št	žd	š

There are also alternations of /c/ with /č/ and of /dz/ with /ž/ in some forms which lack a velar correspondent. The dental alternants occur regularly before /ě/ and /i/ both in declension and in the imperative, and less regularly in various forms after /i/, /ę/, /ь/ and /r<sup>b</sup>/. The palatal alternants occur before front vowels in environments other than those in which the dental alternants occur, and in various places in inflection and in word formation described in section 3.

Owing to the influence of an etymological following /j/, dentals alternate with palatals in various places in inflection and in word formation, as shown in table 4.6. Occurring in the same places as the dental alternations, labials have the alternants /bί/, /pί/, /mί/, /vί/.

As a result of earlier alternations between long and short vowels in roots, and of the fronting of vowels after palatalized consonants in both roots and inflections, the following vowel alternations are found: /ь/:/i/; /ъ/:/y/:/u/; /e/:/ě/:/i/; /o/:/a/; /o/:/e/; /ě/:/a/; /ъ/:/ь/; /y/:/i/; /ě/:/i/; /y/:/ę/.

No vowel:  $\emptyset$  alternations occurred in the language of the original translators, but as a result of the loss of the reduced vowels there arose the following alternations: Western /e/: $\emptyset$ , /o/: $\emptyset$ , and in other dialects either /e/: $\emptyset$  and /ə/: $\emptyset$ , or a single alternation /ə/: $\emptyset$ .

**Table 4.6 Consonant alternations resulting from Proto-Slavonic \*j**

Dental	d	zd	t	st	z	s	r	tr	dr	n	sn	zn	l	sl
Palatal	žd	žd	št	št	ž	š	ř	šřf	žďf	ň	šň	žň	l	šl

### 3 Morphology

#### 3.1 Nominal morphology

##### 3.1.1 Nominal categories

The distinction between singular, dual and plural is strictly preserved, except for twelve examples of the noun /*roditelj*/ 'parent', 20 per cent of the attested total, which have plural forms instead of dual. Nouns referring to groups of people tend to have attributes agreeing syntactically in the singular, but non-attributive forms agreeing semantically, and therefore plural:

*vъsbъ* (SG) *že narodъ* (SG) *sъbravъ* (SG) *sę stojaxъ* (PL) *pozorujęte* (PL)  
(*Suprasliensis* 117.14)

'and all (SG) the crowd (SG), having gathered (SG), were standing (PL) watching (PL).'

Four feminine singular collective personal nouns tend to take feminine singular attributes agreeing syntactically, but non-attributive forms tend to agree semantically, being plural, and masculine if distinct for gender:

*vъlęzъ kbъ sęštii* (F SG) *tu bratii* (F SG) *cęlova ję* (M ACC PL) *oni* (M NOM PL) *že*  
*umyvę* (M NOM PL) *jemu nozę* (*Suprasliensis* 523.21)

'having gone in to the brothers (F SG) who were (literally: being (F SG)) there, he greeted them (M ACC PL), and they (M NOM PL), having washed his feet ...'

Old Church Slavonic has the following cases: nominative, vocative, accusative, genitive, dative, instrumental, locative. While the nominative, accusative, genitive, dative, instrumental and locative have the major meanings that one might expect, each has a number of uses to which it would be arbitrary to attach an invariant meaning, as may be illustrated by the forms in the dative and genitive in the following passage:

*nikomuže* (DAT) *sego* (GEN) *nę slyęati gъčъjъ tъnę* (DAT) *jednomu* (DAT) *povęzđbъ*  
... *semu* (DAT) *otъca* (ACC) *pokaži mi* (DAT) (*Suprasliensis* 241.1)

'There is no one (DAT) to hear this (GEN). Tell only me (DAT) alone (DAT) ... show the father (ACC) of this person (DAT) to me (DAT).'

Of the five dative forms in this example, the first is the subject of an infinitive

tive, the second, third and fifth are indirect objects, while the fourth is in the adnominal dative rather than the genitive because its accusative head noun is homonymous with the genitive. The form *sego* is in the genitive, rather than the accusative, because the existential verb is negated.

In the singular, nouns and short masculine adjectives have vocative forms. There is attested one neuter noun in the vocative, *osile* (*Suprasliensis* 313.17) 'trap'. For masculine and feminine singular nouns, including inanimates, there are attested only two types of exception to the use of the vocative for address. In one example (*Suprasliensis* 146.18), *gospodi vojevoda* 'Lord general', the first noun is vocative, the second nominative. In *Suprasliensis*, /bratъja/ 'brothers' has five examples of the vocative, but fifteen examples of the nominative for the vocative, probably because this grammatically singular noun refers semantically to a group of persons.

While most nouns have consistent gender agreement, either masculine, neuter or feminine, some nouns show variance of gender agreement, having attributive forms with syntactic agreement, and non-attributive forms with semantic agreement. Unlike the collective nouns such as /bratъja/ 'brothers' exemplified above, the nouns in question here show variance only for gender, not for number. For the general relationship of declension and gender, see below.

The noun /děti/ 'children', paradigmatically feminine plural, is attested twice with attributes, which are both feminine, but is attested four times with non-attributive forms, all of which are masculine.

The nouns /čedo/ 'child', /ištedъje/ 'offspring' and /mladętъce/ 'infant' are attested with twenty-two examples of neuter attributes, but with eleven non-attributive masculine forms versus only one neuter form, whereas /otročę/ 'child', belonging to a different declension, is attested only with neuter agreement.

Nouns with the nominative singular inflection -/a/ or -/i/ have exclusively feminine agreement when referring to females, animals and inanimates. Male personal nouns in this declension are attested only with masculine agreement in the singular, but in the dual and plural tend to take feminine attributes, whereas non-attributive forms tend to be masculine:

*va oba* (NOM DU M) *sluzě* (NOM DU) *sotonině* (ADJECTIVE NOM DU F) (*Suprasliensis* 75.1)  
'you both (NOM DU M) are servants (NOM DU) of Satan.'

In the dual, there are attested one feminine attribute and three masculine non-attributive forms, whereas in the plural there is attested a hierarchical opposition with twenty-eight feminine attributes and two masculine, but with ten non-attributive feminine forms and seventeen masculine, apparently showing a stronger tendency for syntactic agreement in

attributes than for semantic agreement in non-attributive forms. The hierarchical nature of the opposition is exemplified in the following:

*sokačije čistije* (NOM PL F) *vasъ srbъ iže* (NOM PL M) *srbъ rabi človēčsti*  
(*Suprasliensis* 116.2)

'Cooks who (NOM PL M) are servants of men are cleaner (NOM PL F) than you.'

In this example, a feminine adjective is the predicate of a noun which is the antecedent to a masculine relative pronoun.

*zъlomъ* (DAT PL M) *sokačijamъ oръdano* (*Suprasliensis* 437.3)

'Handed over to evil (DAT PL M) cooks.'

The noun 'cooks' here has a masculine adjectival attribute.

*slugy věděaxъ počъrъšei* (NOM PL M) (*Zographensis, Marianus*)/*počъrъšęje*  
(NOM PL F) (*Assemanianus*) *vodъ* (John 2.9)

'The servants who had drawn (literally: having drawn) the water knew.'

In this example, the participle agreeing with the noun is masculine in two witnesses, but feminine in a third.

Of the few attested examples of epicene nouns (that is, nouns that can be of either gender depending on the sex of the referent) in this declension, one example has a feminine attribute which does not refer to a female person:

*gospodъ moi* (M) *i bogъ moi ožika moja* (F) *i tvorъsъ moi* (*Suprasliensis* 509.11)

'My Lord and my God, my kinsman and my creator.'

The accusative singular of masculine nouns is homonymous either with the nominative singular, or with the genitive singular. Table 4.7 shows a hierarchical attestation of both types of accusative. Although one may conclude from the table that position on the hierarchy is governed largely by the lexical features Personal, Mature, other types of feature, grammatical, syntactic and referential, are also involved.

Proper and common personal nouns at the head of the hierarchy belong to the major masculine declension with genitive singular in *-/a/*, whereas the common personal nouns *gospodъ* 'lord' and *synъ* 'son' did not originally belong to this declension, but acquired the inflection *-/a/* as a means of expressing the accusative singular. One other grammatical feature is involved, namely the relationship between the noun and the adjectives formed from the noun stem. If the stem forms an adjective referring exclusively to an individual person, then the noun will occupy a high position on the accusative hierarchy. Such adjectives are formed from all proper personal noun stems, but not from all common personal nouns. Of the

**Table 4.7 Attestation of nominative–accusative (NA) and genitive–accusative (GA) of masculine animate nouns**

		<i>G</i>	<i>PS</i>	<i>ES</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>Total</i>	%
1 Proper personal	NA	1	—	—	2	—	3	0.4
	GA	507	31	22	10	220	790	99.6
2 Common personal	NA	17	—	1	2	7	27	2.4
	GA	478	47	75	25	484	1109	97.6
3 gospodъ 'lord'	NA	1	—	—	2	2	5	2.8
	GA	60	65	6	4	38	173	97.2
4 rabъ 'slave'	NA	13	—	2	—	—	15	13.4
	GA	30	8	42	—	17	97	86.6
5 synъ '(mature) son'	NA	27	—	1	—	2	30	20.8
	GA	86	5	7	2	14	114	79.2
6 anđelъ 'angel'	NA	8	—	—	—	—	8	57.1
	GA	2	—	—	—	4	6	42.9
7 Animals	NA	32	4	6	1	9	52	70.3
	GA	3	3	1	—	15	22	29.7
8 synъ '(infant) son'	NA	20	—	—	—	2	22	78.6
	GA	4	—	—	—	2	6	21.4
9 bēsъ 'demon'	NA	28	—	—	—	7	35	87.5
	GA	1	—	—	—	4	5	12.5
10 Infants	NA	12	1	1	—	5	19	90.5
	GA	—	—	—	—	2	2	9.5
11 duхъ 'spirit'	NA	76	7	18	—	9	110	90.9
	GA	1	—	4	—	6	11	9.1
12 Inanimates	NA	1227	320	203	64	743	2557	96.3
	GA	49	5	—	3	40	97	3.7

*Note:* *G* Gospels; *PS* Psalterium Sinaiticum; *ES* Euchologium Sinaiticum; *C* Clozianus; *S* Suprasliensis.

twenty-seven examples of common personal nouns attested in the nominative–accusative singular, twenty-one do not have individual personal adjectives. The common personal stem *gospod-*, which does form such an adjective, is higher on the hierarchy than the common personal *syn-*, which has no such adjective. The stem *rab-* 'slave' does have such an adjective, but its position on the hierarchy may be determined by the fact that a slave was low in the real-world hierarchy of persons. None of the nouns in categories 6 to 12 in table 4.7 has an individual personal adjective. In possessive constructions where the head noun controls a single item, the individual personal adjectives are used, instead of the genitive singular, almost without exception, whereas nouns with no individual adjective tend to use the genitive singular of the noun for reference to a definite possessed entity, but an adjective for an indefinite possessed entity. Similarly, there is a strong tendency for the genitive–accusative to refer to a

definite object, and for the nominative–accusative to refer to an indefinite object: for instance, of the twenty-seven examples of common personal attestations, seventeen have indefinite reference and only ten have definite reference.

There is also a tendency for the nominative–accusative to occur as object of a preposition, rather than as direct object of a verb. For inanimates, the last group to embrace the genitive–accusative, ninety-one of the attested examples of the genitive–accusative are direct objects, whereas only six examples are objects of prepositions. Returning to the common personal attestations, one notices that six of the examples of the nominative–accusative with definite reference occur as objects of prepositions, leaving only four examples referring to definite objects. Thus the features controlling the accusative singular hierarchy were lexical, the features Personal, Mature and Proper; grammatical, declensional membership and the presence or absence of an individual personal adjective; syntactic, direct object versus prepositional object; and referential, definite versus indefinite reference.

### 3.1.2 Noun morphology

There are five noun declensions, which can be distinguished by the inflection of the genitive singular. In the singular and plural, six cases are distinguished, but in the dual there are only three sets of forms: nominative/accusative, genitive/locative and dative/instrumental.

The inflectional suffixes for nouns with the genitive singular in *-/a/*, given in table 4.8, have alternants for phonetically palatalized (soft) and non-palatalized (hard) stem-final consonants. Velar stems undergo alternation before front-vowel inflections, as in table 4.10. In this declension, nouns denoting mature male persons and animals are masculine, while some nouns denoting children and inanimates are masculine, but others are neuter. The noun */podružje/* ‘spouse’, not attested with agreeing forms, is morphologically neuter. Typical examples of this declension are: */gradъ/* ‘city’ (M, hard), */možъ/* ‘man, husband’ (M, soft), */město/* ‘place’ (N, hard), */sr<sup>b</sup>дье/* ‘heart’ (N, soft).

The inflectional suffixes for nouns with the genitive singular in *-/y/* (hard) or *-/ę/* (soft) are given in table 4.9; again, there are hard and soft alternants, and velar stems undergo alternation before front-vowel inflections (table 4.10). Nouns denoting female persons, animals (irrespective of sex) and inanimates are feminine. Nouns denoting male persons have inflectional suffixes identical with the feminine, are attested with masculine agreement in the singular, but with optional masculine or feminine agreement in the dual and plural (see section 3.1.1). Four collective personal nouns, declined only in the singular, have variable number and gender agreement (see section 3.1.1). Stems ending in *-/yń/-* and some in *-/ьj/-* have nominative singular *-/i/*; others have *-/a/*. Typical

**Table 4.8 Inflectional suffixes of nouns with genitive singular in *-/a/***

	<i>Masculine</i>		<i>Neuter</i>	
	Hard 'slave'	Soft 'man'	Hard 'place'	Soft 'heart'
<b>Singular</b>				
VOC	rabe	mōžu		
NOM	rabъ	mōžъ	město	sr <sup>b</sup> dьce
ACC	= NOM/GEN	= NOM/GEN	město	sr <sup>b</sup> dьce
GEN	raba	mōža	města	sr <sup>b</sup> dьca
DAT	rabu	mōžu	městu	sr <sup>b</sup> dьcu
INST	rabomъ	mōžemъ	městomъ	sr <sup>b</sup> dьcemъ
LOC	rabě	mōži	městě	sr <sup>b</sup> dьci
<b>Dual</b>				
NOM	raba	mōža	městě	sr <sup>b</sup> dьci
ACC	raba	mōža	městě	sr <sup>b</sup> dьci
GEN	rabu	mōžu	městu	sr <sup>b</sup> dьcu
DAT	raboma	mōžema	městoma	sr <sup>b</sup> dьcema
INST	raboma	mōžema	městoma	sr <sup>b</sup> dьcema
LOC	rabu	mōžu	městu	sr <sup>b</sup> dьcu
<b>Plural</b>				
NOM	rabi	mōži	města	sr <sup>b</sup> dьca
ACC	raby	mōžę	města	sr <sup>b</sup> dьca
GEN	rabъ	mōžъ	městъ	sr <sup>b</sup> dьcъ
DAT	rabomъ	mōžemъ	městomъ	sr <sup>b</sup> dьcemъ
INST	raby	mōži	městy	sr <sup>b</sup> dьci
LOC	raběxъ	mōžixъ	městěxъ	sr <sup>b</sup> dьcixъ

examples of this declension are: /žena/ 'woman, wife' (F, hard), /sluga/ 'servant' (M, hard), /duša/ 'soul' (F, soft), /rabyňi/ 'slave-woman' (F, soft).

In addition to the velar stem alternants for nouns with genitive singular in *-/a/* or *-/y/* listed in table 4.10, one noun, /vl<sup>b</sup>xvъ/ 'wizard', has the alternants /vl<sup>b</sup>svi/ (NOM PL), vl<sup>b</sup>šve (VOC SG) even though the velar is not stem-final. For velar clusters a few examples of dental alternants are attested: /dreždě/ 'forest (LOC SG F)' (one example only), /dъska/ 'board', /dъscě/, /dъstě/ (LOC SG), /pasxa/ 'Passover', /pascě/ (LOC SG).

Of nouns with the genitive singular in *-/i/* (table 4.11), stems denoting animals and male persons are masculine, inanimates are either masculine or feminine. Declined only in the plural are /ludъje/ 'people', and the morphologically feminine /děti/ 'children' (for agreement, see section 3.1.1). Gender is distinguished inflectionally only in the instrumental singular and the nominative plural. Typical examples are: /kostъ/ 'bone' (F), /pōtъ/ 'way' (M).

For nouns with the genitive singular in *-/u/*, there are attested one male

**Table 4.9 Inflectional suffixes of nouns with genitive singular in *-/y/* (hard), *-/ę/* (soft)**

	SG		DU		PL	
	Hard	Soft	Hard	Soft	Hard	Soft
VOC	ženo 'woman'	duše 'soul'				
NOM	žena	duša	ženě	duši	ženy	duše
ACC	ženȣ	dušȣ	ženě	duši	ženy	duše
GEN	ženy	duše	ženu	dušu	ženъ	dušъ
DAT	ženě	duši	ženama	dušama	ženamъ	dušamъ
INST	ženojȣ	dušejȣ	ženama	dušama	ženami	dušami
LOC	ženě	duši	ženu	dušu	ženaxъ	dušaxъ

*Note:* Nouns such as /rabyňi/ 'slave woman' decline like /duša/ except for the nominative singular in *-/i/*.

personal noun /synъ/ 'son', one animal noun /voľъ/ 'ox' and six inanimate nouns, all masculine. The most conservative of the attested inflections are given in table 4.12.

Of nouns with genitive singular in *-/e/*, masculines include inanimates and one animal, feminines include inanimates and female persons, neuters include inanimates and the young of animals. Table 4.13 lists the singular, including stem alternations in the neuter and feminine. Table 4.14 lists dual and plural inflections. Corresponding to the genitive singular /kamene/ 'stone' (M), the form /kamenъ/ is attested as nominative/accusative singular, and in *Suprasliensis* the form /kamy/ is also used for nominative and accusative. Corresponding to nominative/accusative /korenъ/ 'root'

**Table 4.10 Velar stem alternants in noun inflection**

Genitive in *-/a/*, masculine and neuter

	bogъ 'god'	prorokъ 'prophet'	duxъ 'spirit'
LOC SG	bodžě	prorocě	dušě
NOM PL	bodzi	proroci	dusi
LOC PL	bodžěxъ	prorocěxъ	dušěxъ
VOC SG	bože	proroče	duše

Genitive in *-/a/*, neuter

	věko 'eyelid'
NOM/ACC DU	věčě

Genitive in *-/y/*

	noga 'leg'	rȣka 'hand'	muxa 'fly'
DAT/LOC SG, NOM/ACC DU	nodžě	rȣčě	mušě



**Table 4.11 Inflectional suffixes of nouns with genitive singular in *-i/***

	<i>Singular</i>		<i>Dual</i>		<i>Plural</i>	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
VOC	рѡти 'path'	kosti 'bone'				
NOM	рѡтъ	kostъ	рѡти	kosti	рѡтъје	kosti
ACC	рѡтъ	kostъ	рѡти	kosti	рѡти	kosti
GEN	рѡти	kosti	рѡтъју	kostъју	рѡтъѣ	kostъѣ
DAT	рѡти	kosti	рѡтъма	kostъма	рѡтъми	kostъми
INST	рѡтъмь	kostъјр	рѡтъма	kostъма	рѡтъми	kostъми
LOC	рѡти	kosti	рѡтъју	kostъју	рѡтъхъ	kostъхъ

*Suprasliensis* 399.14 has a scribal error *tvore* for an otherwise unattested nominative singular masculine *\*/korę/*. Masculine nouns with the suffixes *-an/-*, *-tel/-*, *-af/-* are attested with forms of both the *-a/* and *-e/* types in the plural, but with only forms of the *-a/* type in the singular and dual. Stems with *-an/-* and some with *-af/-* follow these suffixes with a further suffix *-in/-* in the singular and dual.

The loss of the reduced vowels occasioned some later changes in declension. Inflectional suffixes containing a reduced vowel in weak position were shortened by one syllable. In nouns with a reduced vowel in the last syllable of the stem, such as */днь/* 'day' (M), genitive singular */дње/*, there arose vowel:zero alternations (see section 2.2). With stem-final */j/*, */učenъje/* 'teaching' (N), genitive plural */učenъѣ/*, for instance, gave Western */učenje/*, */učenej/*, while elsewhere [učeniје], [učeniji] gave */učenje/*, */učenij/*.

In the dative and locative plural of types with *-i/* and *-e/* genitives, there arose younger *-em/*, *-ex/*, or *-эм/*, *-эх/*. In dialects without palatalization of labials before front vowels, the instrumental singular masculine became identical with the dative plural, but in other dialects these two forms came to be distinguished by the presence or absence of

**Table 4.12 Inflectional suffixes of nouns with genitive singular in *-u/***

	SG	DU	PL
VOC	synu 'son'		
NOM	synъ	syny	synove
ACC	synъ	syny	syny
GEN	synu	synovu	synovъ
DAT	synovi	synъма	synomъ
INST	synomъ	synъма	synъми
LOC	synu	synovu	synoxъ

**Table 4.13 Singular of nouns with genitive singular in -/e/**

	'day' (M)	'seed' (N)	'lamb' (N)	'word' (N)	'mother' (F)	'church' (F)
NOM	дѣнь	sěmę	agnę	slovo	mati	cr <sup>b</sup> ky
ACC	дѣнь	sěmę	agnę	slovo	materę	cr <sup>b</sup> kъvъ
GEN	дѣне	sěmene	agnęte	slovese	matere	cr <sup>b</sup> kъve
DAT	дѣни	sěmeni	agnęti	slovesi	materi	cr <sup>b</sup> kъvi
INST	дѣньтъ	sěmenътъ	agnęтътъ	slovesътъ	materęjо	cr <sup>b</sup> kъvъjо
LOC	дѣне	sěmene	agnęte	slovese	matere	cr <sup>b</sup> kъve

palatalization of the final labial. The phonetic reflex of the genitive plural -/ъjъ/ was Western /ej/, but elsewhere either regularly /ij/ or else /ej/ by analogy with the dative and locative.

A number of analogical changes in noun declension are attested. The dative plural in -/омъ/ of -/u/ genitives probably arose prehistorically by analogy with -/a/ genitives and with genitive -/онъ/ of the -/u/ genitive type genitive plural. Then the -/u/ genitive type locative plural -/охъ/ could have arisen prehistorically by analogy with the dative. In Western dialects younger locative and dative -/охъ/, -/омъ/ could have arisen phonetically from the inflections that can be reconstructed as -/ъхъ/, -/ътъ/. While the -/u/ genitive type instrumental singular -/омъ/ may also be analogical with the -/a/ genitive type inflection, an occasionally attested instrumental singular -ътъ for -/a/ genitive type nouns may be a

**Table 4.14 Dual and plural suffixes of nouns with genitive singular in -/e/**

	<i>Dual</i>		<i>Plural</i>		
	M	N	M	F	N
NOM	дѣни	sěmeně	дѣне	materi	sěmena
ACC	дѣни	sěmeně	дѣни	materi	sěmena
GEN	дѣну	*sěmenu	дѣнь	materę	sěmenę
DAT	дѣньта	sěmenъта	дѣньтъ	materęтъ	sěmenътъ
INST	дѣньта	sěmenъта	дѣньми	materęmi	sěmeny
LOC	дѣну	*sěmenu	дѣньхъ	*materęхъ	sěmenъхъ

*Note:* In the neuter nominative–accusative dual, the ending -/i/ is also attested. The feminine dual is not attested, likewise the locative plural of the type /mati/ 'mother' and the genitive–locative dual of the /sěmę/ type (but compare /tělesu/ 'body', of the /slovo/ type). Feminines with nominative singular in -/y/ have in the plural dative -/амъ/, instrumental -/ami/, locative -/ахъ/, as in /cr<sup>b</sup>kъvamъ/, /cr<sup>b</sup>kъvahъ/ 'church'.

Moravian feature. There are also attested a few examples of genitive plural masculine *-ovъ* for *-a/* genitive type nouns by analogy with the *-u/* genitive type form.

Neuter *-e/* genitive type nouns with nominative singular in *-o/* are attested with *-a/* genitive type inflections based on the old nominative/accusative stem, such as younger */slova/* 'word (GEN SG)' for older */slovese/*. Also in the singular *-e/* genitive type nouns have younger genitive/locative in *-i/* by analogy with the dative and with the *-i/* genitive type. In the plural masculine nouns of this declension have in the nominative *-ъje/* and in the genitive *-ъjъ/* by analogy with the *-i/* genitive type.

The neuter nouns */oko/* 'eye' and */uxo/* 'ear' in the singular and plural are attested with *-a/* genitive type suffixes, and with stems */očes-/*, */ušes-/* with *-e/* genitive type suffixes. Dual forms are irregular: NOM-ACC */oči/*, */uši/*, GEN-LOC */očъju/*, */ušъju/*, DAT-INST */očima/*, */ušima/*. In the dual these nouns may take indefinite adjectives in the feminine as well as in the neuter.

### 3.1.3 Pronominal morphology

First- and second-person and reflexive pronoun forms are given in table 4.15. Dative clitic pronouns are not used phrase-initially or after a preposition. Accusative clitic pronouns are used after a preposition, but are only rarely attested as phrase-initial, where the full form is usually used. Phrase-internally, without a preposition, both full and clitic forms are attested for dative and accusative, the full form being apparently more emphatic. The full accusative form after a preposition is an innovation resulting from increasing productivity of the genitive-accusative.

As indicated in table 4.16, the inflectional suffixes of other pronouns have vowel alternations for hard and soft stems. In the dual and plural, genders are distinct only in the nominative and accusative. Typical examples of these pronouns are */тъ/* 'this, that' (unmarked demonstrative) (hard) and */našъ/* 'our' (soft). The personal masculine accusative singular, with a few exceptions after prepositions, is homonymous with the genitive, apart from */jъ/* which is accusative singular masculine regardless of animacy conditions, except as object of a nominative singular masculine definite active participle, as attested, for instance, in */prědajęjъ jęgo/* (*Marianus, Assemanianus, Suprasliensis*) (Matthew 26.25) 'the one betraying him' with the present participle, and */prědavъjъ jęgo/* (*Zographensis*) 'the one who betrayed him' with the past participle. In this construction, object */jęgo/* is distinguished from subject */jъ/*. Later, genitive-accusative */jęgo/* spreads into other contexts.

The pronouns */sicъ/* 'such' and */vъsъ/* 'all' have hard suffixes where the first segment of the suffix is */ě/*, for instance */sicěmъ/*, */vъsěmъ/* (INST SG M/N), but otherwise have soft suffixes. The pronoun */sъ/* 'this'

**Table 4.15 First- and second-person and reflexive pronouns**

	1st person		2nd person		Reflexive	
	<i>Full</i>	<i>Clitic</i>	<i>Full</i>	<i>Clitic</i>	<i>Full</i>	<i>Clitic</i>
<b>Singular</b>						
NOM	azъ		ty			
ACC	mene	mę	tebe	tę	sebe	sę
GEN	mene		tebe		sebe	
DAT	mъnę	mi	tebę	ti	sebę	si
INST	mъnoјо		toboјо		soboјо	
LOC	mъnę		tebę		sebę	
<b>Dual</b>						
NOM	vę		va/vy			
ACC	na	ny	va	vy		
GEN	naju		vaju			
DAT	nama		vama			
INST	nama		vama			
LOC	naju		vaju			
<b>Plural</b>						
NOM	my		vy			
ACC	naъ	ny	vaъ	vy		
GEN	naъ		vaъ			
DAT	namъ	ny	vamъ	vy		
INST	nami		vami			
LOC	naъ		vaъ			

**Table 4.16 Pronominal declension**

	M	<i>Singular</i>		<i>Dual</i>			<i>Plural</i>		
		N	F	M	N	F	M	N	F
<b>Hard 'that'</b>									
NOM	tъ	to	ta	ta	tę	tę	ti	ta	ty
ACC	= NOM/GEN	to	tо	ta	tę	tę	ty	ta	ty
GEN	togo		toję		toju			tęxъ	
DAT	tomu		toji		tęma			tęmъ	
INST	tęmъ		toјо		tęma			tęmi	
LOC	tomъ		toji		toju			tęxъ	
<b>Soft 'our'</b>									
NOM	naъ	naše	naša	naša	naši	naši	naši	naša	našę
ACC	= NOM/GEN	naše	našо	naša	naši	naši	našę	naša	našę
GEN	našego		našeјę		našeju			našixъ	
DAT	našemu		našeјi		našima			našimъ	
INST	našimъ		našeјо		našima			našimi	
LOC	našemъ		našeјi		našeju			našixъ	

**Table 4.17 Irregular forms of the pronoun /sь/**

	<i>Singular</i>			<i>Dual</i>			<i>Plural</i>		
	M	N	F	M	N	F	M	N	F
NOM	sь/sьjь	se	si	sьja	si	si	sьji	si	sьję
ACC	= NOM/GEN	se	sьjǫ	sьja	si	si	sьję	si	sьję

has soft suffixes, including some irregular ones listed in table 4.17.

The interrogative–indefinite pronouns /kъto/ ‘who’, /čъto/ ‘what’, which as indefinites are random ‘anybody’, ‘anything’, the negative pronouns /nikъtože/ ‘nobody’, /ničъtože/ ‘nothing’, and the non-random indefinite pronouns /někъto/ ‘someone’, /něčъto/ ‘something’ have the suffix *-to/* only in the nominative and, in the neuter, in the accusative; see table 4.18 for the forms. Prepositions are embedded in negative and indefinite pronouns, for example /ni o komъže/ ‘about nobody’, /ně o komъ/ ‘about somebody’.

### 3.1.4 Adjectival morphology

Positive adjectives and passive participles with the suffixes of tables 4.8 and 4.9, also active participles and comparative adjectives (for nominative and accusative, see table 4.19) have short forms with indefinite reference (as in ‘a new city’), long forms with definite reference (as in ‘the new city’). For the long forms, see table 4.20. With the exception of the nominative singular masculine and neuter of active participles and comparative adjectives and of the accusative singular masculine and neuter of comparative adjectives, the short forms have the same stem as the nominative singular feminine and are declined like nouns with genitive in *-a/* (masculine and neuter) or in *-y/* (soft *-ę/*) (feminine). Active participles and comparative adjectives have the nominative singular feminine in *-i/* and the nominative plural masculine in *-e/*.

**Table 4.18 Interrogative and indefinite pronouns**

	<i>‘who’</i>	<i>‘what’</i>
NOM	kъto	čъto
ACC	kogo	čъto
GEN	kogo	česo, česogo, čъso
DAT	komu	česomu, čъsomu, čemu
INST	сѣтъ	čимъ
LOC	комъ	чѣтъ, česомъ

**Table 4.19 Nominative and accusative singular and plural of present and past participles /nesy/, /neŝ/ ‘carry’ and of comparative adjective /novějъ/ ‘newer’**

SG	NOM	M	nesy	neŝ	novějъ
		N	nesy	neŝ	nověje
		F	nesoŝti	neŝŝi	novějŝi
	ACC	M	nesoŝtъ	neŝŝъ	novějъ
		N	nesoŝte	neŝŝe	nověje
		F	nesoŝto	neŝŝo	novějŝo
PL	NOM	M	nesoŝte	neŝŝe	novějŝe

Comparison of short and long forms shows that some of the long-form adjectival suffixes are formed directly from the noun inflections of tables 4.8 and 4.9 followed by *-j/-* and the soft inflections of table 4.16. Other forms, genitive, dative/locative singular feminine and genitive/locative dual have dropped a syllable *-je/-*, while the instrumental singular and the soft locative singular masculine/neuter, the dative/instrumental dual and the genitive/locative and dative plural have been influenced analogically by the instrumental plural masculine/neuter, leaving no gender distinctions in the dual and plural apart from the nominative and accusative.

In the nominative singular masculine, younger forms of the definite adjectives arose as a result of the loss of the reduced vowels: Western /novějъ/ ‘new’ gave /*novoj*/, elsewhere [novyj] gave /*novyj*/ then /*novy*/, Western /niŝtjъ/ ‘poor’ gave /*niŝtej*/, elsewhere [ništij] /*ništij*/ then /*ništi*/.

Whereas short active participles do not distinguish masculine from neuter in the nominative singular, long forms have masculine nominative /*nesyjъ*/ (PRS), /*neŝjъ*/ (PAST) and neuter nominative/accusative /*nesoŝteje*/ (PRS), /*neŝŝeje*/ (PAST).

For the long nominative plural masculine active participle /*nesoŝteji*/, there is attested younger /*nesoŝtiji*/ by analogy with oblique cases and with adjectives. Conversely, there are attested younger oblique plural forms and instrumental and locative singular such as /*nesoŝtejixъ*/ (LOC PL) for older /*nesoŝtjixъ*/ by analogy with the old nominative plural, differentiating participial long inflections from adjectives, rather than merging them. Spellings of the long accusative singular masculine may be identical with the various nominative plural masculine forms, Western /*nesoŝtjъ*/ giving /*nesoŝtej*/, spelt *nesoŝtei*; elsewhere both older and younger [nesoŝtiji] gave /*nesoŝtij*/, which may be spelt *nesoŝtii*.

Short participles have younger indeclinable /*nesoŝte*/. For younger adjectival forms arising from the loss of intervocalic /j/ and subsequent vowel assimilation and contraction, see section 2.1.

**Table 4.20 Inflectional suffixes of long-form adjectives**

	<i>Hard</i>			<i>Soft</i>		
	M	N	F	M	N	F
<b>Singular</b>						
NOM	новъѣ 'new'	новоје	новaja	высьнѣѣ 'most high'	высьнѣје	высьнаја
ACC	= NOM/GEN	новоје	новѣѣ	= NOM/GEN	высьнѣје	высьнѣѣ
GEN		новajeго	новyѣ		высьнајeго	высьнѣѣ
DAT		новyјeмy	новѣѣ		высьнѣѣмy	высьнѣѣ
INST		новyјимъ	новѣѣ		высьнѣѣимъ	высьнѣѣ
LOC		новѣѣмъ	новѣѣ		высьнѣѣимъ	высьнѣѣ
<b>Dual</b>						
NOM	новaja	новѣѣ	новѣѣ	высьнаја	высьнѣѣ	высьнѣѣ
ACC	новaja	новѣѣ	новѣѣ	высьнаја	высьнѣѣ	высьнѣѣ
GEN		новyју			высьнѣѣ	
DAT		новyјима			высьнѣѣма	
INST		новyјима			высьнѣѣма	
LOC		новyју			высьнѣѣ	
<b>Plural</b>						
NOM	новyѣ	новaja	новyѣ	высьнѣѣ	высьнаја	высьнѣѣ
ACC	новyѣ	новaja	новyѣ	высьнѣѣ	высьнаја	высьнѣѣ
GEN		новyјихъ			высьнѣѣхъ	
DAT		новyјимъ			высьнѣѣимъ	
INST		новyјими			высьнѣѣими	
LOC		новyјихъ			высьнѣѣихъ	

**Table 4.21 Irregular comparative adjectives**

	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Comparative</i>	
a.	grǒbъ	grǒblъjъ	'coarse'
	dragъ	dražъjъ	'dear'
	lixъ	lišъjъ	'superfluous'
	lūtъ	lūštъjъ	'fierce'
	xudъ	xuždъjъ	'poor in quality'
b.	krǽpъkъ	krǽplъjъ	'strong, firm'
	sladъkъ	slaždъjъ	'sweet'
	težъkъ	težъjъ	'heavy'
	vysokъ	vyšъjъ	'high'
	glǒbokъ	glǒblъjъ	'deep'
	širokъ	šifъjъ	'wide'
c.	velikъ, velъjъ	bolъjъ	'big'
		and vęštъjъ	'bigger, more numerous'
	malъ	mъnlъjъ	'small'
	blagъ, dobrъ	lučъjъ, unъjъ, sulъjъ, sulějъ	'good'
	zъlъ	goŕъjъ	'bad'

Comparative adjectives, other than those listed in table 4.21, are formed as indicated in table 4.19 by the suffix *-/ěj/-*, to which inflectional suffixes are added. The forms in table 4.21 are nominative/accusative singular masculine long and short. The nominative/accusative neuter singular short form has the suffix *-/e/*, as in */bolé/* 'bigger'; all other forms replace the nominative/accusative singular masculine suffix *-/jъ/* by the suffix *-/š/-* to which the inflectional suffixes are added, for instance */bolъše/* (NOM/ACC N LONG). The superlative is usually not distinct from the comparative, but is occasionally attested with a prefix */najъ/-*.

Comparative adverbs have either the form of the nominative/accusative neuter short form adjective, as in */dobrėje/* 'better', or else have the instrumental plural suffix, as in */mъnlъšmi/* 'less'.

### 3.1.5 Numeral morphology

*/jedinъ/* 'one' takes singular and plural and */dъva/* 'two' dual pronominal suffixes of table 4.16; */oba/* 'both' is declined like */dъva/*. */trъje/* 'three' is an *-/i/* genitive plural noun, and */četyre/* 'four' an *-/e/* genitive plural noun. All four of these numerals are inflected for gender. */pęť/* 'five', */šestъ/* 'six', */sedmъ/* 'seven', */osmъ/* 'eight', */devęť/* 'nine' are *-/i/* genitive type feminine nouns. */desęť/* 'ten' has *-/i/* genitive type forms in the genitive and instrumental singular, but *-/e/* genitive type masculine forms in all other cases and numbers. */jedinъ na desęte/* 'eleven' to */devęť na desęte/* 'nineteen' are formed with a digit and the preposition */na/* governing */desęť/* in the locative singular. */dъva na desęte/* 'twelve' is distinct from */oba na desęte/* 'the twelve', the latter with */oba/*



'both'. Other numerals are occasionally attested with definite forms: /desętęjъ/ 'the ten', /jedinęjъ na desęte/ 'the eleven'. The digits in compound numerals are inflected for case. The digits take /desętę/ in the dual for /dęva desęti/ 'twenty', the plural for /tręje desęte/ 'thirty', /četyre desęte/ 'forty', and in the genitive plural for /pętę desętę/ 'fifty' to /devętę desętę/ 'ninety'. From /dęva desęti/ to /četyre desęte/ both elements are inflected for case, but for the higher numerals, only the first element. /sęto/ 'hundred' is a neuter -/a/ genitive inflected for all cases and numbers. /tysęšti/, /tysęšti/ 'thousand' is an -/ę/ genitive feminine and /tęma/ 'ten thousand' a feminine -/y/ genitive.

The ordinal numerals are definite adjectives declined in all cases, numbers and genders: /pr<sup>b</sup>vęjъ/ 'first', /vętoręjъ/ 'second', /tretięjъ/ 'third', /četvr<sup>b</sup>ęjъ/ 'fourth', /pętęjъ/ 'fifth', /šestięjъ/ 'sixth', /sedmęjъ/ 'seventh', /osmęjъ/ 'eighth', /devętęjъ/ 'ninth', /desętęjъ/ 'tenth'. There are various types for higher numerals, all poorly attested: /jedinęjъ na desęte/ 'eleventh', /vętoręjъ na desęte/ 'twelfth', /tretięjъ na desęte/ 'thirteenth', /osmonadesętęjъ/ 'eighteenth', /devętnadesętęjъ/ 'nineteenth', /dvadesętęnjęjъ/ or /dęvodeseętęnjęjъ/ 'twentieth', /sętęnjęjъ/ 'hundredth', /pętęsętęnjęjъ/ 'five hundredth', /tysęštęnjęjъ/ 'thousandth'.

/oboje/ 'both' and /dęvoje/ 'two' are neuter pronouns expressing contrastive entities, as in the following example, where the choice is one of two different objects:

*jedno otъ dvojego prędęložimъ vamъ (Suprasliensis 73.23)*  
'We offer you one of two options.'

/dęvoji/ 'two', which declines like a plural noun, agrees with a collective noun or with a plural noun. Three numerals are attested with various kinds of reference: /četvero/ 'four' refers to contrasted entities, /sedmoro/ 'seven' has multiplicative reference ('seven times'), while /desętoro/ 'ten' is attested governing a genitive singular collective noun.

/polę/ 'half' is either an -/u/ genitive noun or else is indeclinable. /desętina/ 'tenth (part)' is an -/y/ genitive feminine noun.

## 3.2 Verbal morphology

### 3.2.1 Verbal categories

Finite verbs distinguish three persons in all numbers, but the younger third person dual has merged with the second person dual. Finite forms and participles distinguish singular, dual and plural. Perfect participles have short nominative forms in all three genders, while other types of participle distinguish gender of long and short forms in all cases and numbers. Younger short indeclinable active participles are attested. Younger finite dual forms distinguish masculine from non-masculine third person.

All verbal categories can occur in the perfective aspect, which explicitly characterizes the event as occurring in its entirety, and in the imperfective aspect, which does not explicitly characterize the event in this way.

In the present tense, in the following example the imperfective present characterizes an event which is contemporaneous with the speech event, as being actually in progress, and therefore not as occurring in its entirety:

*kto jestъ jegože vedōrъ* (IMPFV PRS) (*Suprasliensis* 146.16)  
'Who is it whom they are leading?'

The perfective present in the next example characterizes an event which is contemporaneous with the speech event, as occurring in its entirety:

*nynja ti otъbъnъr* (PRFV PRS) *glavъ* (*Suprasliensis* 512.20)  
'Now I take your head off.'

In the next example, the perfective present explicitly characterizes a future event as occurring in its entirety, whereas the imperfective present does not imply that there will be any limit to the event:

*pridetъ* (PRFV PRS) *godina egda kъ tomu vъ pritъčaxъ ne glagoljō* (IMPFV PRS) *vamъ* (*Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus, Savvina kniga*; John 16.25)  
'There will come (PRFV PRS) a time when I shall no longer be speaking (IMPFV PRS) to you in parables.'

The distinction between the two present forms in the following example is purely aspectual, not lexical:

*ne otъbēžitъ* (PRFV PRS) *grěšnojū dlanъju našeju ne otъbēgajetъ* (IMPFV PRS) *otъ sōzdenyixъ rъstъ našixъ* (*Suprasliensis* 506.21)  
'He does not avoid (PRFV PRS) our sinful palms, he does not escape (IMPFV PRS) from our condemned fingers.'

In this statement of general validity, the perfective present expresses the entirety of a change of state, whereas the imperfective present expresses the continuity of that state. In the historic present in the next example, the imperfective present characterizes the event as an ongoing state, whereas the perfective present in the following example characterizes two events as occurring in their entirety, one after the other:

*ležitъ* (IMPFV PRS) *vъznakъ* (*Suprasliensis* 456.5)  
'He was lying on his back.'

*i abъje tomuže avirъ* (PRFV PRS) *sę episkopu i glasъ uslyšitъ* (PRFV PRS) *pritrانъ* (*Suprasliensis* 530.10)  
'And immediately he appeared to this same bishop, who heard a clear voice ...'

The aorist and the imperfect, both past tenses, are unmarked for relativity. The imperfect characterizes a past event as being a state or process; the aorist is unmarked for this feature. In the following example, the event characterized by the perfective aorist as occurring in its entirety impinges upon the events characterized by the imperfective imperfect as being ongoing processes:

*i ta besēdovaašete* (IMPFV IMPF) *kъ sebě o vsěxъ sīxъ . . . i samъ isusъ približi* (PRFV AOR) *sę i iděaše* (IMPFV IMPF) *sъ nima* (*Zographensis*; Luke 24.14)  
 ‘And they were conversing (IMPFV IMPF) with one another about all these things . . . and Jesus approached (PRFV AOR) and was going along (IMPFV IMPF) with them.’

Like the forms in this example, the imperfective aorist and the perfective imperfect may refer to an event carried out on one occasion, as in:

*aky kъ člověku bo besēdova* (IMPFV AOR) *i vьzira* (IMPFV AOR) *na nь* (*Suprasliensis* 122.30)  
 ‘for he conversed (IMPFV AOR) with him and looked (IMPFV AOR) at him as if he were a man’

In this example, the imperfective aorists state only that the events occurred, without saying anything about the entirety of their occurrence. In the perfective imperfect in the next example, the perfective component expresses the immediacy of the reaction, whereas the imperfect component presents the event as an ongoing process:

*i ēviše* (PRFV AOR) *sę prědъ nimi ēko bledi glagoli ixъ i ne iměaxo* (PRFV IMPF) *imъ vēry* (*Zographensis, Marianus*; Luke 24.11)  
 ‘And their words appeared (PRFV AOR) to them to be nonsense and they would not believe (PRFV IMPF) them.’

Both the aorist and the imperfect may refer to a repeated event:

*ko tygo sьvlěkъ sъ sebe daděaše* (PRFV IMPF) *ništuumu tako že tvoraaše* (IMPFV IMPF) *vьsa lěta žitija svojego . . . ino že mnogo poučaje ne prěsta* (PRFV AOR) *ni umlъknō* (PRFV AOR) *otъ dobra* (*Suprasliensis* 207.14–208.1)  
 ‘Taking off his coat, he would give (PRFV IMPF) it to a beggar. For thus would he do (IMPFV IMPF) all the years of his life. . . . Teaching many other things, he neither ceased (PRFV AOR) from, nor kept silent (PRFV AOR) concerning the good.’

In this example, the imperfect component of the perfective imperfect expresses a habitual state of behaviour consisting of a set of repeated acts each of which is characterized by the perfective component as having occurred in its entirety, whereas the imperfective imperfect expresses such acts as constituting an ongoing state, without saying anything about the entirety of the process. The perfective aorists sum up two sets of repeated acts as events which occurred in their entirety. Indeed, both perfective and

imperfective aorists may refer to repeated events:

*jednojo i dvašdi i mnogašdi rekoхъ* (PRFV AOR) *ti* (*Suprasliensis* 165.11)  
'I told (PRFV AOR) you once, twice and many times.'

*mnogašdi glagolaxъ* (IMPFV AOR) (*Suprasliensis* 446.16)  
'I said (IMPFV AOR) many times.'

The perfect relates a preceding event to the speech event, or to an event expressed by the present tense; the pluperfect relates a preceding event to an event expressed by either the aorist or the imperfect.

The perfect consists of the present tense of the verb /byti/ 'be' as an auxiliary, in either aspect, plus the perfect participle of the lexical verb in either aspect. In the following example, an event occurring in its entirety precedes the speech event:

*prišelъ* (PRFV) *jestъ* (IMPFV) *vasilisikъ* (*Suprasliensis* 20.2)  
'Basiliscus has (IMPFV) come (PRFV).'

In the next example, the preceding event expressed by an imperfective auxiliary and by an imperfective perfect participle, which says nothing about the entirety of the event, is related to an event expressed by the imperfective present in a statement of general validity:

*radujuгъ* (IMPFV PRS) *se želo jako u svoixъ sгъ* (IMPFV) *si doma ležali* (IMPFV)  
(*Suprasliensis* 267.17)  
'They rejoice (IMPFV PRS) greatly, because they have (IMPFV) been lying (IMPFV) at home with their people.'

In the following example, the perfective auxiliary expresses the eventual result of an event which the imperfective perfect participle expresses as an ongoing process in the past whose limit is not specified, within a statement of general validity:

*ašte na to sъtvorimъ* (PRFV PRS) *vladky podražali* (IMPFV) *bъdetъ* (PRFV)  
(*Suprasliensis* 379.10)  
'If we do (PRFV PRS) it for that purpose, we will have (PRFV) been imitating (IMPFV) the Lord.'

The next example occurs at the end of a long passage in which events of general validity are expressed in both the imperfective and perfective present. The events in the example are all characterized as occurring in their entirety; the perfective auxiliary is coordinated with two perfective present forms, while the perfective perfect participle, unlike the participle in the preceding example, expresses an event which has reached its final limit:

*prěklonitŭ* (PRFV PRS) *šę i padetŭ* (PRFV PRS) *egda udoblěťŭ* (PRFV) *bōdetŭ* (PRFV) *ubogymŭ* (*Psalterium Sinaiticum* 9.31)  
 ‘He will bend (PRFV PRS) and fall down (PRFV PRS) on his knees when he has (PRFV) overcome (PRFV) the poor.’

The pluperfect consists of one of the two different types of the imperfective past of /byti/ plus the perfect participle in either aspect:

*juže bo šę běaxŭ* (AUX) *szložili* (PRFV) *ijudei* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus*; John 9.22)  
 ‘for the Jews had (AUX) already agreed (PRFV)’

*iže i běaxŭ* (AUX) *viděli* (IMPFV) *prěžde* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus*; John 9.8)  
 ‘those who had (AUX) seen (IMPFV) him previously’

*se bo bē* (AUX) *znamenŭe datŭ* (PRFV) (*Zographensis, Marianus*; Luke 22.47)  
 ‘for he had (AUX) given (PRFV) this sign’

*ideže bē* (AUX) *ležalo* (IMPFV) *tělo isusovo* (*Marianus, Assemanianus*; John 20.12)  
 ‘where the body of Jesus had (AUX) been lying (IMPFV)’

Although the auxiliary in the first two examples is formally an imperfect, which happens to be attested only in third-person forms, while the auxiliary in the last two examples is formally an aorist, attested in all persons, there is no discoverable semantic distinction between the two types of auxiliary.

Not including doubtful examples, or scribal errors, there are attested about eighty examples of the perfect participle without an auxiliary. None of these is attested in either the Gospels or the Psalter, most of them being found in a few sermons in *Suprasliensis*.

*ješa i ne szbrali* (PRFV) *szbora ješa i sice ne besědovali* (IMPFV) *jaru tu grěxovŭněi szłobi prěstalŭ* (PRFV) *konŭsŭ nŭ szbrašę* (AOR) *szborŭ i glagolaaxŭ* (IMPF) *čto sztvorimŭ* (*Suprasliensis* 386.6)  
 ‘Would indeed they had not convened (PRFV) the council! Would indeed they had not conversed (IMPFV) thus! Would that at this point an end had been put (PRFV) to sinful malice! But they did convene (AOR) the council, and were saying (IMPF): What shall we do?’

Whereas the aorist and imperfect in this example give a purely objective account of the event, the perfect participles express the narrator’s attitude towards those events. Unlike the perfect and pluperfect, the perfect participle without an auxiliary is unmarked for relativity, but is opposed to the aorist and imperfect in expressing the narrator’s attitude to the event (the category of status): this form emphasizes that the event is of some special significance for the narrator, including regret, as in the above example, rejoicing, and in general adds a rhetorical tone, especially when used in questions.

**Table 4.22 Imperfective correspondents of primary perfective verbs**

<i>Perfective</i>		<i>Imperfective</i>		
INF	3 PL PRS	INF	3 PL PRS	
/dati/	/dadęť/	/dajati/	/dajęť/	'give'
/jęti/	/jъmęť/	/jъmati/	/jemplęť/	'take'
/variti/	/varęť/	/vařati/	/vařajęť/	'go ahead'

There are three periphrastic futures, each distinct from the perfective and imperfective present used to express a future event (see above).

The relative future is expressed with the auxiliary *xotęti* or *xъtęti* 'wish' in all its forms, finite and non-finite, plus an infinitive in either aspect:

*vъny že vъlivaaxę sę vъ ladiję ěko uže pogręzęti* (PRFV INF) *xotęaše* (IMPFV)  
(*Zographensis*, *Marianus*; Mark 4.37)  
'And the waves were pouring into the boat, so that it was already about to sink.'

The auxiliary *imęti* 'have', used only in the present tense with an infinitive of either aspect, expresses the narrator's attitude to the event, and is thus marked for status:

*ne iřęte čъto imate ěsti* (PRFV INF) *i čъto piti* (*Zographensis*; Luke 12.29)  
'Do not consider what you will eat or what you will drink.'

This example expresses the narrator's suggestion that the addressee should avoid asking some important 'matter of life and death' questions. More usually, this auxiliary expresses emphasis that the event is inevitable or inescapable, as in the example from Mark 9.1 below. There are attested eleven examples of the present tense of the probably synonymous perfective verbs *načęti*, *vъčęti* 'begin' used as auxiliaries only with an imperfective infinitive. These examples seem to have no invariant meaning other than that of introducing perfectivity when no other means are available:

*povelę đъrati želęznu nogęty doideže čręva načęnęti* (PRFV PRS) *xъtęti* (INF)  
*izvaliti* (INF) *ę na zemьję* (*Suprasliensis* 113.29)  
'He ordered them to be flogged with iron nails until their intestines were about to pour out onto the ground.'

The conjunction *doideže* is punctual 'until' only with a perfective verb, but durative 'while' with an imperfective verb. Thus the imperfective relative infinitive auxiliary is governed by a perfective auxiliary in order to specify the appropriate meaning of the conjunction.

The formal relation between imperfective and perfective forms of verbs requires comment. The small number of primary perfective forms have

**Table 4.23 Aspect of verbs with lexical prefixes**

<i>Imperfective</i>		<i>Perfective</i>	<i>Imperfective</i>	
/tvoriti/	'do, make'	/zatvoriti/	/zatvařati/	'lock up'
/zbrěti/	'look'	/vъzbrěti/	/vъzirati/	'look at'

corresponding imperfective forms by addition of a suffix which changes the conjugational class, as in the examples in table 4.22. For such verbs, prefixes change lexical meaning, but not aspect, for example /vъzdati/ (PRFV), /vъzdajati/ (IMPFV) 'give in exchange', /vъzěti/ (PRFV), /vъzъmati/, /vъzimati/ (IMPFV) 'take up'. When the primary verb is imperfective, prefixes usually change both lexical meaning and aspect, while the prefixed item has imperfective forms with suffixation, change of conjugational class and sometimes with alternation of root vowel, as in the examples in table 4.23. A number of primary and prefixed forms are distinct only in aspect, the prefixed item being perfective, as in /tvoriti/ (IMPFV), /sъtvoriti/ (PRFV) 'do', /nenaviděti/ (IMPFV), /vъznenaviděti/ (PRFV) 'hate', /slyšati/, /uslyšati/ 'hear'. Unambiguous evidence for bi-aspectuality is attested very rarely:

*ne imořъ vъkusiti sъmřęti donьdeže vidęť* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Savvina kniga*, PRFV) / *uzręť* (*Assemanianus*, PRFV) *česarьstvje božie* (Mark 9.1)  
 'They will not taste death until they see the kingdom of God.'

In this example, *Assemanianus* has a form whose tokens are always perfective, while three of the witnesses have a verb which is frequently attested as an imperfective, but which must be perfective in this example because the conjunction is required to be punctual, not durative.

Six pairs of verbs of motion (table 4.24) are attested with imperfective examples for each member of the pair. One set of members states explicitly that the referent of the subject of the verb ends up in a new location, while the other set is unmarked for this feature. Each of these verbs may refer to single events and to repeated events. The unmarked forms may even refer to a change of location carried out on one occasion, in the imperfect and in the present participle, provided that the change of location is expressed explicitly in the context.

Among the moods, the imperative and subjunctive are semantically marked with respect to the indicative.

Forms of the imperative are attested regularly only for the second person in all numbers and for the first person in the dual and plural, and occasionally for the third person singular. For other person-number combinations, /da/ plus the present tense is preferred. However, the

**Table 4.24 Paired verbs of motion**

<i>Marked</i>	<i>Unmarked</i>	
/iti/	/xoditi/	'go'
/vesti/	/voditi/	'lead'
/vlěšti/	/vlačiti/	'drag'
/гънати/	/goniti/	'drive'
/nesti/	/nositi/	'carry'
/běžati/	/běgati/	'flee'

following forms are also attested: first person singular *отъпадѣтъ* (*Psalterium Sinaiticum* 7.5) 'fall off', third person dual *бодѣте* (*Psalterium Sinaiticum* 129.2) 'be', and third person plural *бодо* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus, Savvinakniga*; Luke 12.35) 'be'.

The subjunctive is expressed by the perfect participle plus an auxiliary. The forms of the auxiliary are given in table 4.25. The leftmost forms are older. Younger forms are those of the perfective aorist of /byti/ 'be', except for the second and third persons singular. The plural has compromise forms as well as the older and younger type. In the dual only the first-person younger form is attested. The subjunctive expresses both condition and result in non-factual conditional sentences, in wishes and, with the conjunction /da/, potentiality. The subjunctive of /byti/ may be expressed by the auxiliary alone. The auxiliary is used with the infinitive to express the desiderative.

The passive is expressed by forms of /byti/ 'be', and for frequentative and historical present /byvati/ 'become', with the passive participle, past or present, in either aspect, or by forms of the verb with the enclitic accusative reflexive pronoun /sę/, there being no apparent difference in function between the two formations.

Non-finite forms are the infinitive, supine (with the inflection -/ъ/, for example, /помолитъ сę/ 'pray') and participles. After verbs of motion, the supine, governing the patient in the genitive case, may be used instead of the infinitive, but is replaced by the infinitive in younger constructions.

Present and past, active and passive participles are attested in both

**Table 4.25 Subjunctive auxiliary**

	<i>Singular</i>	<i>Dual</i>	<i>Plural</i>
1	bimъ    бухъ	буховѣ	bimъ    bixomъ    бухомъ
2	bi        by		biste    byste
3	bi        by		bo        bišę      byšę



aspects in short and long forms. The aspects are clearly distinct, for instance, in the following examples of the definite past passive participle:

*mnoḡašdi naměnjanaja* (IMPFV) *slavъnaja mōža . . . vъ naměneněi* (PRFV) *сръкъви* (*Suprasliensis* 203.10–208.19)

‘the frequently above mentioned eminent men . . . in the above mentioned church’

Although reference to a repeated event is not an invariant feature of the imperfective aspect, the imperfective participle in this example presents a set of events as an ongoing process in the past, whereas the perfective participle expresses a single event in its entirety, there being no lexical distinction between the forms.

Indefinite present active participles may be used with finite forms of /byti/ for explicit expression of simultaneity of one event with another:

*bě bo umiraje* (*Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus*; John 4.47)  
‘for he was dying’

For further information on participles, see sections 3.1.1, 3.1.4 and 4.5.

### 3.2.2 Conjugation

Regular verbs may be divided into two main classes, according to the non-terminal suffixes of the present tense. In the first person singular, there is no non-terminal suffix, but only the terminal suffix -/ǫ/ for both classes. One class (hereafter, -/ǫ/- verbs) has the non-terminal suffix -/ǫ/ for the third person plural and /e/ for other persons; the other (hereafter, -/ę/- verbs) has -/ę/- for the third person plural and -/i/ for other persons. The -/ǫ/- verbs are divided into the following subclasses: consonant stems, -/nǫ/- stems, -/j/- stems and -/a/ stems. In addition to the two main classes, there are also athematic verbs and the anomalous verb /xotěti/, /xъtěti/ ‘wish’.

**Table 4.26 Consonant stem verbal forms of stem /nes/- ‘carry’**

		<i>Present</i>	<i>Aorist</i>	<i>Imperfect</i>	<i>Imperative</i>
SG	1	nesǫ	něsъ, nesoxъ	nesěaxъ	
	2	neseši	nese	nesěaše	nesi
	3	nesetъ	nese	nesěaše	nesi
DU	1	nesevě	něsově, nesoxově	nesěaxově	nesěvě
	2	neseta	něsta, nesosta	nesěašeta	nesěta
	3	nesete	něste, nesoste	nesěašete	
PL	1	nesemъ	něsomъ, nesoxomъ	nesěaxomъ	nesěmъ
	2	nesete	něste, nesoste	nesěašete	nesěte
	3	nesotъ	něse, nesose	nesěaxo	

Finite and non-finite forms of consonant stems, using /nes/- as illustration, are set out in table 4.26. Other conjugational types will be described by comparison with the forms in table 4.26. In the infinitive and supine, labial stems, such as /greb/- 'row, bury' have a zero-alternant of the stem-final consonant, as in infinitive /greti/. Dental stem-final stops, as in /ved/- 'lead', alternate with /s/ in the infinitive and supine (infinitive /vesti/) and with zero in the perfect participle (/velʔ/). Velar stem-final consonants alternate with -/š/- in the infinitive (after which the supine inflection is -/ь/): /rek/- 'say', infinitive /rešti/, /obleg/- 'dine with', supine /obleštʔ/.

Nasal stems have zero alternation of consonant and nasalization of vowel before consonantal suffixes: /jьm/- 'take', /načьn/- 'begin', infinitives /jęti/, /načęti/. -/r/- stems have -/rě/- before an obstruent suffix, as in the infinitive /umręti/ 'die', -/rʲ/- before a consonantal sonorant suffix, as in the perfect participle /umrʲʲʔ/, and -/ьr/- before a vocalic suffix, as in first person singular present /umьrɔ/; an exception to this distribution is the past passive participle /prostrʲʲʔ/ 'stretch'.

In the third person dual finite forms, younger forms merge with the second person dual in -/ta/. For feminine and neuter there is a younger suffix -/tě/ by analogy with nominal nominative forms.

Of the aorist form variants in table 4.26, older forms are on the left, younger forms on the right. Some stems have the older aorist as in table 4.27. Velar stems of this type have palatal alternants before -/e/ and -/e/-: first person singular /mogʔ/, second/third person singular /može/, second person dual /možeta/ 'be able'. There are younger forms: first person singular /idoxʔ/, first person plural /idoxomʔ/, second person plural /idoste/, as in table 4.26. The younger forms are based on a new vocalic stem with the alternation /s/:/x/:/š/ found in vowel-stem aorists and in velar and -/r/- stems as in table 4.28. Nasal stems have earlier first person singular /jęsʔ/, second/third person singular /jętʔ/, younger /jęxʔ/, /ję/ 'take'. Final -/tʔ/ in the second and third person singular is found in nasal stems, -/r/- stems and certain vowel stems; these also have the past passive participle suffix -/tʔ/. As well as the root alternation -/e/-:/ě/- as in tables 4.26 and 4.28, there are /o/:/a/ and /ь/:/i/ alternations. For active participles, see table 4.19. Passive participles past /nesenʔ/, /načętʔ/, present /nesomʔ/ are declined as adjectives.

**Table 4.27 Asigmatic aorist of stem /id/- 'go'**

	<i>Singular</i>	<i>Dual</i>	<i>Plural</i>
1	idʔ	idově	idomʔ
2	ide	ideta	idete
3	ide	idete	idɔ

**Table 4.28 Aorist of velar stem /rek/- ‘say’ and -/r/-stem /umrě/- ‘die’**

	<i>Singular</i>		<i>Dual</i>		<i>Plural</i>	
1	rěxъ	umrěxъ	rěxově	umrěxově	rěxomъ	umrěxomъ
2	reče	umrětъ	rěsta	umrěsta	rěste	umrěste
3	reče	umrětъ	rěste	umrěste	rěšę	umrěšę

For the younger imperfect forms with vowel contraction and, in Cyrillic, assimilation, see page 132. There are younger second and third person dual and second person plural suffixes by analogy with the aorist, such as /nesěsta/. Velar stems have the palatal alternant in the imperfect, as in /možaaše/ from /mog/- ‘be able’.

In the imperative, velar stems have the vowel alternation /e/:/ь/ in the root together with the stem-final dental alternant, as in second person singular /rъci/, second person plural /rъčete/ from /rek/- ‘say’.

Several verbs have vowel alternations between infinitive and present stem, some with the infinitive stem ending in -/a/-. The following list gives infinitive and third person plural present forms: /čisti/, /čьtотъ/ ‘read, count, honour’, /sъsati/, /sъsотъ/ ‘suck’, /zъvati/, /zovотъ/ ‘call’, /bъrati/, /berотъ/ ‘gather’, /gъnati/, /ženотъ/ ‘drive’, /stati/, /stanотъ/ ‘stop’, /lešti/, /leğотъ/ ‘lie down’, /sěsti/, /sęđотъ/ ‘sit down’, /obrěsti/ (stem /obrět/-), /obrěštотъ/ ‘find’, /pluti/, /plovотъ/ ‘sail’, /iti/, /idотъ/ (past active participle /šьdъ/) ‘go’. There are poorly attested data for a suppletive stem /jěd/-, /jěxa/- ‘go by transport’.

-/nъ/- stems include the verbs with infinitives /dvignoti/ ‘move’, /minoti/ ‘pass by’. The present-stem forms /dvignотъ/ (3 PL PRS), /dvigněte/ (2 PL IMP) and rarely attested /podvigněaše/ (3 SG IMPF) parallel forms of /nes/-. Verbs with a root-final vowel have aorist /minохъ/ (1 SG), /minъ/ (2/3 SG), like /rek/- except in the second/third person singular. Verbs with a root-final stop, and some with fricatives, do not have the suffix -/nъ/- in the aorist, which is formed like /idъ/: /dvigъ/ (1 SG), /dviže/ (2/3 SG). Two types of younger aorist are attested: /dvignохъ/ (1 SG), /dvignъ/ (3 SG) and /dvigoхъ/, /dviže/. Rarely attested present participles are active /dvigny/ and passive *neistrъgnomo* (*Suprasliensis* 560.25) ‘ineradicable’; past participles are active /dvigъ/, /minовъ/, passive /dviženъ/, /otъrinovenъ/ ‘pushed aside’; the perfect-participle formation is as in /dviglъ/, /minqlъ/.

In -/j/- stems, except in the imperfect of stems with a low root vowel, -/j/- before a vowel alternates with ∅ elsewhere: infinitive /dělati/ ‘work’, /uměti/ ‘know’, perfect participle /dělalъ/, /umělъ/; present /dělajотъ/, /umějотъ/ (3 PL); aorist /dělaxъ/ (1 SG), /děla/ (2/3 SG). This type and all regular verbs listed below have only one type of aorist, with which the

older types merged analogically. The imperfect of low root vowel verbs is as in /dĕlaaxъ/, /umĕaxъ/, that of high root vowel verbs as in /čujaaxъ/ 'perceive', /bъjaaxъ/ 'beat'. Imperative forms are /dĕlaji/ (2 SG), /dĕlajite/ (2 PL). The participles are: present active /dĕlaję/, /dĕlajęšti/, present passive /dĕlajęmъ/, past active /dĕlavъ/, past passive /dĕlanъ/. The following verbs have unpredictable root-vowel alternations, the cited forms being infinitive, first person singular aorist, third person plural present and first person singular imperfect: /pĕti/, /pĕxъ/ (2/3 SG /pĕtъ/), /pojotъ/, /pojaaxъ/ 'sing'; /brati/, /braxъ/, /bofoṭъ/, /bofaaxъ/ 'fight'; /mlĕti/, /mlĕxъ/, /melotъ/, /melaše/ 'grind'; /biti/, /bixъ/, /bъjotъ/, /bъjaaxъ/ 'beat'.

In -/a/- stems, except in the imperfect, -/a/- has the alternant  $\emptyset$  before a vocalic suffix, with the palatal alternant of the last consonant of the stem. Verbs in -/ova/- have the alternant -/uj/- before a vowel suffix. Examples are: infinitive /kazati/ 'point', /darovati/ 'grant', perfect participle /kazaḷъ/, /darovaḷъ/; present /kaṣotъ/, /darujotъ/ (3 PL); aorist /kazaхъ/ (1 SG), /kaza/ (2/3 SG), /darovaхъ/, /darova/; imperfect /kazaaxъ/, /darovaaxъ/ (rare younger form /darujaxъ/); imperative /kaži/ (2 SG), /kažite/ (2 PL), /daruji/, /darujite/ (with attestation of younger forms, such as *glagolĕte* 'say', *sъvęzate* 'tie' (2 PL), by analogy with /nesĕte/); participles: present active /kaṣę/, /kaṣęšti/, /daruję/, /darujęšti/, present passive /kaṣęmъ/, /darujęmъ/, past active /kazavъ/, /darovavъ/, past passive /kazanъ/, /darovanъ/. Verbs with -/j/ as last consonant of the stem, such as /sĕjati/ 'sow', have spellings such as supine *sĕatъ*, perfect participle *sĕḷъ* showing loss of intervocalic -/j/- and vowel contraction. /pъsati/ 'write' and /jъmati/ 'take' have alternation in the present stem: /piṣotъ/, /jemlotъ/ (3 PL).

Stems of -/ę/- verbs end either in -/i/-, such as /xodi/- 'go', or in -/ĕ/-, with the alternant -/a/ after a palatal, such as /velĕ/- 'order', /slyša/- 'hear'. The stem-final vowel alternates with  $\emptyset$  before a vowel suffix. Examples are: infinitive /xoditi/, /velĕti/, /slyšati/, perfect participle /xodilъ/, /velĕḷъ/, /slyšaḷъ/; present (with the palatal alternant in the first person singular only) /xoṣḏo/ (1 SG), /xodiši/ (2 SG), /xodętъ/ (3 PL); aorist /xodixъ/, /velĕxъ/, /slyšaхъ/ (1 SG), /xodi/, /velĕ/, /slyša/ (2/3 SG); imperfect (with the palatal alternant in -/i/- stems only) /xoṣḏaaхъ/, /velĕaxъ/ (1 SG), /xoṣḏaaše/, /velĕaše/ (2/3 SG); imperative /xodi/ (2 SG), /xodite/ (2 PL); participles: present active /xodę/, /xodęšti/, present passive /molimъ/ 'pray', past (with palatal alternant in -/i/ stems only) active /xoṣḏbъ/, /velĕvъ/ (with younger analogical /xodivъ/ for -/i/ stems), passive /molenъ/, velĕnъ/. The verb /sъpati/, though having a stem in a hard consonant plus /a/, belongs to this subclass: aorist /sъpaxъ/, imperfect /sъpaaхъ/, past active participle /sъparvъ/; present /sъpĭo/ (1 SG), /sъpĭši/ (2 SG), /sъpętъ/ (3 PL).

The athematic verbs are five verbs, of which three are -/d/- stems, one

is an *-s/-* stem in the imperfective present, and one has an *-a/-* stem in the present tense. They are characterized by first person singular *-/mь/*, third person plural *-/ę/-* or *-/o/-*, but no vowel suffixes in other persons of the present.

The athematic *-/d/-* stems are: infinitive */jěsti/* 'eat', */věděti/* 'know', */dati/* 'give', perfect participle */jělъ/*, */věděлъ/*, */dalъ/*; present singular */jěmь/*, */jěsi/*, */jěstъ/*, dual */jěvě/*, */jěsta/*, */jěste/*, plural */jěmъ/*, */jěste/*, */jědęтъ/* (first person singular */věmь/* has an exceptional alternant */vědě/*); aorist */jěsъ/*, */jěxъ/* (both older and younger forms, in second/third person singular */jěstъ/*, but *izě* (*Suprasliensis* 138.27) 'eat from'), */věděxъ/* (productive forms only), */daxъ/* (productive forms only, other than second/third person singular */dastъ/*, */da/*); imperfect */jědęaxъ/*; imperative */jězdь/*, */jědite/*; participles: present active */jědy/*, */jědęšti/*, present passive */jědomъ/*, past active */jědъ/*, */věděvъ/*, */davъ/*, present passive */jědenъ/*, */věděnъ/*, */danъ/*.

The athematic verb */byti/* 'be' has an imperfective present *-/s/-* stem. Forms are: perfect participle */byлъ/*; imperfective present singular */jesmь/*, */jesi/*, */jestъ/*, dual */jesvě/*, */jesta/*, */jeste/*, plural */jesmъ/*, */jeste/*, */sotъ/* (with contraction in the negative, other than the third person plural, as in */něsmь/*); the perfective present is a regular consonant-stem verb */bod/-*; aorist */běxъ/*, */bě/*, probably imperfective, alongside perfective aorist */byxъ/*, */bystъ/* (younger */by/*) 'become, happen'; */běaše/*, attested only in third-person forms and morphologically an imperfect; imperative */bodi/* (2/3 SG), */bodęte/* (2 PL); participles: present */sy/*, */sošti/*, past */byvъ/*, past passive in the derivative */zabъvenъ/* 'forget'.

The athematic verb */iměti/* 'have' has an *-/a/-* stem present tense. Forms are: perfect participle */imělъ/*; present singular */imamь/*, */imaši/*, */imatъ/*, dual */imavě/*, */imata/*, */imate/*, plural */imamъ/*, */imate/*, */imotъ/* (younger */imějotъ/*); aorist */iměxъ/*; imperfect */iměaxъ/*; imperative */iměji/*, */imějite/*; participles: present */imy/*, */iměje/*, definite nominative singular masculine only */imějejъ/*, oblique cases older */imęšti/*, younger */imějęšti/*, past */iměvъ/*.

The anomalous verb */xotěti/*, */xъtěti/* 'wish' is conjugated as follows: perfect participle */xotělъ/*; present singular */xoštę/*, */xošteši/*, */xošetъ/*, dual */xoštevě/*, */xošteta/*, */xoštete/*, plural */xoštemъ/*, */xoštete/* (these present forms as for an *-/a/-* stem *-/o/-* verb), */xotęтъ/* (as for an *-/ę/-* verb); aorist */xotěxъ/*; imperfect */xotěaxъ/*; participles: present */xotę/*, */xotęšti/* (as for an *-/ę/-* verb), past */xotěvъ/*. For the imperative, third person singular */vъxošti/* is attested. In *Suprasliensis*, the root variant */xъt/-* is probably younger.

For all verbs, younger forms without *-/тъ/* (3 SG, 3 PL) or *-/stъ/* (3 SG) are attested, such as third person singular */je/* 'be', negative */ně/*, third person plural */načъno/* 'begin'.

### 3.3 Derivational morphology

#### 3.3.1 Major patterns of noun derivation

A few noun stems are verb roots with no added nominal suffix. Noun stems formed from verb roots with no added nominal suffix occur with or without prefixes: /přichodъ/ 'arrival', /prinоsъ/ 'contribution', /ходъ/ 'movement'. Many nouns have noun, adjective or verb stems with an additional nominal suffix.

The following are examples of noun suffixes. -/ъj/- forms neuter nouns from noun stems /(kamenъje/ 'stones (collective)'), adjective stems (/veselъje/ 'gaiety'), verb stems (/znanъje/ 'knowledge') or prepositional phrases (/bezdъždъje/ 'lack of rain', compare /bez/ 'without', /dъždъ/ 'rain'), in addition to one feminine collective noun, /bratrъja/ 'brothers, brethren'. -/ost/- forms feminine -/i/ genitives from adjective stems (/radostъ/ 'joy'). -/ъstv/ forms neuter -/a/ genitives from noun stems (/cěsarъstvo/ 'kingdom'), verb stems (/roždъstvo/ 'birth'), adjective stems (/mоdъrъstvo/ 'wisdom') and prepositional phrases (/bezočъstvo/ 'importunity', compare /oko/ 'eye'). The suffix -/ъstvъj/- is probably Moravian.

-/in/- forms -/y/ genitives, from adjective stems (/tišina/ 'quiet'), noun stems (/družina/ 'company (collective)') and comparative adjective stems (/starějъšina/ 'senior, elder, leader'). -tel' /- derives agentive nouns from verb stems (/učitelъ/ 'teacher'), while -/ař/- derives them from noun stems (/mytař/ 'tax-gatherer').

-/ъc/- derives nouns of all three genders from all types of stem: masculine: /tvorъcъ/ 'creator', /starъcъ/ 'old man', /bliznъcъ/ 'twin', /gradъcъ/ 'small town'; feminine: /оvъca/ 'sheep', /dvъrъca/ 'small door'; epicene (masculine or feminine): /jědъca/ 'glutton'; neuter: /čędъce/ 'small child'. -/ik/- derives masculine -/a/ genitives from past passive participle stems (/učenikъ/ 'disciple, pupil', /mоčenikъ/ 'martyr'). -/ic/- derives -/ę/ genitive feminines (/proročica/ 'prophetess', /rybica/ 'small fish') and epicenes (/pъjanica/ 'drunkard'). Both -/ik/ and -/ic/ form derivatives from adjective stems with the suffix -/ъn/-: (grěšъnikъ/ (M), /grěšъnica/ (F) 'sinner', /тъmъnica/ 'jail', /тъmъницьnikъ/ 'jailer' (compare /тъma/ 'darkness', /тъмъnъ/ 'dark').

#### 3.3.2 Major patterns of adjective derivation

Of the more than thirty suffixes, there are listed below only those attached to noun stems and referring to individuals and qualities.

The suffixes -/ъn/- (attached only to non-human stems) and -/ъsk/- (attached to human and non-human stems) form adjectives referring to qualities, individuals and groups. Examples with -/ъn/- are: qualities: *vъse zakonъnoje* (*Suprasliensis* 416.17) 'everything legal'; individuals and groups: *slovesy proročъskyimi i zakonъnyimi* (*Suprasliensis* 346.17) 'in

the words of the prophets and of the law', *stražije tьmničьnii* (*Suprasliensis* 184.26) 'the prison guards', *slъzъnyi darъ* (*Suprasliensis* 285.20) 'the gift of tears', *zvěrьnuiumu našьstviju* (*Suprasliensis* 558.20) 'the onrush of the beast', *спррогъ* (GEN PL) *volovъnyixъ* (Luke 14.19) 'a yoke of oxen'. Examples with *-ъsk/-* are: */morъskъ/* 'nautical, of the sea, of the seas', */ženъskъ/* 'female, womanly, of a woman, of women'; with this suffix, older forms have only short forms with no distinction for definite and indefinite, while long forms are younger.

Suffixes which refer only to individuals occur mainly, but not exclusively, with human stems. For human stems other than those with the nominal suffix *-/ik/-*, *-/ic/-*, *-/ьc/-*, these suffixes refer exclusively to individuals, not to groups of persons: *-/ov/-*: */ženixovъ/* 'bridegroom's', */tektonovъ/* 'carpenter's', */isusovъ/* 'Jesus's'; *-/ьj/-*: */božьjъ/* 'God's', */vražьjъ/* 'enemy's', */rabьjъ/* 'slave's'; *-/in/-* (for stems forming nouns with nominative singular in *-/a/*): */sotoninъ/* 'Satan's', */marijinъ/* 'Mary's'; *-/ьń/-*: */gospodьńъ/* 'Lord's'; palatal alternant of stem-final consonant: */proročъ/* 'prophet's' (from */prorok/-*), */кѣнѣжъ/* 'ruler's' (from */кѣнѣdz/-*), */dijavolъ/* 'devil's' (from */dijavol/-*), */grěšьničъ/* 'sinner's' (from */grěšьnik/-*), */otъčъ/* 'father's' (from */otъc/-*), */mateřъ/* 'mother's' (from */mater/-*), */děvičъ/* 'maiden's' (from */děvic/-*). Such is the productivity of these suffixes that they are attested with both native stems, such as */bog/-* 'God', */vrag/-* 'enemy', */prorok/-* 'prophet', and non-native stems, such as */tekton/-* 'carpenter', */isus/-* 'Jesus', */dijavol/-* 'devil'. Adjectives from stems in *-/ik/-*, *-/ic/-* and *-/ьc/-* may refer to groups of persons as well as to individuals. Adjectives from other types of stems have purely individual reference. For this type of stem, a personal adjective, such as */proročъ/*, has individual reference, whereas the adjective */proročьskъ/* 'of the prophets, prophetic' refers either to a quality or to a group of individuals.

### 3.3.3 Major patterns of verb derivation

Verb derivation involves mainly aspect formation by suffixation, and aspect and lexical formation by prefixation, as described briefly in section 3.2.1. The opposition transitive:intransitive is expressed by suffixation for a few roots: */čěliti/* (INF), */čělęť/* (3 PL PRS) 'cure', */čělęti/*, */čělęřotъ/* 'recover', or by root vowel alternation: */tešti/*, */tekřotъ/* 'run, flow', */točiti/*, */točęť/* 'drive, pour', but such morphological contrasts do not express any invariant lexical oppositions, since, for example, */vesti/*, */voditi/* 'lead' are both transitive paired verbs of motion.

## 4 Syntax

### 4.1 Element order in declarative sentences

Word order in Old Church Slavonic texts in general follows that of the Greek original. All possible orders of subject and verb in intransitive clauses and of (subject,) verb and object in transitive clauses are found, except that a noun object never immediately precedes a noun subject, suggesting that Old Church Slavonic had free word order, though the imitation of Greek word order makes it impossible to be more precise concerning the factors governing this freedom:

*slēpii prozirajotъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus; Matthew 11.5*) (Subject–Verb)  
‘The blind regain sight.’

*iscēletъ otrokъ moi* (*Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus; Matthew 8.8*)  
(Verb–Subject)  
‘My servant will recover.’

*mъzdo proročъ priemletъ* (*Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus, Savvina kniga; Matthew 10.41*) (Object–Verb)  
‘He receives the reward of a prophet.’

*nesi darъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus; Matthew 8.4*) (Verb–Object)  
‘Take the gift.’

*bogъ vъzljubi mira* (*Marianus; John 3.16*) (Subject–Verb–Object)  
‘God loved the world.’

*drěvo dobro plody dobry tvoritъ* (*Marianus; Matthew 7.17*) (Subject–Object–Verb)  
‘The good tree makes good fruit.’

*eže ubo bogъ sъčetať estъ* (*Marianus, Zographensis; Mark 10.9*) (Object–Subject–Verb)  
‘for what God has joined ...’

*vlastъ imatъ synъ člověčsky* (*Marianus, Zographensis, Savvina kniga; Matthew 9.6*) (Object–Verb–Subject)  
‘The son of man has power.’

*prědať že bratъ bratra* (*Marianus; Matthew 10.21*) (Verb–Subject–Object)  
‘for brother will betray brother’

*viděvъše i učenicі* (*Zographensis, Marianus; Matthew 14.26*) (Verb–Object–Subject)  
‘The disciples having seen him ...’

Orders for the perfect participle and auxiliary and for clitic pronouns are the only two items for which there is reliable evidence for the indigenous word order.



Phrase-initially, the perfect participle precedes the positive auxiliary (which is thus shown to be enclitic), but follows the negative auxiliary:

*varila estъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus; Mark 14.8*)  
‘She has gone ahead.’

*něstъ umъla* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus; Luke 8.52*)  
‘She has not died.’

Phrase-internally, word order is free, and for negation both the negative auxiliary and the negated participle are attested:

*jako varilъ jestъ* (*Suprasliensis 204.29*)  
‘that he has gone ahead’

*jakože jestъ obyklъ* (*Suprasliensis 382.24*)  
‘as he has become accustomed’

*ideže něsi sělъ* (*Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus, Savvina kniga; Matthew 25.24*)  
‘where you have not sown’

*nikoliže ne datъ esi* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus, Savvina kniga; Luke 15.29*)  
‘You have never given.’

Enclitic pronouns precede the auxiliary:

*vъskojъ mę esi ostavilъ* (*Marianus, Assemanianus; Matthew 27.46*)  
‘Why have you abandoned me?’

*datъ ti bi vodъ živъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus; John 4.10*)  
‘He would have given you living water.’

The enclitic reflexive pronoun, with another pronoun, immediately precedes or follows the verb:

*čъto vamъ sę avlęetъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus; Mark 14.64*)  
‘How does it appear to you?’

*si vъsę priložetъ sę vamъ* (*Marianus, Zographensis; Luke 12.31*)  
‘All these things will be added to you.’

*čъto sę tъnitъ vamъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus; John 11.56*)  
‘What do you think?’

Examples of adjacent clitic pronouns other than with reflexives are not attested. Following the verb, the particle /bo/ ‘for’ may precede the enclitic reflexive pronoun:

*boěaxъ bo sę tebe* (*Marianus, Zographensis*; Luke 19.21)  
 'for I was afraid of you'

#### 4.2 Non-declarative sentence types

Questions requiring the answer 'yes' or 'no', when not marked for a contradictory answer, have the verb or some other emphasized element obligatorily preposed and followed by the particle /li/:

*damъ li ili ne damъ* (*Zographensis*; Mark 12.14)  
 'Shall we give or shall we not give?'

*ne dobro li sęmę sęlъ esi* (*Marianus, Zographensis*; Matthew 13.27)  
 'Did you not sow good seed?'

*ne iže li estъ sъtvoritъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus*; Luke 11.40)  
 'Is it not he who has made ...?'

In the sequence predicate + copula + subject pronoun, /li/ may optionally be omitted:

*prorokъ esi ty* (*Zographensis*)/*prorokъ li ubo esi ty* (*Assemanianus*; John 1.21)  
 '(For) are you a prophet?'

The particle /li/ is not used with interrogative pronouns, which occur in clause-initial position, but may be preceded by a personal pronoun:

*ty kъto esi ... čъto ubo ty esi ... kъto esi* (*Zographensis, Assemanianus*; John 1.19 ... 21 ... 22)  
 'Who are you? ... Now what are you? ... Who are you?'

For eliciting a contradictory answer the particle /jeda/ precedes the questioned word:

*eda kamenъ podastъ emu* (*Marianus*; Matthew 7.9)  
 'He won't give him a stone, will he?'

Questions requiring a positive or negative response may be answered by /ei/ 'yes' or /ni/ 'no':

*bōdi že slovo vaše ei ei i ni ni lixoe bo seju otъ nepriěžni estъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus*; Matthew 5.37)  
 'Let your word be: yes, yes, or; no, no. Anything extra to this is from the Evil One.'

Direct and indirect questions are marked by /li/ in exactly the same way, but /jeda/ in a subordinate clause marks negative purpose, 'lest'.

Commands are expressed by the imperative, in either aspect. The negated imperative of /mošti/ 'be able' is used for pleading:

*ne mozi mene ostaviti (Suprasliensis 539.8)*  
 ‘Do not leave me.’

### 4.3 Copular sentences

The copula is /byti/ ‘be’, or non-actual /byvati/, or, for emphasis, zero; for instance, the copula is often omitted in exclamations:

*azъ glasъ vъrijōštago vъ pustyni (Zographensis; John 1.23)*  
 ‘I am the voice of the one crying in the wilderness.’

The copula is often omitted in the Greek, but included in the Old Church Slavonic in non-exclamatory statements:

*i svētiti vъsēmъ iže vъ xramině sōtъ (Zographensis; Matthew 5.15)*  
 ‘and it shines for all those who are in the house’

The noun predicate is in the nominative, except when the instrumental is used with /byti/ to refer to an anomalous temporary change of state:

*ovogda turomъ (INST) byvъ (Suprasliensis 7.24)*  
 ‘sometimes having become a bull’

*ne bōdi niktože ijudojъ (INST) tu (Suprasliensis 420.10)*  
 ‘Let no one there become a Judas.’

For a normal, permanent or beneficial change of state the nominative is used:

*byšę krъstijani (NOM) (Suprasliensis 4.3)*  
 ‘They became Christians.’

While reliable examples of long-form adjectival predicates do not happen to be attested, there are a number of examples where a short adjective contrasts with a long participle:

*bēaxъ vidēli prēzde ēko slēpъ (SHORT) bē glagolaaxъ ne sъ li estъ sēdęi (LONG)*  
*(Marianus; John 9.8)*  
 ‘They had previously seen that he was blind (SHORT), they were saying: Is not this the one sitting (LONG) ...?’

### 4.4 Coordination and comitativity

Two coordinated or comitative singular subjects take a dual verb:

*otecъ tvoi i azъ skrъbęšta (DU) iskaaxovē (DU) tebe (Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus; Luke 2.48)*  
 ‘Your father and I, grieving (DU), were looking (DU) for you.’

*i ěvi* (SG) *sę imъ iliě sъ moseemъ i bęašete* (DU) *glagoljošta* (DU) (*Marianus, Zographensis*; Mark 9.4)

'And Elijah appeared to them with Moses and they were speaking ...'

If one subject is collective, verbs are plural, not dual:

*mati tvoě* (F SG) *i bratriě tvoě* (F SG) *vъně stojęrъ* (3 PL) *xotęšte* (M PL) *glagolati kъ tebě* (*Zographensis, Marianus*; Matthew 12.47)

'Your mother (F SG) and your brothers (F SG) are standing (3 PL) outside wanting (M PL) to talk to you.'

#### 4.5 Subordination

A few examples are given below of subordinate clauses and of participial and infinitive phrases synonymous with such clauses.

*/jegda/* 'when, after' expresses a limit with the perfective, but specifies no limit with the imperfective:

*egda svoję ovъcę izdenerъ* (PRFV) *prědъ nimi xoditъ* (IMPFV) (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus*; John 10.4)

'After he drives (PRFV) his sheep out, he goes (IMPFV) in front of them.'

*egda že vodęrъ* (IMPFV) *vъ prědajęšte ne rъčęte se prěžde čto vъzglagolete* (*Marianus*; Mark 13.11)

'When they lead (IMPFV) you, handing you over, do not trouble yourself beforehand what you will say.'

*/doňđeže/* 'while' expresses no limit with the imperfective:

*doňđeže dъňь estъ* (IMPFV) (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus*; John 9.4)

'While it is day ...'

Examples of */doňđeže/* with the perfective, expressing a limit, are:

*rovelě đbrati želęznu nogъty doideže črěva načęnęrъ* (PRFV) *xъčęti izvaliti sę na zemъję* (*Suprasliensis* 113.29)

'He ordered them to be flogged with iron nails until their intestines were about to pour out onto the ground.'

*ne imęrъ vъkusiti sъmęrti doňđeže uzręrъ* (PRFV) *cęsarъstvie božie* (*Assemanianus*; Mark 9.1)

'They will not taste death until they see the kingdom of God.'

*/jako/* has temporal meanings similar to the above, but may also introduce a clause of reason or of result:

*izidi otъ mene ěko tęžъ grěšęnъ estъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus*; Luke 5.8)

'Go away from me because I am a sinful man.'

*učaše je na sьnъmišitixъ i xъ ěko divlěaxo sę emu (Zographensis, Marianus; Matthew 13.54)*

'He taught them in their synagogues, so that they marvelled at him.'

Conditional sentences have the subjunctive for unreal conditions, but the indicative for real conditions:

*ašte bi byľъ sьde ne bi moi bratъ umrěľъ (Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus; John 11.32)*

'If you had been here, my brother would not have died.'

*ašte li umrěretъ tьnogoъ ploďъ sьtvoritъ (Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus; John 12.24)*

'If it dies, it will bear much fruit.'

Similarly, /da/ 'so that' with the indicative implies fulfilment of purpose, but with the subjunctive does not necessarily do so:

*idětmъ i my da umrěretъ sь nímъ (Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus; John 11.16)*

'Let us go too, so that we may die with him.'

*molěaxo i da bi prěbyľъ u nixъ (Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus; John 4.40)*

'They begged him to stay with them.'

Long-form participles are synonymous with headless relative clauses:

*věrujei (LONG ACT PART) vь syna imatъ životъ věčny a iže (REL) ne věruetъ (PRS) vь syna ne uzrěitъ života (Zographensis, Marianus; John 3.36)*

'Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life, but whoever does not believe in the Son will not see life.'

Short-form participles in both aspects are synonymous with various types of subordinate clause:

*vьzъrivъ (PAST ACT PART PRFV) glasomъ velětъ glagola (Zographensis, Marianus; Mark 5.7)*

'Having cried out with a loud voice, he said ...'

The perfective past participle in this example characterizes the event as occurring in its entirety immediately before the event expressed by the main verb.

*baliětmъ izdaěvьši (PAST ACT PART IMPFV) vьse iměnie ni oť edinogo že ne može iscělěti (Marianus, Zographensis; Luke 8.43)*

'Having given away all her property to the doctors, she could not be cured by any one of them.'

The imperfective past participle in this example characterizes the event as an ongoing process not necessarily immediately preceding the event expressed by the main verb.

*xode* (PRS ACT PART IMPFV) *že pri mori galilěiscěmь vidě dьva bratra* (*Zographensis, Assemanianus, Savvina kniga; Matthew 4.18*)  
 'Going by the Sea of Galilee, he saw two brothers.'

The imperfective present participle here characterizes the event as being simultaneous with the event expressed by the main verb.

*ašte vidiši človeka dijavola sьtvorьša* (PAST ACT PART PRFV) *sę i pridōšta* (PRS ACT PART PRFV) *kъ tebě* (*Suprasliensis 381.15*)  
 'If you see a man who has become a devil approaching you ...'

In this example, the perfective past participle characterizes the event as having occurred in its entirety before the event expressed by the perfective present participle, which in turn characterizes the event as one which is about to occur in its entirety.

Participial phrases containing a direct object may occur, instead of a clause containing a finite verb, as objects of verbs of thinking or knowing:

*mьněaxo duхъ vidęšte* (PRS ACT PART) (*Marianus, Assemanianus; Luke 24.37*)  
 'They thought they were seeing a spirit.'

*věděše čto xoтę* (PRS ACT PART) *sьtvoriti* (*Marianus; John 6.6*)  
 'He knew what he was about to do.'

Participles may also be synonymous with finite verbs in relative clauses:

*vъzemіeši ideže* (REL) *ne položь* (PAST ACT PART) *i žьneši egože* (REL) *ne sęavь* (PAST ACT PART) (*Zographensis; Luke 19.21*)  
 'You take up where you have not put down, and reap what you have not sown.'

The participle and its subject are in the dative, the so-called dative-absolute construction, when the following clause has a main verb with a different subject:

*vъlęzъšema* (DAT) *ima* (DAT) *vъ korabь přesta větrь* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus; Matthew 14.32*)  
 'After they had got into the boat, the wind stopped.'

The perfective participle in this example presents the event as having occurred in its entirety before the onset of the event expressed by the main verb.

*sicěmi slovesy glagolavъšu* (DAT) *oъcu* (DAT) *ne posluša bratъ* (*Suprasliensis* 290.29)

'After the father had been speaking with such words, the brother did not heed him.'

The imperfective past participle in this example expresses an ongoing process preceding the event expressed by the main verb.

*vъ crъkъve xodęstju* (DAT) *emu* (DAT) *prido kъ nemu* (*Marianus*; Mark 11.27)

'While he was walking to the temple, they came up to him.'

Here, the imperfective present participle expresses an event which is simultaneous with the event expressed by the main verb.

*zъri da ne paky vъzidořtu* (DAT) *mi* (DAT) *sъ plъtijъ ty nevěrnuye rěči vъzъmъ rěčeši* (*Suprasliensis* 506.4)

'Take care lest, when I rise up again in the flesh, adopting words of disbelief you say ...'

The perfective present participle of this example expresses an event which will occur in its entirety in the future, which is one of the contextual meanings of the perfective present in general.

The participial phrase may be in the dative when followed by a subordinate clause with a different subject, even though the main clause has the same subject as the participial phrase:

*obrčēnē* (DAT) *že byvъši* (DAT) *materi* (DAT) *ego marii* (DAT) *iosifovi pręzde daže ne sъnęste sę obręte sę imōřti vъ črěvē oъ duxa svęta* (*Savvina kniga*, *Assemanianus*; Matthew 1.18)

'For after his mother Mary had become engaged to Joseph, before they were married, she was found to be pregnant by the Holy Spirit.'

The dative is also attested even when the subject is identical with that of the main verb:

*približivъšu* (DAT) *že sę svętuumu* (DAT) *i sъtvorivъ* (NOM) *xristosovo znamenije na čelě svojemъ vъnide* (AOR) *vъ crъkъve* (*Suprasliensis* 229.3)

'But the holy man, having approached and having made the sign of the cross on his forehead, went into the temple.'

This use of the dative absolute may imitate a similar use of the genitive absolute in the Greek text.

The dative and infinitive are found as complements of /bystъ/ 'it happened':

*bystъ že umrěti* (INF) *niřtjumu* (DAT) (*Zographensis*, *Marianus*, *Assemanianus*, *Savvina kniga*; Luke 16.22)

'The beggar happened to die.'

Other prominent uses of the dative and infinitive, illustrated below, are, respectively, modal, resultative and existential:

*počto mi* (DAT) *gněviti* (INF) *językъ starcu* (*Suprasliensis* 239.26)  
‘Why should I (DAT) provoke (INF) the old man’s tongue?’

*ěko narodu* (DAT) *diviti* (INF) *se* (*Zographensis, Marianus; Matthew* 15.31)  
‘... so that the crowd marvelled ...’

*nikomuže* (DAT) *sego ně slyšati* (*Suprasliensis* 241.1)  
‘There is no one to hear this.’

#### 4.6 Negation

Verbal negation is expressed by the particles /ne/ or /ni/ immediately preceding the main verb. The basic rule is for the direct object of a negated verb to stand in the genitive; both this and various special instances with the accusative are illustrated below. A single verb is negated with /ne/; when there is more than one verb, /ne/ negates the more prominent, /ni/ the less prominent, but only /ni/ is used when the verbs are of equal prominence:

*ne sějōtъ ni žьnōtъ ni sьbirajōtъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus; Matthew* 6.26)  
‘They do not sow, neither do they reap, nor do they gather.’

*ni ženętъ se ni posagajōtъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus; Mark* 12.25)  
‘Neither do men marry, nor do women marry.’

When a constituent is negated, /ne/ or /ni/ immediately precedes this constituent. If the subject is negated, the object is in the accusative:

*ne mosi li dastъ vamъ zakonъ* (ACC) (*Zographensis, Marianus; John* 7.19)  
‘Did not Moses give you the law?’

A negated pronominal object is in the genitive:

*ni li sego* (GEN) *este čьli* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus; Luke* 6.3)  
‘Have you neither read this?’

/ne/ and /nъ/ contrast negated and non-negated constituents respectively:

*ne otъ kvasa xlěbъnaago nъ otъ učeniě fariseiska i sadueiska* (*Zographensis, Marianus; Matthew* 16.12)  
‘... not from yeast, but from the teachings of the Pharisees and Saducees.’

More than one negative element is allowed in the same phrase:



*ne bē nikъtože nikogdaže položenъ* (Luke 23.53)  
 'Nobody was ever put (literally: Nobody was never not put).'

A negative adverb or pronoun may occur without negating the verb:

*nikъtože otъ vasъ tvoritъ zakona* (GEN) (*Zographensis, Marianus*; John 7.19)  
 'No one of you keeps the law.'

In negative clauses, the direct object is expressed either by the genitive or by the accusative, under various conditions some of which have been exemplified above. When the subject is a negative pronoun, or when the verb is negated, the direct object is in the genitive:

*ne ostaveŕtъ kamene* (GEN) *na kameni* (*Zographensis, Marianus*; Luke 19.44)  
 'They will not leave stone on stone.'

Similarly with a negative adverb, with no negation of the verb:

*nikoliže znaхъ vasъ* (GEN) (*Zographensis, Marianus*; Matthew 7.23)  
 'I never knew you.'

Even if the infinitive is not negated, the direct object of an infinitive dependent on a negated verb is in the genitive:

*ne možeši otъvaliti* (INF) *kamyka* (GEN) (*Suprasliensis* 316.21)  
 'You cannot roll away the stone.'

*otъpustiti* (INF) *ixъ* (GEN) *ne хоѣтo ne ѣдѣшь* (GEN) (*Zographensis*; Matthew 15.32)  
 'I do not wish to let them go without their having eaten.'

The direct object is also in the genitive when the infinitive is dependent on an adjective with a negated copula:

*něsmъ dostoinъ pokloñъ sę razdrěšiti* (INF) *remene* (GEN) *sapogu ego* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus, Savvina kniga*; Mark 1.7)  
 'I am not worthy, having bent down, to untie the strap of his sandals.'

When just the direct object itself is negated, it stands in the accusative:

*dělaite ne brašъno* (ACC) *gybljōštee* (ACC) *nъ brašъno prěbyvajoštee* (*Marianus, Assemanianus*; John 6.27)  
 'Make not the food that perishes, but the food that remains.'

When a negated verb has an object consisting of an adverb of place and an infinitive with a direct object, this direct object is in the genitive:

*ne imať kde glavy* (GEN) *poďkloniti* (INF) (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus, Suprasliensis*; Matthew 8.20)  
 'He has nowhere to put his head down.'

A noun complement of a negated existential copula is in the genitive, regardless of the tense of the copula:

*něstь istiny* (GEN) *въ němь* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus*; John 8.44)  
 'There is no truth in him.'

*ne bodeť grěšnika* (GEN) (*Psalterium Sinaiticum* 36.10)  
 'There will be no sinner.'

*ne bě ima města* (GEN) (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus, Savvina kniga*; Luke 2.7)  
 'There was no place for them.'

When the copula is not existential, the noun complement is in the nominative:

*ne bě ťь svěťь* (NOM) (*Zographensis, Assemanianus*; John 1.8)  
 'He was not the light.'

*něstь bo člověkъ* (NOM) *tvoręi* (NOM) ... *nъ raspęty* (NOM) *za ny xristoŝь* (NOM) (*Clozianus* 8a.14)  
 'It is not a man who is making [this] ... but the Christ who was crucified for us.'

An existential relative pronoun complement is in the nominative:

*ne bōdi emu zastorъnika* (GEN) *ni bōdi ižé* (NOM) *pomilueť* (*Psalterium Sinaiticum* 108.12)  
 'Let there be no intercessor for him, nor anyone who shows him mercy.'

When the complement is the pronoun /кѣто/ 'someone' as the subject of a participle, both pronoun and participle are nominative:

*něstь kto* (NOM) *miluje* (NOM) *i něstь kto* (NOM) *milosręduje* (NOM) (*Suprasliensis* 57.9)  
 'There is no one showing mercy and there is no one showing pity.'

When the complement is the negative pronoun in the genitive case, /nikogože/ 'no one', but the verb is not negated, the participle is also in the genitive:

*nikogože* (GEN) *bě kažōŝta* (GEN) (*Suprasliensis* 415.4)  
 'There was no one instructing.'

When the copula is negated, the participle is in the nominative, but the negative pronoun and any object of the participle are in the genitive:

*ně sьde nikogože* (GEN) *seje* (GEN) *besědy* (GEN) *slyšę* (NOM) (*Suprasliensis* 240.29)

‘There is no one (GEN) here hearing (NOM) this conversation (GEN).’

A dative and infinitive may be the complement of a negated copula, so that the subject of the infinitive remains in the dative, but the direct object of the infinitive is in the genitive:

*něstъ тьнѣ* (DAT) *sego* (GEN) *dati* (INF) (*Marianus, Zographensis* (younger); Matthew 20.23)

‘It is not for me (DAT) to grant this (GEN).’

*nikomuže* (DAT) *sego* (GEN) *ně slyšati* (INF) (*Suprasliensis* 241.1)

‘There is no one (DAT) to hear this (GEN).’

*glagoljortъ ne byti* (INF) *vъskrěsenju* (DAT) (*Zographensis, Marianus; Mark* 12.18)

‘They say there is no resurrection.’

#### 4.7 Anaphora and pronouns

Both Old Church Slavonic and Greek encode the person and number of the subject in the verb and allow subject pronouns to be omitted. The presence or absence of pronouns in Old Church Slavonic simply follows the Greek source. Otherwise, third-person reference is made by the demonstratives, /тъ/ unmarked or ‘the former’, /онъ/ distant or ‘the former’, with /јь/ in the oblique cases. The proximate demonstrative /сь/ is used for ‘the latter’.

#### 4.8 Reflexives and reciprocals

Reflexivity is expressed, for all persons and numbers, by the pronoun /сę/ ‘oneself’). There are various ways of distinguishing the reflexive from the passive, for instance, by the conjunction /и/, by the emphatic /самъ/ in the nominative, or by using the full form /себе/:

*da sъpasetъ i sę* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus, Savvina kniga; Luke* 23.35)

‘Let him save himself too.’

*sъpasi sę samъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus, Savvina kniga; Luke* 23.37)

‘Save yourself.’

*sъpasi sebe* (*Zographensis, Marianus*)/*sę* (*Assemanianus, Savvina kniga*) (Matthew 27.40)

‘Save yourself.’

The antecedent of a reflexive pronoun in a participial phrase may be the subject of a verb in some other phrase, rather than the subject of the participle:

*viđe isusa grđdŕŕŕta kŕ sebě (Marianus; John 1.29)*  
 ‘He saw Jesus coming towards him.’

The reflexive pronoun, governed by the preposition /*među*/ ‘between’, is occasionally used to express reciprocity:

*mirŕ iměite meždju sobojŕ (Zographensis, Marianus; Mark 9.50)*  
 ‘Have peace one with another.’

More usually, reciprocity is expressed by /*drugŕ*/, in the nominative singular, followed by the same word in the appropriate singular case, regardless of the grammatical number of the antecedent:

*kŕždo (SG) že tŕkaše drugŕ druga (ACC) (Suprasliensis 38.13)*  
 ‘Each was pushing the other.’

*poklonista (DU) ŕŕ drugŕ drugu (DAT SG) (Suprasliensis 298.21)*  
 ‘They bowed to one another.’

*drugŕ druga (ACC SG) bijaxŕ (PL) (Suprasliensis 74.10)*  
 ‘They were beating one another.’

The masculine form of /*drug*/- is used with a neuter antecedent:

*čjuvŕstviě (N PL) ... ne zastŕpajŕŕta (N PL) drugŕ (NOM SG M) druga (ACC SG M)*  
*(Euchologium Sinaiticum 7b.8)*  
 ‘Feelings ... not obstructing one another.’

With a feminine antecedent, both components of the reciprocal are feminine singular:

*dŕvěta přeđŕležŕŕŕteta veŕŕtma (F DU) i kotorajŕŕteta ŕŕ ima druga (NOM SG F)*  
*kŕ družě (DAT SG F) (Suprasliensis 59.12)*  
 ‘from two available things contradicting one another’

#### 4.9 Possession

English ‘have’ is normally translated by the transitive verb /*iměti*/ ‘have’.

Within the noun phrase, first and second persons have the possessive pronouns /*mojŕ*/ ‘my’, /*tvojŕ*/ ‘your’, /*naŕŕ*/ ‘our’, /*vaŕŕ*/ ‘your’ for singular and plural possessors respectively. For the third person in all numbers, and for first and second persons in the dual, the genitive of the personal pronoun is used. The reflexive possessive /*svojŕ*/ ‘one’s own’ refers to persons of any number, and may refer back to a constituent other than the subject of the main verb:

*vŕzvratŕ nožŕ svoŕ vŕ svoe město (Zographensis, Marianus, Savvina kniga;*  
*Matthew 26.52)*  
 ‘Put your knife back in its own place.’

Grammatical possession of various semantic types is expressed by the dative or genitive of a noun, or by a denominal adjective agreeing in case, number and gender with a head noun:

*prědanъ imarъ byti synъ člověčьsky* (ADJECTIVE, NOM SG M) *въ rōcě člověkomъ* (NOUN, DAT PL) (*Marianus*)/ *въ rōcě grěšъnikъ* (NOUN, GEN PL) (*Savvina kniga*) (Matthew 17.22)

'The son of man will be betrayed into the hands of men/into the hands of sinners.'

*prědanъ bōdetъ въ rōcě člověčьscě* (ADJECTIVE, ACC DU F) (*Zographensis, Marianus, Savvina kniga*)/ *въ rōcě člověkomъ* (NOUN, DAT PL) (*Assemanianus*) (Mark 9.31)

'He will be betrayed into the hands of men.'

The adnominal genitive or dative is used much more freely for plural than for singular possessors. In the singular, when the head noun is modified by a single word, the adjective is especially highly preferred for human stems whose adjectives refer exclusively to individual persons. There are strong constraints against the adjective when the head noun is modified by more than one word, in which context the head noun is almost always modified by an adnominal dative or genitive with an accompanying attribute:

*tvorei voljō oťca* (NOUN, GEN SG) *mojego* (GEN SG) (*Zographensis, Marianus; Matthew 7.21*)

'The one doing the will of my father.'

This pattern is infringed in only one example, with the reflexive dative singular pronoun *si* modifying 'father', expressed in the accusative singular feminine adjective modifying 'will':

*da sьtvorō voljō oťčr si* (*Suprasliensis 349.27*)

'That I should do the will of my father.'

A denominative adjective may be only very exceptionally modified by another denominative adjective. There are attested only two examples, in both of which an adjective with the suffix *-ьн/-* is modified by a denominative adjective with a personal stem:

*oť uzdy* (GEN SG F) *koňnyjē* (ADJECTIVE, GEN SG F) *cěsarē* (ADJECTIVE, GEN SG F) (*Suprasliensis 193.9*)

'from the bridle of the horse of the Emperor'

*obrazomъ* (INST SG M) *krestъnyimъ* (ADJECTIVE, INST SG M) *xristosovomъ* (ADJECTIVE, INST SG M) (*Suprasliensis 5.19*)

'with the sign of the cross of Christ'

In the one example where a personal adjective appears to have an adjectival attribute, the two adjectives are, in fact, in apposition:

*вѣспојоу имени* (DAT SG N) *господнју* (ADJECTIVE, DAT SG N) *вышњјути* (ADJECTIVE, DAT SG M) (*Euchologium Sinaiticum* 74a.9)  
‘I will sing to the name of the Lord, the highest.’

A personal adjective may be in apposition with an adnominal genitive singular noun, when this noun itself has an attribute that is either another personal adjective or a possessive pronoun:

*ioanna žena xuzaně* (ADJECTIVE) *pristavъnika* (NOUN, GEN) *irodova* (ADJECTIVE, GEN) (*Marianus*; Luke 8.3)  
‘Joanna, the wife of Chuza, the steward of Herod’

*въ domu davydově* (ADJECTIVE) *otroka* (NOUN, GEN) *svoego* (ADJECTIVE, GEN) (*Zographensis*; Luke 1.69)  
‘in the house of David, his servant’

Denominal adjectives may be conjoined with other types of possessive constructions:

*въ slavě svoei i otъci* (ADJECTIVE) *i svętyxъ angelъ* (GEN) (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus, Savvina kniga*; Luke 9.26)  
‘in his and the father’s and the holy angels’ glory’

Denominal adjectives may be antecedents to the subject implicit in the inflection of a finite verb, to relative pronouns, personal pronouns and participles:

*privъgo ję kъ nogama isusovama i icęli ję* (*Zographensis, Marianus*; Matthew 15.30)  
‘They put them down at Jesus’s feet and he cured them.’

In this example, the adjective *isusovama*, whose stem refers to a male person, is antecedent to the implicit subject of the verb *icęli*.

*iakovъ že rodi iosifa mъža mariina iz nejže rodi sę isusъ* (*Assemanianus, Savvina kniga*; Matthew 1.16)  
‘And Jacob fathered Joseph, the husband of Mary, from whom Jesus was born.’

Here, the adjective *mariina*, whose stem refers to a female person, is antecedent to the feminine singular relative pronoun *nejže*.

*glagola mati isusova kъ nemu* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus*; John 2.3)  
‘Jesus’s mother said to him ...’

In this example, the adjective *isusova*, whose stem refers to a male person, is antecedent to the masculine personal pronoun *ñemu*. A noun with a denominal adjectival attribute may govern a participle either in the genitive or in the dative:

*pomoc̃nъ naša vъ imę gospod̃nĕ s̃tvor̃šaaĝo* (GEN) *nebo i zem̃jŕ* (*Suprasliensis* 80.6, *Psalterium Sinaiticum* 123.9)

'Our help is in the name of the Lord, who created heaven and earth.'

In this example, the stem of the adjective *gospod̃nĕ* invariably refers to a male individual, whence the masculine singular participle *s̃tvor̃šaaĝo*.

*ag̃gĕl̃skъ glasъ slyšanъ bystъ pojŕštemъ* (DAT) *i slavoslovęštemъ* (DAT) *boga* (*Suprasliensis* 110.23)

'The voice of angels was heard singing and glorifying God.'

Since the adjective *ag̃gĕl̃skъ* is antecedent to masculine participles that are in the plural, *pojŕštemъ* and *slavoslovęštemъ*, the reference can be neither 'angelic' nor 'of an angel', but only 'of angels' (the noun stem /angel/- 'angel' is male personal and thus forms a masculine noun).

*po božiju že popušteniju nakazajŕštuumu prisno na pol̃z̃noje* (*Suprasliensis* 191.14)

'Through God's permission, who instructs always to good purpose ...'

Grammatically, the participle *nakazajŕštuumu* in this example could be neuter in agreement with the dative noun *popušteniju* 'permission', but for semantic reasons, since an animate subject is required, the participle must be masculine and its antecedent the dative adjective *božiju*, whose stem forms a masculine singular noun. But since participant roles may thus be assigned by purely semantic features, it is possible to break the agreement and government rules and have both adjective and participle agreeing in case, number and gender with the head noun:

*promyslomъ* (INST SG) *božijemъ* (INST SG) *xotęštiumъ* (INST SG) *človęčskyi rodъ s̃ypasti* (*Suprasliensis* 539.30)

'Through the providence of God, who wishes to save the human race.'

The use of the denominal adjective instead of an unmodified genitive or dative singular noun is strongest for personal stems whose adjectives refer exclusively to individuals. For other types of stem, including personal stems with adjectives with the suffix *-ŭsk/-*, there is a strong tendency for adjectives to be used for indefinite reference, whereas nouns are used for definite reference:

*dijavolъ прѣмѣни сѣ въ мѡѣскѣ* (ADJECTIVE) *образъ* (*Suprasliensis* 78.24)  
‘The Devil changed himself into the form of a man.’

*вълѣзъ въ лono мѡѣ* (GEN) *мѡѣаше* (*Suprasliensis* 567.6)  
‘Getting into the man’s chest, it was torturing him.’

#### 4.10 Quantification

/malo/ ‘few’ as a neuter quantifier governs the genitive case and is the subject of a singular verb:

*gospodi ašte malo estъ* (3 SG) *сѣпасajoštiiхъ* (PRS ACT PART GEN PL LONG) *сѣ*  
(*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus, Savvina kniga*; Luke 13.23)  
‘Lord, are there [only] a few who are saved?’

A relative pronoun relating to an item governed by /malo/ will agree in number with that item:

*malo ixъ* (GEN PL) *estъ* (SG) *iže* (NOM PL) *i obrѣtajotъ* (3 PL) (*Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus*; Matthew 7.14)  
‘There are few of them who find it.’

/mъnogъ/ ‘many’ is inflected for case, number and gender in agreement with its expressed or implied head noun:

*mъnodzi* (NOM PL M) *bo sptъ* (3 PL) *зѣvanii* (NOM PL M LONG) *malo že izbъraniiхъ* (GEN PL LONG) (*Marianus, Assemanianus, Zographensis* (younger); Matthew 20.16)  
‘for many are called, but few are chosen’

/jedinъ/ is a pronoun agreeing in case, number and gender with a head noun, and as subject takes a singular verb. Forms agreeing with /dъva/ (M), /dъvѣ/ (N, F) ‘two’ are dual, and with /trъje/ (M), /tri/ (N, F) ‘three’ and /četyre/ (M), /četyri/ (N, F) ‘four’ are plural. The numerals /pѣtъ/ ‘five’, /šestъ/ ‘six’, /sedmъ/ ‘seven’, /osmъ/ ‘eight’, /devѣtъ/ ‘nine’, which are feminine -/i/ genitive nouns taking feminine attributes, and /desѣtъ/ ‘ten’, which has either masculine or feminine agreement, govern the genitive plural (or genitive singular of a collective noun) and as subjects take either plural or singular verbs:

*въсѣ* (NOM SG F) *sedmъ imъrѣšę* (3 PL) *ne ostavlъše* (NOM PL M) *čędъ* (*Marianus, Zographensis*; Luke 20.31)  
‘All seven died without leaving children.’

*sedmъ ubo bratriję* (GEN SG) *bę* (3 SG) (*Marianus, Zographensis*; Luke 20.29)  
‘For there were seven brothers ...’

*nadъ desętъjo* (INST SG) *gradъ* (GEN PL) ... *nadъ pѣtijo* (INST SG) *gradъ* (GEN PL) (*Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus*; Luke 19.17–19)  
‘Over ten cities ... over five cities.’



*сѣрѣте* (3 SG) *i desęty prokaženъ* (GEN PL) *моѡъ* (GEN PL) *iže* (NOM PL M) *стаše* (3 PL) *izdaleče* ... *ne desęty li ištistišę* (3 PL) *сę* (*Marianus, Zographensis*; Luke 17.12–17)  
 ‘There met him ten leprous men who stood a long way off. . . . Were not ten healed?’

There are attested only two examples of /*jedinъ na desęte*/ ‘eleven’ in the nominative with a noun. In the first example below, *ediny* ‘one’ is the long form, and *učenikъ* could be either nominative singular or the homographic genitive plural. In the second example, the attribute and nouns are in the nominative plural and in both examples the verb is in the plural:

*ediny že na desęte učenikъ idę* (*Marianus, Assemanianus, Zographensis, Savvina kniga*; Matthew 28.16)  
 ‘But the eleven disciples went . . .’

*sii jedin na desęte strastotrępci i dobrorobędъnii močenici trudišę сę* (*Suprasliensis* 271.8)  
 ‘For these eleven sufferers and triumphant martyrs strove . . .’

Only one example is attested with this numeral and a noun in an oblique case:

*jedněmi* (INST PL) *bo na desęte zvęzđъ* (GEN PL) (*Suprasliensis* 389.24)  
 ‘for with eleven stars . . .’

/*дѣва na desęte*/, /*oba na desęte*/ ‘twelve’ take either, as an older pattern, a dual noun agreeing with the first element of the numeral in case and gender, or else, as a younger pattern, the numeral governs the genitive plural:

*privesti дѣва na desęte malomošti* (ACC DU) . . . *privъva дѣва na desęte* (ACC) *моѡъ* (GEN PL) *ništъ* (GEN PL) (*Suprasliensis* 121.9–12)  
 ‘To bring in twelve cripples . . . he invited twelve poor men.’

Within the same clause, ‘twelve’ governs a dual verb, but a verb in a separate clause may be plural:

*pristępъša* (PAST ACT PART NOM DU M) *že oba na desęte řęste* (3 DU) (*Zographensis, Marianus*; Luke 9.12)  
 ‘Having come up then, the twelve said . . .’

*сѣtvori дѣва na desęte da бoдoрę* (3 PL) *сѣ nimъ* (*Marianus, Zographensis*; Mark 3.14)  
 ‘He appointed twelve, so that they would be with him.’

The existential copula is attested in the singular:

*дѣва на десѣте ихъ* (GEN PL) *jestъ* (3 SG) (*Suprasliensis* 121.20)  
 ‘There are twelve of them.’

Attributes of ‘twelve’ may be dual or plural, while non-attributive pronouns are plural:

*призѣванъ оба на десѣте ученика* (DU) *svoě* (DU) *dastъ imъ* (PL) *vlastъ ... siję* (PL) (*Zographensis, Marianus*)/ *siě* (DU) (*Assemanianus*)/ *si* (!) (*Savvina kniga*) *oba* (DU) *na десѣте посла isusъ zapovědanъ imъ* (PL) (Matthew 10.1–5)  
 ‘Having summoned his twelve disciples, he gave them power. . . . These twelve Jesus sent, having ordered them . . .’

/trъje na десѣте/ ‘thirteen’ and /četyre na десѣте/ ‘fourteen’ have plural agreement for all types of form in all of the few attested examples. The equally poorly attested numerals /pęť na десѣте/ ‘fifteen’ to /devęť na десѣте/ ‘nineteen’ show government of the genitive plural, and take plural pronouns:

*pęť na десѣте stadii* (GEN PL) (*Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus*; John 11.18)  
 ‘fifteen leagues’

*oni* (NOM PL) *osmъ na десѣте na нѣже* (NOM PL) *pade stлъръ* (*Zographensis, Marianus*; Luke 13.4)  
 ‘Those eighteen on whom there fell a pillar . . .’

/дѣва десѣти/ ‘twenty’ to /devęť десѣтъ/ ‘ninety’ are formed with the element ‘ten’ in the required number, dual (‘twenty’), plural (‘thirty’, ‘forty’) or genitive plural (‘fifty’ to ‘ninety’). Any following unit number is conjoined by /i/ ‘and’:

*сѣ коньчаšę* (3 PL) *že sę svętii* (PL) *četyre десѣте* (PL) *i дѣва męčenika* (DU) (*Suprasliensis* 65.1)  
 ‘There met their end the holy forty-two martyrs . . .’

In this example, the verb and attributive adjective are plural, but the conjoined /дѣва/ requires a dual noun.

A noun preceded by a conjoined numeral requiring the genitive plural is either governed in the genitive plural or else agrees in case with the numeral:

*o devęti десѣтъ i o devęti* (LOC) *правдѣникъ* (GEN PL) (*Zographensis*)/ *o devęti десѣтъ i devęti* (LOC) *правдѣnicęхъ* (LOC PL) (*Marianus*) (Luke 15.7)  
 ‘concerning ninety-nine just men’

Similarly, when there is no conjoined numeral, the noun is either in the genitive plural or else agrees in case:

*četyr̃mi desęty* (INST PL) *дънии* (GEN PL) ... *četyr̃mi desęty дъньми* (INST PL) (*Suprasliensis* 92.7–9)  
 ‘With forty days ... with forty days.’

Of the other plural forms agreeing with these numerals, attributes may be genitive plural:

*ѣви gospodь i iněxъ* (GEN PL) *sedmь* (ACC) *desętъ i posъla ję* (ACC PL) (*Marianus, Zographensis*; Luke 10.1)  
 ‘The Lord appointed yet another seventy and sent them ...’

*въzvратиšę* (3 PL) *že sę sedmь* (NOM) *desętii* (NOM PL LONG) (*Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus*; Luke 10.17)  
 ‘The seventy returned ...’

As in this example, the rarely attested long form /desętiji/ ‘ten’ is in the nominative plural in the compound numerals.

/sъto/ ‘hundred’ governs the genitive plural:

*sъtomъ* (INST SG) *měrbъ* (GEN PL) (*Marianus, Zographensis*; Luke 16.6)  
 ‘with a hundred measures’

In /dъvě sъtě/ ‘two hundred’ to /devętъ sъtъ/ ‘nine hundred’ the unit numeral, in the nominative and accusative, has the normal patterns of agreement. In the oblique cases, both elements of the numeral are in the required case, while a noun collocated with these numerals is either genitive plural or else agrees in case and number with the numeral:

*dъvęma sъtoma* (DAT DU) *penędzъ* (GEN PL) (*Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus*; John 6.7)  
 ‘two hundred pence’

*trъmъ sъtomъ* (DAT PL) *sъcěni dinaremъ* (DAT PL) (*Suprasliensis* 425.24)  
 ‘He valued it at three hundred dinars.’

/tysęšti/, /tysęšti/ ‘thousand’ is governed by other numerals either in the genitive plural or else agrees in number and case:

*sъ desętiję* (INST SG) *tysęštъ* (GEN PL) (*Marianus*)/*sъ desętiję* (INST SG) *tysęštę* (for /tysęšteję/ INST SG) (*Zographensis*) ... *sъ dъvęma desętęma* (INST DU) *tysęštama* (INST DU) (Luke 14.31)  
 ‘With ten thousand ... with twenty thousand.’

A verb may be either singular or plural:

*въzleže* (3 SG) *ubo męžъ čislomъ ёko рętъ tysęštъ* (*Zographensis, Marianus, Assemanianus*; John 6.10)  
 ‘for there dined men in number of about five thousand’

*napitani* (PL) *byšę* (3 PL) *pęty tysęštę* (*Suprasliensis* 428.25)  
 ‘There were fed five thousand.’

/tęma/ ‘ten thousand’ governs the genitive plural:

*tęmoјo* (INST SG) *talantę* (GEN PL) (*Marianus*; Matthew 18.24)  
 ‘ten thousand talents’

From the data attested of quantifiers with collective nouns, the following are of special interest:

*sę inęmi* (INST PL) *šestiję* (INST) *bratiję* (GEN SG) (*Suprasliensis* 145.30)  
 ‘with six other brothers’

*množęstvu* (DAT SG) *že bratјę* (GEN SG F) *otęvęštavęšemę* (PAST ACT PART DAT PL M SHORT) (*Suprasliensis* 113.22)  
 ‘After many of the brethren had answered ...’

This last example is a dative-absolute construction.

## 5 Lexis

### 5.1 General composition of the word-stock

There are very few borrowings, apart from many proper nouns: a few common nouns, and very few verbs taken over directly from the Greek sources or calqued on them.

### 5.2 Patterns of borrowings

Apart from Greek words and calques resulting from the actual translating of the Greek sources there are a few older borrowings from Greek, such as /korablę/ ‘boat’ and /kucija/ ‘sweetmeat’. Germanic accounts for the largest group of borrowings, about forty in number, for instance /kęnędzę/ ‘ruler, prince’, /xlęba/ ‘bread’. Next come Romance, for instance /kotęka/ ‘anchor’, /krabјę/ ‘box’, and Turkic, for instance /bołarinę/ ‘nobleman’, /synę/, genitive /syna/ ‘tower’; for each of these two sources about twenty examples are attested. There are also a few loans from Iranian.

### 5.3 Incorporation of borrowings

Not only borrowed nouns, but also nouns taken from the Greek sources, are declined and may have adjectives derived from their stems. Thus one finds /kęnędzę/ ‘ruler, prince’, genitive /kęnędza/, adjective /kęnęžę/, /xlęba/ ‘bread’, genitive /xlęba/, adjective /xlębęnę/, and also /isusę/ ‘Jesus’, genitive /isusa/, dative /isusu/ and /isusovi/, adjective /isusovę/. Very few nouns are indeclinable, and then only optionally, for instance

/pasxa/ 'Passover' is attested not only as indeclinable, but also as a feminine noun (genitive /pasxy/). Borrowed verbs are usually conjugated in both aspects, for instance perfective /kupiti/, imperfective /kupovati/ 'buy', from Gothic. Verbs taken from Greek sources are conjugated, but are usually bi-aspectual, and may have more than one type of suffix or spelling, for instance /vlasvimisati/, /vlasvimlati/, /vlasfymlati/ 'blaspheme'.

## 5.4 Lexical fields

### 5.4.1 Colour terms

/bělъ/ 'white', /čr<sup>b</sup>нъ/ 'black', /čr<sup>b</sup>мьнъ/, /čr<sup>b</sup>влєнъ/ 'red', /zelenъ/ 'green', /plavъ/ 'yellow', /praprqđьнъ/ 'purple', /sěгъ/ 'grey'.

### 5.4.2 Body parts

/glava/ 'head', /oko/ 'eye', /nozdrī/ 'nostrils' ('nose' is not attested), /uxo/ 'ear', /usta/ 'mouth' (N PL), /vlasъ/ 'hair', /šija/ 'neck', /rōka/ 'arm, hand', /pr<sup>b</sup>stъ/ 'finger', /noga/ 'leg, foot', /nožьнъ pr<sup>b</sup>stъ/ 'toe', /pr<sup>b</sup>si/ 'chest' (F PL), /sr<sup>b</sup>dьce/ 'heart', /zažďь/ 'anus'.

### 5.4.3 Kinship terms

/mati/ 'mother', /otьcъ/ 'father', /sestra/ 'sister', /bratrъ/ 'brother' (as plural, the feminine singular collective /bratrъja/ is used), /žena/ 'wife' (also 'woman'), /mōžь/ 'husband' (also 'man') /dъšti/ 'daughter', /synъ/ 'son'. The term for 'aunt' is attested only once, used figuratively and pejoratively in the diminutive, /tetъka/ (*Suprasliensis* 133.11).

## 6 Variation within Old Church Slavonic

As indicated at several points in this chapter, there is both chronological and geographic variation within Old Church Slavonic, and for details reference should be made to the preceding sections, especially sections 2 and 3. Chronological variation can be seen in that certain forms and constructions can be characterized as older or younger than others. Old Church Slavonic is basically a Balkan Slavonic language, though even within this characterization there is geographical variation between Eastern (Bulgarian) and Western (Macedonian) forms; the use of the language for missionary activity in Great Moravia shows up in the occurrence of some West Slavonic features, even in the major canonical texts. Other local and later features characterize the later recensions of Church Slavonic (see section 1) but do not form part of Old Church Slavonic.

## References

- Arnim, B. von (1930) *Studien zum altbulgarischen Psalterium Sinaiticum (Veröffentlichungen des Slavischen Instituts an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Berlin, vol. 3)*, Berlin (reprinted 1960, Nendeln: Kraus).
- Birnbaum, Henrik (1958) *Untersuchungen zu den Zukunftsumschreibungen mit dem Infinitiv im Altkirchenslavischen (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Etudes de philologie slave, 6)*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Brodowska-Honowska, Maria (1960) *Słowotwórstwo przymiotnika w języku staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskim*, Cracow: Ossolineum.
- Diels, Paul (1963) *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik*, 2nd edn, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Dobrovsky, Josef (1822) *Institutiones linguae slavicae dialecti veteris*, 2nd edn, Vienna: Schmid.
- Flier, Michael S. (1974) *Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic*, The Hague: Mouton.
- Hermelin, E. (1935) *Über den Gebrauch der Präsens-Partizipien von perfektiven Verben im Altkirchenslavischen*, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Horálek, Karel (1954) *Evangeliáře a čtveroevangelia*, Prague: SPN.
- Huntley, David (1989) 'Grammatical and lexical features in number and gender agreement in Old Bulgarian', *Palaeobulgarica (Старобългаристика)* 13, 4: 21–32.
- Jagić, Vatroslav (1913) *Entstehungsgeschichte der kirchenslavischen Sprache*, Berlin: Weidmann.
- (1919, 1922) *Zum altkirchenslavischen Apostolus*, 3 vols (*Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte*, 191.2, 193.1, 197.2), Vienna: Alfred Hölder.
- Kurz, Josef (ed.) (1958–) *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, Prague: ČAV.
- Leskien, August (1969) *Handbuch der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache*, 9th edn, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Lunt, Horace G. (1974) *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, 6th edn, The Hague: Mouton.
- (1977) 'Limitations of Old Church Slavonic in representing Greek', in Bruce M. Metzger (ed.), *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 431–42.
- Meillet, Antoine (1897) *Recherches sur l'emploi du génitif-accusatif en vieux-slave (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes. Sciences philologiques et historiques, 115)*, Paris: Bouillon.
- (1902, 1905) *Etudes sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave*, 2 vols (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes. Sciences philologiques et historiques*, 139), Paris: Bouillon. (Part 2 reprinted 1961, Paris: Champion.)
- Metzger, Bruce M. (1977) 'The Old Church Slavonic version', in Bruce M. Metzger (ed.), *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 394–431.
- Moszyński, L. (1975) *Język Kodeksu Zografskiego*, vol. 1, Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Růžička, Rudolf (1963) *Das syntaktische System der altkirchenslavischen Partizipien und sein Verhältnis zum Griechischen (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Slawistik 27)*, Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin.
- Sadnik, L. and Aizetmüller, R. (1955) *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Stanislav, J. (1933) 'Datív absolutný v starej cirkevnej slovančine', *Byzantoslavica* 5: 1–112.

- Trubetzkoy, Nikolai S. *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik*, 2nd edn, Graz: Böhlau.
- Vaillant, André (1964) *Manuel du vieux slave*, 2nd edn, Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves.
- van Wijk, Nicolaas (1931) *Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Večerka, Radoslav (1989) *Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax*, vol. I: *Die lineare Satzorganisation* (Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris. Fontes et Dissertationes, 27), Freiburg i. Br.: U.W. Weiher.
- Бунина, И.К. (1959) *Система времен старославянского глагола*, Москва: АН СССР.
- Курц, Й. и др. (ред.) (1958) *Исследования по синтаксису старославянского языка*, Prague: ČAV.
- Львов, А.С. (1966) *Очерки по лексике памятников старославянской письменности*, Москва: Наука.
- Селищев, А.М. (1951, 1952) *Старославянский язык*, Москва: Учпедгиз.