

WILLIAM R. VEDER

THREE RUSSIAN COPIES OF THE *SCETE PATERICON*.
ERROR ANALYSIS

0.1. Second-language acquisition is not a discipline students of Slavonic¹ texts would turn to for advice on their study of the Slavonic language. Yet they should, and for three reasons. First, in copying² any deviation of the copy from the antigraph is an error (unless, of course, it can be identified as an improvement). Second, some of these errors have been shown to be related to the dialect of the scribe, which points to differences between a first and a second language. Third, second-language acquisition offers the most powerful tool to determine the cause of these errors: detailed analysis of all the errors committed.³

0.2. Slavonic studies have generally plotted the copies of texts onto *area* and *time*,⁴ which leaves no room for comprehensive error analysis because comparison of disparate copies provides no information on the pivotal relation to their antigraphs. This relation comes to the fore only in full collations of the witnesses to *texts*. They raise

(¹) I use this term as a simple shortcut to refer to the language variously labelled 'Old Bulgarian', 'Old Church Slavonic', 'Old Macedonian', 'Old Russian', 'Old Serbian', 'Old Slovenian', 'Old Ukrainian'.

(²) All Slavonic writing before 1479 (the *Tale of the Translation of St Ivan of Rila* by Vladislav Grammatik in the *Rila Panegyricum*) is copied, save negligible notes.

(³) See Gerhard Nickel (ed.) *Fehlerkunde*. Berlin 1973, id. in English: *Error Analysis*. Stuttgart 1978.

(⁴) In the 1970's-90's, A. S. Gerd and his collaborators (St-Peterburg) have attempted to reduce disparity by adding a category *genre*, but this merely refines the typological matrix and provides no basis for error analysis; see e.g. his *Areal'naja tipologija slavjanskix tekstov XI-XVI vv.*, "Sovetskoe slavjanovedenie", (1982) 5, pp. 74-82.

questions not asked before and so force the textologist, the linguist and the historian of culture and literature to reexamine the received wisdom of earlier scholarship.

1.1. Let us consider three copies of the *Scete Patericon*,⁵ codd. Beograd NBS Dečani 93, 1200-1300 (A¹), S-Pb. RNB Pogod. 267, 1300-1400 (A³) and Moskva GIM Sinod. 3, 1400-1500 (A²). I have made a forms list for each of them (percentages shown in subscript) and a close reading of of ch. A-1 (both incomplete in A¹), B and 2, 9-11 and 20-22 (frequency shown in superscript).

1.2. A¹ is contemporary to 3 copies of the *Patericon* in the Russian cod. Leiden UB Scal. 74 and the Serbian codd. Beograd NBS Peć 3 and Wien ÖNB Slav. 152; A³ is contemporary to 12 copies in the Bulgarian codd. Moskva RGB Popov 93, S-Pb. BAN 13.3.17, Rila NMRM 2/25 and 2/28, Sofia NBKM 673 and NIM 24, the Russian codd. Moscow GIM Čudov. 18 and the Serbian codd. Beograd MSPC Krka 4, Leiden UB BPL 2290, Paris BN Slav. 10, S-Pb RNB Hilf. 90, Sinai MSC Slav. 33; A² is contemporary to 6 copies in the Russian codd. Moskva GIM Čudov. 318A, NBMGU 1310, RGADA MGAMID 603/II, RGB F.304 nr. 37 and nr.703, Saratov NBSGU 45.

1.3. A¹²³ are not comparable to them in structure and many readings. They are copied from antigraphs different from those of A¹²³. They share with A¹²³ only 4 errors, the names *МАРКЪ* → *МАКАРИИ* 10:9 and *ΔΜΟΥΝЪ* → *ΔΜΜΟΝЪ* 11:56, a case and number error *ПОКАИЖЦИ СΛ* → *ПОКАИЖЦИХЪ СΛ* 10:108 and a letter error *ΔΛΛΙΑ* → *ΤΑΛΙΑ* 11:111 which may well belong to the protograph.

2.1. A¹²³ transmit readings comparable to the 8 mostly later⁶ Russian codd. L'viv LBAN ASP 56, Moscow GIM Uvarov 483, RGB F.113 nr.601, F.178 nr.8240, F.310 nr.219 and S-Pb. RNB Kir.-Bel. 20/1259, Sofijsk. 1391 and Tixanov 552. Within the range set in 1.1. they share 210 common errors, which must be ascribed to their hyparchetype †.

⁽⁵⁾ Ed. William R. Veder, Johannes G. van der Tak, *The Scete Patericon. Patericon Sceticum. Скупецкий Паменик*. Amsterdam 2012 (= Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies, 12-14); full collation of the witnesses (in searchable .pdf) in "Polata knigopisnaja", 36 (2006) at <<http://hdl.handle.net/1811/24008>>.

⁽⁶⁾ Cod. RGB F.113 nr.601 is dated to the 15th c. (see A²), the rest to the 16th.

2.2. Beside omissions of verses (9:5:3-4) and some words, these are most prominently substitutions⁷ of names $\text{AMMONA} \rightarrow \text{AMMONZ}$, $\text{AMMOI} \rightarrow \text{AMMONZ}$, $\text{NILZ} \rightarrow \text{DANILZ}$, words $\text{ABBA} \rightarrow \text{OTYЦЬ}^3$, $\text{*BALII} \rightarrow \text{BPAЧЬ}$, $\text{*BRATPZ} \rightarrow \text{BPAТЪ}$, $\text{BECЬ} \rightarrow \text{BINA}$, $\text{*BZLANATI CA} \rightarrow \text{BALLATI CA}$, $\text{GLAGOLIK} \rightarrow \text{PFBVAIK}$, $\text{*GRANЬ} \rightarrow \text{CTИХЪ}^2$, $\text{PRACTI} \rightarrow \text{[ПРИ]ИТИ}^3$, $\text{*ГЗИВАТИ} \rightarrow \text{ГЗИВНЖТИ}$, $\text{ИСКРЪНИИ} \rightarrow \text{БЛИЖЪНИИ}^2$, $\text{ИЦЪЛИТИ} \rightarrow \text{ОУВРАЧЕВАТИ}$, $\text{-КЛЮЧЪ/ИТИ} \rightarrow \text{-ЛОУЧЪ/ИТИ}^4$, $\text{ЛЕКАНЬ} \rightarrow \text{СТРОУГА}$, $\text{ЛЪСТИТИ} \rightarrow \text{ЛАСКАТИ}$, $\text{*[ЗД]МЪДИТИ} \rightarrow \text{[ЗД]МЪДЪЛИТИ}^4$, $\text{МЪДЪНО} \rightarrow \text{МЪДЪЛНО}$, $\text{*НЕРОДИТИ} \rightarrow \text{НЕБРЪЩИ}^2$, $\text{*ОДЪМЪТИ} \rightarrow \text{ОДЪВАТИ}$, $\text{ОТЪКРЪВАТИ} \rightarrow \text{СЪКАЗАТИ}$, $\text{ОТЪНЖДЪ} \rightarrow \text{БЪХЪМА}^2$, $\text{ПОСЪЛАТИ} \rightarrow \text{ПОУСТИТИ}$, $\text{ПРИСЪНО} \rightarrow \text{ВЪ ИНЖ}$, $\text{ПЪНАЗЪ} \rightarrow \text{СЪРЕБРЪНИЦА}$, $\text{*РЪСНОТА} \rightarrow \text{ИСТИНА}$, $\text{РЪСНОТИВЪ} \rightarrow \text{ИСТОВЪ}$, $\text{ХОТЪТИ} \rightarrow \text{ВЕЛЪТИ}$, $\text{ХЪЖА} \rightarrow \text{КЕЛИА}^4 \rightarrow \text{ХРАМИНА}$, $\text{ШОУИ} \rightarrow \text{ЛЪВЪ}$, $\text{ІАКО} \rightarrow \text{ІЕГДА}^2$, $\text{*ЖТРЪ} \rightarrow \text{ВЪНЖТРЪ}^{23}$, forms (*asigmatic* and *first sigmatic* aorist \rightarrow *second sigmatic* aorist, *j*-participles \rightarrow *vъs*-participles or aorist, *j*-adjectives \rightarrow *ъsk*-adjectives, $\text{*ВИМЪ} \rightarrow \text{ВЪИХЪ}^2$, $\text{ВЪИ} \rightarrow \text{ВАМЪ}^2$, but $\text{ВА} \rightarrow \text{ВЪ}$, $\text{ИСКЖ-} \rightarrow \text{ИЦЖ-}$), word formation ($\text{БЛАЖИТИ} \rightarrow \text{СЪБЛАЖИТИ}$, $\text{ВЕЛИИ} \rightarrow \text{ВЕЛИКЪ}^2$, $\text{ВРЪТЪ} \rightarrow \text{ВРЪТЪПЪ}$, $\text{ВЪГОНИТИ} \rightarrow \text{ИЗГОНИТИ}$, $\text{ИЗИТИ} \rightarrow \text{ОТИТИ}$, $\text{НИКЪИЖЕ} \rightarrow \text{НИКОТОРЪИЖЕ}$, $\text{ОХОДАТЪ} \rightarrow \text{ОТИДЖТЪ}$, $\text{ПОКРЪВАТИ} \rightarrow \text{ЗАКРЪВАТИ}$, $\text{ПРЪДЪХОДИТИ} \rightarrow \text{ПРИХОДИТИ}$, $\text{РОГОЗИНИЦЪ} \rightarrow \text{РОГОЗИНЪ}$, $\text{СЪМОТРЕНИЕ} \rightarrow \text{РАСЪМОТРЕНИЕ}^2$) and collocations ($\text{ІАМОЖЕ АЦЕ} \rightarrow \text{ІАМОЖЕ КОЛИЖЪДО}$, $\text{ІЕДА КАКО} \rightarrow \text{ІЕДА КОТОРАІА}$, *dative* possessive \rightarrow *genitive* possessive or *adjective* possessive, *при-verb* + *locative* \rightarrow *къ* + *dative*).

2.3. Another 98 errors defy classification; they range from simple omissions of letters ($\text{ордроса} \rightarrow \text{офроса}$, $\text{строиаше} \rightarrow \text{стоиаше}$) to corruptions of the text ($\text{ни досаждениа чловѣкомъ} \rightarrow \text{ни досаждаи же чловѣкомъ}$, $\text{кротоушъствине} \rightarrow \text{кротость доушъствине}$, $\text{івсифъ} \rightarrow \text{пвмина}$, $\text{всегда глаголетъ} \rightarrow \text{въ соуе троуждаетъ са}$). Yet the misreading of the numeral in the title of ch. 22 $\text{ѿ отьцоу} \rightarrow \text{сватъиухъ отьць}$ gives a clue to as to their origin: here, the Glagolitic numeral ѿѿ ‘12’ was read as an abbreviation of the adjective *вожни* and replaced with the less grating *сватъи*, while the dual *отьцоу* was read as the plural *отьць* (cf.

(7) The substitutions hail from copious notes added to the protograph (brought to Bulgaria in 886) by its first Bulgarian reader, all of which were incorporated into the master copy + (made shortly after the release of its annotated reading), but some of them occur in copies made directly from the protograph (see William R. Veder, *Metodieva zla hiena*, “Kirilo-Methodievski studii”, 17, 2007, pp. 783-798). An asterisk marks words and forms that have been fully eliminated.

→ поити → принити², *[по]гъивати → [по]гъивнѣти, довлѣти → гонѣти, *доньдеже → донелѣже⁴, *дъвоицеѣѣ → дъвашьдъзи, животъ → житиѣ, *зъданъ → глининъ², изволити → възсхотѣти, инъ → другъ → еди- нъ,⁶ единъ → инъ → етеръ³, *искрънии → ближнии, истазати → въз- прашати, *ислючимъ → потрѣбънъ → прѣподобънъ, *приключити → при- лоучити → сзлочити², къзи → которъзи³, *замѣдити → оудлѣжити, мѣка → мѣчениѣ², нагло → напрасно, недѣѣѣ → болѣзнь, недѣѣѣство- вати → болѣзньствовати, *не рѣчити → не хотѣти, *неродити → небрѣ- щи, оставлѣти → ослабѣти, отврѣсти → отати, отвѣщати → реци, отрѣ- ци → отвѣщати, отъдати → простити², *отънѣдъ → възхъма⁸, отъць → старьць⁶, *параскевѣги → патъкъ, посълати → поустити⁵, присно → въз инѣ, промъкнѣти са → пронести са, прѣдати → ѣти, *рѣназъ → сьре- бръникъ², пѣдарь → коупьць, ради → дѣла²⁸, *рѣснотивъ → исти- нънъ², по свѣнѣ → по даль, совоѣѣ → самѣма, сирѣчь → рекъше³, смина- ти са → склѣбити са², възсминати са → осклѣбити са⁵, старьць → отъ- ць⁶, страхъ → трепетъ, стѣбло → мечъ², соулии → хоужии, *сзлаци → сзломити, сзмотрити → сзгладовати, сзхранити → скоутати, *сѣтънѣѣ → послѣдъ, сѣдити → оскѣждати, творити → дѣлати, теци → лѣсти, тогда → югда, третии → другъзи → инъ, оустѣнѣ → ѣзъкъ, храмина → хлѣвина², храмъ → клѣть → хлѣвина, *хъжа → храмина, *цѣгло → единому, цѣсарь → къназъ, *шоуи → лѣвъ, югда → аце), forms (*asig- matic* and *first sigmatic* aorist → *second sigmatic* aorist, *j*-participles → *vъs*-participles: *s*-stems → *o*-stems, би → възхъ², и → ѣго, нзи → намъ, искѣтъ → ищѣтъ), word formation (алъкота → алъкость, ве- лии → великъ⁴, възторити → повъторити, възъ ити → изити, възлѣсти → сзлѣсти, двигнѣти → подвигнѣти, добра дѣтель → добродѣтель, ехидьнова → ехидьнина, замазати → помазати, ити → отити, изгоуби- ти → погоубити, изити → отити, либѣвѣти → либѣвъ възити², наоущѣ- ниѣ → пооущѣниѣ, омочити → намочити, остръгати → истръгати, охо- дити → отити, покръивати → закръивати, проходить → приходити, пѣ- дарь → пѣдъць, расъмотрѣниѣ → сзмотрѣниѣ, рогозиница → рогозина³, сильнѣти → сильнъ възити², срамота → срамъ, стъидѣти са → оустъидѣ- ти са, сзнѣсти → изѣсти, сьревролюбие → сьревролюбьство, фермьскъзи → фермитьскъзи) and collocations (по мьнѣ → въз слѣдъ мене, *dative* possessive → *genitive* possessive or *adjective* possessive, *при-verb + *locative* → къ + *dative* or → на + *accusative*).

3.3. Another 329 errors defy classification; they range from sim-

можетъ → не можетъ). An erroneous spelling is visible in клеветѣщце → клеветѣщце (see also 4.3 below).

4.1. A¹ and A²³ were not copied from the same antigraph: A¹ used α, but A²³ used a copy of α with 100 common errors within the range set in 1.1: 16 omissions, 2 of verses (10:70:4 and 10:110:15-18) and 14 of words or phrases, of which 3 corrupt apophthegms 10:112 (а не оу постигъши въ житиѣ велико), 20:15 (рабе божи виждь стопы моѣ и осажи ма ѡако пльть и крзвъ ѡемь) and 20:16 (и трѡуда къ томоу тѣло не тръпа). Let us give it the siglum α'.

4.2. The other 84 errors, range from simple omissions of letters (поуцѣниѣ → пуцѣниѣ) to corruptions of the text (отъпастн волѣ → пастн волѣж, владѣцѣ богу поемлѣж → и молю са влѣцѣ бѣ внимаю), The antigraph α' of A²³ shows some substitutions of names (тидои → тимофѣи), words (въпросити → въпрашати, изати → извести, инъ → единъ², послати → пустити, гонѣетъ → годѣ естъ) and word formation (велии → великъ, кровъ → покровъ, прѣнемаганиѣ → немоганиѣ), but nothing as frequent as the interventions of † and α.

4.3. 31 of these errors can be readily identified as misreadings of the Glagolitic antigraph: confusion of consonants (ѡ ↔ ѣ: повъторихъ → покоторихъ, ѡ ↔ ѡ: тивандьскъши → дивандьскъши, срьдъцоу → старъцоу, хотаи → хода, ѡ ↔ ѡ: отселѣ → от сего, ѡ ↔ ѡ: иди → или, ѡ ↔ ѡ: строугѣж → слугу, ѡ ↔ р: мамъ → намъ, ѡ ↔ ѡ: гъивнемъ → гъивнемъ, та → ма; a misspelling is visible in вацши → ватцши⁶, similar to the one indicated in 3.3), of vowels († ↔ э: прамень → премень, э ↔ э: тъ → то, э ↔ в: крзвъ → к рову, э ↔ ѡ: ѡхъ и → ѡхъ и) and errors in epenthesis (скитъскъши → секитъскъши), haplograms (съ носитъ → съ нитъ, оупъважѣ дце → оупъважѣще, възъмъ милотаръ → вземъ лотаръ, сътажѣ та → съ та) and tautograms (мало → мало мало, тѣсьнъши → тѣсьнъши, постиша са → не постиша са, възнѣшъниихъ → внѣшъниихъ, ни → ни и). These errors provide no more than circumstantial evidence, but the similarity of the pattern of errors to those in †, α and α' is striking. Proof that α', like † and α, was written in Glagolitic is provided by the retention of a Glagolitic glyph in its copy A³: in the title to ch. 11 (ѡако подоваѣтъ въдрѡу бѣити о вьсемь) въдрѡу is written ѡдрѡу ← ѡдрѡу.

4.4. What is even more striking is that similar patterns of errors are visible in the copies A³ and A² from α'. In A³ we find confusion

→ слѣшашце, ѿ ↔ э: дрогоуе → дрогое, отъпоустѣи → ѿпости, поустѣини → постѣини², сѣдацю → сѣдацю, слоужацюнемоу → сложецемоу, поустѣиньникомъ → постѣникомъ, могѣтъ → моугуть, ѿ ↔ э: игоуменю → игоумень, глаголющѣ → глѣцю, доуци → днѣ, пѣтиць → поутѣць), errors in epenthesis (тѣкнѣ → тѣкноу), anagrams (евхаристѣ → еухаритѣсь), haplograms (жена на мѣстѣ → жена мѣстѣ, поврѣжена на → поврѣжена, наипаче павѣрѣнищѣ → наипавѣрѣнищю, оучинению → оучинию, печально → пьльно, лѣто же → лѣ же) and tautograms (дастѣ немоу → дастѣ е емоу, ѣто то естѣ → ѣсть то естѣ, насилванъ → не насилванъ, никомуже → никомумуже, льнъ → льненъ, хотя же → хоташе же); the misspelling of the numeral ѿ '70' as ѿ '800' 20:15 does not belong to these errors because it forms part of the efforts of the copyist to write ѿ in initial position as ѿ.

5.1. A¹²³ are copied by Russian scribes. For длѣг-/длѣж- A¹ writes длѣж-¹⁰ дѣлѣг-¹⁰ дѣлѣж-⁴⁷ дѣлѣж-³³, A³ долѣг-¹² долѣж-⁷⁰ долѣж-¹⁸, A² долѣг-¹¹ долѣж-⁵⁹ долѣж-³⁰, and for ѣрѣн- A¹ ѣрѣн-⁵ ѣрѣн-⁵ ѣрѣн-⁴⁰ ѣрѣн-⁵⁰, A³ ѣрѣн-⁸⁷ ѣрѣн-¹³; A² ѣрѣн-⁸⁰ ѣрѣн-²⁰. A²³ are copied by scribes from the Russian North (both confuse ц ↔ ѣ), A¹ is not.⁸ The fact that A¹²³ disagree in their Russian spellings shows that those spellings were not in the antigraphs they copied but were the—inevitably various—products of their scribal activity. They are quantitatively marginal in all three copies.

5.2. A¹²³ show deficiencies in the marking of jotation: A¹ jotates in no more than 21% of cases, A³ in 41% and A² in 76%; in addition they show excessive jotation (e.g. A¹ оубниство but юбниство, A³ оужикъ but южикъ) as well as и-jotation (A¹ иен, иепархи, иеретикъ, иетерѣ, иѣноша, A³ иепархии, A² иѣсти). These are deficiencies of the antigraphs: jotation, present in the dialect of the copyists, was not marked, but introduced by the copyists: they produced competing spellings, e.g. for юнъ A¹ юн-⁴⁵ оун-⁴⁷ ѣн-⁵ иѣн-³, A³ оун-⁹⁸ юн-², A² оун-⁹⁸ юн-², in which the non-jotated spelling reflects that of the antigraphs.

5.3. A¹²³ show deficiencies in the marking of palatality. The normal relation of ѣ to ѣ in the text would be 68% : 32%, but of ѣ A¹

(⁸) Could the lack of ѣ in 50% of the occurrences of *Egypt-* (see 5.6) betray a Southern provenance of A¹?

achieves only 42%, A³ 45% and A² 54%. These, too, are deficiencies of the antigraphs: non-palatalisation, distinct from palatalisation in the dialect of the copyists, was not marked in the antigraphs,⁹ but introduced by the copyists: they produced competing spellings, e.g. for азъ A¹ азъ₄₁ азъ₅₈ азъ₁, A³ азъ азъ₉₅ азъ₁ азъ₁, A² азъ₁₀ азъ₈₆ азъ₂ азъ₂, in which the ъ-spelling reflects that of the antigraphs.

5.4. For the adverb авиѣ A¹ has 3 spellings: авиѣ₉₇ авиѣ₁ авьѣ₂, A³ has 5: авиѣ₁ авиѣ₁ авьѣ₄₃ авьѣ₁₂ авьѣ₄₃, and A² has 6: авиѣ₁₄ авиѣ₁₃ авиѣ₆₅ авиѣ₁ авьѣ₃ авьѣ₄. Apart from the marking of jotation, the essential difference is in the spelling of the ‘tense’ ъ/ь before front vowels and *j*. Cyrillic replaces it with ъ/и, but Glagolitic does not. This produced competing spellings, e.g. for брати, братиѣ, братиѣ[ю], братиѣ A¹ брати₉₄ братъ₁ братъ₅, A³ брати₂₉ братъ₇₁, A² (ь dropped in брат₂₅) брати₂ братъ₇₃, in which the ъ/ь-spelling reflects that of the antigraphs; Glagolitic spelling is also reflected in combination with the definiteness marker -и/и (A¹ англскыи, блажензи, вторзи, другзи, другы, имъ^и, имзи, нитриискзи, плачунзи, преподавьнзи, рекомзи, рекзи, чьстьнзи, авльи, новы, A³ бзвзи, вторзи, глѣвзи, златоустзи, зовзи, могилзи, скитъскзи, створивзи) and the pronoun и/и (A²³ възпросихомзи, погубатзи). Excessive marking of tenseness is attested in A¹ видѣвыи и, поимзи и, поимыи и, A³ видивзи и, поимзи и, примзи и, A² блѣзи и, видивзи и, поимзи и.

5.5. The distribution of digraphic оу and monographic у/Ѹ/Ѹ in the three copies is mirrored: for Glagolitic ѡ A¹ writes оу₇₄ and у₂₄ Ѹ₁ Ѹ₁; A²³ write оу₁₆ and у₈₂ Ѹ₁ Ѹ₁. The preference for monographs is part of a tendency away from transcription (оу) and towards transliteration, that culminates in copies of the 16-17th centuries. A similar tendency away from transcription towards monographic transliteration can be observed for Glagolitic ѡ (жа) → а, ж or т.

5.6. For the proper name егуптѣ A¹ has 11 spellings: егуптѣ₉ егуптѣ₂ егуптѣ₉ егуптѣ₂₂ егуптѣ₂ егуптѣ₂ егуптѣ₃₉ егуптѣ₉ египтѣ₂ егуптѣ₂ егуптѣ₂, A³ has 10: егупетѣ₁₃ егуптѣ₂₅ егуптѣ₂ егуптѣ₂ егупетѣ₂ егуптѣ₂₂ егуптѣ₄ егупетѣ₂ егуптѣ₂₂ егуптѣ₆, A² has 7: егуптѣ₄ егупетѣ₅ егуптѣ₉ егупетѣ₂₀ егуптѣ₅₀ егуптѣ₂ егуптѣ₁₀.

⁽⁹⁾ See William R. Veder, *The Glagolitic Barrier*, “Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics”, 34 (2008), pp. 489-501.

Such variety in a text copied is due to the fact that the antigraphs provided no graphic model to be copied and the spelling had to be recreated at almost every occurrence of the word.

6.1. The foremost source of errors in the copies was the Glagolitic script of the antigraphs. This applies only to a limited extent to the second-generation master copy μ , but in full to its third-generation copy α and its fourth-generation copy α' (all in Glagolitic) as well as to its fourth generation-copy A^1 and its fifth-generation copies A^{23} (all in Cyrillic). The overview of the text was limited at the least to a couple of syllables, at the most to a line (which in two-column Glagolitic manuscripts was not long); the room for guesses (few of them educated) was wide open. The copyists themselves were challenged, both by the script and the content of the text, they were learners, and their errors in the marking of syntactic coherence show that they were learners of a second language as well.

ABSTRACT

Applicando la tecnica della rigorosa analisi degli errori sviluppata dalla disciplina dell'acquisizione della seconda lingua a tre copie cirilliche di due antigrafì glagolitici, troviamo schemi di errori corrispondenti. Tali schemi possono essere messi direttamente in relazione con la scrittura glagolitica degli antigrafì.

