Ricerche slavistiche. Nuova serie 2 (62) 2019: 223-233

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 ti-pologija 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. A^{123} are not comparable to them in structure and many readings. They are copied from antigraphs different from those of A^{123} . They share with A^{123} only 4 errors, the names марк $z \to$ макарии 10:9 and амоун $z \to$ аммон $z \to 11:56$, a case and number error поканжии са \to поканжиих $z \to 10:108$ and a letter error далина \to талина 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. Скитский Патерик*. 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 substitutions of names ammona \rightarrow ammona, amмои \to аммонъ, нилъ \to данилъ, words авва \to отъць $^{\mathfrak I},$ *балии \to врауь, * братр $^{\chi}$ ightarrow брат $^{\chi}$, вещь ightarrow вина, * в $^{\chi}$ ланати са ightarrow валнати са, глаголіж \rightarrow птваіж, *грань \rightarrow стих \mathbf{Z}^2 , грасти \rightarrow [при]ити \mathbf{Z}^3 , *г \mathbf{Z} 1 бати \rightarrow г \mathbf{Z} 1бижти, искрънии o ближьнии 2 , ицтлити o буврачевати, oключаити o-лоуча/ити 4 , лекань \to строуга, льстити \to ласкати, *[Za]мждити \to [Za]мьдьлити 4 , мждьно \rightarrow мьдльно, *неродити \rightarrow небръщи 2 , *одъмъти ightarrow отъкръївати ightarrow съкадати, отънждь ightarrow бъхъма 2 , посълати ightarrow поустити, присьно ightarrow въ инж, пъназь ightarrow сърббрьница, * ръснота ightarrow истина, ръснотивъ \to истовъ, хотъти \to велъти, хъіжа \to келига 4 \to храмина, шоуи \rightarrow л'ввъ, нако \rightarrow негда 2 , *жтрь \rightarrow вънжтрь $^{-23}$, forms (asigmatic and first sigmatic agrist \rightarrow second sigmatic agrist, j-participles $\rightarrow vbs$ -participles or agrist, *j*-adjectives $\rightarrow bsk$ -adjectives, *вимь \rightarrow БЪІХЪ, ВЪІ \rightarrow вамъ², but ва \rightarrow въї, искът \rightarrow ищът), word formation (бладнити o събладнити, велии o велик \mathbf{z}^2 , врът \mathbf{z} o врът \mathbf{z} п \mathbf{z} , вхігони \mathbf{z} ТИ ightarrow ИДГОНИТИ, ИДИТИ ightarrow ОТИТИ, НИКЪІИЖЕ ightarrow НИКОТОРЪІИЖЕ, ОХОДАТЪ ightarrowотид π т \mathbf{z} , покр \mathbf{z} івати o дакр \mathbf{z} івати, пр \mathbf{t} д \mathbf{z} ходити o приходити, рогодиницж → рогодинж, съмотренине → расъмотренине²) and collocations (наможе аще \rightarrow наможе колижьдо, неда како \rightarrow неда которана, dative possessive \rightarrow genitive possessive or adjective possessive, non-verb + locative $\rightarrow \kappa z + dative$).
- 2.3. Another 98 errors defy classification; they range from simple omissions of letters (ордроса офроса, стронаше стонаше) to corruptions of the text (ни досаждению чловъкоми ни досаждай же чловъкоми, кротодоушьствие кротость доушьствие, імсифи пумина, высегда глаголети ви соуне троужданети са). Yet the misreading of the numeral in the title of ch. 22 ві отъщоу сватимуи отъць gives a clue to as to their origin: here, the Glagolitic numeral шт '12' was read as an abbreviation of the adjective вожий and replaced with the less grating сватий, while the dual отъцоу was read as the plural отъць (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 Willliam R. Veder, *Metodievata zla hiena*, "Kirilo-Metodievski studii", 17, 2007, pp. 783-798). An asterisk marks words and forms that have been fully eliminated.

идраильтом $\mathbf{z} \to$ идраильтомоу) because Glagolitic \mathbf{a} , \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{a} (cf. мал $\mathbf{z} \to$ мало) are similar enough in shape to allow confusion. That $\mathbf{+}$ was written in Glagolitic is further attested by confusion of consonants ($\mathbf{z} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{z}$: тако \to того, $\mathbf{z} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{z}$: съвръщающим \mathbf{z} са \to съвръщающимь са, ихъже не хощет $\mathbf{z} \to$ имъже не хощет $\mathbf{z} \to$ работающим $\mathbf{z} \to$ вола \to вола, $\mathbf{z} \to$ \to \oplus : пилоусииск $\mathbf{z} \to$ дилосов $\mathbf{z} \to$ палладии \to пеладии, пъраща са \to пъращемь са, $\mathbf{z} \to$ \to \in : волю свой \to вола своа, $\mathbf{z} \to$ Vm: подат $\mathbf{z} \to$ подим $\mathbf{z} \to$ повъдаща \to повъдаще, нарицающе и глаголющи \to нарицающе и глаголющи».

- 3.1. A¹²³ are distinguished from the 8 manuscripts listed in 2.1. by their structure (they preserve the original order of the chapters while the others reflect displacements of quires). Within the range set in 1.1. they share addition of o-titles to the rako-titles of ch. 7 and 11-13, repetition of 10:97:7-8, and omissions of 2 apophthegms (10:113) and 20:16A), 2 groups of verses (11:109:4-5 and 21:4:3-5:2) and 72 phrases or words, of which 15 corrupt apophthegms 10:67 (и гитванеши са на нь, ашоуть гитванеши са and и отстуетъ десижня ржкж твоьж), 10:119 (на мъстъ идеже нъстъ дълатель), 10:100 (повъдажще нерасамотрьливанима), 10:123 (кста бо ота поманшлении поградняти и), 11:68 (и по выса часъі), 11:108 (о колеси аще ли же не дакрънете то не обращаетъ са), 20:3 (и въстасте и пръпонасасте са), 20:11 (идиде отъ мене и даблждихъ слово отъ фалъма и нако коньчаховъ пънине) and 20:15 (и колико лътъ имаши, колицъмъ же страстымъ достоинъ, и блидъ мене ставъшь, и пакъі въложь натра and и помоль са отъпоусти ма). With another 569 errors they must be ascribed to the first copy made of the master copy of the protograph, hyparchetype +; let us give it the siglum α .
- 3.2. Most prominently in α , as in \bullet , figure substitutions of names (алонии \to алонъ, аммои \to аммонъ 2 , аммонъ \to амосъ, еннатъ \to синапъ, динонъ \to динонъ, матои \to матьфъи, памбо \to пуминъ, памбо \to амъбо, петръ \to етеръ, силоуанъ \to сисои, wpъ \to иwpъ, деwна \to деwа), words (авва \to отъць 2 , \to старьць 7 , *ашоутъ \to беζ винъі, *спътти \to беζ винъі, *бальскъ \to врачьвьствьнъ, блаженъіи \to ближьнии 2 , бъівольі \to вельблідъі, вънити \to въльсти 2 , сънити \to сълъсти, въпросити \to въпрашати 10 , въіспрь \to горъ, вьсегда \to иногда, вьсіакъ \to вьсь, глаголати \to рещи, глашати \to ζъвати, гора \to поустъіни, *грасти \to ити 11

→ поити → приити 2 , *[по]гъбати → [по]гыбнжти, довълъти → гонъти, * доньдеже o донелъже 4 , * дъвоицент o дъвашьдъі, животъ o житине, * ZЬДАН * o ГЛИНГАН * 2, ИХВОЛИТИ o ВЪСХОТЪТИ, ИН * o ДРОУГ * o КЕДИ- ${
m NZ},^6$ един ${
m Z}
ightarrow$ ин ${
m Z}
ightarrow$ етер ${
m Z}^3,~^*$ искрынии ightarrow ближынии, иста ${
m Z}$ ати ightarrow вхпрашати, *ключимъ \rightarrow потръбьнъ \rightarrow пръподобьнъ, *приключити \rightarrow прилоучити \to сълоучити², къщ \to которъщ³, *гамждити \to оудлъжити, мжка \rightarrow мжчение 2 , нагло \rightarrow напрасьно, неджг 2 \rightarrow бол 4 днь, неджжьствовати \rightarrow болъдньствовати, * не рачити \rightarrow не хотъти, * неродити \rightarrow небръщи, оставлюти ightarrow ославъти, отвръсти ightarrow отати, отвъщати ightarrow рещи, отре- μ и \rightarrow отвъщати, отъдати \rightarrow простити 2 , *отънждь \rightarrow бъхьма 8 , отъць \rightarrow старьць 6 , *параскерги \rightarrow патькъ, посълати \rightarrow поустити 5 , присно \rightarrow въ инж, промъкнжти са ightarrow пронести са, пр * дати ightarrow нати, * п * натарь ightarrow съребрыник \mathbf{z}^2 , пждарь o коупьць, ради o д \mathbf{z} льг \mathbf{z}^2 , *р \mathbf{z} снотив \mathbf{z} o истииьи \mathbb{Z}^2 , по свънъ \to по даль, собонт \to самъма, сиръчь \to рекъще 3 , сминати са \rightarrow склабити са 2 , въсминати са \rightarrow осклабити са 5 , старьць \rightarrow отьць 6 , страх $^{\rm Z}$ ightarrow трепет $^{\rm Z}$, стьбло ightarrow мечь 2 , соулии ightarrow хоужии, * с $^{\rm Z}$ лащи ightarrowсъломити, съмотрити o съгладовати, съхранити o скоутати, * сътънъе \rightarrow послъдь, сждити \rightarrow осжждати, творити \rightarrow дълати, тещи \rightarrow лъсти, ТОГДА \rightarrow КЕГДА, ТРЕТИИ \rightarrow ДРОУГЪІИ \rightarrow ИНЪ, ОУСТЬНВ \rightarrow БАZЪІКЪ, ХРАМИНА o хлъвина 2 , храм 2 o клъть o хлъвина, * хъіжа o храмина, * цъгло oединому, цъсарь \rightarrow къназь, *шоуи \rightarrow лъвъ, негда \rightarrow аще), forms (asigmatic and first sigmatic agrist \rightarrow second sigmatic agrist, j-participles $\rightarrow vbs$ -participles: s-stems $\rightarrow o$ -stems, би \rightarrow бълх 2 , и \rightarrow него, нъг \rightarrow намъ, искътъ \rightarrow ищътъ), word formation (алъкота \rightarrow алъкость, велии o велик $extbf{z}^4$, въвторити o повъторити, вън $extbf{z}$ ити o идити, вълъсти ightarrow сълъсти, двигнжти ightarrow подвигнжти, добра дътель ightarrow добродътель, ϵ хидьнова o ϵ хидьнина, дамадати o помадати, ити o отити, идгоуби- $TH \to \Pi$ ОГОУБИТИ, ИДИТИ \to ОТИТИ, ЛИБЪВЪТИ \to ЛИБЪВЪ БЪІТИ 2 , НАОУЩЕнине ightarrow пооущенине, омочити ightarrow намочити, остръгати ightarrow истръгати, оходити ightarrow отити, покрightarrow дакрightarrow проходити ightarrow приходити, пightarrowдарь \rightarrow пждыць, расъмотрение \rightarrow съмотрение, рогодиница \rightarrow рогодина 3 , сильнети \rightarrow сильна баіти 2 , срамота \rightarrow срама, стаідети са \rightarrow оустаідети са, съпъсти — идъсти, съребролюбие — съребролюбьство, фермьскъщ \rightarrow фермитьскъзи) and collocations (по мынт \rightarrow въ слъдъ мене, dative possessive → genitive possessive or adjective possessive, *при-verb $+ locative \rightarrow \kappa z + dative \text{ or } \rightarrow \kappa \lambda + accusative).$

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

ple omissions of letters (не зъло \rightarrow не дло, сътвори ими \rightarrow сътвори ми, от врага o отрада) to corruptions of the text (досаждаюмz o досажаше Emoy, moniff if ightarrow moniff ca, no beca Jenh ne himame obbligata facth ightarrowобълчаи имамь по вьса дьни не насти, обратитъ слово свонightarrow обратитъ са слово твоне, братина обидau o братau обидau o на, приходитau вau лauность oприидетъ лъность). Yet the misreading of the numerals $\kappa \vec{\epsilon} \rightarrow \vec{\epsilon} i \ 10:110$ gives a clue to as to their origin: here, the Glagolitic numerals \$\vec{\pi}\$ '10' and $\vec{8}$ '20' were confused, in 20:12 $\vec{\lambda}$ · $\vec{\mu} \rightarrow \vec{\lambda}$ · $\vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{z}$ the numerals $\vec{\kappa}$ '7' and \S '8', in 20:16 MH \rightarrow M· H· \S the numerals \S '8' and \S '9', and in 20:15 $\vec{\lambda} \rightarrow \vec{i}$ the numeral \vec{A} '30' was reduced to $\vec{\Phi}$ '10'; the error 10:99 деватана — десатана reflects confusion of e '9' and f '10' (the errors дъва десати \rightarrow ві and $\vec{k} \rightarrow$ ві reflect the vagaries of internal dictation дъва десати \rightarrow дъва на десате). That α was written in Glagolitic is further attested by confusion of nasals ($\epsilon \leftrightarrow \epsilon$: движжтъ са \to движатъ са, пленица o пленица, твора o творіж, $ext{$\varepsilon$} \leftrightarrow \textit{Vm}$: отъпаджтъ oотъпадемъ, отиметъ іж \rightarrow отъмътанетъ са and $\mathfrak{E} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{I}$: минжтъ \rightarrow ми-Hete, on contraints o on conference, pribalty o pribalty on pribately, our pribately, one инантъ \rightarrow осквръннантъ), of jotation (вън жтръ \rightarrow въ инж 20:15), of con-Sonants ($\mathbb{E} \leftrightarrow \%$: бола $\to \Gamma h$ а, $\mathbb{E} \to \mathbb{F}$: блата $\to \Pi$ лота, $\mathfrak{V} \to \mathfrak{F}$: жидеши ightarrow живеши, съдьдавъще ightarrow въдъвавъще, $\mathfrak V\leftrightarrow\mathfrak W$: съврьшени ightarrow съмъре-NM, $\Psi\leftrightarrow$ P: NACZ \to BACZ, NZ \to BZ, BALLIERO \to NALLIERO, $\Psi\leftrightarrow$ 50: Poymba- $\mathsf{HETZ} \to \mathsf{ПО}\mathsf{Y}\mathsf{И}\mathsf{TAETЬ}, \ \mathfrak{V} \to \mathsf{FT}$: ZA ПОХОТИ $\to \mathsf{ZA}\mathsf{ПО}\mathsf{B}\mathsf{TA}\mathsf{J}\mathsf{H}, \ \mathsf{ПЛАКАХ}\mathsf{Z}\ \mathsf{CA} \to \mathsf{ПЛА}\mathsf{-}$ kabb ca, $\mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{A}$: hnbaf \to hnb ke, $\mathfrak{A} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{A}$: trkcb \to tryab, $\mathfrak{A} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{A}$: hah ightarrow и Тъі, доньдеже ightarrow то идеже, нединонт ightarrow ати ю, х ightarrow ightarrow в: пжждааше ightarrow поудташе, m M
ightarrow
m W: Сжждь ightarrow Сжщь, m W
ightarrow
m O: Иматm M
ightarrow
m M Имамm M
ightarrow
m M $\hbox{\rm Po} \to \hbox{\rm Moispo}, \ \hbox{\rm B} \leftrightarrow \hbox{\rm P:} \ \hbox{\rm coyahh} \to \hbox{\rm Byah}, \ \hbox{\rm B} \leftrightarrow \hbox{\rm P:} \ \hbox{\rm ce camo} \to \hbox{\rm He camo}, \ \hbox{\rm Sp} \leftrightarrow \hbox{\rm P:}$ антонии \rightarrow андонии⁹, диваидыскъщ \rightarrow тиваидыскъщ), of vowels (\leftrightarrow э: глаголаша ightarrow гласие, дълесе ightarrow дъла си, рагдулмантще и ръзкантще ightarrow раддъимажща и ръкажща, в \leftrightarrow э: пафноутии ightarrow паднотии 2 , ightarrow э: единг o едино, данг o дано, o o: растворенг и o растворенгии, o $\leftrightarrow \text{ B: BTITA} \rightarrow \text{BTXA}, \text{ \mathfrak{C}} \leftrightarrow \text{ B: BTACTA} \rightarrow \text{BCACTA}, \text{ \mathfrak{C}} \leftrightarrow \text{ \mathfrak{G}: Canaaxt, tested }$ ръдуж, дълдауж \rightarrow съпдуъ, твордуъ, дълдауъ). Copying from Glagolitic also produced errors in epenthesis (лихоиметъ → лихоемлетъ), anagrams (дивъканъ o видъинъ, бродинево o ибродово, тожде o же то, си немоу ightarrow и семоу, оумрътвити ightarrow оутвръдити, охурахьскоу ightarrow оскуратьскоу, дълъі мъкли имате \rightarrow польдъі мъкль имать) and tautograms (и высыде o се все сыде, нждити ма o нждити са и пакъі нждити са, можеть \rightarrow не можеть). An erroneous spelling is visible in клевещжще \rightarrow клеветщоуще (see also 4.3 below).

- 4.1. A^1 and A^{23} were not copied from the same antigraph: A^1 used α , but A^{23} 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 постигън въ житине велико), 20:15 (рабе божии виждь стопът мона и осажи ма нако плътъ и кръвъ немь) and 20:16 (и троуда къ томоу тъло не трыпа). Let us give it the siglum α' .
- 4.2. The other 84 errors, range from simple omissions of letters (пооущенина \rightarrow пущенина) to corruptions of the text (отъпасти вола \rightarrow пасти волеж, владъщ'в богоу поемлеж \rightarrow и молю са вл^ац'в бу внимаю), The antigraph α' of A^{23} shows some substitutions of names (тидои \rightarrow тимоф'ви), words (въпросити \rightarrow въпрашати, идати \rightarrow идвести, инъ \rightarrow нединъ², посълати \rightarrow пустити, гон'ветъ \rightarrow год'в нестъ) and word formation (велии \rightarrow великъ, кровъ \rightarrow покровъ, пр'внемаганине \rightarrow немоганине), 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 (v ↔ н повъторихъ ightarrow покоторих ${f T}$, ${f B}$ \leftrightarrow ${f G}$: тиваидьск ${f Z}$ III ightarrow диваидьск ${f Z}$ III, срьдьцоу ightarrow ста- $\text{pbyo}, \text{cotah} \to \text{cotah}, \text{ a} \leftrightarrow \text{s.: otcent} \to \text{ot cefo}, \text{ a} \leftrightarrow \text{a.: han} \to \text{han}, \text{ a} \leftrightarrow \text{a.: han}$ so: ctrouply o cauch, $ext{cf} \leftrightarrow ext{p}$: mams o hams, $ext{cf} \leftrightarrow ext{cf}$: psignems o psiвнетъ, та → ма; a misspelling is visible in ващии → ватщии⁶, similar to the one indicated in 3.3), of vowels (4 \leftrightarrow 3: прамень \rightarrow пременъ, 4 \leftrightarrow 9: TZ \rightarrow TO, ϑ \leftrightarrow 8: KPZBL \rightarrow K POBY, ϑ \leftrightarrow ϑ : HAXZ H \rightarrow HAXZI H) and errors in epenthesis (скитьскъщ — секитьскъщ), haplograms (сь носитъ ightarrow сь нить, оупъваіж аще ightarrow оупъваіжще, въдьмъ милотарь ightarrow вдемъ лотарь, сътажж та \rightarrow сь та) and tautograms (мало \rightarrow мало мало, тъсьи \mathtt{Z} іи o т'елесьи \mathtt{Z} іи, постиша са o не постиша са, в \mathtt{Z} и \mathtt{E} шьнии \mathtt{X} \mathtt{Z} o ви'емъшнихъ, ни \rightarrow 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 (како подобают въздроу бълги о высемы) бъдроу is written щодру ← шэвьв.
- 4.4. What is even more striking is that similar patterns of errors are visible in the copies A^3 and A^2 from α' . In A^3 we find confusion

of nasals ($\mathfrak{C} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{C}$: въ келит \to в келита, ватщии \to вутщи), in jotation (Baniaietz ca \rightarrow Banaet ca, a kzi (\leftarrow kz) necminimz \rightarrow iako necythimz), of consonants ($\Lambda \leftrightarrow \alpha$: по нжжди \to поноудит са, пжждъаше \to пуда- $\text{ We, $\flat \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{P}: Koypulem$ } \to \text{ pytelem$ Z$, $$\mathfrak{W} \leftrightarrow $^{\mathfrak{p}}$: $$ $\mathsf{predm} \to \mathsf{perctai}, $$^{\mathfrak{q}} \leftrightarrow {\mathfrak{P}}$:}$ тришьдъі \rightarrow пришедъ), of vowels ($+\leftrightarrow$ э: продръданию \rightarrow предердению, $\$ \leftrightarrow \texttt{9:} \ \texttt{Anoneon} \to \texttt{Anory}, \ \texttt{9} \leftrightarrow \texttt{9:} \ \texttt{ifan} \ \texttt{ce} \to \texttt{ifanko}, \ \texttt{A} \leftrightarrow \texttt{9:} \ \texttt{Bnenthimhyz} \to$ в иъичъшнихъ), errors in epenthesis (оукръпи → оукръпли), anagrams (оуалии \rightarrow аоулии, стрьмоглавь \rightarrow стромъглавъ, идъвъ \rightarrow и въди), haplograms (пришьдашоу ка немоу \rightarrow пришедшюму, покоториха \rightarrow покорихъ, сукамин π \rightarrow суками) and tautograms (никомоуже \rightarrow нъ никомуже : никомуже). Likewise, but in different places and with different outcomes, in A^2 we find confusion of nasals ($\mathfrak{E} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{E}$: побижтъ \to побь \mathfrak{E} ть, боріжтъ \to бореть, бжджтъ \to будете), consonants ($\Psi \leftrightarrow \varpi$: амма ightarrow abba, $\mathfrak{V}\leftrightarrow\mathfrak{H}$: by iby ightarrow by interest of the property of the proper $\mathsf{A} \leftrightarrow \mathsf{o}$: похождь \to похоть, $\mathfrak{W} \leftrightarrow \mathsf{F}$: помаζа \to покаζа, $\mathsf{P} \leftrightarrow \mathsf{F}$: пъждъаше \rightarrow HV, ΔALLIE²), VOWels (+ \leftrightarrow 3: Η ΙΕΙLΙΕ \rightarrow ΔΙLΙΕ Η, 8 \leftrightarrow 4: Ηλ ΡΑΜΟΥ \rightarrow Ηλ ΠΡΑмъ, аноувоу \rightarrow аноувъ, състди \rightarrow сусуди), errors in epenthesis (ослабенине \rightarrow wcлабенине²) and tautograms (имъхух \rightarrow имъхумх, сукаминж \rightarrow роуками жену, аммонъ \rightarrow амомонъ, страньникоу \rightarrow страстьнику); in addition, we find omission of an apophthegm (10:56).

4.5. This is the same pattern as we find in copy A^1 of α : out of a total of 199 errors, 59 attest confusion of nasals (€ ↔ €: оубоуждыжще ма → оубоужающоумоу, на → ю, покланнанm → покланана, ϵ → Vm: принаша o приимъща; $ext{$\varepsilon$} \leftrightarrow ext{$\circ$}$: урьноридьца o урьноридьце, град $ext{$\pi$}$ ща oграджще, $\mathfrak{E}\leftrightarrow\mathfrak{A}$: тъщащоу са \to тъщьщж са, $\mathfrak{E}\leftrightarrow\mathfrak{A}$: пръливаютъ \to проливаю), of consonants ($\mathbb{H} \leftrightarrow \mathbb{P}$: польщина \to большина, $\mathfrak{P} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{P}$: СЪ THMS o carbms, sympaznurs o sympaznuts, $extbf{y} \leftrightarrow extbf{y}$: comfets o coyfets, хощем $z \to x$ очемz), of vowels ($+ \leftrightarrow 3$: ихнемагати \to ихнамагати, оу-ПЪВАНИНА ightarrow оупование, слоужаща ightarrow слоужаще, аще ightarrow неще, продръданина o продърдениа, листвине o листвиа, э o э: побъжденга o побъжоиъ, нестории \rightarrow нестерии, $\mathfrak{F} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{F}$: плачем \rightarrow плачьмь 4 , се \rightarrow сь, пожьнетъ ightarrow noweneth, chorecemb ightarrow chorece umb, nowerete ightarrow nowerete, 9 ightarrow 9: noмъсломь \rightarrow помъслъмъ \rightarrow помъслъмь 3 , феодоромь \rightarrow дедоръмъ, съпьрьникомь \rightarrow супьрьникъмъ, мьнихомъ 4 \rightarrow мнихомь \rightarrow мнихъмь 2 \rightarrow мьнихомь, народомь \rightarrow народъмь 2 , \neg когда \neg^4 \rightarrow \neg къгда \neg^{16} , цѣлова \rightarrow цѣльва, дъломъ \to дломь \to длъмь \to дълъмъ, то \to тъ, $\$ \leftrightarrow$ э: посадивъ-Шоу ightarrow посадивше, сжщоу ightarrow суще, приимъщоу ightarrow приимъще, сазішащоу

- → слашаще, в ↔ э: дроугое → дрогое, отапоусти → \ddot{w} пости, поустани → постыни², съдащоу → съдащо, слоужащоуемоу → сложещему, поустаньникома → постыникомь, могжта → моугуть, в ↔ э: игоуменоу → игоумень, глаголющь → глиоу, доуси → дрб, патиць → поутьць), еггог in epenthesis (такиж → талкноу), anagrams (еухариста → еухаритась), haplograms (жена на мъстъ → жена мъстъ, повръжена на → повръжена, наипаче павечерьницж → наи павечерьницю, оучинению → оучиню, печально → пъльно, лъто же → лъ же) and tautograms (даста емоу → дастъ е емоу, чъто то естъ → чъстъ то естъ, насилована → не насилована, никомоуже → никомумуже, льна → льнена, хота же → хоташе же); the misspelling of the numeral \vec{o} '70' as \vec{w} '800' 20:15 does not belong to these errors because it forms part of the efforts of the copyist to write \vec{o} in initial position as \vec{w} .
- 5.1. A^{123} are copied by Russian scribes. For Anzr-/Anzk- A^1 writes AλZκ $-_{10}$ AZλ Γ - $_{10}$ AZλK- $_{47}$ AZλXκ $-_{33}$, A^3 A0λ Γ - $_{12}$ A0λK- $_{70}$ A0λZκ $-_{18}$, A^2 A0λ Γ - $_{11}$ A0λX- $_{59}$ A0λZκ $-_{30}$, and for Υρβη- A^1 Υργη- A^2 Υργη- A^3 Υεργη- A^3 Υεργη- A^3 Υεργη- A^3 αre copied by scribes from the Russian North (both confuse $\mu \leftrightarrow \nu$), A^1 is not. The fact that A^{123} 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. A^{123} show deficiencies in the marking of jotation: A^1 jotates in no more than 21% of cases, A^3 in 41% and A^2 in 76%; in addition they show excessive jotation (e.g. A^1 оубинство but юбинство, A^3 оужиксы but A^2 южиксы) as well as и-jotation (A^1 инеи, иепархи, иеретиксы, иетерѣ, іжноша, A^3 иепархии, A^2 ітьсти). 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 A^1 юн $_{45}$ оун $_{47}$ жн $_{51}$ іжн $_{3}$, A^3 оун $_{98}$ юн $_{2}$, A^2 оун $_{98}$ юн $_{2}$, in which the non-jotated spelling reflects that of the antigraphs.
- 5.3. A^{123} show deficiencies in the marking of palatality. The normal relation of z to s in the text would be 68% : 32%, but of z A^1

⁽ 8) Could the lack of g in 50% of the occurrences of *Egypt*- (see 5.6) betray a Southern provenance of A^1 ?

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, but introduced by the copyists: they produced competing spellings, e.g. for Δζ Δ¹ Δζ Δζ1, Δζ Δζ2, ΔζΔ1, Δ³ Δζ3 ΔζΔ95 ΔζΔ1, Α² Δζ10 Δζ Δβ6 ΔζΔ2 ΔζΔ2, in which the β-spelling reflects that of the antigraphs.

- 5.4. For the adverb авин A^1 has 3 spellings: авие₉₇ авине авье₂, A^3 has 5: abue1 abue1 abbe43 abbe12 abbe43, and A^2 has 6: abue14 abue13 aвине65 абие1 абые3 абые4. Apart from the marking of jotation, the essential difference is in the spelling of the 'tense' x/b before front vowels and j. Cyrillic replaces it with $\pi I/\mu$, but Glagolitic does not. This produced competing spellings, e.g. for братии, братина, братине[ю], братина A^1 брати $_{94}$ братъ $_{71}$ брать $_{7}$, A^3 брати $_{29}$ брать $_{71}$, A^2 (ь dropped in брат-25) брати-2 брать-73, in which the 13/ь-spelling reflects that of the antigraphs; Glagolitic spelling is also reflected in combination with the definiteness marker -и/I (A¹ англекьи, блажены, вторъї, другъї, другы, имъї, имъї, нитриискъї, плачнъї, преподобынъї, рекомъі, рекъи, чьстьньи, авльи, новы, A^3 бъівъі, вторъі, главъи, длатоустъї, довъи, могіъ!и, скитьскъї, створивъи) and the pronoun и/і (A^{23} въпросихомъі, погубатъі). Excessive marking of tenseness is attested $\inf A^1$ вид π вы и, поим π і и, поимы и, A^3 видив π і и, поим π і и, приим π і и, A^2 б $\tilde{\Lambda}$ Г $\tilde{\Lambda}$ І и, видив $\tilde{\Lambda}$ І и, поим $\tilde{\Lambda}$ І и.
- 5.5. The distribution of digraphic by and monographic $y/8/\pi$ in the three copies is mirrored: for Glagolitic & A^1 writes by A^2 and A^2 write by A^2 write by A
- 5.6. For the proper name ervibt— A^1 has 11 spellings: eroyпт—9 eroyпт—2 ervпт—2 ervпт—2 ervпт—2 ervпт—2 ervпт—2 ervпт—2 ervпт—2 ervпт—2 ervпт—2. A³ has 10: ervпет—13 ervпт—25 ervптт—2 ervптт—2 ervптт—2 ervптт—2 ervптт—2 ervптт—2 ervптт—24 ervптт—26 ervпт—36 ervпт—37 ervпт—37 ervпт—37 ervпт—37 ervпт—37 ervптт—37 ervпт—37 ervптт—37 ervпт—37 ervпт—37 ervпт—37 ervпт—37 ervпт—37 ervпт—37 ervпт

⁽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 +, 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 Cyrilllic). 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 antigrafi glagolitici, troviamo schemi di errori corrispondenti. Tali schemi possono essere messi direttamente in relazione con la scrittura glagolitica degli antigrafi.