

JOS SCHAEKEN

## NOTES ON THE LATER RUSSIAN PART OF SAVA'S BOOK

*Саввина книга. Древнеславянская рукопись XI, XI–XII и конца XIII века. Часть I: Рукопись. Текст. Комментарии. Исследования.* Издание подготовили О.А. Князевская, Л.А. Коробенко, Е.П. Дограмаджиева, Москва: Издательство «Индрик», 1999.

### 0. INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

It is well-known that the name “Sava’s Book” (“Саввина книга”, “Liber Sabbae”) refers to a cyrillic manuscript that belongs to the Old Church Slavonic canon. The codex was discovered in 1866 by I.I. Sreznevskij in the manuscript collection of the Moscow Synodal Printing House. It is now kept in the Российский (formerly: Центральный) Государственный Архив Древних Актов in Moscow (РГАДА, фонд 381, № 14). The name of the codex was coined by Sreznevskij (Срезневский 1868 I, 6) and refers to two medieval notes in the manuscript, where we read at the bottom of fol. 51a **пѣ (= попъ) савѣ ѱалъ** (= **псалъ**) and of fol. 56a **помози ми рабѣ твоѣмоу сави** (or **савю**·?); cf. the enlarged photographs in the 1999 edition (“Рис. 2. Приписки в Саввиной книге”). The Old Church Slavonic text has 130 folios and contains a short evangeliary.

It is not generally known that the same codex also contains two Old Russian additions replacing pages that must have been lost from the original manuscript. The older Russian part has 12 folios and is usually dated at the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century. The later Russian part contains 24 folios and was probably written two centuries later (somewhere in the fourteenth or perhaps as early as the end of the thirteenth century). All in all we are dealing with an Old Slavic codex of 166 folios with portions written in three different periods and in two different regions, Old Bulgaria and Old Rus’.

### 1. EDITIONS

#### 1.1. Previous editions

The Old Church Slavonic part of Sava’s Book was first published by Sreznevskij in 1868 (Срезневский 1868 II, 1–154), together with a short description of the main codicological, paleographic and linguistic features of the manuscript

(1868 I, 5–20). This first edition contains many incorrect readings and was heavily criticized by V. Jagić (1881). In conclusion of an errata list of 18 pages he states: “Wie unangenehm muss den Gelehrten, der sich mit gewissenhafter Genauigkeit auf die Beobachtung der sprachlichen Eigenthümlichkeiten eines Denkmals verlegt, die nachträgliche Entdeckung berühren, dass viele Fälle, welche er in diesem oder jenem Sinne mitzählte und in seine Combinationen hineinzog, einfach falsch gedruckt sind!” (1881, 607). The second edition, provided by V. Ščepkin, appeared in 1903. A few years earlier Ščepkin had already published a lengthy monograph including a detailed paleographic and orthographic description of the Old Church Slavonic text (Щепкинъ 1899). Ščepkin’s edition was reviewed, among others, by N.M. Karinskij (Каринскій 1914), who lists the most important “неточности”. He also notes that the glossary is incomplete, whereas on the other hand “въ «Указательъ къ тексту» большая часть ошибокъ, вкравшихся въ издание, отсутствуетъ” (1914, 213). Furthermore, he considers the few photographs that were added as samples to the edition “далеко не въ состояніи охарактеризовать рукопись *вполнѣ* въ палеографическомъ отношеніи” (1914, 215).

The older Russian part of the codex was published for the first time with a short introduction by Sreznevskij in 1867 (Срезневскій 1867). In more recent times the fragment has been studied mainly by I.H. Tóth, who also offered a new edition that was published on several occasions (И.Х. Тот 1977; 1990; 1995; the last one including a linguistic analysis). Both editions lack a glossary and a full facsimile (photographs of fol. 163b, 164a, and 165a are provided in the publications by Tóth).

The later Russian part of Sava’s Book was briefly mentioned by Sreznevskij in his edition of the Old Church Slavonic text (Срезневскій 1868 I, 5). In the same century several scholars already noted that the language of the later part reveals some interesting features pointing to the northwestern dialect area of Old Russian (cf. Jagić 1881, 584; Соболевскій 1884, 137–138; Волковъ 1897, 58; Щепкинъ 1899, 4). However, it was not until last year that the text was published for the first time in the new edition that will be discussed in the next section.

### 1.2. *The new edition*

The first volume of *Саввина книга. Древнеславянская рукопись XI, XI–XII и конца XIII века* (henceforth: *Ск*) comprises a facsimile and text edition of all 166 folios. The photographs are of good quality, considering the fact that the later Russian part is a palimpsest with a poorly erased underlying text (cf. below, 3.4).<sup>2</sup> Also, it has to be taken into account that an unskilful restoration of the codex carried out in the middle of the last century did considerable damage to the parchment and ink: “Пергамен приобрел необычный темный

цвет, многие тонкие листы стали прозрачными. Почти полностью в Саввиной книге исчезло письмо краской, которое ранее, в XIX и в начале XX в., достаточно хорошо прочитывалось” (Ск 10; cf. also 17, 22–23). The new text edition was prepared by E. Dogramadžieva from Sofia, and O.A. Knjazevskaja and L.A. Korobenko from Moscow. Included is a critical apparatus, in which also Ščepkin’s observations and Karinskij’s corrections are taken into account.

Between 1988 and 1991 the codex underwent a new restoration in the Российский (formerly: Всесоюзный) научно-исследовательский институт реставрации in Moscow. It was decided to restore, among other things, the way in which the Old Church Slavonic and the older Russian folios were originally arranged. The 1999 edition follows the new pagination and divides the codex into four parts:

- fol. 1b–24: the later Russian part (“Часть I”);
- fol. 25–153: the Old Church Slavonic text (“Часть II. Саввина книга”), corresponding to fol. 25–27, 140–141, 28–122, 124–139, 139<sub>2</sub>, 142–151, 123, 164 in Ščepkin’s 1903 edition;
- fol. 154–165a: the older Russian part (“Часть III”), corresponding to fol. 152–163a in the old pagination;
- fol. 166a, containing an additional Old Church Slavonic page (“Часть IV”), corresponding to fol. 165a in the old pagination.<sup>3</sup>

As for the different hands that can be discerned, parts II and III were each written by a single hand. The hand of III might also be responsible for part of the many inserted corrections and comments in II (cf. Щепкинъ 1899, 70–71; Федер 1995, 166). Part IV is usually identified as a separate hand (e.g. Щепкинъ 1899, 4–7; Дограмаджиева 1993a), although W.R. Veder, who inspected the manuscript in 1989 *de visu*, believes that the hand of IV is “вероятно” the same as the one of II (Федер 1995, 166).<sup>4</sup> The hands of part I will be discussed below (section 3.2).

The new edition of Sava’s Book is preceded by a foreword, an introduction, and a “палеографическое описание” of the codex, all written by Knjazevskaja. The introduction deals with the study of the manuscript since 1866 and describes the contents of all four parts. It should be mentioned, that the list of publications on Sava’s Book (Ск 40) is incomplete, even if we take into account “лишь те труды, которые выполнялись непосредственно по рукописи” (Ск 10, fn. 1). What we miss are substantial contributions like Jagić 1881; Погорелов 1927; Horálek 1948; Sławski 1963, and others.<sup>5</sup> Recent titles that are not included are Дограмаджиева 1993b; Тот 1995; Федер 1995, and also Князевская 1998 (covering the text of Ск 9–13).

The “палеографическое описание” is actually more than the title suggests. This lengthy chapter (Ск 15–40) deals with all codicological aspects of the

manuscript and offers detailed information not only on the paleography, but even the orthography of the three major parts. To some extent, phonological issues also are treated.

In conclusion of the introductory chapters *Knjazevskaia* rehearses the history of the manuscript (*Ck* 39). Codicological observations on the old bindings (cf. *Ck* 16–17) and paleographic resemblances between the Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian parts (cf. *Ck* 36 and also Федер 1995, 164) point to the most plausible scenario that both Russian parts were specially written in Rus' in the eleventh-twelfth and thirteenth-fourteenth centuries to replace the lost pages in the Old Church Slavonic manuscript. In this context Jagić already wrote about the older Russian addition: “Das fehlende wurde natürlich im russischen Stile ergänzt, doch offenbar las man zur selben Zeit ohne Anstoss noch die alte südslavische Fassung, sonst hätte ja die Ergänzung eines unbrauchbar gewordenen Textes keinen Sinn, keinen Zweck” (1881, 586).<sup>6</sup>

In the next section I will concentrate on the later part of Sava's Book that is now published for the first time and, consequently, has received only little attention in the past.

### 3. PART I OF SAVA'S BOOK

#### 3.1. Text

The first part of Sava's Book (henceforth: Sav I) contains the beginning of the short evangeliary starting with [И]СКОНИ ВЪБАШЕ СЛОВО (John 1, 1). Since the edition lacks a list of pericopes,<sup>7</sup> I will here sum up the Gospel readings that are preserved in Sav I:

Gospel readings in Sav I			
Marc 15, 43–47	24a 9 – 24b 11	John 3, 16–21	17a 1 – 17b 11
Marc 16, 1	24b 12 – 24b 16	John 3, 22–33	12a 10 – 13b 13
Luke 24, 12–35	4a 11 – 6b 17	John 5, 17–24	17b 14 – 19a 2
John 1, 1–17	1b 1 – 3a 1	John 5, 24–30	19a 5 – 20a 1
John 1, 18–28	3a 3 – 4a 9	John 5, 30–47	20a 5 – 22a 5
John 1, 35–51	7a 2 – 9a 3	John 6, 1–2	22a 5 – 22a 10
John 2, 1–11	15b 10 – 16b 16	John 6, 14–27	22a 12 – 24a 4
John 2, 12–22	10b 15 – 12a 8	John 20, 19–31	13b 15 – 15b 8
John 3, 1–15	9a 4 – 10b 13		

It should be noted that John 5, 24 and 5, 30 are attested twice. On the other hand, we miss the first part of John 5, 33 (“You have sent to John . . .”). There are also instances where single words are left out, e.g. **НЪ • ВЪСН** instead of **НЪ • НЕ ВЪСН**

in John 3, 8 (10a 3) or the last word of John 5, 36 (**ТАКО ОЦЬ МА** instead of **ТАКО ОЦЬ МА ПОСЛА**).<sup>8</sup> Other textual errors are, for instance, **ЮЖЕ** instead of **ЮГОЖЕ** in John 1, 15 (2b 11), **И** instead of **ИНЪ** in John 5, 32 (20a 12), or **ВСИ** instead of **ВЪ** in John 5, 34 (20b 4–5: **ДА ВСИ СПСЕНИ БОУДЪТЕ** [sic]). On fol. 4b 3 the name “Emmaus” is misinterpreted as **КЛМВОВОУСЪ**. Incomprehensible is fol. 22b 13, where we read **ПАДРО НА ДЕСАТОУ** instead of **ТАКО ДВА ДЕСАТОУ** (John 6, 19).

On fol. 10b 5–6 (John 3, 13) the text edition gives the corrupt passage **ТЪКМО СЪШЕДЪШЕ | ТЪ- НБСЪ СНЪ ЧЛВЧЕСКЪИ** (“-” denotes a black spot). What we can see on the facsimile, however, leaves enough room for an interpretation that is grammatically more plausible: **ТЪКМО СЪШЕДЪИ [С] | ТЪ - НБС[А] СНЪ ЧЛВЧЕСКЪИ**. The last letter of line 5 could be an attempt to correct **Е** into **С**, whereas the ending **-А** in **НБС[А]** seems to me not unlikely. Other cases, where the text edition offers wrong or implausible word divisions are rare, e.g. **ВИДЪ ВЪ** instead of **ВИДЪВЪ** on fol. 15a 14 (cf. also below, 3.3.1 and 3.3.7 (1)).

Apart from the Gospel text, we also find a few marginal notes. There are two words written on fol. 1a that are mentioned below, in note 2. At the top of fol. 1b we read “Videtur scriptus seculo 14”. Between this inscription, clearly pointing to Sav I, and the beginning of the main text there is a cyrillic note in seventeenth-century handwriting: **СЕРѢКИНА** (M). The name refers to the Seredkin monastery near Pskov (cf. e.g. Щепкинъ 1899, 3). Similar references can be found in other manuscripts from the collection of the Moscow Synodal Printing House. Together with Sava's Book they were all moved from the Pskov area to Moscow at the end of the seventeenth century (Ск 9; cf. also Убийвовк 1995, 140–141). Considering the fact that the language of Sav I shows some northwestern dialectal features (see below, 3.3), it is reasonable to believe that Sava's Book was in use for some 350 or 400 years in the Pskov area at least from the fourteenth century onwards (cf. Ск 39).

Other marginal notes in Sav I can be found in the upper right corner of fol. 2b (**ПОКОУ|ШАЮ ПЕ**) and of fol. 5a (a single letter: **Д**). I think that the inscription on fol. 2b can be identified as a *probatio pennae* formula: **ПОКОУ|ШАЮ ПЕ[РО]** or **ПЕ[РА]**. Similar formulae are well-attested elsewhere. Thus, for instance, in the oldest Slavic manuscript of the Forty Gospel Homilies of St. Gregory the Great (thirteenth century; Russian Church Slavonic) we find the marginal note **ПОКУША ПЕРА І ЧЕРН[И]ЛА ДОБРО ДА БУДЕТ** (cf. *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského* III, 1982, 130, s.v. **ПОКОУШАТИ**). A similar example can be found in one of the manuscripts that was taken together with Sava's Book from Pskov to Moscow in the seventeenth century. In this manuscript, a Russian Church Slavonic *паремейник* from the second half of the thirteenth century (now РГАДА, фонд 381, № 60), we read on fol. 39b according to the *Сводный каталог...* (1984, 310): **ПОКОУШАТИ ЧЕРНИЛА ДОБРО ЛИ БОУДЕТЬ**.

3.2. *Writing*

Most of Sav I was copied by a single hand: “почерк уверенный, но некрасивый и несколько небрежный” (Ск 36). In addition, two other hands can be discerned: the first one was responsible for the opening lines (fol. 1b 1–5 as well as **ѣ** in line 6), whereas the second one wrote a total of seventeen lines on three different spots: fol. 5a 5–9, 9a 3–6, and 12b 12–13a 3.

In the previous section several textual errors were pointed out, most of them probably due to haste and carelessness. The same practice can also be observed when it comes to orthography. Such errors are numerous, e.g. **бл҃гати** 2b 15 (read **бл҃гдѣти**), **левгитѣ** 3a 10 (i.e. **левгитѣ**), **тѣлесего** 5b 5–6 (**тѣлесе кго**), **живаша** 7a 15 (**живаше**), **града а|андрѣова** 7b 17–8a 1 (**града || андрѣова**), **си** 8b 8 (**еси**), **сѣвѣдѣльство** 13b 11 (**сѣвѣдѣтельство**), **о|ма** 14b 3–4 (**фома**), **видѣхо** 14b 9 (**видѣхомъ**), **волоносъ** 16a 6 (**водоносъ**), **двѣма ли** 16a 9 (**двѣма ли**), **и|ноча дастъ** 17a 2–3 (**и|ночада дастъ**), **можожеть** 18a 7 (**можетъ**), **оуслѣвшѣ** 19a 16 (**оуслѣшавшѣ**), **сѣнодоша** 22b 5 (**сѣнидоша** or **снидоша**), **вѣ** 23a 8 (**бѣ**), **иковла** 24b 14 (**никаовла**).

I would like to stress that some of the examples mentioned above may not be simple errors but can also reflect the northwestern variety of Old Russian (henceforth: NWOR) spoken by the copyist.<sup>9</sup> This was already noted by A.I. Sobolevskij in the case of the third singular imperfect form **живаша** 7a 15, where we find final *'a* instead of *e* (Соболевскій 1884, 137; cf. also Зализняк 1995, 59–60; Галинская 1997, 71–72). The same holds true for the second person singular **си** 8b 8 instead of **еси**; compare **тѣ си мовила** in the Novgorod birchbark letter (henceforth: НБГ) 731 from Novgorod (cf. Зализняк 1995, 327 and also 370, where НБГ 150 is treated, probably containing the first person plural **см[ь]**). Also, **можожеть** 18a 7 may be a (corrected) case of *e* > *'o* after sibilants, a development that is familiar in birchbark letters, especially from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (cf. Зализняк 1995, 56, and also below, 3.3.3). Furthermore, on the facsimile it is clearly visible that **творациа** 18a 10 was changed afterwards into **творѣца** (elsewhere *r'a* is spelled as **рѣ**). The possible reflection of a hardened *r'* in the original form **творѣца** is corroborated by the same development found in birchbark letters from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (cf. Зализняк 1995, 64, and also below, 3.3.3). A final example is the genitive singular form **фомы** 13b 14, in which “левая часть **ѣ** исправлена из **ѣ**” (Ск 95, fn. 14). A genitive singular ending *-ѣ* in the  $\bar{a}$ -stems (taken from the corresponding soft paradigm) is typical of NWOR (cf. Зализняк 1995, 80).

### 3.3. Language

Here I will discuss Knjazevskaja's observations on the main linguistic peculiarities of Sav I (Ск 36–39).<sup>10</sup> Additional notes are given in the last section (3.3.7).

#### 3.3.1. Цоканье and шоканье

Whereas *цоканье* is widespread over NWOR, *шоканье* or *шепелявенье* is a distinguishing feature of the Pskov area. Both innovations are attested sporadically in Sav I, as was already mentioned by Sobolevskij (Соболевский 1884, 137). Knjazevskaja (Ск 38) enumerates two cases of *цоканье* (**агньчь бѣжи** 7a 5 instead of **агньць бѣжи**, and **виць** 11a 8 instead of **вичь**) and three instances of *шоканье*: **ѡвѣржоста (сѡ)** 6a 17 (read **ѡвѣржоста сѡ** 'were opened'), **(тгы) кши (симонъ)** 7b 10 (read **кши**), and **видѣвше** 14a 10 (read **видѣвше**).

As for **ѡвѣржоста** and **кши** the presence of a second sibilant in the following syllable may be attributable to the spelling of *шоканье*. Cf. Зализняк (1995, 43), where some instances of *шоканье* in birchbark letters suggest a similar influence, e.g. **шизъи** НБГ 735 instead of **сизъи**. In the case of **ѡвѣржоста** there may also have been interference from regular forms with *-vřz-* from **отъверечи/отъврѣци, отъврѣж** (cf. **ѡверже** 3a 12).

Furthermore, there is an additional instance of *шоканье* in Sav I that has not so far been noticed. It can be found immediately before the *цоканье* case **агньчь** 7a 5, where the edition reads **и глѣше агньчь бѣжи**, i.e. the second part of John 1, 36. The Greek text, however, says λέγει, ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, which in Church Slavonic is consistently translated as **и глѣ • сѣ агньць бѣжи**. Thus, **глѣше** 7a 5 should be understood as **глѣ ше**.

#### 3.3.2. Assimilations

Sobolevskij not only observed instances of *цоканье* and *шоканье* in Sav I, but also the peculiar case of **кте** < \**kъde* or \**kъdě* which occurs twice (7a 12 and 15). Knjazevskaja (Ск 38) mentions a third instance of **кте** in another fourteenth-century evangeliary from Pskov (now РГАДА, фонд 381, № 19). Zaliznjak (Зализняк 1995, 68–69) not only discusses progressive devoicing of initial *k* before subsequent *d* in NWOR, but also of initial *s* under the same conditions (e.g. **сторовъ** < \**sъdorv-*). Vermeer points out that the idiosyncratic development has parallels in West Slavic and is “conceivable against the background of the radically different consonant systems of the Finnic substratum with which North Russian was interacting at an early stage” (1997b, 91).

In addition to the peculiar cases of progressive assimilation it should be noted that the “normal” regressive development in Slavic is also attested in Sav I: **моуѣнага** 5b 15 and **исѣ цѣрк|вѣ** 11a 9–10.

### 3.3.3. *Reduced vowels*

Apart from the many cases where the reduced vowels are retained in accordance with their etymology, Knjazevskaia (Ск 38) observes instances of the absence of weak jers as well as *ь* > *е* and *ѣ* > *о* in strong position. She mentions ten cases of replacement: **прише|ць** 5a 1–2, **пришелъ** 9a 9, **во нь** 10b 12, **тѣмницю** 12b 4, **на|до всѣми** 13b 1–2, **исти|ненъ** 13b 12–13, **неверенъ** 15a 11, **равенъ** 18a 4, **весь** 18b 8, and **прише|лъ** 22b 9–10. To this may be added: **наченъ** 6a 3, **шедъшею** 7b 4, **пришедъ** 24a 9, and also **оуповасте** 21b 15, where *о* for weak *ѣ* prevented a difficult consonant cluster.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, Knjazevskaia gives five examples of omission: **с нама** 6a 10, **ѡвца** 11a 10, **к немоу** 12b 14, **вѣчнаго** 15b 7, and **правдъ|нъ** 20a 6–7. In total I counted some 140 cases of loss of weak jers, the majority of which are in first stem syllables. In other positions weak jers are omitted relatively rarely (some twenty cases), e.g. **четы|рми** 11b 13–14, **запечатлѣ** 13b 12, **держат сѧ** 14b 3, **оуслѣвшѣ** 19a 16, **брашно** 23b 16, 24a 1.

In the edition the following instances of confusion of jers are listed: **въ тѣмѣ** 1b 8, **свѣти|тъ сѧ** 1b 8–9, **тѣма** 1b 9, first person singular **имаѣ** 20b 10;<sup>12</sup> first person plural **вѣмъ и глѣмъ** 10a 13, **свѣтъ** 17a 15, dative plural **словесемъ** 22a 4, **поль** 22a 6, **и|свѣченъ** 24b 6–7.<sup>13</sup> An additional case is **предъ нимъ** 13a 7. According to Knjazevskaia, “[о]тдельные написания среди них допускают предположение об отражении фонетически закономерного отвердения согласных (**азъ имамъ**) и, следовательно, возможна гиперкоррекция в примерах: **имъ** [cf. below, note 13 – JS], **вѣмъ**” (Ск 38). The loss of word-final jers and the subsequent hardening of *m*’ (cf. Зализняк 1993, 263–265; 1995, 62–63) may well have produced spellings of the type instrumental singular **нимъ** and first person singular **имаѣ**, as well as first person plural **вѣмъ и глѣмъ** and dative plural **словесемъ**. Similarly, the hardening of word-final *t*’ may be reflected in **свѣти|тъ сѧ** and **свѣтъ** (cf. Зализняк 1995, 63, who also notes that third person present forms on *-тъ* start to appear in birchbark letters from the middle of the fourteenth century), although in both cases the spelling of neighbouring forms may have been of influence: **свѣтъ приде|тъ** 17a 15–16 and especially **свѣти|тъ сѧ** 1b 8–9 which is immediately preceded and followed by eight instances of **тъ-** or **-тъ** within four lines (John 1, 4–5). In two of the three cases of **тъ-**, **въ тѣмѣ** and **тѣма** (already mentioned above), it is not clear whether the spelling points to a phonetic

development or is simply erroneous.<sup>14</sup> The third case is the pronoun **тѣмь** 1b 6 in **въ тѣмь животѣ бѣ**, the first words written by the main scribe of Sav I. Here **ѣ** instead of **о** might reflect *бытовой* spelling (cf. below). As for **поль** in **на ѡнѣ поль морѣ** 22a 6, there is a parallel of *l'* instead of *l* in НБГ 682: **посѣлла** for *poslala*,<sup>15</sup> whereas the reverse development is attested several times on birchbark as well as in medieval manuscripts from Pskov: “По-видимому, по крайней мере часть этих примеров отражает свойственные каким-то говорам древненовгородского (в широком смысле) ареала изменения в артикуляции *л'* и *л*” (Зализняк 1995, 64).<sup>16</sup>

There are some instances of **ѣ** and **ь** where we would expect **о** or **е**, respectively. This is regarded by Knjazevskaja (Ск 38) as *бытовой* spelling. She mentions **тѣмь** 1b 6 (cf. above), **вълѣ** 11a 10 instead of **волѣ**, **вълл** 20a 8 instead of **волл**, and **прѣломльни** 6b 17 instead of **прѣломлени**. She also lists the dative plural form **тѣ|ржъникѣмь** 11a 10–11 which, however, is ambiguous because either “**ѣ** после **к** исправлена из **о**” (thus Ск 84, fn. 10–11) or the other way around (the facsimile leaves room for both interpretations). As for **ь** instead of **е**, there is not only **прѣломльни**, but also twice **сѣ** (1b 3, 3a 7) where the neuter **се** is to be expected, as well as the supine **овль|ць** 6a 13–14 for regular **овлещь**.

Furthermore, we find one case of **ь** where perhaps **ѣ** should be read: **моурино-сиць** 24a 7 for dative singular **моуриносицьѣ**. However, the possibility of textual corruption should not be excluded.<sup>17</sup> The few cases of **ѣ** where one might expect **ь** are also hard to interpret as undisputed *бытовой* spelling. First, **нѣсмѣ** 3a 13, 16 for the regular first person singular **нѣсмь** could be a simple error (cf. Ск 38: “Не исключено, что [...] на употребление **ѣ** оказывала влияние закономерная буква **ѣ** в соседних слогах”), although the possibility of a local variety should not be ruled out.<sup>18</sup> Second, **трѣми** (**днѣми**) 11b 11 does not only alternate with the original form **трѣми** (**днѣми**) 11b 16, but also with **трома** 16a 9 (in **по двѣма ли трома мѣрамѣ**). The latter instance clearly indicates that the original form had undergone a phonetic change (with *'e > o* and possible hardening of *r'*; cf. **можожетѣ** and **творѣца|творѣца** treated in 3.2).

#### 3.3.4. \*Тѣт and \*Трѣт

Knjazevskaja suggests that there is a distinction in the reflection of Proto-Slavic sequences of the type \*Тѣт/Тѣт on the one hand and old \*Трѣт/Трѣт-groups on the other: “Так же часто **о**, **е** вместо **ѣ**, **ь** находим в словах с сочетаниями типа \*тѣт: [...]. Интересно, что слова с древними сочетаниями типа \*трѣт последовательно пишутся с **ѣ**, **ь**: [...]. Считаем, что приведенные примеры скорее свидетельствуют в пользу XIII, а не XIV в.” (Ск 38). I think that the distinction is less obvious than suggested by Knjazevskaja and does not indicate a different development of jers in the

two Proto-Slavic sequences. First, whereas Knjazevskaja lists seventeen cases of *o*, *ε* in \**TbrT/TbrT*-groups, there are also nine instances where we find *ъ*, *ь*: *първъи* 2b 13, *смърти* 5a 12, 19a 2, 11, *ѿвѣржоста* 6a 17 (cf. *ѿверстѣ* 8b 16), *въ|рвни* 11a 8–9, *тъ|ржъникъмъ* 11a 10–11, *мъртвъи|а* 18b 3–4 and *мъртвъи* 19a 15 (cf. *мъртвъхъ* 12a 4). Second, the seven cases of *ъ*, *ь* in \**TrьT/TrьT*-groups are confined to three lexemes in four different places in the Gospel text: *нѣ ѿ крѣви ни ѿ похоти* || *пльтьскы* 2a 17–2b 1 and *слово пльть бѣы* 2b 3 in John 1, 13–14, *ро|женое ѿ пльтни пльть | ксть* 9b 13–15 in John 3, 6, *вѣ иѿ|анъ крѣстѣи* 4a 8–9 in John 1, 28, and (*ѿ*ъ) *к|ръцаше* 12a 13–14 in John 3, 22. It is obvious that *крѣвь*, *пльть/пльтьскы*, and *крѣстити/крѣцати* are used here in a strict biblical meaning, so that the jer-spellings are most likely due to Church Slavonic practice.

It should also be noted that Sav I contains two cases of *второе полногласие*: *пърстѣ* 15a 7 (cf. *перста* 14b 13) and *дѣръзноу* 24a 13. Both instances reflect the early innovation in NWOR of *TbrьT* > *TbrьT* before hard dentals (cf. Зализняк 1995, 41).

### 3.3.5. *Jat'*

In 3.3.2 a few incidental cases of *бытовой* spelling were treated that involved jer-letters (*ъ–o*, *ь–ε*, and, although less convincing, *ь–ѣ*). According to Knjazevskaja (Ck 38–39), the frequent cases in Sav I, where the letter *ε* is used to render historical *ě* (and *vice versa*), should also be explained as a *бытовой* orthographic practice. I agree that the use of *ε* for *ě* is of a graphic nature and cannot be considered as evidence for a phonetic change (even though *ě* did indeed merge with *e* in Pskov dialects; cf. recently Галинская 1997, 68–69, 81–83). On the other hand, this practice has a different (i.e. Church Slavonic) origin than the one involving *ъ–o*, *ь–ε* and is also found in “книжные” orthographic systems (cf. on this Зализняк 1986, 106–109; 1995, 23–25, 43–44). It is therefore not surprising that Sav I shows far more cases of interchange of *ε–ѣ* than of *ъ–o*, *ь–ε*.

Knjazevskaja enumerates five instances of *ѣ* instead of *ε* and twenty-six of *ε* instead of *ѣ*.<sup>19</sup> In fact, we have five extra cases of the first type: *рѣмень* 4a 5, as well as the present tense forms *имѣте* 15b 5, 22a 5, *приимѣте* 21b 4, and *ицѣте* 21b 11. As for the use of *ε* to render *ě* I also counted twice as much instances, e.g. the dative forms *тебе* 9a 17, 9b 10, 10a 12 and *себе* 21b 2; *предъ* 4a 2, 5a 8, 13a 7, *преже* 8b 2, 16b 7, and *пре-* in *прѣвѣста* 7a 16, *прѣдѣть* 19a 1, and *прѣвѣвающеε* 24a 1; *въ срѣ* 7a 1 and *средоу* 17b 12; the aorist forms *оумре* 24a 16 and *оумре|тъ* 24b 1–2.<sup>20</sup> The asymmetrical interchange of *ε–ѣ* is the same one as in birchbark letters

where “примеры ъ вместо е (не обусловленные какими-либо особыми частными причинами) встречаются в десятки раз реже, чем примеры е вместо ъ. Такая несимметричность сама по себе говорит в пользу того, что соответствующие фонемы не совпали” (Зализняк 1986, 108).

### 3.3.6. Word-final **ѣ**, **и** instead of **ѣ**, **ь** before **и**

There are a few cases in Sav I where the letters **ѣ** and **и** are used to render “normal” **ѣ** and **ь** in word-final position. Knjazevskaja (Ск 39) notes that final **ѣ** and **и** are regularly followed by **и**: **да въ|просати и** 3a 10–11, **иже глѣти и** 5b 8, **да въ|схытати и • и створиати и** 22b 1–2; **приати | и** 2a 13–14. In the four cases of **-и** we are dealing with third person plural forms of the present tense, whereas **-ѣ** belongs to a third singular aorist form. There are two additional cases mentioned by Knjazevskaja: **добро бы|тъ и** 8a 9–10 and **сѣньми и** 24b 4. However, **бытъ** should be excluded since it is an infinitive (where final **ѣ** instead of **и** is most probably a spelling error). In the case of **сѣньми** we would expect a past participle **сѣньмѣ**.

Knjazevskaja finds it difficult to explain this phenomenon: “Подобные написания известны в древнерусских юго-западных рукописях XII–XIII вв., их наличие не отмечалось в рукописях иной территориальной принадлежности. Убедительно объяснить их в этой части кодекса, на наш взгляд, не представляется возможным” (Ск 39). She leaves open the possibility of a phonetic development in the native dialect of the copyist, although **-и** and **-ѣ** might also reflect the language of the original, “который мог быть и галицко-волыньским. Все остальные приметы письма и языка части I кодекса № 14 соответствуют нашим представлениям о Псковской земле”.

Let us have a closer look at the material. All six instances where we would expect final **-ѣ** or **-ѣ** are followed by **и** in the sense of ‘eum’, not ‘et’. Thus, we are dealing with so-called tense jers in sequences of the type *\*-ьjъ* and *\*-ѣjъ*. The orthography **-ни** and **-ѣни** used for these sequences is well-known in Church Slavonic, not only in *inlaut* but also in cases involving the clitic **и** ‘eum’ (cf. e.g. **сѣньми и** in the Codex Marianus in the same verse – Marc 15, 46 – where Sav I reads **сѣньми и**; for details see Diels 1963, 68–69). As for Sav I, tense jers in *inlaut* are in the majority of cases reflected as **ѣ** or **и**: **истиньѣни** 2a 6, **бѣжикѣ** 2a 15, **градѣни** 2b 11, **исполнениа** 2b 14, **кди|ночадѣни** 3a 4–5, etc. A few instances of **ь** can be found, but they are to a large extent restricted to proper names (**ильѣ** 3b 14, **ти|верьѣдѣска** 22a 6–7, **тнверьѣдѣ** 23a 15) and the fixed expression **цѣтѣкъ бѣжик** (attested three times).

In view of the fact that the set of non-Church Slavonic linguistic features point to the Pskov area, it should be noted that the orthography **-ни** and **-ѣни** could

well be identified with the development of the sequences *\*-bjb* and *\*-tjb* into *-ij* and *-yj* as observed by S.L. Nikolaev in certain northwestern Russian dialects (Николаев 1988, 118–121; 1990, 55–56; cf. also Зализняк 1995, 53–54). In fact, the consistent spelling of *-ни* and *-ъни* (as opposed to many cases of *-ъ* or *-ъ* before *и* ‘et’ and no counterexamples of *-ъ* or *-ъ* followed by *и* ‘eum’), makes it more likely that we are dealing with the influence of the copyist’s speech rather than with a Church Slavonic influence of the *vorlage*.

### 3.3.7. Additional observations

(1) As for the use of *-ни* to render *-j* in cases like *да въ|просати ни* (cf. the previous section) I would like to draw attention to the same practice in intravocalic position: *достонинъ* 4a 4, *принимъ* 6a 15, and also nominative plural *архъникрѣни* 5a 10. In the latter case the edition (*Ск* 60) offers the wrong reading *и како | прѣдша архъникрѣи и | князи . . .* (Luke 24, 20). In fact, the superscript *и* is ‘eum’, the dotted *и* is part of *архъникрѣни* and the next *и* is ‘et’.<sup>21</sup> It is possible that intravocalic *j* is also reflected as *и* in birchbark letter № 21a from Staraja Russa (first half twelfth century): *оу короцькове<sup>не</sup>* (cf. the *прорисъ* in Янин & Зализняк 1993, 109). However, since this is the only case in the entire corpus that could allow for such an explanation, Zaliznjak’s alternative interpretation seems to me still more plausible: “необычное окончание *-еие* здесь скорее всего объясняется тем, что автор сперва написал *-еи*, а затем решил исправить это на *-ее* (но *и* осталось незачеркнутым)” (Зализняк 1995, 282).

(2) In *каравль* 22b 7 and *армафты* 24b 15 we are probably dealing with *аканье*, a feature that is well-attested in historical texts and modern dialects from the Pskov area (cf. Галинская 1997, 70–71, 85–92). However, in both cases a simple writing error should not be ruled out. The first lexeme is spelled further on in Sav I (fol. 22b and 23) several times as *коравль*, whereas the second one is attested only in the older Russian part (*ароматты* 154a 10, *аро|матты* 155b 19–20).

(3) In 19a 15 we find the masculine nominative plural form *мьртвѣни*. The ending *-yi* is attested on birchbark in the middle of the fourteenth century (cf. Зализняк 1995, 106).

### 3.4. Palimpsest

According to the edition (*Ск* 13), Šćepkin was the first to mention that Sav I is a palimpsest (cf. Щепкинъ 1899, 2–3). This fact, however, was already noticed by Jagić in 1881: “diese Blätter sind auf Palimpsest geschrieben, das veranlasst den Akademiker Вуѣков zu behaupten, der ganze Zusatz sei nicht in Russland

gemacht, da man dort Palimpseste nicht kenne, sondern vielleicht auf dem Athos” (584). The only folio that is not a palimpsest is fol. 7. With modern techniques it should not be that difficult to read most of the incompletely erased cyrillic text which belongs in the opinion of Ščerkin to “какой-то богослужебной книги XIV вѣка, русской редакціи, формата первоначально значительно бѣльшаго, нежели Саввина книга; почеркъ этого богослужебнаго текста есть хорошо извѣстный стильный русскій уставъ середины XIV вѣка” (Щепкинъ 1899, 3). In the new edition we can read (Ск 13) that the underlying text was identified in 1993 by R. Mathiesen as part of a *требник*.

It should be pointed out that the bifolia 1–8 of the first quaternion as well as 9–16 and the single folio 10 of the second quaternion were recycled upside down. The first four palimpsest lines on fol. 9b can be read without great difficulty: ... **ОБЛЕЦѢ|ТЕ СЯ ВО ВСА ОРУЖІА БІНА [М]ОЦИ | ВАМЪ СТАТИ ПРОТ[И]ВУ КОЗНЕМ | НЕПРИАЗНЫТЪМЪ ...** In fact, this is a fragment from the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eph 6, 11). The passage also occurs in the oldest extant Slavic *требник*, the Euchologium Sinaiticum (Euch). The palimpsest lines quoted from fol. 9b in Sav I correspond to fol. 93b 18 and further in Euch (cf. Nahtigal 1942, 291). Elsewhere, too, we can recognize similar passages in the palimpsest text of Sav I and Euch: fol. 11a 1–2 = Euch 94b 9–10, fol. 11b 1–2 = Euch 95 a 8–10, fol. 12a 1–2 = Euch 97a 4–6.

On the basis of the new edition it is not possible to make any general conclusions about the linguistic properties of the palimpsest text. Nevertheless, I would like to make two observations. In addition to the imperative form **ОБЛЕЦѢ|ТЕ** on fol. 9b we encounter in the first palimpsest line of fol. 11b another example of **Ѣ** instead of **Ѣ**: **НЕПРЕСТАННО**. A third case is **ВРЕДА** in the final palimpsest line on fol. 21a (**ВЪ ВСАКОГО ВРЕДА**). These examples, taken from the small portion of text that is clearly visible on the facsimile, remind us of the same practice as in Sav I (cf. above, 3.3.5). Furthermore, in the first palimpsest line on fol. 12a we find **ШЛОМЪ** ‘helmet’, where we would expect either Church Slavonic **ШЛѢМЪ** (perhaps spelled as **ШЛЕМЪ**) or Old Russian **ШЕЛОМЪ**. For a discussion of other cases of \**TorT* > *TroT* in Old Russian documents (among which birchbark letters) as well as contemporary Russian dialects and toponyms in the Novgorod area, I refer to Zaliznjak (Зализняк 1995, 35–36).

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The title page of *Саввина книга* informs us that this is the first part of a new edition. In the introductory chapters it was difficult to find information on the second volume to come. It is only on p. 36 where the palimpsest text of Sav I is discussed that we read: “Прочтение нижнего письма будет представлено во II-й части работы”.

In addition to an edition of the underlying text of Sav I, it would be useful to have an exhaustive and detailed glossary which would include the words of the four parts of Sava's Book. Hopefully, such a glossary will also be incorporated in the second volume.

I would like to end by calling attention to some interesting observations in a recent article by N.V. Ubyjvovk (УБЫЙВОВК 1995), in which he gives a brief account of local features in four fourteenth-fifteenth century Church Slavonic evangeliaries from the Pskov area. They all display the same characteristics as found in Sav I, especially *цоканье*, *шоканье*, and the frequent interchange of *ѣ* and *ѣ̆*. One of the four evangeliaries deserves particular notice. It belonged together with Sava's Book to the supply of manuscripts that came from Pskov to the Moscow Synodal Printing House in the last quarter of the seventeenth century (now РГАДА, фонд 381, № 21). According to Ubyjvovk, № 21 has a marginal note on fol. 36b saying "помози ги рабу своем савя попу" (УБЫЙВОВК 1995, 141), which of course reminds us of the same inscription on fol. 56a of Sava's Book (cf. above, 0). He also observes that the handwriting of this note is "идентичен основному. Вероятно, поп Сава – переписчик рукописи. Псковский писец Сава-поп известен как один из создателей Шестоднева 1374 г. Эта рукопись хранится в том же 381 фонде ЦГАДА, № 67 [...]. Почерки Тип-21 и Шестоднева похожи: вероятно, они принадлежат одному человеку – Саве-попу". It would be interesting to find out if this person can somehow be connected with Sava's Book.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to my Leiden colleague Willem Vermeer for many helpful comments.

<sup>2</sup> There is no photograph of fol. 1a, because "[с]траница 1а не имеет текста" (Ск 47; cf. also Ск 700 and 703, where the same is said of fol. 165b and 166b). According to Šćepkin, however, on fol. 1a we find traces of an erased text, "на немъ мелкимъ почеркомъ, повидимому XIV вѣка, написано: **престою твою**" (Щепкинъ 1899, 3). The marginal note is also mentioned in the *Сводный каталог ...* of 1984, although "[в] настоящее время эта запись уже почти не видна" (31).

<sup>3</sup> On those folios where the old and new pagination differs, both page numbers are given in the edition. There are even folios with three different page numbers, the third one being the result of an erroneous rearrangement of some folios carried out during the first restoration of the manuscript (cf. Ск 41).

<sup>4</sup> However, Šćepkin gives nine solid paleographic and orthographic reasons why part IV was copied by a different hand – using only one jer (ѣ̆) – in the same area or even scriptorium and at roughly the same time as part II: "если писецъ л. 165-го [now 166 – JS] и писецъ Саввиной книги были современниками, то первый быть можетъ говорилъ на другомъ, менѣе архаичномъ говорѣ. Возможно однако, что оба писца отдѣлены другъ отъ друга известнымъ промежуткомъ времени" (Щепкинъ 1899, 7).

<sup>5</sup> For a comprehensive list of publications cf. *Сводный каталог...* 1984, 32–33. Schaeken & Birnbaum 1999, 100–102, offer the latest description (including bibliographical data) of the Old Church Slavonic part.

<sup>6</sup> This hypothesis has been called into question, although without any specific argumentation, by H.G. Lunt: "There is good reason to believe that these pages [part III – JS] were *not* originally written to fill lacunae in Sav, but that they are a fragment of a different manuscript, added to Sav at a considerably later date. They do not constitute proof that Sav was in Rus at the turn of the eleventh century" (1981–1982, 405, fn. 1).

<sup>7</sup> A list of pericopes in the Old Church Slavonic part of Sava's Book is provided by Ščerkin (Щепкинъ 1903, V–VII). For the older Russian part see the list in Tot 1995, 26.

<sup>8</sup> Note the transition to the next verse and the next page: ... **ѡКО ОЦЬ МА ПО||СЛАВЪИ МА ОЦЬ ТЪ...** (20b 17–21a 1).

<sup>9</sup> With "the northwestern variety of Old Russian" I have in mind the set of marginal northwestern dialects that did not undergo the Second Palatalization. In terms of the names of early medieval tribes this complex is referred to by Zaliznjak (Зализняк 1995, 3–4) as "севернокривичский диалект", encompassing both the dialect of medieval Pskov (i.e. "совокупность местных говоров Псковской земли") and the dialect of Old Novgorod "в узком смысле" (i.e. "[д]иалект самого Новгорода и непосредственно прилегающих к нему районов"). For a critical discussion of Zaliznjak's detailed classification of the (socio)linguistic situation in and around Novgorod in the eleventh through fifteenth centuries see Vermeer 1997a, 23–30.

<sup>10</sup> The linguistic information provided in Ck 36–39 corresponds almost *verbatim* with the text in Князевская 1990, 221–226. The same holds true for the discussion of the language of the older Russian part: Ck 35 = Князевская 1990, 219–221.

<sup>11</sup> In the case of **оВРѢТОША** 5b 5 it is not clear whether the copyist had the past active participle **оВРѢТЪША** in mind (which is to be expected on the basis of the Greek text and the corresponding Church Slavonic translation) or the aorist form **оВРѢТОША** (attested only a few lines further: 5b 10–11).

<sup>12</sup> Ck 38 also mentions **ИМАМЪ** 3b 2. However, this is not a first person singular, but plural form.

<sup>13</sup> Ck 38 also mentions **ИМЪ** 2a 3. However, this is not a dative plural, but instrumental singular form.

<sup>14</sup> Ck 38 also cites **ТЪМОУ** 17b 1, although on the basis of the facsimile there might be room for reading **ТЪМОУ**.

<sup>15</sup> Note that НБГ 682 is one of the few birchbark letters that has a case of *шоканье*: **во борожь < вь бѣръзѣ** (cf. Зализняк 1995, 43, 323).

<sup>16</sup> In this context I would also like to draw attention to the spelling of 'Maria Magdalena' as **мѣрна же магда|инни** in 24b 9–10 as opposed to **мѣрна магда|ынны** in 24b 13.

<sup>17</sup> The Ostromir Gospel has at the same place the plural form **мѣроносца|мъ**.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Зализняк 1995, 62–63, 120–121 for the variety in first person present forms of athematic verbs that are attested on birchbark. Note also the first person plural form **тѣвори|мъ** 24a 5.

<sup>19</sup> **ицете** 23b 12 is not an imperative but a present tense form and therefore should not be listed as a case of *ѣ* instead of *ѣ*.

<sup>20</sup> In addition, we find some examples where the copyist corrected *ѣ* afterwards into *ѣ*, e.g. **оВРЕТОХОМЪ > оВРѢТОХОМЪ** 8a 5, **соѣе > соѣѣ** 8a 13.

<sup>21</sup> There are also some instances in Sav I where *j* is not indicated: **андрѣа** 7b 1, **андрѣова** 8a 1, **нюдѣ|скоую** 12a 11–12. Since we are dealing either with a foreign name or with a case in line-final position I doubt whether these are examples of a phenomenon that is widespread in fifteenth-century documents from Pskov (cf. Галинская 1997, 78, 106).

## REFERENCES

- Волковъ, Н.В.: 1897, *Статистическія свѣдѣнія о сохранившихся древнерусскихъ книгахъ XI–XIV вв. и ихъ указатель*, Санктпетербургъ.
- Галинская, Е.А.: 1997, 'Из исторической фонетики псковскихъ говоров', К.В. Горшкова, М.Л. Ремнева (ред.), *Русские диалекты: История и современность*, Москва, 67–119.

- Дограмаджиева, Е.: 1993а, 'Ролята на л. 165 в състава на Савина книга', *Palaeobulgica/Старобългаристика* 17/4, 16–21.
- Дограмаджиева, Е.: 1993б, 'Грешки в календара на Савина книга', И. Дуриданов (ред.), *Лингвистични и етнолингвистични изследвания в памет на акад. Владимир Георгиев 1908–1986*, София, 152–158.
- Зализняк, А.А.: 1986, 'Новгородские берестяные грамоты с лингвистической точки зрения', В.Л. Янин, А.А. Зализняк, *Новгородские грамоты на бересте (из раскопок 1977–1983 гг.)*, Москва, 89–219.
- Зализняк, А.А.: 1993, 'К изучению языка берестяных грамот', Янин, Зализняк (1993), 191–321.
- Зализняк, А.А.: 1995, *Древненовгородский диалект*, Москва.
- Каринский, Н.М.: 1914, 'Перечень важнейших неточностей последнего издания Саввиной книги', *Известия ОРЯС ИАН* XIX/3, 206–216.
- Князевская, О.А.: 1990, 'Древнерусские дополнения в рукописи № 14 Типографского собрания', *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* 25–26 (Fs. L'. Dugovič), 217–231.
- Князевская, О.А.: 1998, 'Об изучении рукописи Саввиной книги (РГАДА, фонд 381, № 14)', Т.А. Агапкина (ред.), *Слово и культура I* (Gs. Н.И. Толстой), Москва, 406–414.
- Николаев, С.Л.: 1988, 'Следы особенностей восточнославянских племенных диалектов в современных великорусских говорах. I. Кривичи', *Балто-славянские исследования 1986*, 115–154.
- Николаев, С.Л.: 1990, 'К истории племенного диалекта кривичей', *Советское славяноведение* 1990/4, 54–63.
- Погорелов, В.: 1927, *Из наблюдений в области древне-славянской переводной литературы. III: Опыт изучения текста Саввиной книги*, Братислава.
- Сводный каталог...: 1984, *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР XI–XIII вв.*, Л.П. Жуковская (ред.), Москва.
- Соболевский, А.И.: 1884, *Очерки по истории русского языка I*, Киевъ.
- Срезневский, И.И.: 1867, 'Отрывокъ из русскаго списка евангельскихъ чтеній XI вѣка', *Свѣденія и замѣтки о малоизвѣстныхъ и неизвѣстныхъ памятникахъ (Сборникъ ОРЯС ИАН I/3)*, Санктпетербургъ, 44–57.
- Срезневский, И.И.: 1868, *Древнiе славянскiе памятники юсоваго письма I–II*, Санктпетербургъ.
- Тот, И.Х. [I.N. Tóth]: 1977, 'Русская часть Саввиной книги', *Dissertationes slavicae* 12, 177–205.
- Тот, И.Х. [I.N. Tóth]: 1990, 'Русская часть Саввиной книги. Корректурное издание текста', *Dissertationes slavicae* 21, 363–419.
- Тот, И.Х. [I.N. Tóth]: 1995, *Древнейшая русская часть Саввиной книги*, Сегед.
- Убийвовк, Н.В.: 1995, 'Псковские евангелия XIV–XV веков', Л.Я. Костючук (ред.), *Псковские говоры и их носители (лингво-этнографический аспект)*, Псков, 139–144.
- Федер, У.Р. [W.R. Veder]: 1995, 'Кодикологическая структура Саввиной книги', *Polata knigopisnaja* 27–28, 164–167.
- Щепкинъ, В.Н.: 1899, *Разсужденіе о языкѣ Саввиной книги (Сборникъ ОРЯС ИАН LXVII/9)*, Санктпетербургъ.
- Щепкинъ, В.Н.: 1903, *Саввина книга (Памятники старославянскаго языка I/2)*, Санктпетербургъ (reprint Graz 1959).
- Янин, В.Л., Зализняк, А.А.: 1993, *Новгородские грамоты на бересте (из раскопок 1984–1989 гг.)*, Москва.
- Diels, P.: 1963, *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik. I: Grammatik*, Heidelberg (2nd edition).
- Horálek, K.: 1948, *Význam Saviiny knižy pro rekonstrukci stsl. překlady evangelia*, Praha.
- Jagić, V.: 1881, 'Das altslovenische Evangelistarium Pop Sava's', *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 5, 580–612.

- Lunt, H.G.: 1981–1982, 'On the Old Church Slavonic Codex Assemanianus', *Македонски јазук* **32–33** (Fs. B. Koneski), 405–416.
- Nahtigal, R.: 1942, *Euchologium Sinaiticum. Starocerkvenoslovanski glagolski spomenik. II: Tekst s komentarjem*, Ljubljana.
- Schaeken, J., Birnbaum, H.: 1999, *Die altkirchenslavische Schriftkultur: Geschichte – Laute und Schriftzeichen – Sprachdenkmäler*, München.
- Sławski, F.: 1963, 'Uwagi o słownictwie Księgi Sawy', T. Milewski et al. (eds.), *Studia linguistica* (Fs. T. Lehr-Splawiński), Warszawa, 205–208.
- Slovník jazyka staroslověnského I–IV* (1966–1997), J. Kurz, Z. Hauptová (eds.), Praha.
- Vermeer, W.R.: 1997a, 'Notes on Medieval Novgorod Sociolinguistics', *Russian Linguistics* **21**, 23–47.
- Vermeer, W.R.: 1997b, Review of Зализняк (1995), *Russian Linguistics* **21**, 89–94.

*Rijksuniversiteit Groningen*