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1. Introduction

Areal features in the Balkans were subject to intensive research since the very discovery of first parallels between the affected languages. However, the diachronic dimension of this research was for long based mostly on isolate, exemplary instances interpreted as reflections of developments towards, say, analytic expressions of case relations or definiteness marking. Quantitative research based on digital and annotated corpora was not possible, as available resources included mostly texts of modern, standardized varieties. The preparation of such resources is the primary aim of the Annotated Corpus of Pre-Standardized Balkan Slavic Literature.

The following paper describes individual sources included in the second release of the corpus. Its primary purpose is to provide metadata about these sources for the reader, wishing to find and access the originals, be it for the sake of philology, diachronic linguistics or just fun. It also provides additional information about the context, origins and place of the given sources in time, space and society. As this kind of data is not always available - especially in case of older, anonymous manuscripts - this description sometimes turns into less technical, more speculative discussions, following both hints and clues in the manuscripts, as well as in the descriptions from the secondary literature.

Another role of this text, and also of the corpus itself, is to answer the question, which texts are relevant for diachronic studies of Balkan Slavic? The corpus hardly exhausts the vast number of manuscripts from the given period and area available to the scholars today. For this reason, the description of sources also contains arguments for the very choice of each text in the corpus. Furthermore, relevant linguistic features of individual texts, perceived as separate instances of development of local varieties and norms of language of literature, are not only described for each of the sources, but also serve as a basis for their comparison and classification.

2. Data

Selection of sources for a corpus of pre-standardized Balkan Slavic literature first requires us to clear the two key terms: what is meant with pre-standardized and what is Balkan Slavic. The latter has been already discussed in detail in the technical description of the corpus, which has been added to the first release in November 2020 (link). In short, the term shows the linguistic and geographic classification of the texts: on the one hand, the Bulgarian and Macedonian dialectal area; on the other hand, the Slavic varieties showing features typical for the Balkan sprachbund. From the synchronic point of view, these categories are roughly overlapping. From the diachronic view, the picture is somewhat more complicated due to presence of Church Slavonic, a language of literature, in which the Balkan features are not developed and reflected in the same way as in vernaculars.

The pre-standardized category is a temporal one. It is not a very exclusive club: standardization is a process, whose finish date is hard to determine with certainty. Changing territorial borders reflect themselves on the status of official and minority languages. They provide incentives for levelling of dialectal differences or distancing from the standardized variety in a neighboring state. In the Balkan area, the process of standardization is still a matter of heated discussion, concerning not only peripheral dialects of minorities1, but also the two varieties enjoying the status of an official language of sovereign state, Bulgarian and Macedonian. For this reason, the latest possible date for a text to be considered relevant for the corpus should still remain open.

However, for practical reasons we have chosen the emergence of authoritative grammars like those

---

1 E.g. Pomak in the southern slopes of Rhodope Mountains in Greece.
of Ivan Bogorov (Andreev 1844), Momčilov (1868) and Koneski (1952) as the milestones of standardization. The corpus includes some texts written after these dates, as they belonged to an area, which was likely isolated from the influence of the Bulgarian language reforms in the second half of the 19th century: \textit{Rai.	extit{d.}} from Rhodopes and maybe also \textit{NBKM 728} from Macedonia. Church Slavonic texts included in the sample - the folklorized tale of Trojan War from \textit{Vel.	extit{d.}}, the translation of a Modern Greek text in \textit{Kiev 	extit{d.}}, and a "portable" edition of an originally liturgical text from Vuković 1536 - represent the transitional, "post-standardized" stage, in which the archaic norms of the Resava and Tarnovo schools were giving way to new expressions, typical for the vernacular.

The majority of the included texts belong to the so-called \textit{damaskini} tradition, which has finished this step. These texts can hardly be ignored in any serious analysis concerning the development of the Balkan Slavic dialects in the period of 16th to 19th centuries. However, texts from other manuscript traditions were included too: either if their language was arguably close to the vernacular of the given period too, or if they were important from textological reasons.

The oldest of these documents are Church Slavonic translations of the book \textit{Thēsauros} by Damascênus Stoudítēs in the 16th century. \textit{Thēsauros} was a revolutionary work for the Greek literature. The author considered the archaic literary language of that time too alien for uneducated people. They were thus barred from the corpus of Christian lore and values, which the literature was supposed to convey to them. The matter of bolstering Christian identity among broader populace was the more pressing among Orthodox clergy in his time. The Greek lands were now subject to the Ottoman Empire, stipulating conversion to Islam by taxes and career opportunities. Influence of Reformation and Catholic missions was slowly taking shape as well. Thus Stoudítēs retold famous lives of saints and homilies into the contemporary Greek, the "common" (\textit{koinē}) language of the simple folk. Furthermore, he wrote in a dynamic narrative style, with numerous stories and explanations, refreshed by (of course, rhetorical) questions towards the audience. The book became very popular, with over fifty reprints in the following centuries.

The first translations did not adopt the idea of popularizing the lore by using a dialect. The earliest representative of this tradition in our corpus (\textit{Kiev 	extit{d.}}) is still just a translation into Church Slavonic, following the rules of the Resava orthography. This was, of course, also a kind of common language, which served mutual communication - at least on the level of literature - between the Slavic clergy of various lands. It was, however, not as accessible to the lay audience as the early Modern Greek of Stoudítēs. The first translations into the vernacular followed in the early 17th century. The classification of this language is difficult. Stoudítēs included in the titles of many chapters the phrase \textit{metaphrasteis eis tēn koinēn glōssan} 'retold in the common language', and its translations provide clues about the self-designation. Most Church Slavonic sources, as well as later sources like \textit{Sv.	extit{d.}}, translate the adjective \textit{koinē} directly with \textit{obšt} 'common'. Early vernacular damaskini like \textit{Tixon.	extit{d.}}, \textit{Trojan 	extit{d.}}, but also the later Church Slavonic \textit{Adžar 	extit{d.}} translate it with \textit{prosti} 'simple', \textit{novi} 'new', \textit{blгарски} 'Bulgarian' etc., emphasizing the accessibility of the text to broader audience. To distinguish

\textbf{2} According to the official \textit{Synaxarion} of the Greek Orthodox Church (available online - \url{link}).

\textbf{3} E.g. \textit{na obštie izzykь} in \textit{Sv.	extit{d.}} (Miletić 1923:126), \textit{obštim' iazikom' } (191, 259).

\textbf{4} E.g. \textit{prostym skazuwniemen} in chapter 1 of \textit{Trojan 	extit{d.}} (za desetěxь naouky movseovь, 1r; beginning missing in \textit{Tixon.	extit{d.}}). It is also found in CS \textit{Adžar 	extit{d.}} in various chapters (Demina 1968:86, 149, 177). Phrase \textit{prostym jazikom} is attested in \textit{Ber.	extit{d.}} in the chapter on John the Evangelist (Demina 1968:94) too.

\textbf{5} E.g. \textit{izvádi se na novy ezýkь} 'translated to a new language' in chapter 9 of \textit{Tixon.	extit{d.}} (мčenie stgo Dimitrija, 60v). This translation occurs also in \textit{Trojan 	extit{d.}} and \textit{Ber.	extit{d.}} (Demina 1968:119) in the same chapter. In CS \textit{Adžar 	extit{d.}} we find \textit{novago ezýka} in the title of the chapter about St. Eustatius (Demina 1968:82) too. The term \textit{new Bulgarian (novobolgarskij)} is also used by Demina.

\textbf{6} E.g. \textit{blгar'skym ezykom} in chapter 4 of \textit{Tixon.	extit{d.}} (вњздвиžение čstnago krsta, 21v; also attested in other sources of this chapter, cf. Demina 1968:160), chapter 7 of \textit{Trojan 	extit{d.}} (\textit{slvo apsła Tomy}, 57r).
it from Church Slavonic, as well as later Slavenobulgarian and present-day standard Bulgarian, we prefer the term simple Bulgarian for this variety⁷.

Another aspect common to both Thēsauros and its translations in Bulgaria were its eclectic contents. The first edition, published first in Venice in 1558 (Demina 1968:42), contained 36 chapters. The 1568 edition added further short 6 chapters by Albertos Marinos. Later editions contained chapters by Ioakinnios Kartanos instead (ibid.). Because of the differences in contents between the earliest Slavonic damaskini, it is likely that the printed Thēsauros circulated along with manuscript variants containing other chapters too (Demina 1968:50). Among the Church Slavonic editions, full translations of the Thēsauros are rare. Demina (1968:44) identified two exemplars holding the full translation by Gregory of Prilep: one (manuscript No. 318) was lost in Belgrade during the bombardment of the city in 1941, and the other was divided into two tomes, now preserved in Skopje (Krnino d.) and Kiev (Kiev d. of our corpus).

At the end of the 16th century, another translation has been produced in the Rila Monastery or in the Sredna Gora area, which is only partially preserved (Demina 1968:45). This translation was widely copied in the Balkan Mt. and Danube Basin area, where it was translated into simple Bulgarian varieties. These translations were likely partial - likely based on partial Church Slavonic transcripts. Known sources from these areas - both Church Slavonic and simple Bulgarian ones - are already transcripts from multiple sources. For example, Tixon.d. includes only 12 chapters (out of 41) taken from Thēsauros (Demina 1968:55). For this reason they are also unsuitable for a parallel comparison from the linguistic point of view. Instead, it is preferrable to focus on individual chapters. These can be traced to two classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tixon.d. - Life of St. Petka</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>togazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljub.d. - Life of St. Petka</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>togiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lov.d. - Homily against Drinking</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>togiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sv.d. - Life of St. Mary of Egypt</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>togizi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first classification denotes hypothetical original collections, whose contents and order of chapters was partly preserved in transcripts. Three such content-based types were reconstructed for simple Bulgarian damaskini; the fourth was posited rather on the basis of historical and linguistic data (Demina 1968:56-60). Hypothetical sources of the types I, II and IV included works by different translators (or editors), showing different dialectal features, which are usually distinguished by the relative temporal pronoun (‘then’) they were using (Velčeva 1964; Demina 1968:220; Mladenova 2014:521). Only the type III damaskini (represented by Lov.d. in our corpus) includes works from only one translator (togiva). Translations by the togiva translator are newer, and they occur in the type IV damaskini (like Ber.l.d. and Sv.d.) only. It is possible the two older translators (togazi and togiva) were separated more by the time than by the area (cf. Demina 1985:260). Many differences between the older (togazi and togiva) and newer (togivi-texts) sources also reflect rather orthographic (e.g. preference for <ъ> for /ja/, reflection of unaccented vowel shifts) than dialectal or diachronic differences. It makes sense to choose only relevant examples for the corpus from these categories, to prevent redundant amassing of practically the same data. In our choice of relevant examples we have preferred historically oldest available sources, as well as those, which were available to us as scans.

In our corpus we have also included texts from manuscripts, which are not directly related to the

---

⁷ The glottonym "Bulgarian" is used for historical reasons - the included sources do not use "Macedonian" or "Serbian", even if such names were more geographically appropriate for some of them.
damaskini tradition proper: NBKM 1069 from Belovo, Temski rukopis from Eastern Serbia, the Catholic collection NBKM 1423, as well as the miscellany of pop Punčo (PPS). Some of them contain texts authored by Stouditēs or included in damaskini collections of one of the four types described by Demina, but they were likely assembled by their respective writers from various sources. These sources reflect the general trends in literature in the broad Balkan Slavic area, which can be observed on a smaller scale of the damaskini tradition itself (especially late 18th/early 19th c. sources like Berl.d., NBKM 728, 1064) too: contents become more eclectic and the editors dare to adapt the language of the texts more and more towards their own preferences.

Another group of texts included in our corpus were written by Josif Bradati (NBKM 328) and his students (Jan.s., Ioann.d.). These are new translations from Greek sources, not unlike the 16th century damaskini. The spread of their language, classed as Slavenobulgarian, remained mostly contained to the West (Velčeva 1966:120). From these circles came also the famous Chronicle of Paisius, from which we have included the introduction (NBKM 370). Although it is written in Eastern Bulgaria (Elena), its scribe tries to preserve - rather than reproduce or adapt - the specific language of the source. It is possible that the texts in NBKM 1069 and PPS are also based on Bradati’s translation, but their language is more adapted to local (or author’s) dialects. Sophronius is another curious case: the author was schooled in the East, but his later works, like the Nedělnik 1806 in our corpus, reflect the Slavenobulgarian of the West.

For a better overview, we can classify our sources according to following criteria:

1. **Origin**: classification according to major dialectal areas (mostly following Stojkov 1993), which is indicated by the origin of the source or text. These are Macedonia (Vel.s., Kiev d., Krčovski 1814, NBKM 728), Rhodopes (NBKM 1423, Rai.d.), Serbia or Torlak area (Vuković 1536, Temski r.), West Bulgaria (NBKM 328, Jan.s., Ioann.d., PPS, Nedělnik 1806) and East Bulgaria (Lov.d., Tixon.d., Ljub.d., NBKM 1069, Berl.d., NBKM 1064, 1081, Nedělnik 1856). Variety may further specify the underlying dialect.

---

The scribe of the damaskin NBKM 345, the likely source of NBKM 1069, has also translated some homilies from the Thēsaurōs (Petkanova-Toteva 1965:93), thus we could designate him as a togava-translator. Bradati preferred the Church Slavonic temporal pronoun egda, which is not used in the Bulgarian dialects now (only ega is attested in the Rhodopean area; cf. BAN I:476).
2. **Norm:** hypothetical linguistic norm used by the editor/scribe. The most of our sources are of the **simple** Bulgarian type, the attempts to closely reflect the vernacular, not based on any codified grammar (Lov.d., Tixon.d., Ljub.d., Sv.d., Temski r., NBKM 1069, 1423, PPS, Berl.d., Krčovski 1814, NBKM 1064, 1081, 728, Rai.d.). **Simple** language contrasts with a) Church Slavonic (Vel.s., Vuković 1536, Kie d.), following rules of specific redactions (Kratovo, Resava), with b) Slavenobulgarian (NBKM 328, Jan.s., NBKM 370, Ioann.d., Nedělník 1806), which did not develop into a stable norm, and c) standard Bulgarian (Nedělník 1856), based on codified grammars. Variety can indicate a closer description of this norm too.

3. **Date:** text or (in a limited way) also source date indicate the time, when the text was translated or edited according to contemporary language. Major groups are 15th-16th century sources (Vel.s., Vuković 1536, Kie d.), which are all Church Slavonic, with more variety in the 17th (Lov.d., Tixon.d., perhaps Ljub.d.), 18th (NBKM 328, Sv.d., Jan.s., Temski r., NBKM 1069, 370, Ioann.d., NBKM 1423, PPS, Berl.d.) and 19th (Nedělník 1806, Krčovski 1814, NBKM 1064, 1081, 728, Rai.d., Nedělník 1856) centuries.

The corpus is composed of separate files, each containing texts from one source. Technical aspects of the structure of the data is described elsewhere. Here we describe only the philological information of the texts and their sources, as well as their relevance for the study of Balkan features in Bulgarian and Macedonian. In the following paragraphs we will introduce the individual sources included in this corpus.

To each entry we have attached statistical information concerning morphosyntactic features relevant for Balkan Slavic studies - changes in marking of definiteness, case relations, future tense and others. These enable us to make a simple quantitative comparison between the sources. The first number represents the total number of examples in the text, the second is the percentual frequency relative to the size of the text in tokens. The following filters in Excel were used for counting the data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominal articles</td>
<td>UD_ext: P NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal MASC/GEN/ACC endings</td>
<td>PoS_tag: begins with NM?c⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjectival articles</td>
<td>UD_ext: P ADJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended demonstratives</td>
<td>UD_ext: EXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dative possessive pronouns</td>
<td>PoS_tag: P????o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future particle šte</td>
<td>UD_ext: POSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long-form adjectives</td>
<td>PoS_tag: A??γ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synthetic infinitives</td>
<td>PoS_tag: begins with VMN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-nominative articles</td>
<td>PoS_tag: ends not in N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UD_ext: begins with P _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹ These instances were not counted, if the following token was an article in nominative (PoS_tag: PD-M?N, UD_ext: P NOM), e.g. déto si ugáždaš na uma+ ts 'what do you put on (your) mind' (Sv.d.). In this case, the -a ending likely represents the hiatus vowel between the article and the stem of the noun. If the status is ambiguous because the pronominal root falls out from the article (e.g. támo pominúvasi zivota+ si angelski tzín 'and an angelic host lived there', NBKM 1064), the token is included.

2.1. Vel.s. - Veleško sborniče

**Veleško sborniče** (cf. Conev II 1923:178), also called *Pop Slavkova knižica* (Karanov 1896:266; Mazon 1942:14), is a collection of handwritten texts by various people in 15th and 16th century. The contents
are eclectic, containing Christian, folklore and historical topics - prayers, hagiographies, a calendar, a gromovnik (an astrological interpretation of storms), chapters on Trojan War and kingdoms of the world. The texts are written in Church Slavonic using a simplified orthography. According to a sidenote on the title page, the collection was bound together in 1722 in Veles by the priest Slavko. Later it passed to the National Museum in Sofia, which passed it to the National Library of Bulgaria "St. St. Kirill i Metodii" in Sofia, where it is preserved under the signature HBKM 667 (45). A partial critical edition has been published by Karanov (1896:266-282). The final two chapters concerning geography (titled O velike petoki 'on Good Fridays') have also been digitalized by the University of Sofia "Kliment Oxridski" and are available at its website (link).

Our corpus contains the chapter called Tale of the Trojan War (Razkaz za Trojanskata voina) by Conev (II 1923:179), Tale of Alexander the Elder (Slovo větxago Aleťandra) in other sources (Petriceicu-Hasdeu 1879:183, Močuľskij 1899:371, Mirčev 1978:26, Tvorogov 1988:145). The text can be found on folia 109r-112v, which belong to a part dated by Conev to the 15th century. The text is different from the Legend of Troy (Trojanska pritiča) common in the Middle Bulgarian literature: it is considerably shorter, and the names of protagonists are different. At least three other versions of the Tale are attested in different manuscripts. A longer version is preserved in the manuscript NBKM 326 in Sofia, an 18th century manuscript from Adžar (Conev I 1910:319). An older, well studied version can be found at the National Scientific Library of Odessa, in the collection of V.I. Grigorovič (sign. 1/112) on folia 13v-19v. A critical edition of this version was published by A.I. Kirpičnikov (1891) and V. Močuľskij (1899:371-380). Another version was attested in a manuscript held at the State Archive in Bucharest (sign. Ms slav. 740). The source was first described by B. Petriceicu-Hasdeu (1879:181f.) and the Trojan War story was published soon afterwards by P.A. Syrku (1884:78-88). Miltenova (2018:59) mentions also two other sources: one in the manuscript CIAI 1161 of the Church Archive in Sofia, another in a manuscript in the collection of Jacinirskij at the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg (sign. 13.2.25). Both of these are similar to the Bucharest edition of the story.

The majority of the story is formed by the myth of the Trojan War with some amendments. Paris, named here by his epithet Aleťandra, by the help of his sorcerers meets Helen, called at most places Igulida, in their shared dreams. The name of Helen in this story - Igulida, Igulida, Golida - has also sparked curiosity of the scholars. According to Močuľskij (1899:376), in whose version the most common form is Giluda, the name was likely taken over from the folk stories about fever curses, denoting an evil spirit behind this curse. Paris-Alexander escapes the destruction of Troy and, with

---

10 The majority of the texts are written in a one-ýer (preferring ý) orthography without accentuation, which is identified with the Kratovo school (e.g. Conev II 1923: vii). Our text was written likely on a basis of a text following Resava rules, as ŷ comes twice in prepositions.

11 Arguably the most famous edition of the story is the richly illustrated Manasses Chronicle belonging to King John Alexander and its Vatican transcript (sign. Vat.Slav.2, p.84-102, available online - link). A digital edition of this edition with a dictionary has been published as an MA-Thesis by D. Ruseva in 2011. It has also been published online within the project Evolucija na gramatičeska stroez na bulgarska i ruska ejzik v sãpostavitelen plan (at SU Kliment Oxirdski and State University of St. Petersburg, 2017-2018, link) with partial publication by A. Bojadžiev and C. Dimitrova (link).

12 The manuscript was earlier held at the Library of the University of Odessa under the signature 12[38] (e.g. Mazon 1942:14), later 113/11 (Kopylenko & Rapoport 1960:550).

13 The etymology, the original form, as well as the reason for choosing this name for Helen is unclear. Miklosich (1865: link) has an entry for gilouda, a 'type of a sorceress' (magae genus), which "kills children by sucking their blood" (cit. a Serbian manuscript Cod.Slav. 183 at Austrian National Library). Already Kirpičnikov (1891:4) considered the name Igulida to be of Greek origin. Vasmer (I:405) translates giluda as 'tainted' (nečist), considering it a borrowing from Middle Greek (citing the Odessa version). Mazon (1942:27) identified giluda with Gelous mentioned by Sappho.
the help of Saracens, leads a war of revenge, in which 14 kings with their armies and 230 cities including Jerusalem are destroyed; an allusion to the adventures of the "younger" Alexander of Macedon (cf. Mazon 1942:30), but also showing parallels to biblical conquest of Canaan by Hebrews\textsuperscript{14}.

Such a remarkable synthesis of folklore elements with various literary traditions is scarce among the available texts. For this reason, as well as the mentioned distance from the literary standards of the late Middle Bulgarian period, the text has been included in our corpus. Our text was included in the Karanov's (1896:273-274), as well as in the Conev's (II 1923:180-181) description of the manuscript. Our text was first based on Conev's edition, corrected by using facsimiles of the original manuscript. Omitted passages, which render the text incomprehensible, as well as the lost beginning have been reconstructed on the basis of Odessa edition, adding in total 527 tokens in 78 sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>Razkaz za Trojanskata voina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>794 (+527)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>104 (+78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source date</td>
<td>15th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source origin</td>
<td>Veles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text date</td>
<td>15th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text origin</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>Church Slavonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Kratovo orthography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source contents\textsuperscript{15}</td>
<td>(section I, folio 1r) [katavasili], (13r) Slavš stym izbranuľu przadnikom, (section II, 46r) [tropari, kondaci molitvi], (62r) mesecoslov, (67v) pravilo stgo Vasilia, (section III, 75v) [gromovnik], (87r) o mscxix koliko koi držiti, (section IV, 89v) [Xoždenie Bogorodicę po mukax], (104r) [razkaz za sv. Agapija], (109r) [razkaz za Trojanskata vojna], (112v) O velikie petoky, (113r) Všprosi i otgovori [za carie i carstva] (Conev 1923 II:178-181)\textsuperscript{16}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal articles\textsuperscript{17}</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC.GEN/ACC nouns</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjectival articles</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ext. demonstratives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.POSS pronouns</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future particle šte</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long-form adjectives</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synthetic infinitives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3.PLAOR endings</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also other hints at an unknown Middle Greek basis or original of the story. The Trojan Horse is made of copper (or bronze?) instead of wood and seems to move on its own. It is led (\emph{i povele Ale\v{s}andra vvesti mednog kona}), not simply brought into the city. The text includes an incomprehensible adverb to describe the "walking" of the horse: \emph{a medni kons imantsky xo\v{z}daše} 'the horse walked by the means of \emph{imant}', in Odessa edition \emph{maeataskii}, in Bucharest (as well as CIAI 1161 and RAN 13.2.25) \emph{matatoky}. Syrku (1884:86) translates it as \emph{automatus}. Also Kirpičnikov (1891:2) considers it an erroneous reading of \emph{automaodos}. Jagić in a sidenote mentions the suggestion of Destinii, that the word may reflect Gr. \emph{metatopizōmenos} 'changing place'.

\textsuperscript{14} The title of other versions (e.g. in CIAI 1161: \emph{Slovo stgo ale\v{s}andra, kako oubi sianaa cra amoreiska i oga cra i *v* crei xannaosnyxe}) includes the reference to 12 (or 14) kings of Canaan, similarly to Ps 135:11. Names of Alexander's enemies - \emph{Sion} for Menelaus and \emph{Og} or \emph{Jug} for Agamemnon - are actually taken from biblical kings of Amorites and Bashan (cf. e.g. Num 21), as already recognized by Veselovskij (1884:77).

\textsuperscript{15} Titles are diplomatized (accents and spirits are removed, \emph{w > o}, \emph{u/i > i}). Titles in brackets are reconstructions by the editor.

\textsuperscript{16} Text in brackets represents titles reconstructed in the cited secondary literature or critical edition (in this case Conev 1923 II). According to personal communication with Dr. Uzunova of NBKM, the order of chapters was recently changed due to an accident, and the folios have received new numbers.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. below §3 for the description of statistical data included to description. The parts reconstructed on the basis of Odessa edition were excluded from the analysis.
2.2. Vuković 1536

So far the oldest part of our sample with a clear date, this Church Slavonic source presents an early example of Cyrillic printing, produced in the publishing house of Božidar Vuković in Venice. Published in a small format, the book was meant for travels. It contains various prayers and homilies, as well as hagiographies of St. Petka of Tarnovo and St. George. A scan of the 1536 edition is available in the Library of Matica Srpska in Novi Sad under signature PCp I 3.1, as well as online (link). The book, titled by librarians as Zbornik za putnike ("Traveller's collection") has 636 pages, the beginning is missing.

Our corpus includes the Life of St. Petka from this source, available on folia 191r-200v, with an illustration on 190v. It is a shortened version of the panegyric hagiography of St. Petka composed by Patriarch Euthymius in the 14th century. It was edited and adapted to Resava standard by monk Moses, whose name we know from the afterword. A critical edition of the text, based on an earlier edition by Vuković from 1520, was published by S. Novaković (1877). The same edition, following a different orthography (preferring \( \nu \)), is also preserved in the manuscript NBKM 665 in Sofia (f. 182r-193r), which also contains other elements of the liturgy in honor of the saint. Conev (1923:177) dates this manuscript already to the 15th century. The passages added to the Euthymius' work by Gregory Tsamblak during his stay in Serbia (ca. 1402-1409) were not reflected in the Moses' edition. It is thus likely, that the protograph of the editions in NBKM 665 and Vuković 1536 was much older then the copy used in our corpus.

Although the text is an example of Middle Bulgarian literature, it has been added into the corpus for textological reasons. The text is very close to the damaskini editions (Demina 1980:186). Among Church Slavonic damaskini, it is preserved only in the damaskin of Adžar from 1686 (Sreznevskij 1874:227). Final part of the text is also included in the 17th century manuscript NBKM 709 from Sliven - the rest is simple Bulgarian. The protograph of the simple Bulgarian edition, whose copies can be seen in Tixon.d., Ljub.d., NBKM 709 and similar sources, was likely based on the Moses' (or Vuković's) edition too, although an intermediary Church Slavonic edition may have existed. The translation attested in Berl.d. is directly based on the Moses' edition.

Damaged parts of the scan were reconstructed basing on the critical edition by Novaković (1877), as well as manuscripts NBKM 665 and NBKM 709. The songs for the praise following the hagiography in the original were not included. The text has been also published as a browser-capable digital edition (link), reflecting the structure of the manuscript, sentence-based translation and morphological

---

18 Both prints by Vuković and manuscripts with the full service of the NBKM 665 type seem to have been widespread. The panegyric Life, based on a 1547 edition of Zbornik of Vuković, was translated into Latin by Raphael Levakovich (1597-1649), a Franciscan friar of Croatian origin. It was published in print first in 1875 addenda to Acta Sanctorum (Rigollot 1875). A short Latin-Slavonic index based on this edition was made by Ilievski (2013). The shorter synaxar Life, which we can find in the NBKM 665, served likely as a basis for the later Church Slavonic version by Demetrius of Rostov, which was later translated by Sophronius of Vratsa in Nedělník 1806 (cf. its entry), and likely also by Punčo. The synaxar Life was also likely the basis of the Arabic translation by Patriarch Makarios az-Zā'im of Aleppo in 1650s (Feodorov 2006:16).

19 Presently in Petersburg, at the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, No. 79 of the collection of I.I. Sreznevskij (old signature БАН 24.4.32). Sreznevskij transcribes the year in the sidenote in the damaskin as "1636", but this does not match the given Cyrillic form (\( \xi\delta\varepsilon\nu\eta\sigma\delta \)). The given anno mundi dating (\( \xi\varepsilon\varphi\nu\varepsilon\delta \), i.e. 7194 ~ 1685 AD by the Alexandrian counting) approximates a later date too. Russian scholars (including Demina 1968:45) prefer the form канджарскй, as the village is called in the damaskin (actually кан'ярь), while Bulgarians (e.g. Petkanova-Toteva 1965, Dončeva-Панаяотова 1993) prefer the modern form (in fact, the village was renamed to Свецен in 1934).
annotation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>Žitie i žiznь přepodobnyje matere naše Petky</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>2247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source date</td>
<td>1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source origin</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text date</td>
<td>15th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text origin</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>Church Slavonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Resava orthography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source contents</td>
<td>(1r-25v) empty lists, (26r) prayers (pagination missing, handwritten), (32v) some handwritten notes concerning the year 1716, (34r) molitvenik (časoslov?) without beginning, (110v) sloužba akademicou Prěestyje Bec, (130r) kanonъ molbъs ke svoemou aggu xranitelju, (136r) čestnii parakliss stomu i slavnomu prrokou Kрstiju Ioannu, (146r) Čestnii parakliss přěstěi vlčci našei Bci (handwritten), (148r) continuing of other prayers (printed), (154v) Čestnii parakliss přěstěi vlčci našei Bci, (182v) Čestnii parakliss stomou i slavnomu prrokou Ille, (190v) Žitie i žiznь přepodobnyje (mtre) naše Petky, (202r) Mučenie Stgo i slavnago mčnika Georgiа, (225r) some handwritten notes, (225v) picture of the Cross, (227r) continuing of a text about Cross, (229r) Epistola Avgara cra, (232r) Čudo o stěmь oubrouse Gny, (233r-240v) empty lists, (241r) Katavasie, (281r) Otpělo po+ grčskómu ezýkou, (289r) Pripěla prazdnikomь izbrańnymь, (297r) Pasxala šs+ lounovnіikomь i+ sinažaramь, (309r) O širotě i+ dšgотa zemlі, (311r) afterword by hierodeacon Moses (Movsi), (312r-316v) empty lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal articles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC.GEN/ACC nouns</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjectival articles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ext. demonstratives</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.POSS pronouns</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future particle šte</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long-form adjectives</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synthetic infinitives</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3.PLAOR endings</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NOM articles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variety

2.3. Kiev d. - Kievski damaskin

Kievski damaskin is held in the National Library of Ukraine "V.I. Vernadsky" in Kiev under the signature IP Ф.301 № 290. It is basically a Church Slavonic translation of Thēsauros, preserving both the contents and the order of chapters. According to Ilievski (& Ilievska 2015:21f.), the damaskin was written in the Kičevo Monastery, which was a very productive literary center after its reconstruction in 1560s. As already mentioned above, the text is based on the earliest Slavic translation of Thēsauros by Gregory of Prilep (e.g. Demina 1968:42), most likely before he was elevated to the rank of a metropolite in the 1580s (Ilievski & Ilievska 2015:18). Due to its size, the translation was bound in two tomes already in the beginning, preserving the contents and order of chapters. The first tome (20 chapters) is held in Skopje; a facsimile with a detailed description was published by Ilievski (1972). The second tome (chapters 21-36) was brought to Kiev by the archimandrite Antonin Kapustin (1817-1894) likely during his visit to Macedonia in 1865 (Ilievski & Ilievska 2015:23).

For the corpus, we have selected the Life of St. Mary of Egypt, chapter 27 of Thēsauros. This is actually the only text by Stouditēs included in this corpus. We have used the facsimile provided by Ilievski (& Ilievska 2015:564-583, or pp. 226-246 by the pagination of the source). As it is the case with other
hagiographies in the *Thēsauros*, Stouditēs used an authoritative Greek version, here attributed to St. Sophronius of Jerusalem (†638), which he edited to a "common language" with minimal changes in the content (Ilievski & Ilievska 2015:41). Stouditēs authored only an *Afterword on Penance* (*Epilogos symbeleutikos peri Metanoiaos*), the rest reflects the Sophronius' text. There were actually more parallel translations of the *Life* circulating among the 17th century damaskinars: some of them were based on *Thēsauros* (Kiev d., NBKM 327 and Sv.d.), others on an older Church Slavonic translation (e.g. Tixon.d.; cf. Velčeva 1996), which, of course, lack the afterword by Stouditēs (Demina 1968:169).

The translation is done on a strict word-by-word basis. While the Stouditēs' edition switches between Modern and Koine Greek in Bible citations, the difference is not reflected in the Slavonic text. However, as Stouditēs' edition is mostly in Modern Greek, some Balkan features can be observed on the text well. Sometimes, the Balkan features are overtly avoided. Subjunctive constructions are often translated with Slavonic synthetic infinitives, even if a conditional or subjunctive marker would be more suitable, as it can be observed in the translation of (Ruthenian-born) Samuil Bakačič from the manuscript *NBKM 327*:

*Kiev d.: edâ wbrě´štet se ktô éže poučiti me ně´koe dělo inočъ´skoe.*
*NBKM 327: Oúbo estu li póne edînî nê´kta, iže da mè naouúčît nê´koeg dê´la kalúgerskago.*

Stouditēs 1751: *taxates einai kanenas hopu na me didâѢιε, tipotes ergon kalogerikêe;* 'is there anyone, who would teach me something about hermitry?'

Of course, some Balkan features surface because of the language shift in the native dialect of the translator. This can be well seen in the choice of case endings. The set of available options differs between Modern Greek, Balkan Slavic and Church Slavonic. In the following example, the Macedonian translator used a locative case instead of instrumental (used by Bakačič20), unsure how to render the ambiguous Greek dative:

*Kiev d.: jako tъ” polóži vь nbsa na wblácěx.*
*NBKM 327: jåko tь” wdévaestь nbo w´blaki*

Stouditēs 1751: *hoti autos periballei ton uranon en nefelais* '[because] He covers the sky with clouds' (Ps 147:8 NIV)

For our purposes, we have used a manual transcript based on the facsimiles provided in the edition by Ilievski. Similarly as Vel.s. and Vuković 1536, also *Kiev d.* is a source more typical for Church Slavonic or Middle Bulgarian literature. However, there are multiple reasons for its inclusion in the corpus. One is the Modern Greek original of the text, which interacts with both Church Slavonic and the supposed dialect of the translator/scribe. Another reason is the general lack of comparable sources from the Macedonian area, and especially its western part.

| Text title | Žitie i žiznь prěpodobnyje Marie Egipţënnî |  |
| Tokens | 4270 |  |
| Sentences | 599 |  |
| Source date | 1570s |  |
| Source origin | Kičevo |  |
| Text date | 1570s |  |
| Text origin | Macedonîa |  |
| Norm | Church Slavonic |  |
| Variety | Resava orthography |  |
| Source contents | (page 1) Slovo o prîtči mitara i farisea, (54) Vь prîtči bludnago, (88) O vtorem prišstvî, (135) Slovo ob izgnanii Adama, (160) Radi styе ikony, (211) Na poklonenie čstnomu i životvoreštomu krstu, (226) Žitie i žiznь prpinden |  |

20 Actually, the Slavic words used to translate *periballei* require different cases in Church Slavonic: *oděvati* could be used with both accusative (requiring a preposition: *oděvati se vь svoju krasotou* ‘to clothe oneself with his beauty) and instrumental, while *položiti* expects an accusative.

nominal articles 17 0.3981%
masc/acc nouns 71 1.6628%
adjetival articles 1 0.0234%
ext. demonstratives 7 0.0234%
dat. poss pronouns 3 0.0703%
future particle šte - -
long-form adjectives 253 5.9251%
synthetic infinitives 121 2.8337%
2/3.plaor endings 11 0.2576%
non-nom articles 7 0.1639%

2.4. Lov.d. - Loveški damaskin

Loveški damaskin is a manuscript in the Regional Museum of Loveč, designated L5, currently displayed at the office of Georgi Terzijski (link). As with other 17th century damaskini, it does not contain explicit information about its scribe or origin. Watermarks (three crescents; Mladenova & Velčeva 2013:10; link) are not conclusive, as they were used throughout the 17th century. On the analysis of the script, Mladenova and Velčeva (2013:11) suppose that it was written by four or five scribes, although they wrote very similarly to each other. The script is also similar to that of Avram Dimitrievič (+1710), the scribe of Trojan d. and other manuscripts from 1660-1670s, who was schooled at the monastery "Varovitets" in Etropole and later became very active in the Karlovo-Kuklen school (Ivanova 2016). It is possible that Lov.d. also comes from this period. Mladenova and Velčeva (2013:20) argue that the order of chapters and ornaments in the togiva-part of Tixon.d. seems to reflect a later edition than that of Lov.d., and for this reason, they consider Lov.d. to be older.

The damaskin belonged to a private collection until 1944, when it was donated to a čitalište "Nauka" in Loveč, which passed it to the Museum in 1980s (Mladenova & Velčeva 2013:9). The document escaped the attention of modern linguists until very recently. In 2013, a critical edition by Mladenova and Velčeva was published, alongside with an online edition, available at the website of the University of Sofia (link). From the point of view of the mentioned typology of damaskini, it is the first damaskin published of the type III described by Demina (1968:59), characteristic by containing only the texts of the togiva-translator, and by beginning with the Homily on the Second Coming of Christ by Damaskenos Stouditēs. This completed the quest for having published all of the major damaskini types (I - Kopr.d. in 1908, Trojan d. in 1967, Tixon.d. in 1972; II - Ljub.d. in 1895; IV - Sv.d. in 1923). Until the discovery of the Lov.d., the preserved examples of this type were too different from each other to determine the contents and structure of the original collection 21.

The damaskin contains only seven homilies, missing pages at the beginning and the end. Also multiple chapters are missing beginnings. For our corpus, we have selected the last chapter, the Homily against

---

21 The specific position of the Demina’s type III of simple Bulgarian damaskini is also apparent in the typology, proposed by Radoslavova (2013:344). Some of the damaskini (e.g. NBKM 721 and 1073 of the Demina’s type I, NBKM 1067 of the type IV) preserve the calendar setting of Thēsauros in the titles of the chapters, others only partially (other of the types I and IV, all of the type II). Damaskini of the Demina’s type III show no date. Instead of being based on the annual cycle of this world, they are collections of homilies on various topics of moral instruction - a "guide for eternity", as dubbed by Mladenova and Velčeva (2013:28).
Drinking, in full title Teaching for kings and counts and priests and all Christians about not getting drunk by wine (cf. below), which can be found on folia 85r-87r. The topic was common already in Old Bulgarian literature. Mladenova and Velčeva (2013:88) mention a homily On drinking (O pianstvě) in a late 12th or early 13th century Sbornik from the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius as the earliest attested example. They consider the text to be an original work in Church Slavonic, despite its attribution to John Chrysostomus.

The togiva-translator used likely a Church Slavonic source, which was similar to the edition included in the damaskin CIAI 134 from Lukovit (Prostranov 1900:211f.; Demina 1968; Mladenova & Velčeva 2013:90) dated to the end of the 17th century (Mladenova 2018:183). This edition has been included in the corpus file for reference. There are only minor differences in content. Translated are both the body text and Bible quotations, which are usually left in Church Slavonic in the togazi-texts:

CIAI 134: rěče bô velíky apsλь pávλь. jako piánicí ne naslě´detь crstvo nbsno. Lov.d.: Katô rčé i+ apsλь pávλь. oti piánicí crstvo nbsno ne+mógatь namě´ri.

'as Paul the Apostle says, the drunkards cannot find the Kingdom of Heaven' (1 Cor 6:10)

The simple Bulgarian version of the Lov.d. can also be found in Tixon.d. (chapter 20, cf. below) and in Sv.d. with only very minor differences. We have used the online edition of the damaskin as the basis of our corpus, with missing end (6 sentences, 106 tokens) complemented on the basis of the Tixon.d. edition.

2.5. Tixon.d. - Tixonravovski damaskin

The manuscript of the Russian State Library in Moscow with signature OP Φ.299 №702 (collection of N.S. Tixonravov) is one of the earliest known manuscripts containing longer passages of an early variety

---

22 Preserved in the Russian State Library in Moscow, sign. OP Φ.304/I №12 (link).
of simple Bulgarian. The scribe, the date and also the location of its composition are so far unknown. On the basis of watermarks, Lavrov established the earliest date at 1604 (Demina 1972:38). Miletić (1908:xxi) placed its origin to Sopot in the first half of the 17th century. But it was actually only bought by the church in Sopot from a certain priest Georgi. A priest Georgi sold a similar damaskin (NBKM 708) to the village of Protopopinci in 1689 (Demina 1968:10); but they do not have to be the same person. He would likely not be one of the scribes himself, but rather a "salesman" in service of the scriptorium (Mladenova & Velčeva 2013:22).

Demina (1972:33) identified three different scribes on the basis of the script, the first of which likely wrote a menaion from 1642 in the monastery "Varovitets". The watermarks on the paper are common in other damaskini discussed (three crescents; a crown, a star, a crescent) too. The particular designs used on the paper of Tixon.d. were dated to 1658-1678 by Demina (1972:38). As the relative dating of Lov.d. and Tixon.d. (see above) is not fully clear, we may place the origin of the manuscript roughly to 1650s-1670s in Etropol too.

According to a side note from 1829, it was given by priest Cvjatko from Sopot to a certain Xristo, who brought it to Kishinev to print it. Although Xristo writes in the note of his intention to send it back to Sopot, the book somehow remained in Russia. It is possible, that it was returned only to be taken by Jurij Venelin (†1839) during his journey in Bulgaria in 1830s (Kuev 2019), who even used the Life of St. Petka from this source as a model for orthography for modern Bulgarian, which he was working on (Demina 1998:96). Nikolai S. Tixonravov (1832-1893) received the manuscript from Mixail Pogodin, a fellow Slavist. In this time it was also studied by Lavrov (1899). His collection was given to the Rumyantsev Museum in 1912 (Kuev 2019). The repository was later to become the State Library of the USSR "V.I. Lenin", the predecessor of the present-day Russian State Library in Moscow. A full critical edition with a detailed study reaching far beyond the scope of this single damaskin has been published by Evgenia I. Demina (1972). She also led the publication of a dictionary based on the source (Demina et al. 2011).

The manuscript contains a partial translation of Θέσαυρος, as well as other texts in both Church Slavonic and simple Bulgarian. With its 41 chapters it is likely the best-preserved example of the early damaskini collections (Demina 1968:64). As already mentioned above, the simple Bulgarian part of the damaskin contains transcripts from at least two translators, distinguished by the pronouns togazi and togiva. According to Demina (1972:75f.), they were separated more by the time then by the place. The texts containing togiva (which also fully replaces togazi in the later Trojan d.) pronoun were based on a later translation, but the both translators show features typical for the Lukovit and Teteven dialects in the western part of the Balkan Mountain area (Demina 1985:260). However, both the dating and the localization is not uncontested. Later studies by Mladenova on the basis of the dialectal atlas (BDA) showed, that the area with the same features also includes the dialects of the Bela Slatina-Pleven group (Mladenova 2007), as well as Central Balkan dialects around Trojan (Mladenova & Velčeva 2013). This would bring the togazi and togiva translators closer to the third one, responsible for the togizi texts, but also to the newer editions from the East, represented in our corpus by Ljub.d. and NBKM 1064.

The corpus contains the eighth chapter of the manuscript, Euthymius' Life of St Petka, which can be found on folia 55r-60r23. The text is based on the edition by Vuković (Demina 1980:185) and it belongs to the togazi-section. The text can also be found in many other related damaskini (e.g. Kopr.d., NBKM 709, CIAI 225; also as a new togiva-redaction in Trojan d.) from the 17th century, as well as in later editions, represented in our corpus by Ljub.d. and NBKM 1064. The main difference from the version in Vuković 1536 is, of course, the language. While the script and orthography does not differ much

---

23 The source has two paginations: smaller numbers are likely older, used in Demina 1972 and in our index. The new, larger numbers are decremented by one, e.g. 54r-59r for Life of St. Petka.
between the Church Slavonic and simple Bulgarian sources from the given region and time, the differences are well-apparent in morphology, syntax and also style. Some of the forms were not understood by the editor, like the synthetic comparative in the very beginning:

Vuković 1536: *Světléčiska slinca (prěpodw bnyje) páměť pětky.*
'The remembrance of Reverend Petka is brighter than the sun.'

Tixon.d.: *Sınce kolık koto ima svę́ tı+ svę́ tı tıl'koci i+ na prpodoxhnaa pěťka páměť (...)*
'As the world has Sun to shine, so much {shines} the remembrance of our Reverend Petka (...)'

A typical stylistic difference is the use of subordinated clauses with verbal participles in Church Slavonic, reflected as multiple sentences separated by a coordinating conjunction in simple Bulgarian:

Vuković 1536: *poústynjù w´stávlьši kь wtčь´stvoù vьzvráti+ se,*
'To leave the desert and go back to your homeland!'

Tixon.d.: *da+ wstávišь pústynja+ta, i+ iďi+ sì pákь nazádь na+ tvoè wtčštvо.*

From the aspect of the textual tradition, the difference in contents is minimal between Vuković and damaskini editions. Already Demina (1980:186) remarked the addition of the author’s name in the introduction (*napísax aze ev’timіe...*), which is also absent in the Euthymius’ original. An intriguing passage, where Petka threatens Georgi with divine fire, if he fails to meet her demands (cf. Kalužniacki 1901:68), is also found only in this damaskini edition. The contents have been preserved in transcripts up to the 19th century, including those of Ljub.d., Ioann d. and NBKM 1064, included in our corpus. For the purposes of our corpus, we have used first an automated transcript of the critical edition by Demina (1972:94-98), which reflects the original word boundaries and accentuation. Later we have corrected it using a scan of the original manuscript, available at the website of the library (link). Generally, the text was well preserved and did not require to consult other sources for reconstruction. The text has also been published online as a browser-capable edition (link).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>Žitie přepodobnye matere našee Petky Trьnovskye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>2486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source date</td>
<td>1650-1670s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source origin</td>
<td>Etropoli?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text date</td>
<td>early 17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text origin</td>
<td>Lukovit-Teteven area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>simple Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>early togazi type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| nominal articles | 34 | 1.3677% |
| MASC.Gen/Acc nouns | 32 | 1.2872% |
| adjectival articles | 11 | 0.4425% |
| ext. demonstratives | 37 | 1.4883% |
| DAT.POSS pronouns | 15 | 0.6034% |
| future particle šте | 5 | 0.2011% |
| long-form adjectives | 104 | 4.1834% |
| synthetic infinitives | 5 | 0.2011% |
| 2/3.PL.AOR endings | 1 | 0.0402% |
| non-NOM articles | 1 | 0.0402% |

### 2.6. Ljub.d. - Ljubljanski damaskin

This damaskin is held under the signature NUK Cod. Kop. 21 in the National and University Library of Slovenia in Ljubljana. The original whereabouts of the manuscript are unknown. Some indices are provided by the already mentioned damaskin NBKM 708, sold to Protopopinci (later Pirdop) in 1689. While its structure and contents reflect Tixon.d., the script is very similar to Ljub.d. and Conev (II 1923:340) considers the two to be written by the same hand24. Covers were made of a firman by Sultan Mehmed IV from 1682. Watermarks were dated by librarians to 1696 and 1703 [link], the design (a crown, a star and a crescent) is common for the 17th century. On the other hand, the contents reflect the order of chapters in the damaskini of Drjanovo (NBKM 711) and Trjavan (NBKM 710). Although Ljub.d. contains only a part of their chapters, Demina (1968:57) classed it with them as an example of a second type damaskin. A similar text from the Kotel-Elena area could have served its scribe as a protograph. The available information thus hints at an origin in the beginning of the 18th century.

How the manuscript made its way to the present-day Slovenia remains a question. A side note mentions the town of Karlovo, where it was possibly held in the past. In any case, it was part of the

---

24 Although the author would not agree with that, the both sources show a similar alternation between a neat polustav font used for titles and cursive for the main text.
collection donated by Kopitar (†1844) to the gymnasium in Ljubljana. It was referenced by Miklosich in his dictionary (1865) and studied by Lamanski and Grigorović in 1869 (Argirov 1895:463). A critical edition of the whole collection - a first of its kind in the field of damaskini studies - was published by Argirov (1895:466-560).

For our purposes, we have selected from this source the Euthymius' Life of St Petka, which can be found on folia 96v-103r (or pages 550-556 in the Argirov's edition). A critical edition of the whole collection - a first of its kind in the field of damaskini studies - was published by Argirov (1895:466).

For our purposes, we have selected from this source the Euthymius' Life of St Petka, which can be found on folia 96v-103r (or pages 550-556 in the Argirov's edition).

The text is very close to the edition available in Tixon.d., sharing mostly the same structure and contents. One of the minor differences can be seen in occasional omissions or extensions on a phrase level. The same omissions can be seen in the related sources too:

Tixon.d.: iwâns asê’ nju. snь stârîmu blь’ gar’skymu cáru asê’ nju. krę’ p’ko drâzsâse togaži cárstvo
Ljub.d.: ióannь asê’ nju, krę’ pko drâzsâse togâzi crstvo
Kotel d.: i iwâns asê’ njâ, krę’ pko drâzsâse togâzi crstvo to sî
'the King John Asên, son of Asên, the old King of Bulgaria, held (his) kingdom fast'

There are also small differences in the vocabulary. In comparison to Tixon.d., the editor of Ljub.d. seems to have been more apt to replace archaisms taken over from the Church Slavonic edition. Also this feature is common to the related sources, although not always reflecting the damaskini typology by Demina:

Tixon.d.: I+ slučî+ se tâ umrê` nê` koî korábnikî
Ljub.d.: I+ slučî+ se tâ umrê` nê` koî gemyèï^n^a
'and so it came to pass, a sailor died'

The language of Ljub.d. also seems to be more innovative from the perspective of the general trends in Bulgarian dialects. This can be observed, for example, on the removal of certain archaic (or Church Slavonic) case forms both for pronouns and nouns. It is unclear, which of these were still productive in the early 17th century, as not all of them were simply copied from Church Slavonic.

The phrase do zemlje 'to the ground' from the example was likely added by the togazi-translator. It is not found in the NBKM 721 edition (jú+ je svoîma čîstně` izebâm’še rukâma. dše jú+ je i+ vseš’mь crement ljûbszno lobizåxu), nor in Vuković 1536. Of course, it is unlikely the genitive was still productive (e.g. pâk’+ sî prêklonî glavå+ ta do+ zemljå) and he again bowed down his head to the ground' in Tixon.d.; Demina 1972:62), but the phrase could have been lexicalized.
This manuscript is held in the National Library in Sofia under signature НБКМ 328 (62). According to a sidenote at the end, it was written in 1749-1750 in Samokov and Vratsa (Conev I 1910:324f.) by Josif Bradati (ca. 1714-1789). Although the source was known to the scholars already since the 19th century, it was attributed to Bradati only after the discovery of the manuscript No. 4/7 (26) of the Rila Monastery, which included his own signature. Signatures in НБКМ 328 itself (Conev mentions two: on folio 153v and 271v) were long considered to be mere transcripts. First after the discovery of RM 4/7 (26), НБКМ 328 was identified as one of his autographs too (Angelov I 1963:42).

Although their works are often classed as damaskini, works of Bradati and his students represent a new tradition of literature. They are no products of professional scriptoria, meant to be sold to churches, like in the case of Tixon.d. and priest Georgi. НБКМ 328 is not a “representative” manuscript like the above mentioned damaskini, written calligraphically and rich in ornaments. Its texts were written on a small format paper, using a radically simplified orthography, discarding most accents as well as archaic letters. Nor the contained texts seem to follow any existing collections. НБКМ 328 was one of his knižici (Angelov I 1963:55), working notebooks, carried during the travels as a monk in service of the Rila Monastery. During these travels he both collected and spread the texts, teaching them to his students in the visited towns.

The dynamic origin of the Bradati’s collections was reflected on the language too. While explicitly trying to write in a language close to the common people (Angelov I 1963:32f.), Bradati did not adopt the language of the 17th century damaskini, although it is unlikely they did not reach him27. The reason

---

27 Angelov (I 1963:51-56) compared the texts by Stouditēs in Bradati’s works and various 17-18th century damaskini, acknowledging he translated the Thēsauros anew. However, Angelov argues the total amount of translations done by Bradati is hard to determine, as he paraphrases the texts much more freely than earlier translators. Nevertheless, the Life of St. Petka in Ioann.d. is based on a damaskin similar to НБКМ 709.
could have been their apocryphal contents. It is not clear, what was the language of the apocryphal collections accused by him of spreading falsehoods (karstanovи knigi), but only two of the stories mentioned by Bradati (e.g. visions of St. Paul and of the Mother of God, cf. Angelov I 1963:157) are attested in simple Bulgarian damaskini.

As his travels were mostly limited to Western Bulgaria (especially Samokov and Vratsa) and East Macedonia (Orizare), he adapted the language to some of the local phonetics, replacing jats with /e/ (e.g. grex 'sin'), strong jers (and often back nasals too) with /a/ (staracъ 'old man', maka 'torment'), although not always consistently (Kristova 1990:67f.). The Church Slavonic influence is strong too. He adapts a lot from the Church Slavonic vocabulary including function words (e.g. ašte 'if', temporal relative pronoun egda 'then'), but also morphosyntactic features, although does not employ them consistently. The old synthetic infinitive (blue) appear along forms typical for Modern Bulgarian (red) within a single sentence:

\[ \text{ne+ trebu₂tь da+ se sramueme wt+ ljudie, ašte li+ se wt+ boga boiši. to+ nigde ne možeši da+ se sakrie. ašte+ i+ pods zemli ne+ možeši+ se sakriti da+ te ne+ vidit' bgь} \]

'We do not need to feel shame in front of people. If you fear God, you cannot hide anywhere. You cannot hide even beneath the earth, so that God does not see you.'

Double conditionals are, of course, complex syntactic constructions. The parallel sentence in PPS shows inconsistent employment of verbal forms (PRS + conditional) and conjunction (first ili + i, then ili + to):

\[ \text{ili se wt lúge srámu_vašь i tuka da ležíme nikoi ni ne vidi ili se wt bţa boišь to kako bi se skril 'i pod zemljь 'i támо bţь vidi (PPS 195r)} \]

'Either you feel shame from people, so we can lay here, nobody sees us; or you fear God, then even if you hide beneath the earth, God sees you there too.'

As it is unlikely, that such instances can be interpreted as deliberate archaisms, and not rather habits, acquired during his school years in Elena or Rila Monastery. It is possible, that some of the archaic forms were still productive in the West Bulgarian dialects or at least comprehensible due to contact with Serbian (cf. section on Temski r.). Bradati's own language was not fixed: it developed in course of his travels and writings, especially on the lexical and syntactic level, slowly discarding archaic terms (Angelov i 1963:51). The analysis of linguistic features of the included text showed similarity with the texts by Punčo and Sophronius' Nedělnik 1806 (Šimko 2021). For this reason, at least the language of NBKM 328 can be seen as a predecessor of Slavenobulgarian.

Many of the Bradati’s works are new translations, including texts unknown to older damaskini. This may also be the case of the Legend of Thais the Harlot (folla 43v-47r), which we have included in the corpus. The text was translated to Church Slavonic and it is attested in the Bдinski zbornik from the 14th century28. It was also widespread in Russian manuscripts of the 15th-16th century as a part of the appendix of the short Zlatostrui (Milenov 2013:51)29. Bradati's edition seems closer to the Russian editions30. The comparison of currently available texts (both Church Slavonic and Greek) is inconclusive from the aspect of the question, which edition served as the source for the author.

The text was later transcribed by some of Bradati’s students, including Todor and Ioann of Vratsa. It is also attested in PPS, although this edition shows, characteristically of Punčo, more changes. In this way

---

28 Held at the University of Ghent, sign. Ms. slav 402, f. 106v-110v (link).
29 Е.g. manuscript GIM Sin.988 of the State Historical Museum in Moscow, f. 758r-759r (Arabic pagination; link). A similar version can be found in the Menaion of Demetrius of Rostov (Rostovski 1689:152r-153v).
30 Е.g. the cited passage аšte+ 'i/ pods zemli ne+ možeši+ se sakriti da+ te ne+ vidit' bgь is found only in the Menaion of Demetrius: дшь by sokryl’ сę es i pod’ землěї, i támо Bгь видitвь. However, this edition lacks other parts attested in GIM Sin.988 and Bдinski zbornik.
it can be compared with works of authors usually not considered a part of the circle of his students. For our purposes, we have used scans of the original manuscript provided by the National Library in Sofia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>Radi blaženou Taisiju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text date</td>
<td>1749-1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text origin</td>
<td>Samokov or Vratsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>early Slavenobulgarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Source contents | (folio 1r) Zlatousta slovo na vtorata nedělja otъ posta: za pokajanie i za Kaina, Iroda, Avela, pror. Dаниilo, i za caretэ Azava i Davida i i aapostola Pavla, (12r) Vъ sredo *e*-ju nedlu Kirila Monaxa, (16r) Zlatousta radi dvore, i zmiju, i radi žitie věka sego suetnago, (27r) [отъ sǫštija slovo na cvetonosie], (27v) Vъ sredu *e*-ju nedlju Kirila Monaxa, (30v) Zlatousta radi dvore, i zmiju, i radi žitie věka sego suetnago, (32v) 

2.8. Sv.d. - Svištovski damaskin

The manuscript is currently held in the čitalište "Elena i Kiril D. Abramovi" in Svištov (link) under the signature 556 (Miltenova 1980:103). It was published as a critical edition by Ljubomir Miletič in 1923. According to a note on folio 159v, after the chapter 7, it was written by a certain Georgie pop Peter in

---

31 A title Slovo radi milostina precedes the chapter, but the text contains only one line, telling us the source was "taken" (ouzeše+ mi izvotъ) by the author.
1753. However, the document continues after the note for next 12 chapters. Miletič (1901:62) at first considered Georgi to be the scribe of the whole manuscript. Later he admitted it was written by more hands with different orthographies, but yet all showing characteristic features of the same dialect (Miletič 1923:5)\textsuperscript{32}.

The damaskin is one of the oldest among those including newer translations, classified above as the *togizi* group. Demina (1968:62) mentions also other sources containing works by the *togizi*-translator from the area: the damaskin *NBKM 713* comes from Belene, *Berl.d.*, *CIAI 133* and *NBKM 1067* from Pleven, *NBKM 1083* from Svišťov\textsuperscript{33}. Among them, *NBKM 713* was originally considered to be the oldest among them, but the watermarks were recently dated to 1760-1770s (Mladenova et al. 2016:441). All of these sources known to Demina, classified as type IV by her, included sources from older translations too\textsuperscript{34} and are very heterogenous in content. It is likely the scribes behind these sources worked on a similar basis as the school of Josif Bradati: more a circle of independent teachers, text collectors and students, than a professional scriptorium.

The focus of the study of Miletič was on the linguistic features of the damaskin, namely of the texts attributed to the *togizi*-translator. Miletič (1923:3) considered them to be close to the Moesian dialects of the Šumen-Provadjia-Popovo-Razgrad area; similar dialects were likely spoken in the Svišťov area too in the time of the *togizi*-translator. Some of these were new editions of texts, which were already known in older damaskini. Unlike the new *togiva* editions from *Trojan d.*, these were not based on previous damaskini translations. This is the case of the two *togizi* texts included in our corpus, the *Life of St. Petka* in *Berl.d.* and *Life of St. Mary of Egypt* in the currently described source.

As already mentioned, there were multiple versions of the *Life of St. Mary of Egypt* in the damaskini tradition. The version available in earlier sources like *Tixon.d.* and *NBKM 1073* was based on an older, Church Slavonic edition, attested also in the damaskin *CIAI 1570\textsuperscript{35}*. *Sv.d.* includes a newer edition by the *togizi*-translator, which can also be found in *Berl.d.* and in another related damaskin held in the National Scientific Library of Odessa, designated *Grig. 39(65)\textsuperscript{36}*. The texts of this *Life in Kiev d.* and *Sv.d.* are both based on the edition of Stouditēs, but otherwise they are not related to each other (Demina...)

\textsuperscript{32} The pictures at the end of the 1923 edition show, that the damaskin was likely a collection written by at least two or three different scribes. First hand, Georgi’s, uses a slightly cursive script, putting e.g. hooks on subscript parts of letters and the three-legged <\textit{n}> for lowercase /t/. This hand wrote the most of the given examples, although the size of the letters varies too (e.g. 20 lines on 42r, 23 on 130r). The example of the folio 256r, showing a part of the *Life of St. Mary of Egypt*, is written in a *poluustav* font similar to older damaskini sources, curiously using one-legged <\textit{t}> for lowercase /t/ on the whole page. This scribe also prefers \textit{ž} as the word-final jer (Georgi prefers \textit{č}). The \textit{n} is preferred also by a third scribe, responsible for the folio 303r. Unfortunately, Miletič and Mladenova did not provide a detailed description of watermarks, which could help to determine the date of the respective parts of the collection.

\textsuperscript{33} Another damaskin usually designated *Svišťovski* is actually a collection of Sunday homilies with some lives of saints (including that of St. Petka, *Tixon.d.* edition) without any texts from Stouditēs, bound by daskal Stefan in 1797 in Kili fatevo, which is also held in the čitalište of Svišťov (Mladenova 1980:94-102; sign. 145a and 145b).

\textsuperscript{34} Mladenova, Petkanova and Uzunova (2016:452) have identified a damaskin in the Regional Museum of Loveč (designated *L4*) which is written with the *poluustav* of the Karlovo-Kuklen school on a paper from 1690s (carrying watermark designs familiar from earlier damaskini like three crescents). The damaskin already includes chapters of all three translators (with majority being of the *togizi*-type; some of those are not found in other known sources). However, new *togizi* translations were still appearing in that time - *Berl.d.* contains homilies of Elias Mēniatēs, which were published first in 1716 (Mladenova et al. 2016:441).

\textsuperscript{35} This source is likely identical with the *Boboševski damaskin* mentioned by Demina (1968:170).

\textsuperscript{36} The present signature is unknown. Previous designations were *39(65)* by Grigorovič (Demina 1968:62) and *124(14)* by Kopylenko & Rapoport (1960:551). According to Demina (1968:171), the scribe of the *Grig. 39(65)* seems to have edited the text with more common words (e.g. *golêmo* instead of *veliko* in the very beginning), while that of *Berl.d.* only transcribed it.
1968:170). Sv.d. is also less of an exact word-by-word translation like Kiev d., focusing more on the meaning of the whole phrase. The 'humans' (ACC.PL. anerōpus) are clearly marked as recipients in Sv.d. with preposition na (or dative in NBKM 327):

Kiev d.: ἠ& bα idēže+ poda vaete+ razum&t+ νt+ ēcexe, wno`+ me+ nau& si&+ sloves&.
NBKM 327: No& Ve iže dāete rāzum ēkoms, td mi pokāze&ē s&s sloves&.
Sv.d.: amē bq&ē, dēto dāva rāzumt na célovcēnt, onzi mi gi pokāzeva tēzi dūm&

Stouditēs 1751: amē ho θeos hopu didei tēn gnōs&n& τ&is τ&t anerōpus, ekeinos me ta97 deixnei auta ta logia
`but God, who gives reason to humans, He taught me these words'

It is possible that the Sv.d. is based on the translation of Samuil Bakačić, as NBKM 327 leaves out the doubled citations from Gospel in a similar way. On the other hand, NBKM 327 seems to omit the Modern Greek passages, while Sv.d. prefers them:

Kiev d.: ištēte+ prēže crstvîa bži`a i+ právdy egō i+ si`a v&ss& priložit+ se+ v&m&. sy`reč proče ne+ pomýšljaite+ gļjušte št&+ j&mi ili čt&+ pięme, ili+ čm&+ w&dēždim+ se. zan&+ si`a+ v&ss& ęzyci ištut. zan&+ b&+ w&c&+ v&&a&+ i&+e es(t) na+ nsb&ex& v&`e* s&tr&bovan&i+ si&`a+ v&ss&. s&ego+ radi ištēte pr&`ve crstvye bži`e i+ právdy egō.. pr&oce i+ imy" ljūbymici, ne pomýšljaimy+ t&ǎkovo.

NBKM 327: Ištete+ že prē žde vsego Crstvïa Bžîa i právdy egō, a si& v&ss& priložit+se v&am&. Prōc&ée Bļsvēnîi
Xristiâne da+ ne mỳslim tak&ǎv&x&v&
Sv.d.: Rādi tūl ištēt`ti, pr`vo crstvo bo&&ī+ i pra&vda i tēzi si&k&i+te ot gōrē vi si sa zd&(d&ľ)Ď&ţ i tēzi si&k&i+te ot gōrē vi sa zd&&y&Ď&ľ&y&. Rādi tūl i n&ľ&y, bl&agosv&lo&g&i x&sti&rîni, ᇩ& ni si enỳ&&s&v&ami za tēzi

Stouditēs 1751: zēтеite de prōtoν tēn basileian tu θēu, kai tēn dikaiosynēn autu, kai tauta panta pro&stee&e&seta&i hymīn. ēg&oun, to loipon m&n ennoia&sa&ēte, leg&oen&te, ti na famen, ē ti na pi&̆men: ē ti en dy&en&o&um&en, di&ot ho h&ola, ta e&nē ta zēt&on, di&ot ho θēos ho Pateras sa&ς, hopu eina&i eis τ&s uran&s, ē&ge&re&i p&s τ&sa x&r&ei&v&sa&ē &aut&u, dia tuko zētate prōtoν b&asileiaν tu θēu, kai tēn dikaiosynēn tu, kai auta h&ola saς ap` an&&d&i&untas. to loipon kai hēmeis, eu&lo&g&ēn&en&i x&sti&rîni, a m&n ennoi&az&o&seen sa toiaut&u

'Seek first His Kingdom and His truth, and this all will be included. [Lk 12:22] That is: do not worry, saying , 'what we eat' or 'what we drink' or 'what to put on', for this is what all the heathens want
Let us too, my blessed Christians, not think about this.'

The tagizi-translator usually does not adapt complex constructions involving participles with additional conjunctions, breaking them to separate sentences. Like in Kiev d., this results sometimes in the loss of original meaning, because the conjunctions are translated very rigidly too:

Kiev d.: si`a+ v&ss&pomi&na&śe, vid&ę& st&u&ji i+ pris&sē
NBKM 327: Si&+že pomys&lē& e, vid&ę& st&u&ji j&ako pri&de.
Sv.d.: Ty`i si mísle&i, vid&ę& svet&ę& i st&i&g&na
Stouditēs 1751: auta ene&ny&u&mo&nu&en&os, eide tēn hagian kai efoa&se
'as he was thinking about that, he saw the saint as she came'

The inflection of articles in Sv.d. is a feature, which caught already the attention of Miletič (1901:20). Although this phenomenon can be seen in older damaskini sources, Sv.d. employs them with a high consistency on MASC. SG animate nouns in various non-subject positions. Unlike in Kiev d. and NBKM 327, the occurrence of Bulgarian articles is not bound to the presence of Greek demonstratives ekeinos and autos:

Kiev d.: i+ da+ rčēši i+ avv&i w&&n&n&g igum&enu+ monastirskomu
NBKM 327: I da rečēš i Ávě& w&&v&n&u igum&enu monastyr&y& và&še&g&
Sv.d.: i da ra&čē&š na Avá Jo&&n&a, na igum&enu+tok&k na monastirį+tu vy

37 Speaking of word-to-word translation, Sv.d. reflects the object doubling (gi... tēzi dūm&) in the original, unlike both CS sources. It is open to a question, whether such constructions were already productive in the dialect of the tagizi-translator - as well as why it was not included in the text from Macedonia, which otherwise often preserves such doubling (Ilievski & Ilievska 2015:140).
There are also other arguments, which speak for a direct translation from Greek. Sv. d. sometimes borrows Greek words instead of translating them, like 1PL.PRS enbijasovami 'we think' in the given example, but also e.g. nāvlunь 'fare' (wtikψ in Kiev d.; naēmь in NBKM 327). The Sv. d. translates Greek plēn with ami or ala 'but' and to loipon with radi tui or legomi 'thus', while Kiev d. and NBKM 327 use pročе 'igitur' for both. It is thus more likely the togizi-translator worked with the Greek text. Together with the text selected from Berl. d., these texts enable us not only to see the interaction between Modern Greek, Bulgarian and Church Slavonic, but also provide us access to a dialect, which can be considered peripheral from the point of view of Balkan Slavic studies (Friedman 2008:142).

Because the author was not yet able to access the original manuscript, we have used a text based on the critical edition for our corpus (Miletić 1923:259-268). The critical edition does not specify which chapters were written by which scribes, only some repeated passages (as given in our list of contents). A sample of the original text can be seen on page 325 of this edition.
2.9. Jan.s. - Jankulov sbornik

This voluminous manuscript containing mostly homilies for Sundays and other feasts is held at the National Library in Sofia under signature HSKM 689 (272). As written on the folio 697, it was written in 1755 by Jankul, a student of Josif Bradati, who is also the author (or, rather, translator) of the text (Conev II 1923:249). The tome is also an important historical source. It contains a note about the destruction of a "house for reading in Samokov" by Turks in 1745, which is curious from two aspects: on the one hand, it presents a very early instance of a kind of čitalište, a public library typical for the later National Revival era (Angelov I 1963:83); on the other hand, it also shows, that, back then, the business of literature could become dangerous.

Jankul himself is an obscure person, known only from the scarce sidenotes. He lived in Xrelovo (today Reljovo) close to Samokov. The manuscript NBKM 690 is likely written by his hand too (Conev II 1923:269). He adopted various aspects of Bradati’s writing. He follows his simplified orthography with a single jer, no jats (some where added by a second hand), and no juses. Similarly to Bradati, he tends to paraphrase his source, instead of just copying it (Angelov I 1963:112). He mostly preserves the archaic features typical for Bradati’s texts - the use of old PL:AOR endings, synthetic infinitives, Church Slavonic vocabulary (like e.g. ašte ‘if’, že ‘and’, glagolati ‘speak’). Still, there are also innovations to observe. It is currently the earliest source attesting an l-participle based on an imperfect stem (Edinь wt naši bratıa znajalь nixni ezikь ‘one of our brothers knew their language’), an important component of the development of the narrative mood (Miřčev 1978:232).

We have selected the Story of the Fathers slain at Sinai and Raithu (Kako izbieni biša otcì na Sinai i Raiu). The story concerns St. Nilus of Sinai (ca. †450), a student of John Chrysostomus, telling of his and his son Theodulos’ fate during the Arab raids on Sinaite monasteries. It can be found on f. 457r-464r. The text is not known in the earlier damaskini. It is a summary of a larger work by Nilus himself, which has been published in Russia in 1856 (Ovsjannikov 2000), our text was likely composed later after his death. As the original was not yet available to the author, the transcript by Conev (II 1923:259-264) was used for the corpus text. Due to its size, the list of contents, based on Conev’s description, is given with numbers.

| Text title | Prepodobnago i bgonosnago oca naše Theodula sinь ochi Nilu iže pisa koliki i kako izbieni biša oci na Sinai i Raiu |
| Tokens | 1954 |
| Sentences | 293 |
| Source/Text date | 1755 |
| Source/Text origin | Samokov |
| Norm | early Slavenobulgarian |
| Source contents | (chapter 1, folio 1r) Slovo kako Ioanь Bgoslovь nauči čika da pišetь ikoni. (2, f. 3r,v) Slovo radi blgopodanie ot Luki *iii*, (3, 5r,v) Slovo nakazanie vlastilinnьmь, (4, 6r) Slovo nekoi sveštenikь egda krьštavaše ženi sablaznavaše se, (5, 7r-9r) list of the following chapters, (6, 1r) Tlьkovanie evlisko načinaet ot Mitara i Fariseja, (7, 6r) Nedelja vtora bljudnago sna, (8, |

---

38 A Church Slavonic edition is attested for example in the 15th century manuscript Ms slav 150 of the Romanian Academy of Sciences (Panaitescu 1959:196). The author was not able to retrieve this version yet, but by the number pages it seems to be twice as long as the Jan.s. edition.
Petra i Pavla praznuem kako izvoli i vьplьti se vь nei Gdь Is Xs i kako podobaetь dxovno da preobraženie Gda našego Isusa Krista


2.10. Temski r. - Temski râkopis

*Temski râkopis* was the designation used by Vasil P. Vasilev in his study of the manuscript PP 169 of the Library of *Matica Srpska* in Novi Sad. The manuscript was titled *Iz' duševnogo obrêda v' nedelnyxъ dnexъ slova izbranna* (Selected homilies of the Sunday liturgy) and it was written by two hands (Vasilev 1986:55). In a sidenote on the f. 232v, one of the scribes identifies himself as the hieromonk Kiril. This was likely Kiril Živković (1730–1807), at the time the abbot of Temska Monastery "St. Georgi", where the manuscript itself was discovered who later became the Bishop of Pakrac. Kiril also specifies the date of completion of his book as 13th of July, 1764 (Vasilev 2001:280). The other hand wrote folios 205r-206v and 207v-209r.

The manuscript has also a curious subtitle: *na prosti jazykъ bolgarskïi*, that is, *in simple Bulgarian language*. Kiril was born in Pirot, not far away from the monastery itself, in an area of Torlak dialects, which today studied for their transitional character between Bulgarian and Serbian. However, he lived since youth in Vojvodina and studied at the (Bulgarian) Zograph Monastery on Mount Athos before coming to Temska. In that time, he started to "fervently follow the traditions of Bulgarian literature" (Vasilev 1986:61), although he also adopted some practices (e.g. writing of <ћ>, lack of both juses) more typical for the literature of Serbia. According to the description by Vasilev (1986), his orthography is otherwise quite conservative, using all traditional accent markers, both jers (mostly ъ as the phonetic one, ъ as the orthographic one), jats and Greek letters (ѳ,ѱ,ѯ) on traditional positions. In this respect, however, *Temski r.* is not very different from the damaskini of the same era. As in case of the damaskini, this does not seem to affect his the grammar.

For our corpus, we have selected the fourth homily *On punishment of the children* (*Slovo o nakazanii*...
dětei, f.21v-28r), written for the Sunday of the Prodigal son (Lk 15:12), which is transcribed in the article by Vasilev (1986:67-72). The choice is not based on philological knowledge, as the text is not attested in the damaskini sources. As we did not have an access to the original manuscript yet, this is so far the only 18th century text related to the Torlak area available to us.

The manuscript is held at the National Library of Sofia under the signature NBKM 1069. According to a sidenote on the f. 172v, it was written by a certain Dimitri in 1776 likely in Belovo. Other sidenotes mention events in adjacent towns Klisura and Pazardzhik, including a solar eclipse in 1788. The last note is from 1836, later it belonged to the collection of the renowned philologist, writer and politician Naiden Gerov (1823-1900; Kodov & Stojanov III 1964:372f.). There is not much explicit information provided about the scribe, but Pazardzhik and Belovo are known

2.11. NBKM 1069 - Beljovski damaskin

The manuscript is held at the National Library of Sofia under the signature NBKM 1069. According to a sidenote on the f. 172v, it was written by a certain Dimitri in 1776 likely in Belovo. Other sidenotes mention events in adjacent towns Klisura and Pazardzhik, including a solar eclipse in 1788. The last note is from 1836, later it belonged to the collection of the renowned philologist, writer and politician Naiden Gerov (1823-1900; Kodov & Stojanov III 1964:372f.).

There is not much explicit information provided about the scribe, but Pazardzhik and Belovo are known

40 Sbornic BAR 765 has a Slovo o nakazanii čad on f.159v-160v (Panaitescu & Mihail 2018:302), but we were not yet able to compare it with the Temsksi r. edition. Texts on the same topic can be found in later sources like NBKM 436 by Nikifor of Rila (Angelov I 1963:176-179) and in Nastavlenija by Krčovski (1819:61) included, but these are both based different text traditions.
for literature. A priest from Belovo bound the Bradati’s manuscript, which served as one of the protographs of Jan.s. (Conev II 1923:269). Teofan of Vratsa, a monk from the Rila Monastery and a student of Josif Bradati, was active in both towns in 1770-1790s with many followers\(^1\). However, at least half of the 22 texts in NBKM 1069 are taken from an earlier damaskin NBKM 345, written in 1753 in Pazardžik (cf. Conev I 1910:362-370). The both are similar in other aspects too. The script alternates between cursive Cyrillic and Greek - the difference is only in non-Greek letters. NBKM 1069 rarely uses even Latin letters. Both use Arabic numerals in pagination. Bible citations and titles are often in the Greek language. Juses are absent, jat and ы only rarely, and only one jer (ъ in both) is used (Kail 2013:48). The accentuation is rich, but not consistent, alternating between acute, gravis and dots. The both are written in a language reflecting the local dialects of the Panagjuriště area, with some influence of Rhodopean dialects (Kail 2013:77; Kodov & Stojanov III 1964:372; link).

We have selected the *Homily on divination* (*Slovo radi orisanje*), which can be found on folia 137r-140r. The text is likely copied from NBKM 345 (f. 69r-71v), where it uses the Greek title *Peri proorismou*. In both it ends abruptly, likely missing the end. The topic of divination (and the fight against it) was a common topic around the middle of the 18th century. It is discussed in various texts translated by Josif Bradati (Anguševa-Txanovna & Dimitrova 2013), but this *Slovo radi orisanje* is not among them. It comes likely from a Greek source, translated by the author of NBKM 345. The text in the corpus is based on the scan of the original, provided by the library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>Slovo radi orisanje</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>1168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source date</td>
<td>1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source origin</td>
<td>Belovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text date</td>
<td>1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text origin</td>
<td>Pazardžik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>simple Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Panagjuriště</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| nominal articles | 27 | 2.3116% |
| MASC.GEN/ACC nouns | 22 | 1.8836% |
| adjectival articles | 11 | 0.9418% |
| ext. demonstratives | 34 | 2.911% |
| DAT.POSS pronouns | 6 | 0.5137% |
| future particle šte | 18 | 1.5411% |
| long-form adjectives | 26 | 2.226% |
| synthetic infinitives | 3 | 0.2568% |
| 2/3.PL.AOR endings | - | - |
| non-NOM articles | - | - |

\(^1\) In a manuscript from 1791, written in Belovo, Teofan gives the names of his collaborators or students, but a Dimitri is not among them (Angelov I 1963:126).
2.12. NBKM 370

The manuscript is held at the National Library in Sofia under the signature NBKM 370 (431). One of the title pages contains the name of the scribe - Doino Gramatik of Elena (†1810), as well as the year of transcription (1784). It contains also the name of the author of the text, Paisius (1722-1773), hieromonk of Hilendar monastery on the Mt. Athos, born in the Samokov eparchy. Besides the Istoria Slavěnobolgarskaa, the manuscript also contains two historical poems from the cycle Razgovor ugodni naroda slovenskoga by A. Kašić-Miošić (Conev I 1910:413).

It is out of scope of this article to provide an exhaustive description of Istoria Slavěnobolgarskaa or even the critical editions and secondary literature concerning it (e.g. Ivanov 1914, Radev et al. 2013, Peev 2020, other articles - link). The text is one of the first modern works on the history of Bulgaria. Its composition and spread among the intellectuals is one of the pivotal moments in the very beginning of the process of Bulgarian national awakening. But while these facts are nearly (e.g. Trendafilov 1996) unanimously accepted, the language of the Paisius' chronicle has opened many questions. Despite the author's own explicitly stated intention to write in a simple language, many, especially earlier, philologists considered his language to be (at least based on) Church Slavonic. Andrejčin (1986) considered Church Slavonic (with both Middle Bulgarian and Russian redactions) to be a mere influence on a dialectal basis. According to Minčeva (1984:40), Paisius based his language on the simple Bulgarian literature, what can be seen on the syntax of his work.

The controversy points to the fact, that the language of Paisius cannot be described only as a deliberate archaizing variant of the dialect, or vice-versa, a partial modernization of Church Slavonic. It is more an mixture of habits inherited from the vernacular and from the literature. Thus I would prefer the position attributed by Andrejčin to A. Teodor-Balan, who called the language Slavenobulgarian. This is, of course, a mere label, which has only weak support by empirical research, which points rather to a distinct literary standard, emerging in contact with the school of Josif Bradati (Šimko 2021). But this is exactly the reason for including a part of the Istoria in this corpus - to compare the text with those of damaskini and other sources of the period, and thus to determine the influence of the dialects and its role in the development of the literary language. For the sake of such studies we have included the Paisius' original Introduction, where the interferrence of the languages of the sources of the chronicle should be minimal.

The text is based on the facsimile of the Doino's transcript provided by the library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>Istoria Slavěnobolgarskaa - Predislovie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source date</td>
<td>1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source origin</td>
<td>Elena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text date</td>
<td>1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text origin</td>
<td>Mount Athos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>Slavenobulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source contents</td>
<td>(folia 1r-100v) Istoria Slavěnobolgarskaa, (30r) added two songs about Khan Krum and King Samuil by A. Kašić-Miošić, (101r-112r) empty folios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nominal articles: 7 0.5766%
MASC.GEN/ACC nouns: 21 1.7298%
adjectival articles: 9 0.7414%
ext. demonstratives: 4 0.3295%
DAT.POSS pronouns: - -
future particle šte: 1 0.0824%
2.13. Ioann.d. - Pop Ioannov damaskin

The manuscript is held at the Archive of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (BAN) under signature 3312. Its scribe was pop Ioann of Vratsa. He became a priest in 1777 as a student of pop Todor of Vratsa, himself a very productive scribe and likely a student of Josif Bradati (cf. Angelov II 1964:98; Petkanova-Toteva 1965:251). According to sidenotes, this damaskin was written in Vratsa in 1788 and for a certain time it belonged to a convent in Teteven. It was first described by Angelov, who also clarified the relations between Ioann's manuscript and works of pop Todor and Nikifor of Rila (II 1964:140-148). Although sometimes called "damaskin" (e.g. Petkanova-Toteva 1965:251), it does not include any chapters from Θέσαυρος.²⁴²

In our corpus we have included Ioann's transcript of the Life of St. Petka, which, too, has been published as a critical edition by Angelov (1958:100-104). The digital text in our corpus was based on the Angelov's edition, corrected by consulting the facsimile provided by the library. This edition is curious from the aspect of being a certain re-archaization of the damaskini edition. Also our mutual comparison of sources puts it close to the edition by Vuković. Although Angelov (I 1963:61 n.1) attributes this edition to Bradati, it could have been translated by pop Todor or Ioann himself. It finishes with a passage written in outright Church Slavonic, very similar to the mixed edition preserved in NBKM 709. The contrast is not so apparent for obvious reasons. Still, Ioann seems, for example, to prefer generalized forms or MASC obliques for Church Slavonic instrumentals, like the older damaskini, elsewhere in the text:

Vuk. 1536: в ставьшĕ пĕткоу, сѫ+ брăтоть еѡимиĕть
Tixon.d.: и воста стаа пет'ка, сצפון+ брăт+ сѫ еvtkимъа
Ioann.d.: и остана стаютъ сѫ+ брата svoego Eftimia

The text was already used in author’s previous studies concerning Life for qualitative comparison with other sources, but it was not included in the first corpus release due to the lack of access to the original. Now, it is being included anyway, as it is a rare instance of literary contact between the Bradati’s and damaskini circles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>Žitie prepodobni матери нашеi Petki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source date</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source origin</td>
<td>Vratsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text date</td>
<td>2nd half of the 18th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text origin</td>
<td>Vratsa?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>Slavenobulgarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Source contents               | (page 2) [Žitie na Varvara], (6) [Žitie na Filaret], (8-20) missing pages (21) [Žitie na Spiridon], (28) [Žitie на маčеник Ignatii], (32) [Žitie на маčеница Domna], (42) [Žitie на маčеница Evgenija], (51) [Žitie на маčеница Tekla], (59) [Žitie на маčеник Trifon], (61) [Slovo ot Dorotei za velikija post], (64) Slovo za svetite petozarni маčenici is attributed to Stouditēs, but the text is likely based on an edition by Agapios of Crete.²⁴²

²⁴² The pages are marked with two page numbers. Angelov followed Ioann’s own Cyrillic pagination, but without marking of the side, e.g. Life of St. Petka is on folia 268v-270v. Following Arabic numbers, written by a pencil, the same chapter is on f. 255v-257v.
Within our corpus, this manuscript is unique from many aspects. It is so far the only source written with Latin characters. The diplomatized variant of the text thus required more invasive processing (e.g. recognizing difference between c and č) than the Cyrillic texts. *NBKM 1423* contains short stories about miracles of (Catholic) saints. These are generally shorter than those, found in the "Orthodox" sources.
in our corpus. For this reason, we have selected eight such chapters concerning St. Nicholas of Tolentino (f. 83v-86v) and St. Anthony of Padua (134r-137v) as a sample. Of these texts, there is one with content comparable to a damaskini source - the Miracle 5 of St. Anthony On a baby, who said, who was its father\(^{44}\). A similar miracle was attributed to an earlier saint from Padua, the martyr St. Daniel (†168), and a Church Slavonic edition of the story can be found in Tixon.d., titled Homily of Daniel the Monk, falsely accused of adultery (Slávo o Daniile mnisě, iže obilgánь bys ljuboděaniem; f. 213r). From the point of view of dialectology, Kovačev's language was classified as belonging to Paulician subgroup of Rhodopean area, yet before the difference between the northern and the southern subgroup emerged (Abadžieva 2017:18). Nevertheless, it is an important source for us, as otherwise the Rhodopean area is underrepresented in the corpus.

The linguistic features deserving mention are numerous. Phonetic and lexical peculiarities were already well described by Abadžieva (2014, 2017). Among morphosyntactic features, it includes l-participles built on imperfective stems (e.g. zaśctò besce tolcova zaslepel od kaskangilak 'because he had been so blinded by jealousy'; cf. Jan.s.). Possession is often expressed by the preposition od, lit. 'from', instead of na, usual in other sources (e.g. zarad Krau+tà od Sina+ si Jasussa 'for the blood of His Son, Jesus')\(^{45}\). Masc/fem/pl is marked by both -i and -e endings (both sas Missi+te and sas Misse 'with liturgies'). Similarly as in damaskini, simplified case inflection of the nouns is limited to masc proper names and theonyms (e.g. Maci+se Sveti Antun 'St. Anthony tortured himself'; the title Ciudessa od Sveti Antuna 'miracles of St. Anthony'); elsewhere, old nominatives are generalized, but for the originally sg.gen form of the s-stem in ciudesse 'miracle'. The language also shows many loanwords, even conjunctions like angiak 'but', zere 'how' and others (cf. also Abadžieva 2014:237).

The texts in the corpus are based on scans of the original provided by the library. Already Conev (II 1923:479) was recommending the literature of "our Paulicians" of the 18th century (two Kovačev’s manuscripts among them) for study of Bulgarian linguistics. The documents stand mostly outside of the text traditions inherited from Church Slavonic, making a good example of the democratization of the language (Abadžieva 2017:9). Any study, however, has to be aware of possible interferences by the source languages of the texts, like Italian or Croatian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>various</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>3203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text date</td>
<td>1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text origin</td>
<td>Plovdiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>simple Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Paulician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source contents</td>
<td>(folio 1r) Jedin, deto sviri na horo, ubi go jedna strela od nebe, i duscata mu u Pacalat. Jurnek 1. (1v) Jedna moma cato igra vez den jedin den, prez noscta se prinesi, ta utidi u Pacalat, i se tu e promena xivot. Jurnek 2. (2r) Ghiaulat pod prilika od cileka, igrai sas jednogo, i navi mu, i pres noscta zavlece go u pacalat. Jurnek 3. (3r) Sled smart javeva se na sveti Cirillo jedin negov ounuka, i kasova mu, ci besce u Pacalat zarad igrata. Jurnek 4. (3v) Dvamina cato igrajeha i pzuwaha, i kalneha, umreha zaklani, ama nicoi ni vide, coi ghi zakla. Jurnek 5. (4r) Jedno momce cato igrajescie sas bасcta si, ze da kalne caco to si imasce adet, i ghiavlete i zavlekoha uskore u pakal. Jurnek 6. (4v) Jedin momak zascto zagubi, rasardi se, i farli jedna strela cade nebe, sas nejhiore da udari Boga, i cato vide, ci strelata padna karvava,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{44}\) Titled NaKarova jednò maninco detè, da Koxi ci besce Basctà mu '[Anthony] compels a small child to tell, who was its father'.

\(^{45}\) This construction is also seen in NBKM 1081 (cf. the title Slòvo wt+ stagò proko danoila 'Homily of/by the holy prophet Daniel') and in Krčovski 1814 (sládki ra-bóti wt ovól vê ’k buoy ‘sweetness of this world’). The expression seems to be productive in Rhodopes and in Macedonia (Lunt 1952:60).
(II 1923:284) coined the name, which is now used in most works concerning the manuscript, which is remarkable both for its eclectic contents (e.g. Angelov II 1964:149f.; Petkanova-Toteva 1965:99f.), as well as for the language, being a rare example of a 18th century Northwestern dialect of the Vidin-Lom area (Šaur 1970:61), a transitional variety between Bulgarian and Serbain. The scans of the original are also available online at the websites of the library and of the Europeana project (link).

Punčo began writing by his own words (f. iii-v) in 1796. Šaur (1970:5) believes it was finished in the same year; in 1797 the region was affected by a war between the Sultan and the Vidin warlord Osman Pazvantoglu, which is not mentioned. Furthermore, the Punčo's words are part of an introduction, which may have been placed originally at the end of the book, among the historical chapters taken from the Istoria Slavěnobolgarsḳạa. The fate of Punčo and his manuscript in the next years are unknown. A school was founded in Mokreš in 1796, it was active in 1800, and it is likely Punčo was involved there as a teacher (Šaur 1970:14). The only sidenotes, both written by others, mention consecration of a Church in the village Dâlgoševci, today Zamfir in 1814 (Šaur 1970:17) and the book's later (1878) proprietor, Todor Bono Aleksov of Progorelec (f. vii-v at the end).

Even if the total size of the manuscript is smaller in comparison to Jan.s or Nedělník 1806, the contents of the manuscript are very rich. Some of the texts were, according to Punčo’s own words, translated directly from Greek (f. i-v), but this may have been merely transcribed from his source. One of the sources were likely the damaskini, although it is not sure, if Punčo worked with simple Bulgarian ones. Petkanova-Toteva (1964:99) identified three texts (lives of St. George and St. Demetrius, as well as some parts of the Miracles of Archangels Michael and Gabriel) authored by Stouditēs. As with all chapters, Punčo paraphrased and shortened his sources heavily, so it is not clear, whether he used a Slavic or Greek text for them. The Life of St. Parascheva (i.e. Petka of Tarnovo) reflects more the synaxar edition (attested e.g. in NBKM 665) than that of the damaskini46, but, again, it is drastically shortened. Another source were apocryphal miscellaneous, from which he took, for example, the story of the fight of archangel Michael and Satanail (Miracles of Archangels Michael and Gabriel) from the translation by Josif Bradati, attested in NBKM 328. Punčo also used sources of Russian redaction of Church Slavonic, which show influence in the Tale of Joseph, son of Rachel (e.g. 3PL.AOR prodadōša ‘they sold’47). Traces of Middle Bulgarian secular literature, like the anecdote about Socrates and his wife (f. 323r of Arabic pagination) can be found too. Punčo also included an introduction and four chapters of the Istoria Slavěnobolgarsḳạa, although he did not mention the name of its author.

In short, similar miscellaneous were being composed in the time with an increasing variety of contents, but none of the known ones has managed to collect pieces from all of these topics in such an encyclopaedical way. Punčo's manuscript is like an anthology, reflecting at least parts of a large proportion of non-liturgical Bulgarian literature as we know it in the 18th century - damaskini, apocrypha, homilies of Church Fathers (often pseudoepigraphic), Bradati's school, anecdotes on ancients, Istoria. The tome was also used as a source of at least two other damaskini identified by Conev (II 1923:284), NBKM 722 and 726. A third manuscript based on PPS is NBKM 1005, written by

---

46 It is puzzling, why Punčo did not use the panegyric edition, which includes the exploits of King John Asen, given his interest in historical (or national) topics - it seems his access to the damaskini tradition, which conveyed this edition, was very limited, if any. This supports the claim of Šaur (1970:18) that Punčo did not know Sophronius of Vratsa, who wrote at least two versions based on this edition, nor used his works as a source.

47 PL.AOR endings are in most dialects the same as for the imperfect tense already in early damaskini, e.g. rodîxa ‘they gave birth’ (Tixon.d.), although occasionally old endings appear with the Resava reflect of the old nasal, e.g. polažiša+ ju ‘they placed her’ (< *poležišča). It is possible the old endings were still productive in some western dialects by then. NBKM 328 uses both reflexes (e.g. satvoriša ‘they did’, pominuše ‘they passed’), Punčo too, but in different texts (Šaur 1970:49).
daskal Pârvan in 1847 in the village Banja in the vicinity of Montana, which copies even Punčo’s illustrations (Angelov II 1964:167; Kodov & Stojanov III 1964:162).

As already mentioned, the language of the manuscript is also a remarkable one. There are not many other sources relevant for the study of Northwestern dialectal area of this time. Later works by Sophronius of Vratsa, like the Vidin Miscellany and also the Nedělnik, show an influence of these dialects (Vătov 2001), but their author was not a native to the region. Punčo uses many forms, which are rare or ambiguous already in earlier damaskini. For example, markers of definiteness are employed systematically alongside accusative marking in both MASC and FEM genders, as it is still attested in nearby Torlak dialects (Vuković 2021), both in nouns and adjectives (e.g. ne+štējā bās da bīgosīvī negōvu+tu mītvu ‘God did not want to bless his prayer’; 101v). Dative marking alongside definiteness is attested too, but only rarely (e.g. mladō+tomu ĕvēku ‘to the young man’; 88v), the constructions with na preposition are more productive. These occur both with oblique (reče na+svojā stopanici ‘he said to his wife’; 62v) and generalized nominative (dadē na+ženā+to žīto ‘he gave crops to his wife’; 14r) endings. The MASC.sg definite ending is often written with an -o, which is not attested in the local dialect today (which has -d). Šaur (1970:39) considers this writing an orthographic feature invented by Punčo, who writes the middle vowel /ā/ mostly with ŭ or a - he tried to escape the ambiguity, as these characters were used to mark other cases.

As the texts are generally shorter, we have selected two chapters for our corpus, which we have already mentioned above - Life of St. Parascheva, (f. 74v-77v of Arabic pagination) and the biblical Story of Joseph, son of Rachel (f. 79v-92r). Of course, given the rich contents of the manuscript, such a sample is hardly sufficient to represent the whole work. For this reason, a digital edition of the whole Sbornik is being prepared separately within another project.

| Text title | various |
| Tokens | 3725 |
| Sentences | 532 |
| Source/Text date | 1796 |
| Source/Text origin | Mokreš |
| Norm | simple Bulgarian |
| Variety | Vidin-Lom |

48 A similar solution was later adopted by Neophyte of Rila in his grammar (Rilski 1836:86; Fielder 2019:46).
49 PPS shows multiple paginations, which may be confusing for a reader. Punčo’s own pagination uses Cyrillic numerals, starting with the prayer to the Guardian Angel (5). As other pages were later placed to the beginning, a new pagination by Arabic numerals was created likely by the librarians by a pencil. There are also traces of another Arabic pagination by a pen (e.g. p.180/f.82r), which was not fully implemented. Roman page numbers added by various hands appear at various places. For the sake of convenience, we give pencil-written Arabic numbers “folia” and page numbers of the .pdf edition (link) as “pages”. The titles in our list correspond to page titles, which are sometimes different from those in the Punčo’s index.

nominal articles 46 1.2349%
nominal nouns 62 1.6644%
adjunctive articles 9 0.2416%
ext. demonstratives 67 1.7987%
DAT.Poss pronouns 18 0.48322%
future particle šte 5 0.1342%
2.16. Berl.d. - Berlinski damaskin

The manuscript is held at the library of the Jagiellonian University in Cracow under the signature Slav. fol. 36. The origins of the damaskin are not clear. Demina (1968:61) classifies it as a type IV damaskin\(^{50}\). It includes a sidenote the year 1791 by pop Georgi, who is considered to be the scribe (Connev 1937:3; Petkanova-Toteva 1965:241)\(^{51}\). However, a more recent analysis of the watermarks argued, that it could not have been written before 1803 (Ciaramella 1996:120). There is another sidenote from 1847 by Alexander Živkov from Pleven (1830-1856), author of one of the first etymological dictionaries of Bulgarian (link). Živkov was likely a student of Kesarii Popvasilev from Kazanlăk (1805-1862, link) at the time and likely transcribed a Church Slavonic text into it (Connev 1937:15). Due to similarity in contents with other type IV damaskini, the main text was likely written over more years (at least 1791-1803) in Pleven or in the area.

It is unclear, how the manuscript landed in Germany. Another sidenote shows the book was acquired by the State Library in Berlin from Otto Harassowitz in 1899 (Connev 1937:4). It was likely moved to the abbey of Grüssau in 1942 along with other manuscripts of the library due to the bombardment of the city. After the war, the collection was claimed by the restored Polish government, and since 1947 it is placed in the Library of the Jagiellonian University in Cracow, being available to scholars, despite the dispute about its ownership between Poland and Germany (cf. Rutowska 2012). But let us not overshadow the importance of this source by politics - with its more than 40 chapters, Berl.d. is the largest among the surviving type IV damaskini. Similarly to other miscellanies from the late 18th century, its structure does not seem to follow any precedent: only the first three chapters remind us of the Sv.d., but even from here not all chapters are included.

Our corpus includes the untitled\(^{52}\) Life of St.Petka, which can be found on f. 179r-185v (Arabic pagination) or 180r-186v (Cyrillic). This edition of the Life is unique from multiple aspects. It was composed by a togizi translator on the basis of the shortened Church Slavonic text anew. The structure is much closer to the CS edition than the togazi translation (Demina 1968:167). Furthermore, the text is extended by the story about the capture of relics by Turks, the miracles performed in the Sultan's palace and their final translation to Jassy, which is likely based on the menaion edition by Demetrius of Rostov. It also includes a homily on Petka's virtues, which is not found in other sources. This edition is not attested in other sources in the same extent. A fragment of this edition containing a part taken from Demetrius is attested in the damaskin CIAI 133 from Pleven. The differences are minor; the texts had likely a common source, if CIAI 133 was not the protograph of the Berl.d. itself. The surviving text in CIAI 133 (cf. Sprostranov 1900:211) is too short to be clear.

From the linguistic point of view, Connev (1937:8) considered Berl.d. less interesting than Sv.d. due to certain "Russian" influences, like the o reflex of the old strong jer, mostly in prefixes (e.g. vozlóžix 'I laid'; Vuković 1536: vvozlóžix) and the use of <a> for /ja/ (e.g. toľga 'baton'). Although the vowels are

\(^{50}\) Her dating of the damaskin (second half of the 17th c.) is most likely wrong, as well as the signature (№ 35), which is not met among the manuscripts described by Connev (1937:2-15).

\(^{51}\) There is no apparent relation with the Georgi mentioned in Sv.d., but it is possible it was the name of the translator or editor of the togizi-circle from the early 18th c., duly copied in transcripts.

\(^{52}\) Likely unfinished, manuscript has empty place instead of titles and capital letters, at least in the chapter available to us.
given mostly phonetically, *Berl.d.* mostly discards the ă-stem ending with a jer\(^53\), which is attested in older damaskini, including CIAI 133:

Rostovski 1689: *togdā cārī tāi Sēlīm, vā grāda terniwo rātīju vosxītīnu, sī ‘inim’ bīgbolēpim’ cérkovaṃ’ i cārskim ōukrāšēniṃ*, i sī ę čēstnē mūštî prdōnypę paraskēviī ‘then Selim, having conquered Tarnovo with his army, took these honorable relics of the Reverend Parascheve also with other church and royal ornaments’

CIAI 133: *i toızī selîm moštī+te čūstnē petkī sas druģī xūbavī premeņī čērkovnī i crsī darove sas voīskā+ to sī ze Berl.d.: i+ togizī selîmī, čūstnī+te moštī stēč pēltī, sūs druģī xūbavī preměnī čērkojni, i+ crsī’ darovē, sūs voīskā+ ta+ to+ sī+ gī ęzē ‘then Selim took the honorable relics of the St.Petka, together with other beautiful ornaments of the church and royal gifts, taking them with his army

Still, the ă-stem final jer is attested elsewhere in the manuscript (e.g. on f.53r: *štēšy da ižlēzy na voīskā*^\(^-\) ‘he was going to war’; Conev 1937:5). It is likely the editor rather followed to orthography known from newer Church Slavonic sources, which is also indicated by the use of <ъ> as the MASC.SG.OB or stem ending - older sources prefer <ъ>, on this position according to Resava rules. Generally, nominal inflection seems to be limited to MASC.SG animate nouns (wstāvxīa stopānā 'they left [them] as landlords’, *kam_to edinago bqa* 'towards the only God’, nē’kogō mom’kā svē t’lā ['she saw] a shiny boy’, *šīn na+ stārōgo cq’* asē’ na ‘son of the old king Asen’, *pred’ cṛ+tokō* ‘before the king’). This includes the names (*Krtsītelē īwān’na oupripiličāvā* ['she likened [herself] to John the Baptist’), unless they end on -ii (sūs brāta+ i ēveimīe). FEM.SG inflections are rare, but inconsistent (e.g. *wtīde v’ žēmlījū* [ACC] *moldovskījē* [GEN] ['she went to the land of Moldova’).

Another *togizī* edition can be found in the damaskin NBKM 1083, written in 1821 in Svīštov. It is unclear, whether its scribe used an older *togizī* translation or the Church Slavonic text as a basis. The text has the same structure as Vuković 1536 edition: it ends at the placement of the Petka’s relics in Tarnovo, with no trace of the “update” and the homily from the CIAI 133/Berl.d. edition. There are also some notable lexical differences:

Vuković 1536: *nikāko+že prēstā loūkavy’* tou’ iskoušajuštī, *mu’čtān’mi+ že i+ prividēn’mi.* ‘and the Evil one was not stopping to make her trials by visions and apparitions’

*Berl.d.: a+ drāvūl lūkāvīl nikāk’ ne+ prestāna da+ ę *b’stī, i+ da ę plāś’* ‘and the evil Devil was not stopping to deceive and scare her’

NBKM 1083: *alā nikāk’ ne+pristāna, lūkāvī drāvol, tāmu da+ā ispitūva sās* *nalūkī i+ sanovē* ‘and the Evil one was not stopping to make her trials by wraiths and dragons’

We have used in our corpus a manual transcript based on the facsimile of the original. Both were provided by Prof. Barbara Sonnenhauser and Prof. Jürgen Fuchsauer. The text was also been published online as a browser-capable edition (link).

---

\(^53\) This marking is common in older damaskini, but the reason behind it is not clear. Velčeva (1966:117) considered it an oblique case marker, but it was not very strictly employed. The variation between a and b in ă-stem endings likely reflects conflicting tendencies for phonetic transcription of the ending and the preservation of the orthographic final jer, as in the case of Punčo’s article form -o (cf. section on PPS). East Bulgarian dialects generalized the old FEM.SG.ACC ending -a (< OCS -o; Mirčev 1978:170; see also below the section on *Nedēnīk* 1856). Due to the shift of unstressed vowels, the ending in many words with non-final stress was realized as /a/; under stress, the pronunciation remained an /â/. In *Tixon.d.*, the marking is not consistent from any of these points of view (e.g. a jer under stress within a word: *do+ si ukraśi dšē+ta* ‘to make her soul beautiful’; a word-final jer under stress: *na+ t’bīi strānš* ‘into this land’; a word-final a under stress: *i+ vēksūjuvaše ķērēvā* ‘and she ate grass’). *Trajan d.* employs often a jus, Cyrillic <ъ>, on such positions, yet with no more consistency than the *Tixon.d.* edition (e.g. *i rodīxā tęp ćištō i xva gōlubica* ‘and they gave birth to that pure dove of Christ’; Ivanova 1967:77).
Conev uses the Cyrillic pagination written by the scribe. Chapter numbers should match those given by Demina to the manuscript (1968:62-63).
**2.17. Nedělnik 1806**

*Kyriakodromion sirečъ: Nedělníkъ - Poučenie* is the title of the book of Sunday homilies by Sophronius, bishop of Vratsa (1739-1813), published in 1806 in Rầmnic. It is often considered one of the first - if not the very first - printed book in the modern Bulgarian language, said to be more spread in the Revival period Bulgaria than the Bible itself (Stefanov 2008:61). The scans of the original edition are available at the World Digital Library, where it is titled as *Sunday Book* ([link](https://digitallibrary.org/sunday-book)).

Together with Paisius of Hilandar, Sophronius is counted among the founders of modern Bulgarian literature. Born as Stoiko in Kotel in a family of a cattle merchant, he changed various trades after the death of his father in 1750. When he became a priest in 1762 he was already an active scribe. In 1765 he transcribed a damaskin on the basis of a type II source (Demina 1968:57), as well as the *Istoria Slavěnobolgarskaa*, using likely Paisius' own manuscript (cf. Romanski 1938:vi). Active in various parts of Bulgaria and on Athos, he became a bishop of Vratsa in 1794. During the rebellion of Osman Pazvantoğlu he abdicated from the episcopal seat and was interned by him in Vidin in 1800. During this time he wrote other two miscellanies, the first of which is sometimes considered an early variant of *Nedělník* (Staneva 2013:122). In 1803 he left for Bucharest, were he wrote the *Nedělník*, as well as *Žitie i stradanie grěšnago Sofronia*, likely the first autobiography written in modern Bulgarian (cf. Dylevskij & Robinson 1976).

Both *Nedělník* and *Žitie i stradanie* can be considered his late works, planned and finished systematically. The both, however, differ widely from the point of view of their language. Sophronius himself writes that he translated texts from the "deep and wide Slavonic and Greek" into "simple and short Bulgarian" (266r), but, in fact, the *Nedělník* is a typical example of a *Slavenobulgarian* text, adapting many elements from Church Slavonic of the Russian redaction like the expression of possession with genitive pronouns instead of dative forms or adjectives. In this respect, *Žitie i stradanie* is much closer to Bulgarian vernaculars:

*Nedělník* 1806: *da+ sę` nasladì na+ gledánie Krasotỳ egò*

'to enjoy the vision of His beauty'

*Žitie i stradanie*: *lice+to mu kato ogʹnь zapalen*

'his face (was) like a burning fire'

The difference was maybe due to prestigious reasons, due to sacral character of *Nedělník*. They may also be caused by the interference of Church Slavonic: Sophronius may have perceived the differences between his originals and produced texts less exactly than we do. On the other hand, his autobiography was written anew. But still, there are also many features common for both texts, distinguishing them from works closer to the vernacular, especially in syntax. Constructions using periphrastic infinitives, like the future in past, are using the past (mostly imperfect) verbal root *xoču* as an auxiliary verb. This form is common in *PPS* (along shorter *šta*), but as it appears more frequently in biblical texts, it is more likely a Church Slavonic influence. Sophronius uses this auxiliary verb in both texts:

*Nedělník* 1806: *xočeše da wstávi ónyę stóplъ*

'he was going to leave the pillar'

*Žitie i stradanie*: *xočexe ot studь da izmrem*

'we were going to die of cold'

We have selected the *Life of St. Petka* (called here *Parascheva of Tarnovo*) from the *Nedělník* for our corpus, which can be found on folia 184v-187r. The text is based on the Russian edition by Demetrius of Rostov (Rostovski 1689), which has also been used by the *togizi* translator of the CIAL 133/Be rl.d. edition. Sophronius has added his own prologue and epilogue to the text. The text was further spread
in handwritten damaskini. A transcript with Greek letters is available in CIAI 369 and NBKM 1064, which however, lacks the prologue and is also influenced by the damaskini edition. The NBKM 728 edition, included in our corpus, is also most likely based on Nedělník or a transcript of it. The whole Nedělník was edited into Bulgarian (Bogorov’s) standard in 1856 by Todor Xrulev. This edition is also added into our corpus.

For our corpus, we have used a digital transkript based on facsimile of the original edition. The text has been used in both studies using the parallel corpus of Life of St. Petka editions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>Skazanie o žitie prepodobnyh matere našej Paraskevi Ternovskij</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>2215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text date</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text origin</td>
<td>Rânnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>Slavenobulgarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.18. Krčovski 1814

The book titled *Tale of the Terrible and Second Coming of Christ* (*Повесть рай ди страшнаго и втораго пришествие Христова*) was written by xadži Joakim Krčovski (†1820), published as a printed book in Budapest in 1814. Its author is respected as one of the founding fathers of both modern Bulgarian and Macedonian literature. He was born around 1750 in Oslomej, a village next to Kičevo in today’s North Macedonia, becoming a priest in 1780s. Later he worked as a teacher in Kratovo, in one of the first schools open both to male and female students (Georgiev 1980:147). Krčovski published at least five books in print, containing both original works and translations. The *Tale* was reprinted at least three times with language corrections (Cojnska 1979:28).

Similarly as the scribes of damaskini, Krčovski adds to the title of this work the phrase *preveděnna na prostěišii jazykъ Bolgarskii* ‘translated into simple Bulgarian language’. At least from the point of view of features listed below, his language is truly closer to that of the damaskini and the local, West Macedonian vernacular than that of *Nedělnik* and similar works. As such, the publication was heartly welcomed already by slavists as a primary source for the studies of Bulgarian (Kopitar 1829:67). The content of his works included the genres typical for damaskini - apocryphal stories, homilies on specific topics and hagiographies, mostly without references to the liturgical year. His orthography is generally conservative, but his works are also among the first ones using predominantly Arabic numerals (Cojnska 1979:48).
From among the archaic features, Krčovski uses occasional nominal datives (e.g. pákъ sè poklánětъ diávolu 'they bow to the Devil again') and adjectival long forms, used as in Church Slavonic in subject phrases (e.g. oubъ níxni slépъ 'their mind is blind'), both common in damaskini. Other oblique case forms are rare, used according to Church Slavonic norms (e.g. MASC.PLINST in sè učínilie pustýnnikami 'they became hermits'). According to Cojnska (1979:336), his choice subordinate clause markers also reflects the language of the damaskini. On the other hand, Krčovski expresses past tense mostly using l-participles, similarly to Nedělník. However, he uses them without an auxilla and with the vernacular plural ending -le (e.g. ne+ gò ızéle 'they did not eat him'), common otherwise (among the texts of our corpus) in NBKM 728. Future is expressed by the characteristic particle ke followed by a da-construction (e.g. kě+ da+ č posákams 'i will search for her'). Another vernacular feature is the use of 3PL.PRS form se (e.g. zašto sè dušmáni bgu 'because they are enemies of God'), which has also been standardized in Macedonian (Lunt 1952:79). Abundant are also instances of double object marking, with a preference for 3rd person forms (e.g. da+ gi naúči násъ 'to teach us'). This construction is not always used clearly, causing some confusion in the later transcript in Rai.d., which may be relevant for the study of its developments:

Krčovski 1814: zatuvá ne+xévé rni+te gi frsîlåle ou oginъ
'for that reason they were thrown to fire by the unbelievers'

Rai.d.: zatu:vá nê+vern+te xi+ fârleli na+ agan
'for that reason they threw the believers to fire'

For the Rhodopean editor, the pronoun was perceived to mark the syntactic role of the preceding noun as an object - thus the negative particle had to be struck for logical congruence, as in the narrative the believers were the victims, not the perpetrators. This contrasts with the original text, where one would expect object double object marking to occur earlier, as in Macedonia we can observe the feature common also in non-Slavic languages (Friedman 2008:135f.).

For our corpus we have selected the second part of the book (p. 25-46) about the prophecy of Daniel (Slovo vtoroe světago proroka Danila). Our transcript is based on a facsimile provided by the National Library of Bulgaria (link). Similarly to the first part, which shows only very loose influences of the Second Coming by Stouditēs, the text may be considered Krčovski’s own composition. A transcript of the text can also be found in the Rai.d., which shows some intriguing differences between Macedonian and Rhodopean dialects. We have used a digital transcript based on a scan of the original edition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>Slovo vtoroe světago proroka Danila</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>2306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text date</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text origin</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>simple Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Kičevo-Poreče</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source contents</td>
<td>(page 3) Slovo zaradi strašenъ sudъ božii i vtoroe prišestvie Kristovo, (p.25) Slovo vtoroe světago proroka Danila</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55 These appear along constructions with na and oblique case, e.g. davâte na diávola 'you give to the Devil'.
56 We have found the same text in the manuscript NBKM 724, which is dated to the 18th century by Conev (1923 II:381). We were not able to analyze this source yet. The parts texts available at Obdurodon show, that it includes both chapters. The dating of the manuscript is questionable. Conev describes the language as a "western" dialect, but the text has future marker šte instead of Macedonian ke used by Krčovski. The passages provided by Obdurodon show some differences, which may have emerged due to misunderstanding of Krčovski’s vocabulary (e.g. in Krčovski 1814:7 ovde sme surgunъ 'we are in an exile here' > ovde sme sutrunъ 'we are here in the morning [?]’ in NBKM 724). The manuscript also lacks about a half of both texts. Page numbers show that three of the first pages were likely lost, but the second text ends abruptly. Still, this does not fully exclude the possibility Krčovski used an existing text tradition as his source.
2.19. **NBKM 1064**

Modern scholars identified three manuscripts from Sliven, dated to early 19th century, which were written by the same person in an East Bulgarian dialect using Greek letters. The first of them, a collection of Sunday homilies roughly based on *Nedělnik*, was published as a critical edition already by Miletić (1920), and it is held in the Library of the Academy of Sciences in Bucharest under number 440 (Dimitrova 2015:124). Another one, which we have used for our corpus, is held in the National Library in Sofia with signature НБКМ 1064. It was first described as a damaskin by Kodov & Stojanov (Ill 1964:358-361), who also identified the scribe with that of *Ms slav. 440*. The third manuscript, the largest one of them, is held in the Church Archive in Sofia under number 369, described first only briefly by Petkanova-Toteva (1965:250). *CIAI 369* contains some sidenotes (f. vi-r) about its origin: it was written in Sliven in 1827 and it belonged to *xadži* Gendo Vălkov.

Sliven was among important cultural and political centers of Bulgarians in the early 19th century. A Greek school existed here in early 19th century, which was likely visited by Gendo himself. He was a rich man and a collector of books, who left Sliven after the war in 1829 for newly liberated Wallachia, taking the *Ms slav. 440* with him (Dimitrova 2015:125). From Wallachia he sponsored the construction of a church in Sliven in 1834 ([link](https://example.com)). He could have sponsored a scribe to prepare the manuscripts for him, but also could have had the knowledge to produce them by himself.

In any case, the text is written phonetically - at least as far as the Greek script allows it. Its closeness to contemporary East Bulgarian dialects was noticed already by Miletić (1920:7). The text shows common features like the reduction of unstressed vowels (e.g. *mpiz*+ *postêlka lizesi* 'she laid without a bed'), but also less frequent changes like *l > r* (*istzirjóvane* 'healing'), which hint at the possibility that the scribe used Greek language more. Middle vowel /ā/ is usually written with an alpha (e.g. *sâlzi* 'tears'). From the point of view of morphology, the text has the highest frequency of articles following adjectives. It contains some features, which are not met in other damaskini. One of them is frequent double marking of possession, especially in phrases containing datives in older texts:

*Tixon.d.: i+ tâmo prîpâde na+ ikôna prstêi bci*

**NBKM 1064:** *tâmo prîpâdno na+ ikona+ ta+ i na+ presfetâe mpogorôditza*

'there she bowed to the icon of the most holy Mother of God'

Our corpus contains the *Life of St. Petka* from this source, which we have also used in our study concerning standardization (Šimko 2021). The *Life* is contained in both *CIAI 369* and *NBKM 1064*. Both versions are very similar: they are close to the old (*Ljub.d.* type) damaskini edition, extended by the story of translation of Petka’s relics to Jassy and Sophronius’ epilogue taken from *Nedělnik*. However, the beginning in *CIAI 369* is closer to that of *Nedělnik* (typically locating Epibates in the "land of Serbia")

---

57 As mentioned in the previous note, Krčovski uses the form *kê*, which is (like *şte* in standard Bulgarian) not conjugated for person and number.
while that of NBKM 1064 is close to older damaskini editions - for this reason we have chosen the latter for the corpus.

Our transcript is based on a facsimile provided by the library. Due to the peculiarities of the Greek script, the diplomatic transcription contained in the corpus file contains more changes than in sources using Cyrillic. These mostly include the transcription of consonants written with two letters (e.g. ḡalampıtsa > galabica) and ambiguous sibilants (e.g. dutzjákaxa > dućjakaxa 'they suffered', but tzarográždenı > carográždenı 'Tzarigradians'). In this way, a comparison with Cyrillic sources can be done more easily.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>Živeenitu i na sfetae prepodobnae maika našja Petka Tarnovskaja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>3705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text date</td>
<td>1820s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text origin</td>
<td>Subbukan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>simple Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source contents</td>
<td>(folio 1r) recipe for a medicine, prayers, (chapter 1, 4r) Na sfetago oca našega Simeona Stolpnika, (2, 16r) Rasdiganietou na čestnago i životvornago kresta Gospodnia, (3, 26r) Čjoudo deto sa e storilo f Carigrat na cerkova Vlaxernae, (4, 31v) Živeenitu i na sfetae prepodobnae maika našja Petka Tarnovskaja, (5, 43r) Mačenieto na sfetago slavnago velikomoučenika Dimitria, (6, 53v) Oumiranieto na sfetago apostola i evangelista Ioanna Bogoslova, (7, 69v) Slovo na sfetago apostola Θομᾶ, (8, 80r) Na prepodobnago oca našega Savva Osfeštennego, (9, 89r) Mačenieto mou i čjesesata mou na sfetago slavnago i velikomoučenika Georgie Pobedonosca, (10, 123r) Slovo out sfetago Ioanna Zlatooustago zardai doušvenoe pokajanie, (11, 138r) Slovo u to out sfetago Ioanna Zlatooustago zardai deto sa zli ženi, (12, 139v) Slovo tretiou i to out sfetago Ioanna Zlatooustago zardai doubri ženi, (13, 140r) Slovo četvertoe out sfetago Ioanna Zlatooustago i to zarat pokajanie, (14, 146v) Mačenieto na sfetago velikomoučenika Eustatie novago iova deto sa nareče i žina mou Θεapist, (15, 170r) Mačenieto na sfetago velikomoučenika Eustatie novago iova deto sa nareče i žina mou Θεapist, (16, 182r) Slovo f sabota na Voskresieni na sfetago Lazara, (17, 193r) Živeenitou mou na sfetago oca našega archepiskopa Nicolae Čjoudotvorca Mirilikiiskago, (17a, 195v) Zarati triti moumi detou gi vazvarna i gi kouroulisa out kourouvstvou sftetii Nikolae, (17b, 199r) Zarati katou xodi sftetii Nikolae da sa pokloni na Božii grom, (17c, 202r) Zarati okelu čamanda da sou storat vladika sfetago velikago Nikolae, (17d, 205r) Zarati Oria eretika deto sou zasrami na saboura sftetii Nikolae pret sftetii ocoi, (17e, 208v) Zarati glad kogitou stana na sčkata mirilikiieska starna iz okoulou, (17f, 210r) Zarati trima čelovec gi kouroulisal sftetii Nikolae out apansas oumiran no praved detou štexas da gi pogobuat, (17g, 215r) Zarati trima valvoi carski ka gi kouroulisa i tjax out smart sftetii veliki Nikolae, (17h, 224v) Podir oumiranietou mou na sfetago Nikolae, (17i, 229r) Čjoudo zaradi kourotolisa σftetii Nikolae out tourski race Agrikouva sin Vasilie, (17j, 234v) Čjoudo zaradi pop Kristofora kaou kouroulisa out pouščeni sftetii Nikolae, (17k, 237r) Čjoudo zaradi niakouisi türčen kaou gi izvadi sftetii Nikolae out temnica, (17l, 240v) Čjoudo zaradi edno dipe detou padad f ouda golema o sftetii Nikolae ouz goupadi da sa ni oudavi, (17m, 244v) Čjoudo zaradi niakouisi čelovec Dimitrie imitou mou kaou kouroulisa sftetii Nikolae out poutoupjavane i negou, (18, 249r) Mačenietou mou na sfetago slavnago sfeštennomoučenika Karalampie, (19, 261v) Ouvaoždianietou f cerkova na prepofte maika našja Bogorodica.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the language of active earlier in Samokov (cf. Angelov I 1963:I:168 f.). Whether Pavle was related to any of them is unclear.

According to this sidenote, the manuscript was written in 1821. Popovič also gives 1817 as the time of writing, it is likely it was written over a longer period. Later it belonged to Sava Filaretov (1825-1863), an archivist and founder of the first school for girls in Bulgaria, and then to Naiden Gerov. It is self-titled domaskin, but only the last chapter seems to be based on a text from Thēsauros.

The dialectal classification is not clear. Kodov & Stojanov (III 1964:398) localize the features to the Pirdop-Koprivštica area of the Balkan Mt. dialects. Relation to Sophronius and Filaretov would hint at an origin in the Kotel-Elena area. The text shows full MASC.GEN articles (e.g. sîvta+tBU 'the world') and reduced vowels (e.g. dEtu 'which'), which are more in favor of Kotel-Elena (cf. Stojkov 1993:112-113). Other features typical for the Pirdop area are somewhat less clear to see due to Church Slavonic influences: for example dialectal sequence rBU is given with the Russian reflex (e.g. têr'pim 'I suffer'). On the other hand, many instances show the middle vowel /a/ reflected with an i (e.g. vlik'B 'wolf', sîs 'with', kâlič'B 'sword', cf. tr. kilič). Such a feature is not known from either of the two areas. A variation between â or i as reflexes of Old Bulgarian y according to accentuation can be found in Rhodopes, in the area of Široka lâka (Stojkov 1993:133), as well as in the area of Thessalonica (Stojkov 1993:185).

2.20. NBKM 1081

This collection of mostly moral teachings and apocryphal texts is held in the National Library of Sofia under the given signature. It was first described by Kodov & Stojanov (III 1964:396-398). The scribe identifies himself as Pavle Popovič on the folio 53v, following the Homily on penance of the soul. According to this sidenote, the manuscript was written in 1821. Popovič also gives here his sources: a text from 1805 by pop Dimitrić, who transcribed a text written by a certain pop Stoiko in 1769. Kodov & Stojanov (III 1964:398) identify this Stoiko with Sophronius of Vratsa. As an earlier sidenote (f. 20v) gives 1817 as the time of writing, it is likely it was written over a longer period. Later it belonged to Sava Filaretov (1825-1863), an archivist and founder of the first school for girls in Bulgaria, and then to Naiden Gerov. It is self-titled domaskin, but only the last chapter seems to be based on a text from Thēsauros.

The dialectal classification is not clear. Kodov & Stojanov (III 1964:398) localize the features to the Pirdop-Koprivštica area of the Balkan Mt. dialects. Relation to Sophronius and Filaretov would hint at an origin in the Kotel-Elena area. The text shows full MASC.GEN articles (e.g. sîvta+tBU 'the world') and reduced vowels (e.g. dEtu 'which'), which are more in favor of Kotel-Elena (cf. Stojkov 1993:112-113). Other features typical for the Pirdop area are somewhat less clear to see due to Church Slavonic influences: for example dialectal sequence rBU is given with the Russian reflex (e.g. têr'pim 'I suffer'). On the other hand, many instances show the middle vowel /a/ reflected with an i (e.g. vlik'B 'wolf', sîs 'with', kâlič'B 'sword', cf. tr. kilič). Such a feature is not known from either of the two areas. A variation between â or i as reflexes of Old Bulgarian y according to accentuation can be found in Rhodopes, in the area of Široka lâka (Stojkov 1993:133), as well as in the area of Thessalonica (Stojkov 1993:185).

59 There is no apparent connection to the scribe of NBKM 1069.
60 The Life of St. Eusthatius is a similar edition to that of NBKM 1064. Petkanova-Toteva (1965:254) did not consider it Stouditēs edition.
61 From Žeravna, birthplace of Filaretov, also comes the teacher and translator Raino Popovič (1773-1858), the founder of a Greek schools in Kotel, Svîštov and Karlovo. Other family of writers with the name Popovič was active earlier in Samokov (cf. Angelov I 1963:I:168 f.). Whether Pavle was related to any of them is unclear. However, the languange of NBKM 1081 does not show influence of Bradati's school.
Another feature found in Rhodopoes is the use of preposition of for possession (*edná stáva ut teló+tu 'a bone of the body'; Miletić 1920:16; also in the title of the included text), as in *NBKM 1423*, but this is only rarely attested. The *y* is also found in the East, at some locations within the Shumen area (Stojkov 1993:105; *BDA* 2001:91). Thus the text likely represents a transitional variety between the Shumen and Central Balkan areas, where the old *y* was undergoing a similar development as in the Široka lăka dialect. From the point of view of compared features, *NBKM 1081* is also very similar to the Bulgarian standard of the *Nedělnik* 1856.

The corpus includes two texts from the manuscript. The first is titled *Homily of St. Prophet Daniel*, which can be found on folia 54r-56r. Similarly titled chapters can be found in Krčovski 1814 (and Rai.d.) and *PPS*, but these are based on a different text traditions. The former is likely Krčovski’s own composition. Punčo’s edition reflects the paraphrase of chapters 6 and 14 of the biblical Book of Daniel, which was widespread in apocryphal miscellanies like *NBKM 309* (Milenova 2018:96). The story in *NBKM 1081* uses motives from the chapters 10-12 of the biblical story, but reformulates them as a prophecy of the destruction of Ottoman Empire. This is the topic of the following chapter too, *Homily of a certain hermit* (f. 56r-57v), which has also been included in the corpus. The text was identified already by Kodov & Stojanov (III 1964:397) as a transcript of the prophecies of Martin Zadek. These were first anonymously published in Basel in 1770 in German. They became popular in Russia, where they inspired various new texts, pioneering the fantastic genre here (e.g. Veitman 1833). Likely one such text was used by Popovič too62.

The texts were manually transcribed on the basis of facsimiles provided by the library. Both texts represent well the trend of democratization of literature: religious themes are gradually replaced by secular, national ones, and the language moves further from norms typical for older Church Slavonic and damaskini literature. Although the contents hardly show any reference to precedent source, they likely show a language variety very close to the local vernacular.

---

62 It is possible such texts could serve propaganda purposes during the wars between Russia and Turkey (the last before our damaskin in 1806-1812), as well as in the outbreak of national revolutions in Wallachia and Greece in 1820. The text really speaks of a war between Greeks and Turks, but starting first after the Constantinople is taken by Poles.
nominal articles 50 2.5484%
MASC.GEN/ACC nouns 22 1.1213%
adjectival articles 29 1.4781%
ext. demonstratives 21 1.0703%
DAT.POSS pronouns 6 0.3058%
future particle šte 76 3.8736%
long-form adjectives 50 2.5484%
synthetic infinitives 2 0.1019%
2/3.PL.AOR endings - -
non-NOM articles - -

2.21. NBKM 728

National Library in Sofia holds a short manuscript under signature НБКМ 728 (388), described by Conev (II 1923:383) as a "fragment of a folk damaskin". The booklet contains only 12 lists, which were originally bound with a copy of Miracles of the Mother of God by Joakim Krčovski published in 1817. The book was sent to Sofia from Thessalonica, and it used to belong to a certain pop Jakov "from Macedonia"63, although it is not clear, whether he was also the scribe64 or not. Unfortunately, there is no more precise information available about the place and date of origin of the booklet than 19th century (likely after 1817) in Macedonia in the broad sense.

The geographic and dialectal classification is the main reason behind including a text from this source. Similar handwritten sources are scarce in Macedonia and mostly written in Church Slavonic, like Vel.s. and Kiev d. included in our corpus. It is also the only known attested copy of the Life of St. Petka in a damaskin from the area. The text (titled Žitie prepodobnaę Paraskeva), available on folia 7r-9r, is a shortened version of the edition from the Nedělnik 1806. NBKM 728 shows well lexical (takoina 'homeland', krah 'king'), phonetic and morphosyntactic characteristics of the area, examples for the both of which can be seen on the following sentence:

\[
\text{Nedělnik 1806: I katò kopaïli (…) toqc `róvn (…) naišlé edino tě`lo člčskoe ne izgnílo} \\
\text{NBKM 728: kopaïki grobo naïdoa tělo ne+izgnięno} \\
\text{`as they dug the grave, they found an unscathed body'}
\]

A typical Macedonian phonetic feature is the elision of \(x\) in 3PL.AOR naídoa 'they found'. A morphosyntactic example is the use of the uninflected gerund form kopaiki 'digging'. Although it is today standardized in both Bulgarian and Macedonian (with the palatal marker as -\( ki\)), it is only rarely seen in other sources in our corpus, also with different endings (e.g. plačiskomь 'crying' in Sv.d.). The ending -\( ki\) is also common in West Bulgaria (Mirccev 1978:243), and it shows a specific phonetic development of old PTCP.PRS.ACT.FEM.SG.NOM ending, attested in Church Slavonic as -\( št\). The scribe seems to prefer adjectival possessive pronouns instead of dative clitics (e.g. sladki glasь negovi 'his sweet voice'; Nedělnik has egò), which are mostly used as indirect objects (e.g. da+ e65 reča 'to tell her'). Past tense is frequently expressed by l-participles without an auxiliary verb (e.g. toku+ go stavile

---

63 There was a certain pop Jakov Sazdanov active as a priest in Tetovo, who tried to found here a school for girls in 1836 (link). However, the information on both Sazdanov and the booklet is too scarce. The scribe erroneously interpreted year of translation of Petka's relics to Jassy (given by Sophronius in Cyrillic numerals as -\( x\)a inexp., i.e. 1641) as a word naxama, which would be unexpected from a priest. The day of the Petka's feast (14th of October) is reflected correctly, but in Arabic numerals.

64 Or one of two scribes - the included text is written partly in a simplified polustav and partly in cursive, switching approximately in the middle. Conev interprets this as two different scribes, but it is possible the scribe just was in a hurry. The language of both is the same, and orthographically they are very close too. One of them writes i as <\( i\)>, the other one with <\( ci\).

65 This form of the FEM.SG.DAT personal pronoun is frequently attested in the folk songs collected in Macedonia by Miladinov brothers. They write it down as unaccented $e$, to be read as /e/ (Miladinovi 1861:iv).
'they just left it'). Long-form adjectives seem to be preferred in \textit{MASC.SG} too (as in \textit{sladkí glasь negovi}). Unlike other sources, the text does not show any accentuation. The scribe uses a unique cross-like graphem similar to older Cyrillic <ꙃ>, likely reflecting the palatal /ǵ/ (given as \textit{ћ} in our transcript, e.g. \textit{ћorћïę} ‘Georg’).

For the purposes of our corpus, we have used the facsimile provided by the library as a basis for the transcript. The text was already used in the study concerning standardization.

2.22. \textit{Rai.d. - Raikovski damaskin}

\textit{Raikovski damaskin} is a late collection containing both handwritten and printed texts, now preserved in the National Library in Plovdiv under signature НБИВ 160 (600). It was bound together around the year 1879 in Raikovo (today part of Smoljan) by Georgi Radev (†1910), whose family donated the book to the library in 1922. It consists of five parts: only the first, newest part was likely written by Radev. Sometimes only the third part, dated to 1859-1860, is considered the damaskin "proper". According to Stojanov (1972:230) this part was written by another hand, signed as \textit{Voutzof} (Bučov?) or \textit{Vasiliou}, who likely was a student of Kirjak Belkovski (1820-1892), a renowned local translator.

The works by Belkovski and his circle are characterized by the use of Greek letters. This phenomenon, not limited to a single scribe, is likely due to the isolation of the area from other circles of Bulgarian literature - both geographically and politically. The character set is very similar to that of NBKM 1064, although no clear contact between the Belkovski’s circle and Sliven could be discovered so far. The main difference is in use of digraphs for the vowel /e/ (e.g. \textit{ståi+ da+ ni+ pusetzé ‘it will slice us’}, actually written like a single letter (similar to \textit{un}). Jotified vowels like \textit{ia} are not underlined and the accentuation is also simplified. In any case, the manuscript includes works, which were known to other damaskini circles, like the \textit{Martyrdom of St George}.

We have selected the \textit{Homily of saint prophet Daniel about Lord’s Judgement} (\textit{slóvo ftóroe zaradı´ góspodova+ta sadóviai sfetágw proróka daniila}), which can be found on pages 147-155. The text is dated in the title to 1860. Although Stojanov considered the damaskin to be a translation of Greek works (e.g. Stojanov 1972:227), as the manuscript also includes translations of Stoudités’ works.
produced by the Belkovski or his students (Mitrinov 2015:6), this chapter is more likely a transcript from Krčovski (1814). This is obvious from the title, which copies the ordinal of the "second chapter" in the original (slóvo ftóroe), although it is the tenth chapter in the damaskin. The scribe also preserves some traces of original's typically Macedonian features, like the 3PL.PRS se ‘they are’ (e.g. zaštò mi’sle+ se pózii 'because [such] thoughts are of God'; but also zaštò sa+ dusmàne pógu). Sometimes the scribe did not fully understand the text, simply copying the graphics, but with different word boundaries:

Krčovski 1814: i komù mu xódi oumъ támw i vámw po pómysli grě´šni
Rai.d.: i+ kómu+ mu xódi támu+ i+ vám pópomu zlí grésni
‘and whose thoughts wander about sinful ideas’

For the purposes of our corpus we have used a manual transcript of the facsimile, provided at the website of the library [link].

Text title Slovo ftoroe zaradi Gospodovata sadovie sfetago proroka Daniila
Tokens 2329
Sentences 313
Source/Text date 1860
Source/Text origin Raikovo
Norm simple Bulgarian
Variety Smoljan
Source contents (chapter 1, page 1 of the damaskin) Slovu kazuva zaradi sfeti Georgi čudata mu, (2, p.32) [V nedelja na Petedesetnica, samo načaloto], (3, p.39) [Mǎčenie na svetija slaven slaven, Teodor Stratilat], (4, p.57) [Za sveti Xaralampi], (5, p.70) [Slovo v petata nedelja po Luka], (6, p.79) Slovu zaradi prorok Ilie, (7, p.105) Na Karstovden didaksuvanie, (8, p.131) Slovu na sveta Nedele, (9, p.146) [Nedelja Vrăbnica. Za podgotovkata za priemane na božestvenoto pričastie, samo načaloto], (10, p.147) Slovo ftoroe zaradi Gospodovata sadovie sfetago proroka Daniila, (11, p.155) [Nedelja na Petedesetnica], (12, p.160) [Bàzxvala na Bogorodica], (13, p.170) [Nedelja XI, ot Miniat], (14, p.179) [Na samarjankata], (15, p.187) [Nedelja na slepija, samo načaloto], (16, p.190) [Na nedele na malak Veliden zaradi verata], (17, p.194) [Tàlkovanie na evangelieto ot Luka za tretata nedelja], (18, p.199) Damaškino na čerkvata, (19, p.222) [Nedelja na svetite otci na Damaskina monaxa], (20, p.239-285) Patilutu i tegilutu na Gospoda našego lissusa Xrista (Stojanov 1972:225-227)

nominal articles 49 2.103%
MASC.GEN/ACC nouns 41 1.7597%
adjectival articles 21 0.9013%
ext. demonstratives 39 1.6738%
DAT.POSS pronouns 4 0.1717%
future particle šte 6 0.2575%
long-form adjectives 61 2.618%
synthetic infinitives - -
2/3.PLAOR endings 1 0.0429%
non-NOM articles - -

2.23. Nedělnik 1856

The last entry in our corpus is titled Evangelie poučitelno. This is a second edition of Sophronius’s Nedělnik, heavily edited by the teacher, writer and politician Todor Xrulev (1821-1865), according to the norms of standardized language of the 1850s. Xrulev did not edit only the grammar, but also the contents of the book, which reflects the Church year more exactly. The book was published in Novi Sad in 1856. Xrulev himself contributed much to the standardization process himself - not only by his redaction of one of the most influential and widespread texts among literate Bulgarians, but also by
writing many schoolbooks, including a work on grammar (Xrulev 1859).

The process of standardization did not cease in this time: the theoretical works of Marin Drinov and the development of a system of mass education in Bulgaria after 1878 were yet to come. Still, after the publication of Bogorov's grammar in 1844, the course of the standardization was already set. One of the typical features of the Bogorov's grammar, which was later removed from the standard, was the specific marking of FEM.SG.ACC nouns with an ending -ơ (Cyrillic <ъ>; Andreev 1844:20). This was not seen in the earlier grammar of Neophyte of Rila (cf. Rilski 1835:78), being basically an Old Church Slavonic ending66. Although Xrulev reiterated the rule in his own grammar (Xrulev 1856:17), he was inconsistent in its use, often using the ACC marker only on one element of the noun phrase (e.g. predadi blažennǫ+tǫ si duša 'she gave her blessed soul') or not at all (e.g. učexa svęta Paraskeva 'they taught St. Parascheva').

The text of the Life of St. Petka (titled Oktomvrię 14. za svętąc Paraskeva, p. 256-258) has been digitalized earlier for our study of definiteness markers (Şimko 2020), but it was not included in the first release of the corpus yet. We have used a copy of the book in the National Library of Sofia (signature Cr 56.339). It has also been digitalized and it is available online at the website of the library (link).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text title</th>
<th>Oktomvrię 14. za svętąc Paraskeva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text date</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Text origin</td>
<td>Novi Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Andreev 1844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

66 Although the specific FEM.SG oblique case marking of nouns was attested in some dialects and works (employed even with the same letter -ơ in Trojan.d.; see above the entries for PPS and Berl.d.), it was unknown to Central Balkan (the location of both Bogorov’s and Xrulev’s origin - the former being from Karlovo, the latter from Ljaskovec near today’s Veliko Tărnovo) and Svištov (the location of most of their scientific activity) dialects. A similar practice, openly aimed at preservation of CS case semantics, can be seen in the grammar of Neophyte of Rila, who created his own MASC.SG paradigm based on different dialectal reflexes of the article, to ensure easier learning of languages with a complex paradigms of nominal inflection (cf. Rilski 1835:60). Bogorov’s grammar was a prescriptive one too, but it did not aim at such didactic ends; the reasons were more likely phonetic. As mentioned above (Berl.d. section), the old accusative ending was generalized the FEM.SG paradigm and phonetically developed into the middle vowel /ā/ (written mostly with Cyrillic <ъ> by Bogorov) under stress or the vowel /a/ when unstressed. Bogorov and Xrulev misinterpreted this phonetic variation as a paradigmatic one.

nominal articles 43  2.6204%
MASC.GEN/ACC nouns 22  1.3406%
adjectival articles 52  3.1688%
ext. demonstratives 14  0.8531%
DAT.POSS pronouns 9  0.5484%
future particle šte 4  0.2438%
long-form adjectives 40  2.4375%

67 "227" in the original index.
3. Linguistic features

The frequencies listed under each entry of a source included in the corpus were used in the author's study of standardization based on a comparative corpus of damaskini editions of *Life of St. Petka* and *Legend of Thais* by Josif Bradati (Šimko 2021). Using the same method, these frequencies allow us to compare the sources quantitatively. Differences between individual sources are reinterpreted as distances and thus can be visualized in a two-dimensional space as a map:

To interpret the diagram, two or three sources can be taken as guiding points. On the left side, Vuković 1536 and *Kiev d.* (with a red underline) represent the "archaic" varieties, based on Church Slavonic norm. This norm has had strong influence on works produced by the Bradati's students, as well as on Sophronius' *Nedělník*. *Temski r.* from the Torlak area is relatively close to these works: thus we can expect a certain structural similarity (at least concerning the given features) between West Bulgarian and East Serbian dialects and Church Slavonic in the 18th century. The very distantly placed Vel.s. represents a case, in which this norm was likely not successfully followed, resulting in many inconsistencies.

On the right side, we can follow the 1856 edition of *Nedělník* (green underline) as the representative of the "innovative" varieties. Although it is not the youngest text in our corpus, it is the first (and only) one, claiming to "correct" the language of its source into a standardized variety, as codified by Bogorov and Xrulev himself. This text is placed close to a number of texts from the damaskini tradition, as well as other sources (*NBKM 1069, 1081, 1423*), mostly from East Bulgaria. The only damaskin from this area (*Tixon.d.*) is placed close to *PPS* and Krčovski 1814, which is curious from the point of view of the debate concerning the dialectal classification of the *tagizi* translator (e.g. Demina 1985, Mladenova 2007). Unlike the works by Bradati's students, these works converge despite their origin in different circles of literature. This could be interpreted as a kind of spontaneous standardization, preceding codification of the norm. Its influence seems to have encompassed Rhodopes (represented by *Rai.d.* and partly *NBKM 1423*), but it was limited in Macedonia (*Krčovski 1814, NBKM 728*) and West Bulgaria (Bradati's school, *NBKM 370, Nedelnik 1806*).
This interpretation, of course, is suitable only for the mentioned features, according to the above mentioned criteria for their assessment. Still, this demonstrates the method of comparing grammatical features in texts written in different, dynamically changing language varieties.

4. Damaskini texts

As already mentioned above, many manuscript sources from the Balkan Slavic area are colloquially called "damaskini" even if they contain no texts based on the original Thēsauros by Damaskēnos Stouditēs - as is the case of Life of St.Petka frequent in our corpus too. Nevertheless, similarity with Thēsauros is important from the historical/philological point of view. For this reason we will provide also the contents of Thēsauros of the 1751 edition (with approximate English and Church Slavonic translations) with a list of above described manuscripts, which contain the text. Majority of the data in this overview is not new, but it should be mentioned, as there are sources not included in the previous analyses (cf. Petkanova-Toteva 1965:237-255, Demina 1968:42-64).

1. Annunciation to the Mother of God (eis ton Evangelismon tēs Θεοτοκου, Blagoveštenie B-čě) - Sv.d. (7), Jan.s. (43), Berl.d. (5)
2. Birth of Christ (eis tēn Xristu genēsin, Roždestvo Xristovo) - Tixon.d. (33), Sv.d. (1), Jan.s. (32), Berl.d. (1)
3. Epiphany (eis hagia Theofania, Bogojavlenie) - Sv.d. (2), Jan.s. (33), Berl.d. (3)
4. Presentation of the Lord (eis tēn Hypapantēn tu Sōtēros, Srětenie Gospodně) - Tixon.d. (41), Sv.d. (3), Jan.s. (42), Berl.d. (4)
5. Resurrection of Lazarus (eis tēn egersin tu Lazaru, Všskresenie Lazarovo)
6. Palm Sunday (eis ta Baia, Na Cvětonosie) - Tixon.d. (34)
7. Burial of Christ (eis tēn Θεοσομon Tafēn, Pogrebenie Xristovo) - Tixon.d. (35), Sv.d. (6), Berl.d. (37)
8. Resurrection of Christ (eis to Pasxa, Všskresenie Xristova)
9. Ascension of Christ (eis tēn Analēψin tu Sōtēros, Vţznesenie Xristova) - Jan.s. (38), Tixon.d. (38)
11. Transfiguration of Christ (eis tēn Metamorfōsin, Preobraženie Xristovo) - Jan.s. (37), Berl.d. (13)
12. Dormition of the Mother of God (eis tēn Koimēsin tēs Θεοτοκου, Uspenie B-čě) - Sv.d. (9), Jan.s. (44), Berl.d. (14)
13. Presentation of the Mother of God (eis ta Eisodia tēs Θεοτοκου, Vŏvedenie B-čě νę хахь) - Jan.s. (47)
14. Martyrdom of St. George (Martyrion tu hagiu Geōrgiu, M-čenie s-tago Georgia) - Tixon.d. (39), Ljub.d. (2), Berl.d. (10), PPS (59-60), [NBKM 1064 (9)]68, NBKM 728 (1), Rai.d. (1)
15. Homily against mourning of the dead (peri tu mē sfodrōs erēnein tus teleutōntas, Protivъ plača utpēvšixь radi) -
16. Homily on fasting and abstinence (peri Nēsteias, O vţzdržanii) - Berl.d. (45)
17. Martyrdom of Theodor Stratēlatēs (Martyrion tu Hagiu Theodōru tu stratēlatu, M-čenie Θeodora

68 Squared brackets are used, when the edition is not clear from the available data.
18. **Miracles of Archangels Michael and Gabriel** (σαματα τον Ταξιαρχην Μιχαηλ και Γαβριηλ, Αναστασης Χριστης και Αγιας Εικονων Μειξηαι σε Γαβριηλια και Γαβριηλια) - Tixon.d. (11), Sv.d. (10), Jan.s. (45), Berl.d. (34), PPS (8-13)

19. **Martyrdom of St. Eustatius, the second Job** (Martyrion tu hagiu Eustauiu tu deuteru Iōb, Μεντενια Ευσταθιου τον Δευτερων Ιωβον) - Tixon.d. (5), NBKM 1064 (14), NBKM 1081 (16)

20. **Life of St. Nicholas the Wonderworker** (Βιος του θαγιου Νικολαου του Θαματουργου, Ζειτεις τος το Νικολαου Αναστασης Χριστης Εικονων) - Tixon.d. (15), Ljub.d. (3), Svd.d. (13), [Jan.s. (31) ?] Berl.d. (30), NBKM 1064 (17)

21. **Sunday of Pharisee and the Tax Collector** (τησ Κυριακεις του Τελωνου και Φαρισειου, Πρεσβετος του μητριου και φαρησαιου) - Kiev d. (1)

22. **Sunday of the Prodigal Son** (τησ Κυριακεις του Ασοτου, Πρεσβετος του Μητριου συνης) - Kiev d. (2)

23. **Second Coming of Christ** (περι της δευτερας παρουσιας του Κυριου ομνης λεγεν Χριστου, Vtora prišstvstvie Xvo) - Kiev d. (3), Lov.d. (1), Tixon.d. (18), Ljub.d. (1), Berl.d. (32)

24. **Expulsion of Adam** (εις την στοιχια του Αδαμ, O izgnanii Adama) - Kiev d. (4), NBKM 1069 (17)

25. **Homily on Holy Icons** (περι την θαγιον Εικονων, Radi s-tsy ikony) - Kiev d. (5)

26. **Veneration of the True Cross** (εις την προσκυνησιν του τιμιου Σταυρου, Na poklonenie č-stnomu i životvorčštemu Kr-stu) - Kiev d. (6), Tixon.d. (16)

27. **Life of St. Mary of Egypt** (Βιος και πολιτεια της Αιγυπτιας Μαριας, Ζειτεις και ζηνη Μαρια Εγυπτηνινις) - Kiev d. (7), Svd.d. (14), Berl.d. (16)

28. **Sunday of Apostle Thomas** (τησ Κυριακεις του Θωμα, Slovo vъ nedelju Θομινου) - Kiev d. (8)

29. **Sunday of the Myrrhbearers** (τησ Κυριακεις του Μυροφορου, Slovo vъ nedelju Mvrnosŏxes) - Kiev d. (9)

30. **Sunday of the Paralytic** (τησ Κυριακεις του Παραλυτου, Slovo vъ nedelju rasslabenago) - Kiev d. (10), NBKM 1069 (11)

31. **Sunday of the Samaritan Woman** (τησ Κυριακεις της Σαμαρειτιδας, Slovo vъ nedelju samaranyh) - Kiev d. (11), NBKM 1069 (9)

32. **Sunday of the Blind** (τησ Κυριακεις του Τυφλου, Slovo vъ nedelju o roždenii sîlpago) - Kiev d. (12)

33. **Sunday of the 318 Holy Fathers of the Nicean Council** (τησ Κυριακεις την Ηγιον της Νικαιας Συνεδριον, Slovo vъ nedelju s-tsxhь *tiē* b-gonosnyx o-cy) - Kiev d. (13), Rai.d. (19)

34. **Sunday of the All Saints** (τησ Κυριακεις την Ηγιον παντων, Slovo vъ nedelju vsekh s-tsxhь) - Kiev d. (14)

35. **Martyrdom of St. Demetrius the Myroblyte** (Martyrion tu hagiu eudou Megalomartyros Dēmētriou tu Myroblytu, M-čenie s-tago i slavnago velikom-čnika Dimitria Mvprotočivago) - Kiev d. (15), Tixon.d. (9), Berl.d. (24), PPS (39), NBKM 1064 (5)

36. **Martyrdom of Theodore Tyron** (Martyrion tu hagiu eudou Megalomartyros Θεοδωρου tu Tyranos, M-čenie s-tago i slavnago velikom-čnika Θεodoras Tirona) - Kiev d. (16), Svd.d. (4), Berl.d. (8)

---

69 Some of the titles differ between the text and the table of contents in the 1751 edition. The chapter is titled here τησ Κυριακεις της Αποκρεω 'Sunday of the Shrovetide' (CS μησωπτζ), which is neither reflected in the chapter title in the text, nor in most of the translations, but for example the next chapter (Expulsion of Adam) is titled Slovo na siropsna nedelja in NBKM 1069, as in the index (τησ Κυριακεις της Αποτυρησεος).
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