

[The Knowledge Bank at The Ohio State University](#)

Feature Title: Лѣтопись Lietopis'

Article Title: 13-27 August 1980: Sofia. The Second Summer Colloquium on Old Bulgarian Studies

Journal Title: Polata Knigopisnaia

Issue Date: October 1981

Publisher: William R. Veder, Vakgroep Slavistiek, Katholieke Universiteit, Postbus 9103, 6500 HD Nijmegen (Holland)

Citation: *Polata Knigopisnaia: an Information Bulletin Devoted to the Study of Early Slavic Books, Texts and Literatures* 5 (October 1981): 29-41.

Appears in:

Community: [Hilandar Research Library](#)

Sub-Community: [Polata Knigopisnaia](#)

Collection: [Polata Knigopisnaia: Volume 5 \(October 1981\)](#)

ЛЪТОПИСЬ

7-9 JULY 1980, HODDESDON, HERTS.:

MEDIAEVAL AND 18-TH CENTURY STUDY GROUPS JOINT MEETING

Unfortunately, we were not able to get either a full review, or the abstracts of the papers read at this meeting. We can do no more than record who spoke about what:

Paul DUKES (Aberdeen) *The Leslie Family in the Thirty-years War and the Poršnev Thesis.*

Lindsey HUGHES (Reading) *The Nemeckaja Sloboda.*

Philip LONGWORTH: *Aleksej Miĥajlovič and His World.*

Robin LUCAS (East Anglia) *Dutch and Polish Contributions to the Architecture of Russia 1660-1725.*

Rod MCGREW (Temple University, USA) *Paul I: Some Problems of His Reign and Personality.*

Patrick O'MEARA (Dublin) *Mediaeval and Eighteenth Century Themes in the Work of Ryleev.*

Maureen PERRIE (Birmingham) *Pretenders and Popular Monarchist Ideas in the Time of Troubles.*

Will RYAN (London) *Scientific Concepts and Terminology in 17th Century Russia.*

David TAYLOR (East Anglia) *Franco-Russian Alliance Negotiations in 1725: The Porte, the Princess and the Peace of the North.*

13-27 AUGUST 1980, SOFIA:

THE SECOND SUMMER COLLOQUIUM ON OLD BULGARIAN STUDIES

WILLIAM R. VEDER

Bulgaria, in the 20th century, is regaining a role it had in the golden age of the 10th and the silver age of the 14th centuries: it is again becoming the busiest of centers for the study of early Slavic books and texts. Our attention is regularly focused on Sofia or Šumen and Tărnovo for general congresses and topical symposia, and we all follow with rising interest the industrious realization of our Bulgarian colleagues' ambitious publication plans.

One of the most pleasant, and at the same time most dynamic, occasions created by our Bulgarian colleagues for the international exchange of news and views, is the *Summer Colloquium on Old Bulgarian Studies*, organized now for the second time (First Colloquium: cf. *Полата књигописъната*

·Ѓ· p.31-41) by K.M.KUEV, E.DOGRAMADŽIEVA and R.ZLATANOVA, congenial hosts who cared well for the relaxation required for fruitful informal contact, as well as able organizers with an acute concern for concentration which is a condition for the efficient formal exchange of information. Owing to their personal dedication, this colloquium will be well remembered by all who took part in it.

If these colloquia are to become a biannual tradition - which I sincerely hope I should nevertheless like to propose two points of possible improvement: (1) to further the comprehension of the papers presented, and (2) to reinforce the *colloquial* over the *alloquial* character of the meeting.

I have much difficulty in grasping complex matters if they are: (a) communicated orally without any visual support, and/or (b) related in a language of which I have no speaking experience. These difficulties (and I suspect that they are not mine alone) could be alleviated simply by providing handouts (abstracts, summaries, theses or the like) or any other consistent visualization to support the text read. And if an effort could be made to drop the fiction that any Slavist is equally proficient in all the Slavic languages, I should be completely happy: it would mean that we could limit the languages in which we discuss questions of Cyrillic texts to just a few (e.g. Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian).

Fuller comprehension of the topics to be discussed furthers, of course, also the cause of *colloquy*. But not alone: Colloquy needs time, too. 7 minutes discussion time per paper, as allotted at this colloquium, is not enough, unless organizers can find ways of cutting short the laudatory fringe and more readily direct comments to the essence (e.g. by improving the topical grouping of papers and substituting topical discussion for discussion of single papers).

I shall not repeat at length remarks made earlier on the pages of this bulletin (cf. *Полата изнигописнама* ·Ѓ· 42-43, ·Ѓ· 54-55) but rather proceed to acquaint you with all the interesting topics treated by colleagues from all over the world.

CODICOLOGY

- ALTBAUER M. (Jerusalem) *The Newly Discovered Slavic MSS on Mt.Sinai.*
DŽUROVA A. (Sofia) *The Ornament of the Assemani Gospels.*
KNJAZEVSKAJA O.A. (Moskva) *The Dating of Middle Bulgarian Parchment MSS.*
KOSEK N.V. (Moskva) *The Language of the Kočvo Gospels.*
KUEV K.M. (Sofia) *A New Era in the Study of Old Bulgarian Literature.*
SMJADOVSKI S. (Sofia) *The Rila Glagolitic Fragments.*

TÓTH I. (Szeged) *The Cyrillic Reims Gospels*.
VELČEVA B. (Sofia) *The 13th Century Macarius Gospels at Athens*.

The colloquium's keynote was struck right at the opening session by KUEV. He compared the state of Old Slavic studies before and after WW II and pointed out how, in less than four decades, the narrow textological base of exemplary copies had been supplanted by the much sounder broad approach of the tendency towards completeness in the assessment of the ms tradition. Since WW II not only the corpus of works by S.Clemens of Ohrid has grown considerably; a much more spectacular growth could be observed in the number of ms witnesses, which increased more than fiftyfold. The painstaking systematic search in ms repositories (which leads to manifold new discoveries as a fringe benefit) and the resulting increase in documentation of Old Slavic texts provide the sound base for completely new complex studies in Old Slavic literature which hold the promise of far reaching revision of many of our traditional notions of this literature. This optimistic view of the development of our field of studies should always be in our minds, lest we give up all too easily when we are more and more often antagonized by obstruction of research from the side of keepers of mss in the richest of repositories, both in the Soviet Union and the monasteries of the Greek Orthodox Church.

Four papers concerned new discoveries. The bulk of them were communicated by ALTBAUER: this was the first time he was able to give precise information on at least some of the 24 or 26 Slavic mss discovered in S.Catherine's Monastery on 26 May 1975. Among them are:

- 1 complete glagolitic homiliary of undetermined age
- 1 complete glagolitic psalter of undetermined age
- 1 Russian scroll of the 15th century
- f. 120 of a homiliary, written in 1370 by *попъ петръ* at *нѣмеполн* Znepole
- f. 12 of a 14th c. Bulgarian ms containing erotapocrires
- f. 20 of a Serbian Oktoechos
- f. 48 of a Serbian Horologium
- f. 4 of a Serbian Horologium
- f. 5 of a Serbian Horologium of the 15th century
- f. 8 of a Serbian liturgical text
- f. 24 of a Greek and Serbian liturgical text
- f. 40 of a South Slavic liturgical text

and a number of important complements to well-known mss:

- f. 4 of the *Euchologium* Sin.Slav.37 + LENINGRAD, *GPB*, Glag.3
 - f. 16 of the *Byčkov Psalter* Sin.Slav.6 + LENINGRAD, *GPB*, Q.1.73
 - f. 16 of the *Serbian Psalter* Sin.Slav.8
 - f. 30 of the *Dobromir Gospel* Sin.Slav.43 + LENINGRAD, *GPB*, Q.1.55
- (to the latter also belong the f. 2 PARIS, *BN*, F.Slave 65c, which form the

transition between the Leningrad and the Sinai parts of the ms, as K. STANČEV recently discovered in Paris and told us in his comments to Altbauer's paper). SMJADOVSKI succeeded in reconstituting part of a glagolitic codex from 11-12th century Western Bulgaria, the *Rilski glagoličeski sbornik* = SOFIA, CIAM, "Rilski glagoličeski listove" + LENINGRAD, BAN, 24.4.17 ("Gri gorovičev listok") + 24.4.15 ("Makedonskij ili Ryl'skij listok"); he also pointed out the lexical affinity of the texts of this miscellany to the *Glagolita Clozianus*. KOSEK and VELČEVA presented two new Middle Bulgarian mss from the 13th century: the *Evangelie Koxmō* (ODESSA, OGNB; treated by Kosek already at the First Colloquium (1978), but only now dated and localized), a sober East Bulgarian ms from the 1st half of the 13th century: and the *Makarijevo Evangelie* (ATHINA, NB), a South Bulgarian ms from the 2nd half of the 13th century, perhaps from Vălandovo near Strumica. Both mss present interesting complements to the grammar and lexicon of Middle Bulgarian; the latter is also of historical importance for its elaborate marginalia.

New data on the origin of two well-known mss were presented by DŽUROVA and TÓTH. The *Assemani Gospels* (ROMA, BAV, Vat.slav.3) were compared by DŽUROVA to Greek mss and Slavic writing and painting of the 10th and earlier centuries. The strictly geometric ornamental forms (not the illuminations) with their specific colour contrasts can be traced, as those of the other old glagolitic mss, to models from Bithynia, repeated in the South of Italy; the absence of vegetal ornament betrays Greek models from before the 2nd half of the 9th century, while the marked affinity of the ornament to the Preslav ceramic decoration allows to date the ms in the 2nd half of the 10th century. I. DUJČEV urged her and us not to date the ms too early: some of the Cyrillic additions must be considered almost contemporaneous to its origin, and they obviously come in the way of such an early dating. TÓTH reexamined the *Reims Gospels* (REIMS, BM, 255), not in its artistic, but in its linguistic features: aside from an interesting overview of the past tense forms of verbs, his investigation resulted in confirmation of Šaxmatov's South Russian localization (e.g. ѡни → ни: *родить сѣнь и наречеѡу ти нма ѡмоу f.4v*), identification of a double-yer (Bulgarian) antigraph (e.g. зни → ѡни, not ни) and confirmation of the traditional dating at the end of the 11th century, while rejecting the presupposition voiced by ŽUKOVSKAJA that the ms might be dated *before* the *Ostromir Gospels*.

knowledge of Middle Bulgarian palaeography: the absence of dating criteria for mss without watermarks, due to the lack of explicitly dated mss of the type (exceptions: ZAGREB, JAZU, III.a.30 of 1273, and ZAGREB, JAZU, IV.d. 106 of 1277; if we could get at it, also the Znepole ms of 1370 mentioned by ALTBAUER, cf.p.31). Moreover, the Middle Bulgarian parchment mss seem to present a highly intricate mixture of archaic features and innovations, both in their script and their ornament. Reasons enough, I would think, to ask for the compilation of an album of specimina of these mss as a first step towards the systematization of their features.

TEXTOLGY

- BUJUKLIEV I. (Sofia) *The Manasses Chronicle and Its Literary Style.*
 DOBREV I. (Sofia) *The Structure of the Codex Suprasliensis.*
 DUJČEV I. (Sofia) *The New Edition of the Manasses Chronicle.*
 DŽONOV B. (Sofia) *The Old High German Translation of the Confessional Prayer from the Euchologium Sinaiticum.*
 HAUPTOVÁ Z. (Praha) *The Laudation Simeonis - Its Author, Its Models.*
 IVANOVA K. (Sofia) *Some Problems of the Synaxaries.*
 KOŽUHAROV S. (Sofia) *The Office to S.Philothea.*
 MARTI R.W. (Basel) *The Stylistics of Hrabr's Treatise On Letters.*
 MORIYASU T. (Tokyo) *The Khazar Mission of S.Constantine-Cyril.*
 POPOV G. (Sofia) *Traces of Glagolitic in Constantine of Preslav's Akrostichs.*
 RUSEK J. (Kraków) *Old Testament Passages in the Triodion.*
 ŠIMA P. (Bratislava) *S.Clemens of Ohrid's Poučenie za Sretenie.*
 VEDER W.R. (Nijmegen) *The Second Florilegium of Czar Simeon.*
 VALČANOV S. (Sofia) *From Which Greek Recension of the Bible Did Cyril and Methodius Make Their Translations?*

The keynote of 'completeness in coverage' could be heard in this group of papers, too, albeit in two distinct senses: in the most direct reminiscence of Kuev's paper it was used by ŠIMA, who pleaded for more attention for young mss from the very periphery of the *Slavia orthodoxa*: he adduced data from three 16-17th century mss from Slovakia (PREŠOV, SA, a ms from the Redemptorist monastery at Mihajlovce; PRAHA, NM, IX.A.44 and IX.E.63) which demonstrate the complexity of textological relationships within the tradition of this sermon. It is notably their relative lexical independence, which gives rise to the question of attribution: on which grounds should this sermon be considered to have been written by S.Clemens? The question cannot, of course, be answered without a complete *collatio codicum*. The same keynote, but then in a more introverted sense of 'completeness in analysis of the contents' could be detected in the both textologically and historically very important papers of MARTI and MORIYASU. Both hit a notori-

ously weak spot in our studies of early Slavic texts: the lack of sound rhetorical analysis (perhaps prompted by the suspicion of some that the texts studied, after all, would only appear to be devoid of any artisticity). MARTI gave an exemplary analysis of the lexical stylistics of Hrabr's *Treatise On Letters*, confining himself to no more than the three words ѠУ КЪ and КЪННГЪ. Thus, he was able not only to show how masterfully the author composed his text, but also to detect its *function* as a double apology of Slavic writing (directed towards Greeks and Pilatians in general) and of the *original* Slavic writing (directed towards the proponents of transcription from glagolitic into cyrillic while, at the same time, modernizing the texts; yet the author applied great care not to antagonize this group in the common resistance to the Pilatians), and finally to propose localization of the author in the conservative circle of S.Clemens and Naum of Ohrid, perhaps identification with one of them. MORIYASU demonstrated the intimacy of the relation between form and function of a text in his compositional analysis of the *Vita Constantini*. He pointed out that 73,8% of the text length (in lines of Lavrov's edition) are devoted to the description of the *missionary* activity of S.Constantine-Cyril, and that to the single Khazar mission no less than 42,86% of the total text is given; the latter mission also occupies the central chapters of the *Vita*, while its own center is constituted by the theological dispute with the Jews and Constantine's affirmation of the superiority of the Christian faith over both: the Jewish and the Moslem faith. Thus, positionally and statistically, the Khazar mission is the main content of the *Vita*, not the life of S.Constantine-Cyril, while the affirmation of the superiority of Christianity is its focus. Moriyasu was so prudent as not to indulge in further speculation. Yet I could not help, when the discussion remained very much at the surface of the text and the questions of its historical reliability, musing whether the origin of the *Vita* could not be related to the manifest decline of the Khazar state throughout the 10th century and, at the same time, to the struggle for the christianization of Rus'

New data on the history of texts were presented by HAUPTOVÁ, KOŽUHA-ROV and POPOV. HAUPTOVÁ reexamined the *Pohvala Simeonu* in the *Izbornik of 1073*. She pointed out that it was originally intended as a poetic preface to a different book (v. 5-6) evidently the *Hexameron* or some other collection of texts by S.Basil the Great, which points to John the Exarch as its probable author, who may have modeled it, as Sobolevskij already suspected,

after the poetic preface to the *Menologium* of Basil I by simply substituting the better-known metre of the *Proglas* and the *Azbučna molitva*. POPOV took a close look at the Middle Bulgarian mss of the *Triodium* and discovered in the canons for the weekdays of Lent a long akrostich, consisting of a title (ГРАНЕСА ДОВРА КОНСТАНТИНОВА), 16 verses and an epilogue. These canons were obviously written in Glagolitic (the *Bitolski Triod* preserves whole lines of Glagolitic text; moreover, two original *а*'s in the verse СВЕРНАТЕ СЕ СЛОВЪНАНИ are represented by Ѡ and some original *о*'s are represented by Ѫ, which points to early glagolitic *Ѡ* and *Ѫ* with *Ѣ* and *ѣ* written apart), which makes it quite plausible that their author, the КОНСТАНТИНЪ in the title, is no one else than Constantine of Preslav. KOŽUHAROV, who had earlier found two copies of an unknown office for S.Philothea Temniška (ODESSA, *OGNB*, Grigorovič 7 of the 13th century, and SOFIA, *NBKM*, 154 of the 16th century), was now able to give more precisions on the history of the text: it had served, along with the *Egipetskiĭ Paterik*, as the major source for both Euthymius' and Joasaph's works on this little-known saint, and it can be definitely dated to the early 13th century, for it does not correspond to the rules of the Jerusalem typikon, as do the later offices of the Tărnovo school.

Two papers on the history of texts met with strong disapproval. DŽONOV tried to tie the *S.Emmeran Prayer* not, as usual, to a Gothic, but to a Bulgarian model, arguing that S.Methodius may have had a hand in making it popular in the public confession that was taking shape at the time (the earliest Old High German copies of the prayer come from S.Emmeran, Oberalteich, Reichenau and Luxeuil, where S.Methodius spent time in exile). This interpretation, however, disregards the fact that the corresponding Old Slavic confessional prayer in the *Euchologium Sinaiticum* contains features which may be Germanisms (e.g. the high incidence of anteposition of possessives), and that reception of Slavic texts in the given circumstances was highly unlikely. VALČANOV tried to argue, on the basis of data from John the Exarch's *Prologue* to John of Damascus' *Theology*, that there existed in Old Slavic a full Bible, based on the Constantinopolitan (Lukian) version of the Septuagint. Of course, the mere thought of 'a Bible' as a *book* or a series of *volumes* is anachronistic, the more so, since the Old Slavic Biblical texts are not homogeneous in their textological characteristics (e.g. the Psalter has a definitely non-Lukian base with remarkable Occidentalisms, the Acts and Epistles have strong traces of the Hesychian version).

DOBREV, IVANOVA, RUSEK and VEDER presented chapters from their continuing research of complex texts. DOBREV looked into the oldest Slavic reflexes of menologia (*Codex Suprasliensis*, *Uspenskiĭ Sbornik*, *Germanov Sbornik*, *Sevast'janov Sbornik*) and found such consistent traces of the tradition of the pre-Metaphrastic 12-volume menologium (widely used as late as the time of Theodore Studites), that he found himself forced to ask the question whether this menologium had not been available as a whole or in its major parts in Old Slavic translation. The *sborniki* mentioned, in any case, are based upon complementary selections from the menologium, which cover much of its content as reconstructed by ERHARD (*Überlieferung und Bestand...*) a book which should be more widely consulted by Slavists in order to give more precise direction to their research in hagiographic-homiletic literature and higher probability to their reconstructions. IVANOVA looked at the fortunes of the two types of synaxaries in Bulgaria: the *Prolog* and the *Stišnoj Prolog*. The former came to Bulgaria from Russia in the 20s of the 13th century but was supplanted in the early 14th century, even before fundamental order could be brought in the memories of South Slavic saints, by the latter. The *Stišnoj Prolog* is known in two translations, a 13th century Tărnovo translation, well documented especially in Moldavian copies, and a second one, probably Serbian 14th century, as Bogdanović and Mošin have proposed. RUSEK's research of the *Triodium* yielded an interesting perspective on the *Paroimiarium*: the pre-14th century Triodia contain nearly the whole *Paroimiarium*. Its texts exhibit the same mixture of Pannono-Moravisms and Bulgarisms which is so characteristic of many of the great texts of the Old Slavic canon. Thus the *Triodium* must play an important role (together with the Biblical Odes in the Psalter and the Old Testament texts in the *Euchologia* (*Leiturgika*), as KOCEVA pointed out in the discussion) in any serious study of the *Paroimiarium*. From my own study of the earliest Slavic compilations not based on Greek texts, I contributed arguments to determine the *Izbornik of 1076* as the top of an iceberg: a Russian copy of a 10th century Bulgarian compilation, put together from earlier Bulgarian compilations. The major source, which I tentatively name the *Second Florilegium of Czar Simeon*, can be reconstructed from extant post-15th century dogmatic and ascetic florilegia of the type of the ms KIEV, CBAN, Mel.m./P.119.

A new edition project was presented in a fine concerted effort by BU JUKLIEV and DUJČEV: the 3-volume *Manassieva Lětopis'*. planned for 1981-82

by joint effort of the BAN and the IRLI ANSSSR, and realized by I.DUJČEV, D.S.LIXAČEV and M.A.SALMINA. As BUJUKLIEV pointed out, the text merits much more attention than it got so far, because its translator succeeded in giving such original solutions for difficulties both familiar and new, that his translation may, indeed, be considered a contribution to the development of the Bulgarian literary language. The paradox is well-known: the better a text, the more 'regular' a ms, the less attention is paid to it.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE

- DINEKOV P. (Sofia) *The Canticum Canticorum and the Vita S.Parascevis*.
GEORGIEV E. (Sofia) *Innovation in Our Literature of the 13-14th Centuries*.
HANNICK C. (Wien) *The Contribution of Patriarch Euthymius to the Adoption of Byzantine Homiletics by the South Slavs*.
KOŽUHAROV S. (Sofia) *The Concept of the Tărnovo School*.
NAUMOW A. (Pisa) *The Creation of a Card Catalogue of Biblical Quotations in Original Slavic Texts*.

The now familiar keynote of 'completeness in coverage' was most effectively struck by NAUMOW. He presented the project of a catalogue of all uses of Biblical texts in Orthodox religious practice and in Cyrillic original texts, which would form the basis for a determination of the specific *functions* of Biblical quotations in Slavic texts. The project is to be executed at the Instytut Filologii Słowiańskiej UJ, Al.Mickiewicza 9-11, 31-120 KRAKOW, over the years 1980-1990. Naumow requested all colleagues to give their support to the project by putting at the disposal of the Institute their data on Biblical quotations or by sending to the Institute a copy of their text editions. Since the result of the project may well be an answer to the question how Slavic men of letters knew and used their Bible (aside from such secondary benefits as a complete overview over the variability of the text itself), I sincerely recommend this project to the attention of every interested colleague. Unwittingly, the first colleague to make a contribution to the project was DINEKOV. His contribution was both practical (a collection of all quotations, reminiscences and structural or topical parallels from the Song of Songs in the *Vita* of S.Petka) and theoretical (the important question of the immediate sources: quotations from the Song of Songs have been in hagiographic use since Leontius of Neapolis, panegyric texts generally contain quotations and reminiscences from the *Canticum Canticorum* - so how much of the material collected testifies of direct use of the Biblical text?).

GEORGIEV, HANNICK and KOŽUHAROV devoted their attention to the literature of the Second Bulgarian Empire. KOŽUHAROV surveyed the extant definitions of the term 'Tărnovo School' and found them too narrow: a new definition is needed to encompass the earlier development stages of literary activity in and around Tărnovo in the 13th century, for it is that period in which the change of Typikon leads to a peak in demand for adapted, corrected texts of the Psalter and other liturgical books, satisfied in close collaboration with centers at Mt.Athos, Rila and Thessaloniki. Not the Euthymian final phase, but the 13th century preparatory phase produced new redactions of the Paterika, new hagiographic works like the *Vita* of S.Philothea Temniška (cf.p.35) and others. Much more work, painstaking but rewarding, especially if carried out with the same scrupulousness as that of Kožuharov himself, is required to give colour to this blank spot in our literary history. The opposite end of the period, its Euthymian phase, was the subject of HANNICK's paper. He tried to prove that the patriarch was involved, if not instrumental, in the translation into Slavic of the homilies of the 10-volume Studion-corpus. This has been identified by J.Jufu in a number of Moldavian mss, but parts of it are also known to exist in Resavian and Raškian Serbian mss (up to half of the corpus). Since Euthymius' original work is for the better part homiletic, and since his work of correcting texts *ad fidem codd.* bore largely on homiletic texts, and since we know from Gregory Camblak that Euthymius did translate himself, we are entitled to search for Euthymian translations, bearing in mind that they would be anonymous either from modesty of the translator or from the fact that their translation was some sort of teamwork, organized by Euthymius. This is, of course, no proof, but I wonder who else in the period would be in a position to take upon himself a task as ambitious as the translation of the Studion-corpus.

GEORGIEV uses literary data along with data from the visual arts to abstract the conception of Czar Ivan-Alexander as a '*car ot renesansov tip*'. He legitimately singles out innovations to characterize the czar as a new type of king. Unfortunately, we can recognize innovations only against the background of tradition, and that background is so vague (cf. Kožuharov's first meagre data to fill it in, above) that they are not sufficiently in contrast to be recognized. As long as the background is not better explored, Georgiev's remarks are nothing but another *pohvala*.

LINGUISTICS

- ALTBAUER M. (Jerusalem) *Secondary Calques in the Psalterium Sinaiticum.*
- BAJRAMOVA M. (Sofia) *The Question Mark in Old Slavic Mss.*
- DOGRAMADŽIEVA E. (Sofia) *On the Methodology of the Analysis of Syntactic Grecisms.*
- GEORGIEV V. I. (Sofia) *Some Features of the Old Slavic o- and u-Declension.*
- HORGOSI Ö. (Jaszberény) *Lexical Features of the Turov Gospels.*
- IVANOVA-MIRČEVA D. (Sofia) *Observations on the Lexicon of Old Bulgarian.*
- KOČEV I. (Sofia) *The Development of the Labiality Correlation in Bulgarian.*
- LE GUILLOU J. Y. (Montréal) *Concurring Forms of the Aorist in Old Slavic.*
- MICHEL G. (Saarbrücken) *Coding and Word Length in Old and Modern Bulgarian.*
- MOSZYŃSKI L. (Gdańsk) *Dualia Tantum in Old Slavic.*
- PLATONOVA I. V. (Moskva) *The Use of κ+D in Adverbial and Object Function in the Development of Bulgarian.*
- REINHARDT J. M. (Wien) *Observations on Word Formation in Old Slavic.*
- SIMEONOV B. (Plovdiv) *On the Structure of the Old Bulgarian Phonemic System.*
- STANČEV K. (Sofia) *Rhythmic Structures in Old Bulgarian Poetry and Oratorical Prose.*
- STEMPNJAKÓWNA W. (Kraków) *Linguistic Analysis of the Description of the Holy Sites in the Bđinski Sbornik.*
- VEČERKA R. (Brno) *Local Variants in Old Slavic from a Functional-Stylistic Point of View.*
- XODOVA K. I. (Moskva) *Combinability of Lexemes in Old Slavic.*

Phonemic-graphemic questions were treated by KOČEV, MICHEL and SIMEONOV in the framework of studies in the dynamics of systems. Even though their papers were only indirectly relevant to the study of manuscript texts, I should like to retain one piece of information from MICHEL's wealth of statistical data: Modern Bulgarian differs (in word length) from Old Bulgarian more than Modern Greek does from New Testament Greek, and the single most important factor to account for the difference is the loss of the *yere* which affected 43% of all words.

From the papers on morphological questions by GEORGIEV, LE GUILLOU, MOSZYŃSKI and STEMPNJAKÓWNA, I wish to retain LE GUILLOU's main idea: that of the possible aorist forms only those in $-o-\pi\alpha$ were not archaic in the early Preslav days (the other forms being strictly limited to 52 verbs: 28 asigmatic, 15 sigmatic, 9 in $-\pi\alpha$).

Syntax was the topic of the papers by BAJRAMOVA, PLATONOVA and XODOVA. Of them, only BAJRAMOVA worked directly on mss. She studied both Greek and Slavic mss prior to the 15th century and found that, while the Greek mss do have means to mark questions, but do not apply them with much consistency, no such means are known to either Old or Middle Bulgarian mss, the mark ; being used indiscriminately both in questions and exclamations.

HORGOSI, IVANOVA-MIRČEVA and REINHARDT gave papers on lexical topics. HORGOSI examined the 10 folia that remain of the *Turov Gospels* (VILNIUS, *MACB*, F.22 n.1) and found that it contained an important number of lexemes generally considered to be 'primary Bulgarian' REINHARDT examined the variation of the suffixes -НІЕ, -ВСТВНІЕ and -ВСТВО in S.Gregory the Great's *Dialogi*, the Second *Vita* of S.Wenceslas and the *Nicodemus Gospel*, all three known to be of West Slavic origin; his conclusions were that, in this respect, no particular relation could be discerned between the three texts and that Czech influence was not sufficient to explain the choice between the suffixes. IVANOVA-MIRČEVA announced a more than welcome publication: a 3-volume *Starobŭlgarski rečnik*, to be published from 1981 on, based on 38 genuine Old Bulgarian texts, including epigraphic texts. The dictionary is set up as an explanatory dictionary, the Slavic context providing the basis for the semantic descriptions, the Greek parallels providing only correctives. From her experience in working on the preparation of this dictionary, she adduced numerous examples that illustrate the close relationship between written and spoken language in the earliest subsisting re cords.

STANČEV devoted his paper to the rhythmic structures of Old Slavic texts. He made a heroic attempt to systematize the rhythmic principles of texts known to be sung or recited and other, i.e. oratorical texts, at the same time attempting to give a fundamental periodization of their development (during and after the First Bulgarian Empire). Considering the rather violent discussion, his attempt was obviously premature. TRIFUNOVIĆ remarked, that we seemed to have got too much of the taste of 'syllabomania', re presentative of an unproductive approach. "Slavic hymnography," he said, "has no metre in the Byzantine sense." He suggested that we approach Old Slavic poetry with greater care for its proper features, relating to each other form and function, ecclesiastic tone, accent and interpunction, and the like.

Questions of translation were treated by ALTBAUER, DOGRAMADŽIEVA and VEČERKA. An idea, voiced independently by both DOGRAMADŽIEVA and VEČERKA, seems to me worth to be retained even before we have access to the printed text of their very rich studies: that the influence of the Greek models should be studied primarily on the macro-syntactic level, at least as far as the oldest translations are concerned. VEČERKA argued that translations from the Cyrillo-Methodian period are marked by the external relation of

the texts (translation of key words in their proper position and proportion) and the internal completion of the goal text (filling out the syntactic microstructure), Bulgarisms and Grecisms being (in the Moravian situation) no more than localization features of the resultant text.

Two participants presented papers on the history of science: R.ZLATANOVA (Saarbrücken) *Old Slavic Studies at the Saar University 1959-1969* (the Sadnik-era) and P.ZWOLIŃSKI (Warszawa) *The Discussion on the Age of the Glagolica in the 18th Century* (J.L.Frisch as early as 1727 voiced the opinion that the Cyrillic alphabet was older than the Glagolitic).

22 NOVEMBER 1980, OXFORD:

MEETING OF THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN MEDIEVAL STUDY GROUP

Unfortunately, your editors could not get more information about the papers read at this meeting, than the bare titles, which we pass on to you:

- DU FEU V.M. (Norwich) *Problems of Transmission in Judging Linguistic Development.*
GREENAN A. (Liverpool) *Women and Sanctity in Moscovite Russia.*
HEPPELL M. (London) *Serbia Under Tsar Dusan: A Socio-Political Study Based on an Analysis of Dusan's Zakonik.*
HIPPISEY A. (St.Andrews) *Simeon Polockij's Library.*

21-24 MARCH 1981, BIRMINGHAM:

FIFTEENTH SPRING SYMPOSIUM OF BYZANTINE STUDIES

BYZANTIUM AND THE SLAVS

Your editors did solicit a full review of at least those contributions that were relevant to the study of early Slavic mss, but did not receive it in time to be printed in this issue of our bulletin. In preparation of more in-depth information in PK 6, here is the full list of contributions:

- Opening lecture:* TONKIN E. (Birmingham) *Types of Cultural Transmission.*
ALLEN J. (Dumbarton Oaks) *An Unknown French Princess Serbian Queen Jelena.*
BABIĆ G. (Beograd) *Adopting and Adapting Byzantine Models in Early Serbian Painting.*
BARNEA I. (Bucureşti) *La région du Bas-Danube aux 10-12e siècles à la lumière des découvertes archéologiques.*
BURNS Y. (London) *Some Aspects of Slavonic Gospel MSS and Their Greek Counterparts.*
ĆURČIĆ S. (Urbana-Champaign) *The Byzantine Element in the Architecture of Medieval Serbia.*
FRANKLIN S. (Cambridge) *Byzantine Chronicles in Kievan Russia.*