



Alessandro Maria BRUNI (Naples)

**THE TEXTUAL TRANSMISSION OF THE PARTICIPLE *BYŠEŠT-/BYŠQŠT-* IN THE
OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC TRADITION OF THE HOMILIES OF GREGORY OF
NAZIANZUS***

Abstract. The present paper offers fresh insights into the textual transmission of the occurrences of the participle *byšešt-/byšqšt-* in the Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) translation of the *Homilies* (λόγοι) of Gregory of Nazianzus the Theologian. The study of this very rare and quite obscure verbal form, deemed to be one of the most challenging issues in the grammatical description of the Old Church Slavonic language, represents an outstanding question in palaeoslavistics. In contrast to the traditional approach, which bases the participle’s linguistic analysis solely on examining the oldest extant 11th-century Old East Slavic copy, the author explores the entire manuscript tradition, consisting of 18 testimonies dating from the 14th up to the 17th centuries. The adoption of this methodology leads to innovative results; first, it demonstrates that the participle survives not only in the East Slavic, but also in the South Slavic (Middle Bulgarian) tradition; second, it identifies a paradigm form which had previously escaped the attention of scholars, supporting V. Jagić’s reconstruction of the participle’s nominative singular. Third, this study considers for the first time the variant readings as a key asset for investigating the participle’s original meaning, understanding its description of a dynamic process, an ongoing situation, rather than the expression of a future time reference in the strictest sense. Accordingly, a different view with regard to its significance may confidently be offered: rather than representing a future form of the verb *byti* ‘to be,’ as had been previously assumed, this participle can be seen to have been used as an expression for a developing process, similar to the verb *byvati* (‘to become,’ ‘to happen,’ ‘to occur,’ ‘to be’).

Keywords: Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) language; manuscripts; textual criticism; historical linguistics

Prof. PhD Alessandro Maria Bruni
University of Naples “L’Orientale”
Naples, Italy
e-mail: alessandromaria.bruni@unior.it

*This paper is part of a research project funded under the “PRIN 2022” grant scheme, awarded by the Italian Ministry of University and Research (Project title: “The Transmission of Old Church Slavonic Texts”/ CUP H53D23006810006).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LXIV (2025), 1

Special Issue

EMOTIONS AND INTELLECT: REPRESENTATIONS IN BALKANS LANGUAGES

Proceedings from the International Scientific Conference
23 – 24 January 2025, Sofia

Guest editors: **Bilyana Mihaylova, Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski**
Ivan P. Petrov, University of Vienna

Editorial

Bilyana Mihaylova, Ivan Petrov. Emotions and Intellect Representations in
Balkans Languages 3

Articles

Borislav Petrov. On the Etymology of Old Albanian *dro* ‘to Be Afraid, to Fear’ 6

Bilyana Mihaylova. On Fear and Desire: The Etymology of Modern Greek
λαχτάρα 18

Aneta Dimitrova. Infinitives and Participles after the Verb ‘to Think’ in the
Preslav Translation of John Chrysostom’s *De statuis*..... 24

Alessandro Maria Bruni. The Textual Transmission of the Participle
byšęšt-/byšqšt- in the Old Church Slavonic Tradition of the Homilies of
Gregory of Nazianzus 35

Анастасия Петрова. От перцепции к эмоции. Синестемия в балканских
языках как предмет лингвистического исследования..... 52

Yovka Tisheva, Marina Dzhonova. Aspectual Features of Emotional
Predicates 69

Martin Stefanov. The Conceptualization of Intellectual Capacities and
Emotions in Animalistic Comparative Idioms in South Slavic Languages 83

Review Articles

- Martin Henzelmann.** Buchbesprechung: Срето З. Танасић. Српски језик и ћирилица: Огледало српско. (Лингвистичке едиције. Едиција Расправе, књига 4). Нови Сад: Прометеј, 2023 97
- Ana Kocheva.** New Work on Comparative Historical Linguistics by Borislav Popov. 102

Chronicle

- Albena Mircheva.** International Scientific Conference *Balkan Parallels* – 30 Years of Balkan Studies at the University of Sofia Saint Kliment Ohridski 106

Bilyana MIHAYLOVA (Sofia), Ivan P. PETROV (Vienna)

EMOTIONS AND INTELLECT: REPRESENTATIONS IN BALKAN LANGUAGES

The articles in this issue of the journal *Linguistique balkanique* are from papers presented at the international scientific conference *Emotions and Intellect: Representations in Balkan Languages and Cultures* which took place at Sofia University from January 22 to 24.

The aim of this scientific forum was to discuss different approaches to the study of the concepts of emotion and intellect as represented in the languages and cultures of the Balkans and the neighbouring regions.

Both our emotional and rational dimensions form essential parts of our inner world, attracting the attention of diverse civilizations throughout history. Our understanding of this non-material world is mainly based on the way it is represented in human language in its oral or written forms. Moreover, literary traditions show a unique interest in these issues, whether they are perceived in a religious (i.e. theological) perspective or as part of the perennial poetic narratives.

The conference embraced a broad historical timeline, spanning from Classical and Late Antiquity through the Medieval period to Early Modern and contemporary times.

In recent years, the intersection of emotion studies and linguistics has gained significant attention, with researchers exploring how language shapes emotional experiences and vice versa. Studies have shown that language plays a crucial role in emotion perception, regulation, and expression, influencing how individuals interpret and communicate their feelings. Researchers have found that different languages encode emotions in unique ways, affecting how speakers of those languages experience and describe their emotions. Today some researchers challenge traditional views of emotions as merely biologically determined, emphasizing instead the critical role of language and culture.

The first two articles are dedicated to etymological research, aiming to find the origins of two Balkan words and to establish the semantic changes attested in their history. The diachronic analysis reaches back to the Indo-European linguistic roots. Searching for the etymology of Albanian *dro* ‘to be afraid, to fear’, BORISLAV PETROV

first examines the explanation attempts that have been made so far. He proposes that the Old Albanian *dro* originates from the *-ie/o-* present stem of the Proto-Indo-European root **dreh₂-*, meaning ‘to run away’, which yielded Gk. ἀποδιδράσκω ‘to run away, to flee’ and Ved. $\sqrt{drā}$ - ‘to run’.

In her paper BILYANA MIHAYLOVA examines the Modern Greek noun *λαχτάρα* and the related verbs *λαχταρίζω/λακταρίζω*, combining the meanings of ‘desire’ and ‘fear’. Analyzing their morphological structure and semantic evolution over time, the author concludes that the substantive *λακτάρα/λαχτάρα/* is derived from Ancient Greek *λακτέα* ‘kick’ with the addition of the augmentative suffix *-άρα*, while the verb *λακταρίζω/λαχταρίζω* is a denominative formation.

The articles of ANETA DIMITROVA and ALESSANDRO MARIA BRUNI deal with issues related to Old Bulgarian (Old Church Slavonic). Dimitrova’s paper focus on a specific syntactic problem: the rendering of the so-called declarative infinitives after verbs meaning ‘to think’ in the Preslav translation of John Chrysostom’s preaching series *On the Statues*. The author concludes that the deviations from the grammatical structure of the source text in the Preslav translation are an interesting characteristic feature of translator’s idiolect and most importantly – of the language of 10th-century Bulgaria.

Bruni examines the textual transmission of the participle *byšęšt-/byšęšt-* in the Old Church Slavonic translation of the Homilies (λόγοι) of Gregory of Nazianzus the Theologian. Unlike the traditional method, which relied solely on analysing the oldest existing 11th-century Old East Slavic copy for the participle’s linguistic analysis, the author explores the entire manuscript tradition. This broader analysis encompasses 18 testimonies dating from the 14th to the 17th centuries. For the first time, this study treats variant readings as essential evidence for uncovering the participle’s original meaning. It reveals that the participle describes a dynamic, process, an ongoing situation rather than merely expressing a future time reference in the strictest sense.

ANASTASIA PETROVA examines how different senses – such as taste, smell, sight, and touch – interact through metaphorical associations. She explores the intrinsic nature of synaesthesia and examines how its various expressions can be captured through linguistic means. Petrova argues that similar perceptions across these modalities, as reflected in the linguistic material of modern Balkan languages, give rise to unique metaphorical transfers. Systematic cognitive research into the phenomenon using corpus data could reveal the cross-modal nature of many figurative schemas in Balkan languages.

YOVKA TISHEVA and MARINA DZHONOVA examine how the internal structure of events determines their lexical aspect by applying Vendler’s classification of verbs and Dowty’s modification tests in Bulgarian. Their paper analyses emotional predicates, dividing them into Subject Experiencer and Object Experiencer verbs, and finds that their aspectual differences correlate with the way the Experiencer role is marked. The analysis of the two authors shows that transitive and intransitive *fear*-type verbs express stative events, whereas *frighten*-type verbs denote caused change of emotional state.

MARTIN STEFANOV investigates how intellectual capacities and emotions are conceptualized through animal-related idioms in Bulgarian, Serbian, Croatian, and Slovene. He employs cognitive metaphor theory and cluster linguoculturology to reveal that the same basic conceptual models are used across these South Slavic languages.

The editors of the volume thank the authors of the articles, whose contributions have provided a wealth of linguistic insights and investigative strategies. The guest editors also express their profound gratitude to the editorial board of the journal *Linguistique balkanique* for agreeing to publish the contributions of the conference. The organization of the Forum was part of an Alexander von Humboldt reintegration program at the Institute for Balkan Studies and Center of Thracology at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.

The financial support of the Bulgarian National Scientific Fund (contract Nr КП-06-МНФ/42 – 26.09.2024 г.) was provided for the organization of the conference in accordance with the Memorandum of August 2020 between the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and the Fund. No financial means received through the framework of this contract were planned or used for the publication of the articles in the present journal issue.



Alessandro Maria BRUNI (Naples)

**THE TEXTUAL TRANSMISSION OF THE PARTICIPLE *BYŠĚŠT-* /
BYŠQŠT- IN THE OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC TRADITION OF THE
HOMILIES OF GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS***

Abstract. The present paper offers fresh insights into the textual transmission of the occurrences of the participle *byšěšt-/byšqšt-* in the Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) translation of the *Homilies* (λόγοι) of Gregory of Nazianzus the Theologian. The study of this very rare and quite obscure verbal form, deemed to be one of the most challenging issues in the grammatical description of the Old Church Slavonic language, represents an outstanding question in Palaeoslavistics. In contrast to the traditional approach, which bases the participle's linguistic analysis solely on examining the oldest extant 11th-century Old East Slavic copy, the author explores the entire manuscript tradition, consisting of 18 testimonies dating from the 14th up to the 17th centuries. The adoption of this methodology leads to innovative results; first, it demonstrates that the participle survives not only in the East Slavic, but also in the South Slavic (Middle Bulgarian) tradition; second, it identifies a paradigm form which had previously escaped the attention of scholars, supporting V. Jagić's reconstruction of the participle's nominative singular. Third, this study considers for the first time the variant readings as a key asset for investigating the participle's original meaning, understanding its description of a dynamic process, an ongoing situation, rather than the expression of a future time reference in the strictest sense. Accordingly, a different view with regard to its significance may confidently be offered: rather than representing a future form of the verb *byti* "to be", as had been previously assumed, this participle can be seen to have been used as an expression for a developing process, similar to the verb *byvati* ("to become", "to happen", "to occur", "to be").

Keywords: Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) language; manuscripts; textual criticism; historical linguistics

1. In the grammatical description of the Old Church Slavonic (hereafter OCS) language a certain degree of uncertainty still remains surrounding the interpretation of a very rarely attested participle, whose origin, tense and lexical meaning have not yet been unequivocally established. Among academics in this field, it is commonly referred to by the form *byšěšt-* or *byšqšt-* because of the incomplete inflectional paradigm and of the existence in the sources of both an athematic and a thematic

form. For more than a century its study has been the subject of a fierce debate among linguists, the overwhelming majority of whom consider it to be a remnant of a future participle, allegedly built by adding the Indo-European *-s- formant to the stem of the verb *byti* (“to be”), as found in some languages such as Greek and Lithuanian (Miklosich 1876: 768; Jagić 1906: 35; Leskien 1919: 213; Van Wijk 1931: 228-229; Vaillant 1948: 237; Селищев / Selischev 1952: 174; Кузнецов / Kuznetsov 1961: 132; Герджиков / Gerdzhikov 1973: 149; Добрев / Dobrev 1982: 109; Patri 1990: 312-317; Bubenik 1997:83)¹.

However, different approaches are also known to exist. According to Meillet (1965: 240-241) the *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* should be regarded as a vestige of the Indo-European “desiderative”. In Aitzetmüller’s (1978: 199) opinion it should not be interpreted as a future, but as a past active participle. In his view it was originally formed from the aorist of the verb *byti* (“to be”). On the other hand, Whaley (2000: 21), who expresses deep skepticism that the Slavic language inherited from Proto-Indo-European a specific morpheme for marking futurity², maintains the participle denotes a change-of-state. The longstanding problem of establishing the participle’s tense and lexical meaning remains completely open for discussion. It is therefore quite evident that the conflicting views held by scholars underline how much work has still to be undertaken before any irrefutable answer can be reached³.

The present paper aims at offering a number of remarks both on aspects that have so far been insufficiently looked into and on new data that have hitherto escaped the attention of Slavicists. The investigation focuses on the participle occurrences in the OCS version of the *Homilies* (λόγοι) of Gregory of Nazianzus the Theologian (ca. 329-390), which were translated from Greek in Bulgaria between the end of the 9th and the first half of the 10th century by at least two anonymous authors⁴. This homiletical corpus can be demonstrated to be of crucial relevance to the issue here under discussion: it not only contains a fifth of the *byšęšt-/byšqšt-*’s inflected forms which have come to light until now, but also presents a number of hitherto unconsidered variant readings. As will be shown, the philological analysis of this fresh material enables our understanding of the participle to be sharpened and new light to be shed on its paradigm, usage and semantics.

2. The study of *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* is characterized not only by the paucity of sources in which it is attested, but also by the fact that it is apparently limited to a specific period of the literature of *Slavia Christiana*. The list of occurrences originally drawn up by Срезневский / Sreznevskiy (1893: 209) and Jagić (1906: 35) was recently supplemented by Miltenov (2009: 159-167; 2024: 92-93, 168-169) with some previously unknown entries as well as with the addition of Greek parallels to each textual passage. The present day’s documented checklist includes 45 records which are distributed as follows⁵:

(a) as far as the Bible is concerned, it comprises 31 passages from the translation of the *Major* and *Minor Prophets* flanked by Theodoret of Cyrrhus’ *Commentaries* (CPG 6208) and 1 from the second OCS complete version of the *Book of Daniel*;

(b) as to the theological literature it includes 9 instances from the OCS translations of the *Homilies* of Gregory of Nazianzus (CPG 3010) and 2 from Constantine of Preslav's version of the *First Oration against the Arians* by Athanasius of Alexandria (CPG 2039);

(c) moreover, the participle is to be found in a liturgical hymn (the *Canon for the Prophet Jeremiah* in manuscript RNB, Sof. 202, 11th century) as well as in the OCS translation of the so-called *Soterios*, a Byzantine miscellany, which is to be found in the Old East Slavic copy of the *Symeonic Florilegium* (I, fol. 159v)⁶.

All these texts represent translations undertaken from Greek between the late 9th and the early 10th centuries by exponents of the Preslav literary school (Eastern Bulgaria, reign of Tsar Symeon, ca. 893-927 C.E). However, the *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* forms have been generally believed to have solely survived in later East Slavic copies, only a few of which date from the second half of the 11th century, while the majority are from the 15th and the 16th centuries. Nowadays there is no evidence of the use of the participle in question either in earlier Cyrillo-Methodian versions, or in original works of the literature of *Slavia Christiana*; moreover, no cases of the participle's occurrence in South Slavic manuscripts have been detected todate.

Consequently, from a quantitative point of view, the use of *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* appears to be a rather isolated, if not an entirely marginal, phenomenon in the OCS language, possibly restricted to a very specific literary milieu of Old East Bulgarian origin (Preslav). Nevertheless, in today's debate its occurrence in the manuscripts is commonly considered to reflect archetypal readings (Милтенов / Miltenov 2009: 160). This is something scholars have taken for granted but curiously not demonstrated. Furthermore, as far as the participle's inflectional paradigm is concerned, only genitive, dative, accusative, locative and instrumental forms have hitherto been traced in the sources, while the nominative case was putatively reconstructed as **byšę* (m.s.), **byšęšti* (f.s.), **byšę* (n.s.) (Jagić 1906: 36; Кузнецов / Kuznetsov 1961: 128). Likewise, the supposed finite form of the verb (the alleged sigmatic finite future) was assumed to appear as **byšq*, **byšiši*, **byšitiŭ*, **byšimŭ*, **byšite*, **byšętiŭ* (Jagić 1906: 35-36; Кузнецов / Kuznetsov 1961:128; Bubenik 1997: 83). Therefore, there are still many open issues requiring further research. In order to gain further insight into this challenging grammatical problem, there is little doubt that a much closer look into the Slavonic tradition of the *Homilies* of Gregory of Nazianzus is today more than necessary.

3. Every attempt to compile an inventory of the various forms of *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* in the OCS version of the *Homilies* has up to now been exclusively based on the earliest extant testimony of the translation, namely on the 11th-century Old East Slavic manuscript P (Срезневский / Sreznevskiy 1893: 209; Jagić 1906: 35; Милтенов / Miltenov 2009: 159-167). The remainder of the very abundant East and South Slavic manuscript tradition has been completely ignored. Recent progress in research into its text-critical features enables us to obtain a more nuanced picture of the transmission of *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* within this corpus⁷.

The currently available list of the occurrences may be complemented not only by a new entry, a tenth instance of use of *byšęšt-/byšqšt* (in *Homily* 40, Chapter

31), which has eluded the attention of scholars, but also by a comprehensive analysis of the existing variant readings in manuscripts, until recently totally disregarded. These are not only the abovementioned codex I, but also the 18 testimonies E F G J K L M Men1 Men2 N O Q R S U V Y Z dating from the 14th up to the 17th centuries, containing relevant material for investigating the participle *byšęšt-/byšęšt*-⁸. The results of the new data collation are shown below in Table 1.

Table 1.

№	Homily	Chapter	<i>byšęšt-/byšęšt- in ms P</i>	<i>Variant readings in other mss</i>
I	40	9	и <u>взишаци</u> горьши отъ трѣпѣнїи καὶ γινομένου χειρόνος ἐκ τῆς εἰς τοῦτον μακροθυμίας <i>...and becoming deteriorated by the longsuffering shown to this one...</i>	взишаци Men1, Men2
II	40	14	мѣнѣ даждь нзїнѣшьнїе: а бѣнѣ <u>взишаште:</u> Ἐμοὶ δὸς τὸ παρὸν, Θεῶ τὸ μέλλον: <i>...give to me the present, and to God the future...</i>	взишаште I: взишаше Men1: взишаше Men2
III	40	15	и <u>взишаште</u> оутѣрьдиши: καὶ τὸ μέλλον ἀσφαλίσαι <i>...and secure yourself for the future...</i>	взишаше I : взишаше Men1, Men2:
IV	40	31	ѣмаже тождѣ ѣсть вѣдзи: и прїтажати чѣто благънїхъ: нѣ <u>взиша</u> и прїтажавше: сзна- вѣдѣши: ἐπειδὴ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐστὶ δυσχερείας, καὶ κτήσασθαι τι τῶν ἀγαθῶν οὐχ ὑπάρχον, καὶ κτηθὲν διασώσασθαι <i>...since it is equally difficult both to obtain something from the blessings one does not possess and, once gained, to preserve it...</i>	нѣ взишаше Men1, Men2
V	41	2	нже отъ <u>взишашадо</u> вѣка прїахомъ ἦν ἐκ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος προσελήφамεν <i>...which we borrow from the century to come...</i>	Ѡ взишашадо FGJKLMOQRSUVYZ

VI	41	11	<p>α Δροϋζιν βζιшащєε прѣждє ονѣδ'βша οί δὲ καὶ τὸ μέλλον προέγνωσαν ...and the latter also foreknew the future...</p>	<p>βζιβαющєε FGJKLMOQRSUVYZ</p>
VII	41	11	<p>и акѣи съ сѣщиими • съ βζишщиими сѣще • καὶ ὡς παροῦσι συνόντες τοῖς ἐσομένοις. ...so as to have an understanding of future things as if they were already present...</p>	<p>съ βζиβαющиими FGJKLMOQRSUVYZ</p>
VIII	43	62	<p>παχε же съ миръ прѣпоуцаиоу настоащии къ βζишщииоу: μᾶλλον δὲ κόσμον κόσμῳ παραπέμπουσιν, τὸν ἐνεστῶτα τῷ μέλλοντι ...or rather to abandon the world for another world, the present one for the future one...</p>	<p>къ βζиβαщииоу N</p>
IX	43	71	<p>съ неχοуѣдоуъ прѣсѣтѣоуъ: ѡ βζишщиииуъ: σὺν οὐκ ἀγεννεῖ προφητεῖα τοῦ μέλλοντος. ...with a not insignificant prophecy about the future...</p>	<p>ω βζишщиииъ N</p>
X	45	28	<p>не акѣи неβѣдѣшио бѣ • βζишщииаго • οὐκ ἀγνοοῦντος τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἐσόμενον ...not because God does not know the future...</p>	<p>βζиβαющииаго FS : βζишщииаго GJKLMOQRUVYZ : om. E</p>

4. The above collected data permit a number of relevant observations to be made. They can schematically be grouped into the following points, which show the need to radically reconsider many of the previously expressed views regarding the OCS participle *byšęšt-/byšęšt-*.

(a) As to the relationship with the source text, the *byšęšt-/byšęšt-* participle, besides translating Greek future related forms such as μέλλων (present active participle of μέλλω “to be about to”, 6 examples) and ἐσόμενος (future middle participle of εἶμι “to be”, 2 cases), is also used to render present participles (two instances in Table 1: № I, IV). These are γι(γ)νόμενος (present mediopassive participle of γί(γ)νομαι “to become”, 1 occurrence) and ὑπάρχων (present active participle of ὑπάρχω “to be in existence”, “to be on hand”, “to be at disposal”), the latter preceded by negation (οὐχ). This feature seems at odds with the mainstream assumption that

byšęšt-/byšqšt- has only future time reference in OCS; this discrepancy inevitably poses fresh questions demanding inquiry.

(b) With regards to the variety of OCS forms, manuscripts incorporate both the athematic (*byšęšt-*) and the thematic (*byšqšt-*) participle. Moreover, they were excitingly uncovered not only in the earliest codex P, but also in later testimonies, one of which is of South Slavic origin. Accordingly, 15 examples of *byšęšt-* can be traced respectively in P, I, Men 1, Men 2 (see Table 1: № I-VI and VIII-IX), while *byšqšt* is to be found twice in P and in one instance in the Middle-Bulgarian manuscript N (Table 1: № VII, IX, X). This indeed appears to be the very first case in which *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* has been detected outside of the East Slavic tradition. As such it provides conclusive evidence how the generally held view that the *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* is absent from the South Slavic codices is in need of a complete overhaul.

(c) As to the participle's inflectional paradigm, the newly traced form of the neuter accusative singular *byšę* (Table 1: № IV) provides indirect confirmation for Jagić's (1906: 36) reconstruction of the nominative singular of the participle as *byšę* (m.s.), *byšęšti* (f.s.), *byšę* (n.s.). This a logical consequence of the paradigmatic identity of the neuter nominative singular and the neuter accusative singular of the participles in the OCS language.

(d) As far as textual variants are concerned, in two instances the alternative reading is represented by *byvŭ*, the past active participle from the verb *byti* ("to be"). This clearly deviates from the original Greek text, which instead displays a present and a future participle (Table 1: № IV, X^{GJKLMOQRUVYZ}). However, in the remaining cases the manuscripts transmit readings not related to the verb *byti* ("to be"), from which *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* supposedly derives, but to the verb *byvati* ("to become", "to happen", "to occur to be"). This holds particularly true for *Homily* 41, in which the entire group of its Old East Slavic testimonies (FGJKLMOQRSUVYZ) reads the present active participle *byvajęi* in all three textual passages (Table 1: № IV-VI). Moreover, this type of textual variant was shown to be attested in the South Slavic tradition as well, as was found in *Homily* 43 according to codex N (Table 1: № VIII). This evidence suggests an early origin of this reading: rather than being attributable to the editorial activity of East Slavic copyists, it more likely emerged in the initial phases of the textual transmission. Such a conclusion can be supported by the South Slavic tradition of the *Minor Prophets* flanked by Theodoret of Cyrrihus' *Commentaries*, which likewise also presents *byvajęi* instead of *byšęšt*, a reading which is thought to be only found in the Old East Slavic testimonies of this corpus (Милтенев / Miltenov 2009: 162).

5. The undertaken analysis of the transmission of *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* in the testimonies of the *Homilies* seems to rule out that the participle can be interpreted as having a past tense value. This can be inferred not only by looking at the source text (present or future tense forms in Greek), but also at the participle's variant readings according to the East and South Slavic codices of this corpus. In this respect, special attention should be paid to the use of *byvajęi* as an equivalent of *byšęšt-/byšqšt-*, which from a text-critical standpoint can be deemed to date back to the initial

stages of the manuscript tradition. Such a view can be corroborated by a number of supplementary linguistic remarks.

As already highlighted in scholarly literature, in the OCS language the verb *byvati* (“to become”, “to happen”, “to occur to be”) does not only have an iterative value but also describes an “ongoing situation”⁹. Precisely with this meaning it is used in the Cyrillo-Methodian translation of the “Apostle”, as can be observed in 1 Corinthians 15:37 (see Table 2), in which *byvajęi*, according to Codex Christinopolitanus, renders *γενησόμενος*, the future middle participle of *γίγνομαι* (“to come into being”, “to become”)¹⁰.

Table 2.

	Chapter	Verse	<i>byvajęi</i>
I Corinthians	15	37	<p>ѣже сѣиши, не тѣло <u>бывающе</u> сѣиши, нъ голо зѣрно καὶ ὁ σπείρεις, οὐ τὸ σῶμα <u>τὸ γενησόμενον</u> σπείρεις ἀλλὰ γυμνὸν κόκκον ...and what you sow is not the body <u>that is to be</u>, but a bare kernel...</p>

Moreover, the OCS version of the Gospel of Luke displays another participial form deriving from the verb *byvati* when translating *ἐσόμενος*, the future middle participle of *εἶμι* (“to be”), and *γι(γ)νόμενος*, the present mediopassive participle of *γί(γ)νομαι* (“to become”). In either case the translator uses *byvaemoe*, the substantivized present passive participle of *byvati* (“to become”, “to happen”, “to occur to be”) to render the dynamic process, expressed by the underlying Greek text, which describes a situation that was going to happen, that was about to be done (see: Table 3)¹¹.

Table 3.

	Chapter	Verse	<i>byvaemoe</i>
Gospel of Luke	22	49	<p>видѣвъше же ѣже бѣдахъ сѣ ѣнѣмъ <u>бываемоу</u>. рѣша ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν τὸ ἐσόμενον εἶπαν ...when those around Him saw what <u>was going to hap-</u> <u>pen</u>, they said...</p>
	23	8	<p>и надѣваше сѣ знаменье етеро <u>видѣвти</u>. оуъ него <u>бываемо</u> καὶ ἤλπίζεν τι σημεῖον ἰδεῖν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ γινόμενον ...and hoped to see some miracle <u>to be done</u> by him...</p>

These examples may be claimed to support the idea that the various inflected forms of the present active participle *byvajęi*, to be found in the *Homilies* as textual variants, are fully consistent with the meaning of *μέλλων* (present active participle of *μέλλω* “to be about to”) and of *ἐσόμενος* (future middle participle of *εἶμι* “to be”). They can well illustrate a circumstance that is ready to take place, an imminent action about to develop.

On the contrary, the reading *byvŭ* (past active participle from the verb *byti* “to be”), which appears twice in a number of later East Slavic testimonies (Table 1: № IV, X^{GJKLMOQRUVYZ}), should be understood as a secondary insertion into the manuscript tradition of the *Homilies*. In the OCS translation of the Gospel of Matthew *byvŭ* is coherently used for the translation of γενόμενος, the aorist middle participle of γίγνομαι (“to come into being”, “to become”). This is evident in chapter 18:13, in which τὰ γενόμενα is rendered with *byvŭša* (Table 4).

Table 4.

	Chapter	Verse	<i>byvŭ</i> (: <i>byvajei</i>)
Gospel of Matthew	18	31	<p>ВНДѢВЪЗШЕ ЖЕ ОУБО КЛЕВРѢТИ БЪЗІВЪША (: БЪЗІВАИЦІАИ) СЪЖАЛИША СИ СЪЛО.</p> <p>ιδόντες οὖν οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτοῦ τὰ γενόμενα (: τὰ γινόμενα) ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα. ...So, when his fellow slaves saw what had happened (: was happening), they were deeply grieved...</p>

The occurrence in some testimonies of the alternative reading *byvajōštaja* (neutral accusative plural of the present participle of *byvati* “to become”/ “to happen”/ “to occur to be”) can be explained by the influence of the corresponding textual variant τὰ γινόμενα (neutral accusative plural of the mediopassive present of γί(γ)νομαι “to become”), that is to be found in a number of Greek testimonies¹².

In the transmission of *Homily 40* (Table 1: № IV) it is possible to firmly establish that the reading *ne byšę* (in P) dates back to the archetype, while *ne byvŭšee* (in codices Men1 Men2) is of secondary origin. In this specific textual passage, the Greek present active participle of ὑπάρχω (“to be in existence”, “to be on hand”, “to be at disposal”) is preceded by a negation (οὐχ ὑπάρχον) and can be translated as “things which (one) does not possess”, or “things which are not at one’s disposal”. The present tense of the Greek original seems to be in conflict with the translator’s choice to opt for *byšęšt-/byšęšt-*, which generally renders future or, more precisely, future-related participle forms. However, this apparent incongruity can be clarified by analyzing a similar example extracted from the OCS Old Testament. As shown by Sreznevskiy (Срезневский / Sreznevskiy 1893: 209), in the Book of Isaiah, the participle *byšęšt-/byšęšt-* preceded by a negation translates the Greek substantivized present infinitive τὸ μὴ εἶναι (of εἶμι “to be”). As shown in Table 5, the anonymous translator resorts to the use of the participle *byšęšt-/byšęšt* preceded by a negation to express the semantic sphere of the lack of something. Consequently, the reading *ne byšęšti* (“not being available”) takes on a present tense value and typologically appears to be very close to the translation strategy used in *Homily 40* (*ne byšę* “[something] that is not in possession”).

Table 5.

	Chapter	Verse	<i>ne byšęšt-</i>
Isaiah	50	2	НЕ БЪШИЩИИ ВОДѢ ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ὕδωρ ...because there is no water...

A similar approach is also to be found in a passage from the *Book of Amos*, recently quoted by Miltenov (Милтенов / Miltenov 2009: 161), in which the present active participle of ὑπάρχω, once again preceded by a negation, is used in the context of a periphrastic construction with the third person singular of the future (ἔσται) of the verb εἶμί (“to be”). Accordingly, the Greek original text is rendered into OCS by means of a calque (Table 6), in which the third person singular of *bqđq*¹³ is followed by the participle negative form *ne byšęšti*.

Table 6.

Amos	5	5	И ВЕТИЛЪ ВОУДѢТЬ НЕ БЪШИЩИИ καὶ Βαιθηλ ἔσται ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρχουσα ... and Bethel shall come to nothing...
------	---	---	---

Moreover, a further example is given by John the Exarch’s *Hexameron*, where the Greek adjective ἀνύπαρκτος “not existing / non-existent” is rendered with *ne byšęšti* (Славова / Slavova 2017: 354).

In light of the above, one can consequently infer that when looking at the opposition between *ne byšę* and *ne byvŭšee* within the text of *Homily 40* (Table 1: № IV), the first reading may be ascribed to the archetype, while the second appears to be the result of a scribal error¹⁴.

6. These fresh insights into the transmission of the *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* in the manuscript tradition of the *Homilies* of Gregory of Nazianzus therefore enable the following conclusions to be logically drawn.

From a methodological perspective this research has demonstrated how introducing new evidence, resulting from in-depth philological and text-critical analysis, is so crucial when a grammatical description of the OCS language is at stake. The topic investigated here is extremely complex, one might even say elusive. Since at least the late 19th century, prominent scholars have been faced with the longstanding issue of finding a way to interpret this rare and enigmatic verbal form, whose origin, tense and lexical meaning is exceptionally difficult to establish with a high degree of certainty. Broadening the research horizon to manuscripts dating from more recent times was shown to be a major asset, an essential condition for overcoming the impasse, in which the debate surrounding the participle seems to have stalled. The previous approach, which envisaged the examination of only the oldest extant manuscript, was shown to be not merely inadequate but even misleading. In fact, the widely held assumption that the *byšęšt-/byšqšt-* is a uniquely distinguishing feature of East Slavic manuscripts turned out to be completely unsubstantiated as

a direct consequence of its discovery also in a South Slavic testimony of the OCS version of the *Homilies* of Gregory of Nazianzus, the Middle Bulgarian codex N. Furthermore, a previously undetected form of the participle, the neuter accusative singular *byšę* preceded by negation *ne*, was shown to exist in the 11th century codex P, offering strong support for Jagić's (1906: 36) hypothesis that the paradigm of the nominative singular should have appeared as *byšę* (m.s.), *byšęšti* (f.s.), *byšę* (n.s.). The research's overturning of broadly held opinions has undoubtedly facilitated an improved perception of the diachronic and diatopic evidence, leading to a more profound knowledge of the morphology, the occurrence and the spreading of this distinctive verbal form in the manuscript sources.

This radical change of approach in analysing the transmission of the participle has revealed itself not only to be extremely helpful, but indeed invaluable in enriching our understanding of its usage by Old Bulgarian translators. The investigation into the various variant readings to be found in 18 testimonies dating from the 14th up to the 17th centuries (E F G J K L M Men1 Men2 N O Q R S U V Y Z) has led to a series of highly relevant data for linguistic analysis being extrapolated, until now completely ignored.

In this light, special attention should be paid to the identification of a semantically equivalent entity for *byšęšt-/byšęšt-*, whose meaning has been judged so obscure that it has given rise to starkly contrasting interpretations ranging from the future participle, to the desiderative and to the past active participle¹⁵. A certain amount of guidance in solving the intricate puzzle of establishing the participle's tense and lexical meaning is indeed provided by the substitution of *byšęšt-/byšęšt-* with *byvajei*. In all probability, the attempt to establish a synonymisation with the present active participle from *byvati* ("to become", "to happen", "to occur to be") suggests that the *byšęšt-/byšęšt-* may have been used by the anonymous translator of the *Homilies* with an aim to describe a dynamic process, to illustrate an ongoing situation, to render a change-of-state predicate, rather than to express a future time reference in the strictest sense. As already argued by Aitzetmüller (1968:14), the *byšęšt-/byšęšt-*'s primary meaning would have been "becoming" ("werdend"). The shift to post-temporality can indeed be explained in the light of grammaticalisation processes of change-of-state verbs that transform them into future markers. Specifically, "become" is a lexical entity that frequently undergoes such a development (Whaley: 127-130). This would perhaps explain why participles such as *bōdy*, *bōdōšti* and *grędy*, *grędōšti*, or periphrastic constructions such as *chotęštaja byti*, commonly attested in the OCS language with a future tense value, were not here adopted for the purpose of rendering the underlying Greek original in the textual passages of the *Homilies* of Gregory of Nazianzus, examined above in *Table 1*.

The textual variants identified in later manuscripts therefore offer us a valid interpretative key to tackle the thorny problem of how to understand the meaning and use of the participle *byšęšt-/byšęšt-*. The illustrated case of its replacement by *byvajei*, far from representing a mere accidental scribal error, should be rather understood as an attempt by Old Bulgarian scribes to interpret its meaning in the light of the translation techniques adopted in several Cyrillo-Methodian versions of

the New Testament. In this regard, the hypothesis that the usage of *byšęšt-/byšęšt-* was supposedly limited to a particular dialectal area, regional context, purportedly in an Eastern Bulgarian scriptorium, cannot altogether be excluded. From a textual standpoint it seems plausible to assume that the copyists' attempt to identify an equivalent expression for *byšęšt-/byšęšt-* was originally placed alongside the text as part of a series of marginal notes (glosses) to be later integrated into the main body of the work.

Investigating a greater volume of manuscripts enriches our sensibility in gaining a more nuanced understanding of the meaning of the participle *byšęšt-/byšęšt-*. Accordingly, a different view with regard to its significance may confidently be offered: rather than representing a future form of the verb *byti* "to be", as had been previously assumed, this participle can be seen to have been used as an expression for a developing process, similar to the verb *byvati* "to become".

The encouraging outcome from the present study inevitably invites further inquiry to be undertaken in order to gain a more comprehensive picture of the usage of the participle *byšęšt-/byšęšt-*. The approach and the methodology adopted in making such progress in investigating the tradition of the *Homilies* of Gregory of Nazianzus may hopefully be applied in further scholarly inquiry focusing on the remainder of textual corpora, containing occurrences of the participle, whose textual transmission still begs appropriate in-depth investigation¹⁶.

ABBREVIATIONS

- GIM = Gosudarstvennyj istoričeskij muzej [= State Historical Museum], Moscow, Russian Federation
- GVSM = Gosudarstvennyj Vladimiro-Suzdal'skij istoriko-architekturnyj i chudožestvennyj muzej-zapovednik [= Vladimir-Suzdal State Historical-Architectural and Art Reserve Museum], Vladimir, Russian Federation
- JaMZ = Jaroslavskij istoriko-architekturnyj i chudožestvennyj muzej-zapovednik [= Yaroslavl Historical-Architectural and Art Reserve Museum], Yaroslavl, Russian Federation
- KhDNB = Kharkivs'ka deržavna naukova biblioteka im. V.H. Korolenka [= Kharkiv Korolenko State Scientific Library], Kharkiv, Ukraine
- LMAB = Lietuvos Mokslų Akademijos Biblioteka [= Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences], Vilnius, Lithuania
- NBKM = Nacionalna Biblioteka "Sv.sv. Kiril i Metodij" [= SS. Cyril and Methodius National Library], Sofija, Bulgaria
- RGB = Rossijskaja Gosudarstvennaja biblioteka [= Russian State Library], Moscow, Russian Federation
- RNB = Rossijskaja Nacional'naja biblioteka [= Russian National Library], St. Petersburg, Russian Federation
- ZNBS = Zonal'naja naučnaja biblioteka imeni V.A. Artisevič Saratovskogo gosudarstvennogo Universiteta [= Zonal Scientific Library of the Saratov State University], Saratov, Russian Federation

LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS

- E = RGB F. 38 *Egor. 257*, late 15th century
 F = ZNBS *Mal'c.* 38, late 15th-early 16th century
 G = KhDNB 816067 (inv. A 64959), mid /second half of the 16th century
 I = GIM *Sin.* 1043/ 31-д, year 1073
 J = JaMZ *inv.* 15473, early 15th century
 K = RNB *K-B* 82/207, second half of the 15th century
 L = RGB F. 304 *TSL* 8, 14th century
 M = GIM *Sin.* 54, 14th century
 Men1 = GIM *Sin.* 990, 16th century
 Men2 = GIM *Sin.* 178, 16th century
 N = NBKM 674, years 1350-1360
 O = LMAB 55, 15th century
 P = RNB Q.п.I.16, second half-late 11th century
 Q = GIM *Čud.* 11, 14th century
 R = LMAB 56, 16th century
 S = GIM *Sin.* 43, 14th century
 U = GIM *Sin.* 51, 16th century
 V = GVSM B-5636/24, year 1551
 Y = RGB F. 209 *Ovč.* 81, 17th century
 Z = RGB F. 209 *Ovč.* 82, 16th century

NOTES

* This paper is part of a research project funded under the “PRIN 2022” grant scheme, awarded by the Italian Ministry of University and Research (Project title: “The Transmission of Old Church Slavonic Texts”/ CUP H53D23006810006).

¹ For an overview of the issue and a critical assessment of the various views see: Birnbaum 1995: 85-88; Славова / Slavova 2017: 353-355.

² Generally speaking, one of the obstacles in interpreting the participle as a future consists in the fact that the OCS language has no inflectional future. The latter is expressed either with the present tense of some verbs (mostly of perfective, but also of imperfective aspect) or with periphrastic constructions consisting of the verbs *načeti* (“to begin”), *chotěti* (“to want”), *iměti* (“to have”) followed by the infinitive.

³ According to Birnbaum (1995: 90) there is “no compelling evidence for or against the existence of a Slavic sigmatic finite future”. Similarly, Славова / Slavova (2017: 354-355) also remains very cautious about drawing definitive conclusions on this very issue.

⁴ On this tradition see: Бруни / Bruni 2004, 2010, 2021.

⁵ Kuznetsov’s claim regarding the presence in a single Old East Slavic codex of more than 80 participle forms is unfortunately not supported by a full catalogue of quotations

(Кузнецов / Kuznetsov 1961: 131), but only with a couple of examples in which the participle appears to be prefixed (*sŭ-byšęšt-* in GIM, Čud. 184, late 15th century, f. 71 and 93).

⁶ Сим.сбор. / Sim. sbor. 1991: 512.

⁷ A critical edition of the OCS version of Homilies 40 and 43 is available in Bruni 2010, while that of Homilies 41 and 45 is currently being prepared.

⁸ Each one of the above listed testimonies of the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus was directly investigated on site by the author, with the exception of manuscript I studied via a digital copy.

⁹ See: MacRobert 2021: 180. On the non-iterative value of *byvati* see also: Meillet 1902: 56; ЭССЯ / ÈSSYa 1976:158; Шевелева / Sheveleva 2016: 529.

¹⁰ Kałużniacki 1896: 160. A later Middle-Bulgarian copy, known as the “Apostle of Slepče”, features the secondary reading *spšte* “being” (Ильинский / П’inskiy 1912: 38), while the “Aposle of Ohrid” omits this textual passage (Кульбакин / Kul’bakin 1907: 43).

¹¹ The reading *byvaemoe* is to be found not only in major OCS testimonies of the Gospels such as Codex Marianus (Ягич / Jagich 1883: 300 [Lc 22:49], 303 [Lc 23:8] and Codex Zographensis (Jagić 1879: 130 [Lc 22:49], 131 [Lc 23:8], but also in later Middle-Bulgarian copies (Банишко / Vanishko 1981: 356 [Lc 22:49], 359 [Lc 23:8]; Добромирово / Dobromirovo 1975: 268 [Lc 22:49], 272 [Lc 23:8].

¹² For details see: NTG 1998: 1998: 51; Евангелие / Evangelie 2005: 100.

¹³ The special nature of *będę* in the verb paradigm was emphasized by Trubačev (ЭССЯ / ÈSSYa 1976: 233-243), who considers it to be a kind of perfective present in the role of future tense. On this issue see also Van Wijk’s view (1931: 229), according to which *będę* is on the one hand the perfective form of the imperfective *byvajo* “I will” (from *byvati* “to become”/ “to happen”/ “to occur to be”), while on the other the simple imperfective future tense of *esmi* “I am” (from *byti* “to be”). On this problem see also: Jagić 1882; Dostál 1954: 146.

¹⁴ Cases of substitution of Old Bulgarian archaisms with East Slavic innovations (e.g. the replacement of *byšĭnŭ* by *byvŭ*) are listed in: Славова / Slavova 2023, 45, n.7.

¹⁵ The participle’s ambiguous nature was particularly emphasized by Aitzetmüller (1968: 13).

¹⁶ This is especially true for the translation of the Major and Minor Prophets flanked by Theodoret of Cyrhus’ Commentaries which awaits to be investigated on the basis of the entire manuscript evidence. Moreover, further attention should be devoted to Constantine of Preslav’s version of the First Oration against the Arians, in which the participle is twice used for the translation of γενητός (“originated”).

REFERENCES

Aitzetmüller 1968: Aitzetmüller, R. Das angebliche s-Futurum des Slavischen. – In: Mayrhofer, M. (Hrsg): *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde. Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Brandenstein (1898-1967)*. Innsbruck: Institut für Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft der Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck, 19-43. [Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, 14].

Aitzetmüller 1978: Aitzetmüller, R. *Altbulgarische Grammatik als Einführung in die Slavische Sprachwissenschaft*. Freiburg i.Br.: U.W. Weiher. [Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris. Fontes et dissertationes, 12].

Birnbaum 1995: Birnbaum, D.J. The Church Slavonic Future Participle from a Comparative Perspective. – *Die Welt der Slaven*, 40, 1, 76-92.

Bubenik 1997: Bubenik, V. The Verbal System of Old Church Slavic. – In: Hewson, J., Bubenik V. (Eds.): *Tense and Aspect in Indo-European Languages: Theory, typology, diachrony*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 82-102. [Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 145].

Dostál 1954: Dostál, A. Studie o vidovém systému v staroslověnině. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakl.

Jagić 1882: Jagić, V. Das slavische Praesens бждж – bađa. – *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 6, 287-289.

Jagić 1879: Jagić, V. *Quattuor Evangeliorum Codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*. Berolini: apud Weidmannos.

Jagić 1906: Jagić, V. Einige Streitfragen. 9. Das Futurum des Stammes бы. – *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 28 (1906), 35-36.

Kalužniacki 1896: Kalužniacki, Ae. *Actus Epistolaeque Apostolorum Palaeoslovenice. Ad fidem codicis Christinopolitani saeculo XII scripti*. Vindobonae: apud Caroli Geroldi filium.

Leskien 1919: Leskien, A. *Grammatik der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

MacRobert 2021: MacRobert, C. M. 9 Present Events: The Interactions of Verbal Aspect and Non-Past Tense in Early Church Slavonic. – In: Suerbaum, A., Sutherland, A. (Eds.): *Medieval Temporalities: The Experience of Time in Medieval Europe*. Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 159-182.

Meillet 1902: Meillet, A. *Études sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave*. Partie 1. Paris: Émile Bouillon.

Meillet 1965: Meillet, A. *Le slave commun*. Seconde édition revue et augmentée avec le concours de A. Vaillant. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion.

Miklosich 1876: Miklosich, F. *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen*. Bd. III: Wortbildungslehre. Wien: W. Braumüller.

Miltenov 2009: Miltenov, Y. Uses of Participle бѣшащии 'future' in the Slavonic Translation of the Minor Prophets with Commentary. – *Linguistique balkanique*, 43 (2009), 159-167.

NTG 1998: *Novum Testamentum Graece post E. et E. Nestle editione vicesima septima revisa*. Aland, B. et K., Karavidopoulos J., Martini, C.M., Metzger, B.M. (Eds). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Patri 1990: Patri, S. Le participe futur en slave et en indo-européen. – *Die Welt der Slaven*, 35 (1990), 2, 312-317.

CPG: *Clavis patrum graecorum*. Ed. Geerard, M. Vol. 2. Turnhout, 1974.

PG: *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*. Ed. J-P. Migne. Vol. 35. Paris, 1857.

SJS: *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*. I-IV. Praha 1966-1997.

Vaillant 1948: Vaillant, A. *Manuel du vieux slave*. Vol. 1: *Grammaire*. Paris: Institut d'Études slaves.

Van Wijk 1931: Van Wijk, N. *Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache*. Erster Band: *Laut- und Formenlehre*. Berlin- Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.

Whaley 2000: Whaley, M.L. *The Evolution of the Slavic 'be(come) '-type Compound Future*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ohio State University.

Атанасий 2022: Атанасий Александрийски. *Първо Слово против Арианите*. Том I: Издание на текста. Тотоманова, А. М. (ред.). София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“. [Atanasiy 2022: Atanasiy Aleksandriyski *Parvo Slovo protiv Arianite*. Tom I: Izdanie na teksta. Totomanova, A. M. (red.). Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“].

Банишко 1981: Банишко *Евангелие. Среднобългарски паметник от XIII век*. Подготовили за печат с увод и коментар Е. Дограмаджиева и Б. Райков. София: Издателство на Българската академия на науките. [Banishko 1981: *Banishko Evangelie. Srednobałgarski pametnik ot XIII vek*. Podgotvili za pechat s uvod i komentar E. Dogramadzhieva i B. Raykov. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Balgarskata akademiya na naukite.].

Бруни 2004: Бруни, А. М. *Θεολόγος. Древнеславянские кодексы Слов Григория Назианзина и их византийские прототипы*. Москва - Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Нестор-История СПб ИИ РАН. [Россия и Христианский Восток. Библиотека, 6]. [Bruni 2004: Bruni, A.M. *Theologos. Drevneslavjanskie kodeksy Slov Grigoriya Nazianzina i ikh vizantijskie prototipy*. Moskva-Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo Nestor-Istoriya SPb II RAN. [Rossiya i Khristianskiy Vostok. Biblioteka, 6].].

Бруни 2010: Бруни, А. М. *Византийская традиция и старославянский перевод Слов Григория Назианзина*. Том I. Москва, Институт всеобщей истории Российской Академии наук. [Россия и Христианский Восток. Библиотека 9]. [Bruni 2010: Bruni, A.M. *Vizantijskaya tradiciya i staroslavjanskiy perevod Slov Grigoriya Nazianzina*. Tom I. Moskva: Institut vseobščej istorii Rossijskoj Akademii nauk. [Rossiya i Khristianskiy Vostok. Biblioteka, 9].].

Бруни 2021: Бруни, А. М. *Византийская традиция и старославянский перевод Слов Григория Назианзина*. Том II: *Коллекция 16 Слов: описание славянских кодексов*. Москва: Институт всеобщей истории Российской Академии наук. [Bruni 2021: Bruni, A. M. *Vizantijskaya tradiciya i staroslavjanskiy perevod Slov Grigoriya Nazianzina*. Tom II: *Kollekciya 16 Slov: opisanie slavyanskikh kodeksov*. Moskva: Institut vseobščej istorii Rossijskoj Akademii nauk.].

Будилович 1871: Будилович, А. С. *Исследование языка древнеславянского перевода XIII Слов Григория Богослова. По рукописи Императорской публичной библиотеки XI века*. Санкт-Петербург: Типография Императорской Академии наук. [Budilovich 1871: Budilovich, A. S. *Issledovanie yazyka drevneslavjanskogo perevoda XIII*

Slov Grigoriya Bogoslova. Po rukopisi Imperatorskoy publichnoy biblioteki XI veka. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiya Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk.].

Будилович 1875: Будилович, А. С. *XIII Слов Григория Богослова в древнеславянском переводе по рукописи Императорской публичной библиотеки XI века. Критико-палеографический труд.* Санкт-Петербург: Типография Императорской Академии наук. [Budilovich 1875: Budilovich, A. S. *XIII Slov Grigoriya Bogoslova v drevneslavyanskom perevode po rukopisi Imperatorskoy publichnoy biblioteki XI veka. Kritiko-paleograficheskiy trud.* Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiya Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk.].

Герджиков 1973: Герджиков, Г. За спорните въпроси на българската темпорална система. – *Известия на Института за български език*, 22 (1973), 125-150 [Gerdzhikov 1973: Gerdzhikov, G. Za spornite vaprosi na balgarskata termportalna sistema. – *Izvestiya na Instituta za balgarski ezik*, 22 (1973), 125-150.].

Добрев 1982: Добрев, И. *Старобългарска граматика: теория на основите.* София: Наука и изкуство. [Dobrev 1982: Dobrev, I. *Starobalgarska gramatika: teoriya na osnovite.* Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.].

Добромирово 1975: *Добромирово Евангелие. Български паметник от началото на XII век.* Подготви за издаване Б. Велчева. София: Издателство на Българската Академия на науките. [Dobromirovo 1975: *Dobromirovo Evangelie. Balgarski pametnik ot nachaloto na XII vek.* Podgotvi za izdavane B. Velcheva. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Balgarskata Akademia na naukite.].

Евангелие 2005: Алексеев А. А. и др. (составители). *Евангелие от Матфея в славянской традиции.* Санкт-Петербург: Российское библейское общество. [Evangelie 2005: Alekseev A.A. i dr. (sostaviteli). *Evangelie ot Matfeya v slavyanskoy tradicii.* Sankt-Peterburg: Rossiyskoe bibleyskoe obschestvo.].

Ильинский 1912: Ильинский, Г. А. *Слепченский Апостол XII в.* Москва: Типография Г. Лисснера и Д. Собко. [Il'inskiy 1912: Il'inskiy, G.A. *Slepchenskiy Apostol XII v.* Moskva: Tipografiya G. Lissnera i D. Sobko.].

Кузнецов 1961: Кузнецов, П. С. *Очерки по морфологии праславянского языка.* Москва: Издательство Академии наук СССР. [Kuznetsov 1961: Kuznetsov, P. S. *Ocherki po morfologii praslavyanskogo yazyka.* Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.].

Кульбакин 1907: Кульбакин, С. М. *Охридская рукопись апостола конца XII в.* София: Държавна печатница [Kul'bakin 1907: Kul'bakin, S. M. *Okhridskaya rukopis' Apostola konca XII v.* Sofia: Izdatelstvo Derzhavna pechatnica.].

Милтенев 2024: Милтенев, Я. *Преславските лексикални маркери.* София: Авалон. [Miltenov 2024: Miltenov, Y. *Preslavskite leksikalni markeri.* Sofia: Avalon.].

Селищев 1952: Селищев, А. М. *Старославянский язык. Часть вторая. Тексты. Словарь. Очерки морфологии.* Москва: Государственное учебно-педагогическое издательство Министерства Просвещения РСФСР. [Selischev 1952: Selischev, A. M. *Staroslavyanskiy yazyk. Chast' vtoraya. Teksty. Slovar'. Ocherki morfologii.* Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatel'stvo Ministerstva Prosvesheniya RSFSR.].

Сим. сбор. 1991: *Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.) в три тома.* Под общата редакция на акад. П. Динев. Том 1: Изследвания и текст. София: Издателство на Българската Академия на науките. [Sim.sbor. 1991: *Simeonov sbornik*

(*po Svetoslavoviya prepis ot 1073 g.*) v tri toma. Pod obshtata redakciya na akad. P. Dinekov. Tom 1: Izsledvaniya i tekst. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Balgarskata Akademiya na naukite.].

Славова 2023: Руските преписвачи на старобългарския превод на Словата против арианите от Атанасий Александрийски. – *Palaeobulgarica / Старобългаристика*, XLVII (2023), 3, 43-56. [Slavova 2023: Ruskite prepisvachi na starobalgarskiya prevod na Slovata protiv arianite ot Atanasiy Aleksandriyski. – *Palaeobulgarica / Starobalgaristika*, XLVII (2023), 3, 43-56.].

Срезневский 1893: Срезневский, И. И. *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам*. Том 1: А-К. Санкт-Петербург: Типография Императорской Академии наук. [Sreznevskiy 1893: Sreznevskiy, I. I. *Materialy dlya slovarya drevnerusskogo yazyka po pis'mennym pamjatnikam*. Tom 1: А-К. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiya Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk.].

Шевелева 2016: Шевелева, М. Н. К истории древнерусского глагола бывать (аспектуальная семантика). – *Труды Института русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова*, 4 (10), 526-543. [Sheveleva 2016: Sheveleva, M. N. K istorii drevnerusskogo glagola byvati (aspektual'naya semantika). – *Trudy Instituta russkogo yazyka im. V. V. Vinogradova*, 4 (10), 526-543].

ЭССЯ 1976: Трубачев, О. Н. (ред.). *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*. Выпуск 3: (*bratъсь – *сърку). Москва: Наука. [ESSYa: Trubachev O. N. (red.). *Ètimologicheskij slovar' slavyanskih yazykov. Praslavyanskiy leksicheskij fond*. Выпуск 3: (*bratъсь – *сърку). Moskva: Nauka.].

Ягич 1883: Ягич, И. В. *Мариинское четвероевангелие: Памятник глаголической письменности с примечаниями и приложениями*. Санкт-Петербург: Типография Императорской Академии наук. [Jagich 1883: Jagich, I. V. *Mariinskoe chetveroevangelie: Pamjatnik glagolicheskoy pis'mennosti s primechanijami i prolozheniyami*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiya imperatorskoj Akademii nauk.].

Prof. PhD Alessandro Maria Bruni

University of Naples “L’Orientale”

Naples, Italy

e-mail: alessandromaria.bruni@unior.it