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Abstract

Using the thirteenth-century Dobrejšo Gospel (“D”) as an example, the article examines issues of geography and chronology that come into play in attempts to classify medieval manuscripts as Macedonian vs. western Bulgarian on the basis of orthographic and lexical features. The paper demonstrates that with the exception of the orthographic substitution of o for etymological strong back yer, and a single lexical variant, both of which can be traced to an early shared ancestor of D and its two closest relatives, each of the orthographic features of D that corresponds to a Macedonian phonological feature can also be found in non-transitional dialects of the southwestern territory of contemporary Bulgaria.

1. Issues of Space and Time

Determining whether a given post-Old Church Slavonic Central Balkan manuscript should be classified as Macedonian or western Bulgarian is a messy task, but an unavoidable one in the preparation of a diplomatic edition of such a manuscript. This article sets forth the issues and obstacles encountered in attempting to make this determination in connection with the preparation of a second corrected edition of the thirteenth-century Dobrejšo Gospel (“D”).

The provenance of D is not straightforward, particularly because any colophon it may have had is now lost. Despodova and Slaveva include D in their 1988 catalogue of

---

1 This article is based on a paper presented on February 12, 2010 at the conference “Slavic Languages: Time and Contingency” at the University of California at Berkeley. The following abbreviations are used here: ac. pres. part. = active present participle; acc. = accusative; aor. = aorist; du. = dual; f. = feminine; gen. = genitive; indef. = indefinite; instr. = instrumental; loc. = locative; masc. = masculine; mis. fol. = missing folio; nom. = nominative; pl. = plural; sg. = singular.

2 The second edition corrects errors in Conev’s 1906 edition and provides complete liturgical rubrics. I believe Conev’s thirteenth-century dating is correct; see also the early thirteenth-century dating by Christova, Karadžova, and Ikonomova 1982.
Macedonian manuscripts, and Koneski cites D once in his 1965 history of the Macedonian language; on the other hand, Bulgarian scholars, beginning with Conev consider D western Bulgarian (see, for example, Christova, Karadžova and Ikonomova 1982:24). D contains a number of unmistakable orthographic Macedonianisms, in the sense of Macedonian-type features, which appear sporadically in an otherwise relatively conservative Bulgarian Church Slavonic text. Whether these features are sufficient to classify D as a Macedonian manuscript depends on a determination of how the term “Macedonian” should be applied to a thirteenth-century manuscript. In turn, reaching this determination requires consideration of certain major issues of space and time.

1. 1. Geography

Of course, when D was written, the Bulgarian state extended to the west well beyond Ohrid and there was no Macedonian state. In this sense, any thirteenth-century manuscript produced within the territory of the modern-day Republic of Macedonia can be viewed as Bulgarian. But in describing the dialect features that a thirteenth-century manuscript reflects as “Macedonian”, should the term “Macedonian” refer to dialects within the geographic territory that is now the Republic of Macedonia? Conev's 1906 analysis of D distinguishes between Macedonian and western Bulgarian dialects, but what Conev meant by “Macedonian”, of course, was what he understood to be the territory of Macedonia at the turn of the twentieth century. This is clear from Conev’s assertion that D’s orthographic features reflect a “western Bulgarian” dialect that he situates somewhere between the Pčinja and Bregalnica rivers, and somewhere between towns of Kratovo, Kočani, Štip and Veles, all of which now are in eastern Macedonia.

1.2. Chronology

Even if it is established broadly that the term “Macedonian” refers to dialects within the territory of the present-day Republic of Macedonia, should a thirteenth-century manuscript be classified as Macedonian because it contains orthographic features that match phonological features of modern Macedonian dialects? In other words, is it realistic to assume that all modern Macedonian dialects preserve features of the thirteenth-century vernaculars that preceded them and were not subject to phonological change?

Moreover, should the determination of a medieval manuscript as Macedonian vis-à-vis western Bulgarian rest on the features that the last copyist first wrote into the manuscript, or should it also include the features of earlier antigraphs that were copied into the manuscript?3 Usually there is no way to distinguish with any success which

---

3 Following Capaldo (1981), I use the term “antigraph” (Gr. “response”, “copy”) for any hypothetical direct ancestor of the manuscript in question. I prefer “antigraph” to “protograph” in reference to Slavic ancestor
orthographic features of a manuscript are original to its copyist and which were from his immediate antigraph. This distinction can be made, however, to a great extent for D, because it is unique among Bulgarian and Macedonian gospel manuscripts in having two identified close relatives, the Banica Gospel (B)\(^4\) and the Curzon Gospel (C),\(^5\) both of which probably were written a century later.\(^6\) But should the determination of whether D is western Bulgarian or Macedonian be based solely on orthographic features unique to D, or should it include those Macedonian-type features that D shares with one or both of its close relatives? If most or all of D’s Macedonianisms co-occur in C and D in the same textual locations, indicating that these were features of their shared ancestor (DBC), should all three manuscripts be classified as Macedonian, regardless of where they themselves may have been written?\(^7\) Or, alternatively, if most or all of the Macedonianisms in C and B are shared in the same locations with D, should all three simply be considered western Bulgarian manuscripts that reflect an earlier Macedonian tradition in their shared prehistory? And finally, even if, among the three manuscripts, only D were to contain occasional Macedonianisms, can D be classified as Macedonian on that basis alone, or can it be said at most that Macedonianisms have appeared at some time in D’s prehistory, most likely in an apograph of DBC?

2. Orthographic Issues

Even setting aside the broad issues set out above, whether a given manuscript is Macedonian or western Bulgarian hinges on a determination of the types of features that can be identified as indisputably Macedonian, as opposed to western Bulgarian, in origin. There are no such features on the textual level, because so far there are no identified families of post-OCS Macedonian gospel manuscripts: in fact, the only gospel manuscript with Macedonian features that has been identified as a member of a specific family is the Carpinian Gospel (Despodova 1995), which, on the basis of its

---


\(^6\) C is datable to c. 1354, the first year listed in its Easter/Sexagesima table. While most Bulgarian scholars date B to the thirteenth century, I prefer to date it more conservatively to the fourteenth century on the basis of its rather unorthodox palaeographic features.

\(^7\) D itself clearly was not the ancestor manuscript for C and B, as the latter share some segments of standard text that D omits.
textual features, is considered a member of the Serbian Miroslav Gospel family of long lectionaries.

On the linguistic level, no identifiably Macedonian morphological or syntactic features show up in thirteenth-century manuscripts either: the only recognizably Macedonian features of manuscripts of this period are orthographic and lexical. It can be assumed that to some extent, these orthographic features reflect some underlying vernacular or vernaculars, but it cannot be assumed that Bulgarian or Macedonian scribes of this period tried to apply orthographic rules that reflected their own vernacular pronunciation. As an example, most thirteenth-century Macedonian and western Bulgarian manuscripts preserve both \textit{jusy} (ѧ, ѧ), even though the nasal vowels that these graphemes were originally meant to represent had disappeared by then from most dialects. It must also be considered that less confident copyists slavishly strove to reproduce the spelling of their immediate antigraph letter by letter. In such cases, spellings that reveal the copyist’s vernacular occasionally show up in slips of the pen, but they are generally repressed in favor of the orthographic variants in the immediate antigraph, which more often than not reflect a different dialect or dialects. For this reason it is not at all unusual for a thirteenth-century manuscript to reflect orthographically several strata of different dialects, a fact that makes comparison with modern dialect isoglosses not particularly helpful.

Another complication is the development of orthographic conventions that were not intended to reflect phonological reality, the best-known example being the widespread Central Balkan convention, adopted from Glagolitic, of representing both etymological ja and etymological ā with jat’ (ѣ). The use of this convention by a given scribe does not necessarily mean, of course, that the dialect of the scribe merged the Common Slavic vowel sounds *ja and *ā. In some post-OCS manuscripts, the distribution of \textit{jusy} follows orthographic patterns that are clearly not phonologically based. Some scribes routinely spell the front nasal vowel *ě as ѫ immediately after a palatal consonant, particularly when writing the third-person plural aorist -šě. Although this spelling convention coincides with the pronunciation in some Macedonian dialects (Koneski 1965:40), this does not mean that it reflects a feature of the dialect of the scribe who uses it, or indeed a feature of any dialect, if the spelling was adopted as a strictly superficial orthographic convention by the copyist or the scriptorium. Other scribes intentionally alternate the \textit{jusy} so that neither jus appears twice consecutively in a line, a convention that clearly does not reflect a phonological feature of any known Slavic dialect.

On a separate level, an orthographic convention that is associated with a particular dialect may appear in a manuscript only in the spelling of a particular word, and it may be used for that same word in various manuscripts that otherwise have different orthographic systems. An example is B’s consistent spelling \textit{пѧтель} for OCS \textit{пѣтелб}, substituting ѧ for ѫ (Lunt 1984:63; Vakareliyska 2008, vol. II:148). This
vowel alternation is identified by Koneski as a Macedonianism (1965:10), but B does not exhibit it except in this word.

With these issues in mind, in the following section I shall compare the Macedonian-type orthographic features of D with those of its close relatives C and B, in order to determine whether D contains any post-DBC orthographic Macedonianisms that can serve as evidence that D itself was written in Macedonia.

3. Orthographic Macedonianisms in D

D has a two-jer, two-jus orthographic system, with characteristic post-OCS South Slavic inconsistencies in the distribution of ъ and Ѽ, whereas the later C and B manuscripts use Ѽ to represent both jers. Numerous post-OCS orthographic features of D correspond to phonological features that Koneski identifies as Macedonian, particularly with respect to the reflexes of the etymological back jers and the nasal vowels.

3.1. Jers

3.1.1. Strong jers

The most striking orthographic Macedonianism in D is the occasional rendering of the etymological back jers in strong position as џ. This can be considered a true Macedonian feature, in that there are no attested Bulgarian dialects in which the reflex of o for *ъ occurs consistently (Stojkov 1993:89). A very preliminary survey of D, which I have conducted largely in reliance on the orthographic analysis in the introduction to Conev’s edition (1906:21-85), yields 59 substitutions of Ҁ for ъ in strong position.8 Of these, 45 are shared in the same locations by either C or B, or by both. This subgroup includes 30 instances of Ҁ for strong back jers within word stems:9

| ГРОТЪКЪ | Mt 11: 29 (B, C), Jo 12: 15 DBC |
| ГЪТОПЪ | Mt 21: 13, Mk 11: 17, Lu 19: 46 |
| ОПРЕШНОКЪ (gen. pl.) | Mt 26: 17 (DC, B); Mk 14: 12; |
| DC ОПРЕШНОУЪНЪНІ | Lu 22: 1, 7 (B mis. fol.) |
| ЖЪНОВЪНІ | DB Mk 9: 42 |
| cf. DBC Mt 18: 6 ЖЪНЬКЪ, Lu 17: 2 D ЖЪВЪНЬ, sic. |
| СЪНЪНЪКЪ | DC Mk 15: 39 (B СЪТЪНЪКЪ) |

---

8 This paper reports on preliminary research at a very early research stage; thus the lists of occurrences of individual features given here, and the totals of occurrences reported, are still tentative and are not intended to be exclusive. A comparison of D with other post-OCS manuscripts known or considered to be from Macedonia is yet to be undertaken.

9 Following Conev 1906, these are listed in order of first occurrence in D.

10 This variant also occurs in the Strumica Apostol (“Strum.”, Blachova and Chauptova 1990:xvii), which is also dated to the thirteenth century.

11 Also in Strum. (Blachova and Chauptova, ibid.)
The co-occurrences in Matthew must be assessed differently from those in Mark, Luke, and John, however, because among the three manuscripts in the DBC family, only D’s entire Matthew text stems from the DBC version of Matthew. Since B substitutes an entirely different version of Matthew, any co-occurrences in Matthew between D and B must be considered coincidental, with the possible exception of the last few chapters of Matthew, where B appears possibly to have switched to the shared DBC version. C contains the DBC version beginning only at about Mt 15: 2; its first half of Matthew is from a third different textual version. In light of these facts, the co-occurrence of о for strong back jer in врьтопъ in all three manuscripts at Mt 21: 13, where D and C have the DBC textual version but B does not. In either case, it is doubtful that the lowering of etymological strong jer to о was a feature of the vernacular of either the C or B scribe, because the corresponding orthographic convention occurs more infrequently in C and B than in D, and when it does occur, usually it occurs in both manuscripts in the same location.

In some locations outside Matthew, D’s о-variant is shared only with one of its two relatives, as, for example, D and C m. nom. sg. demonstrative тон (tojoy) in Jo 21: 22. This long-form demonstrative variant is characteristic of D, but C and B typically use тън (tnjo). The single co-occurrence of тон in C suggests that perhaps тон was the orthographic variant used in the shared DBC source, and that it was replaced throughout with тън at some time in the prehistory of the CB apograph, except in this one location, where it was missed and emended only later in B’s post-CB prehistory.

In three instances, all three manuscripts share о for etymological strong back jer at word-end before the demonstrative тъ or съ: DBC домотъ Mk 3: 25, увьсловъ Jo 12: 27, мнрость Jo 9: 39. Also, at Mt 24: 48, where D and C both have the DBC version of Matthew, it can be assumed that these correspondences reflect the forms in

---

12 Cf. къ прькновъ in D at Mk 11: 15 (CB loc.), and in CB at Mk 15: 29, now missing from D.
the shared DBC ancestor. Similarly, the shared DC phrase \( \text{злиѡть рабъ} \) at Mt 24: 48, where D and C both have the DBC version of Matthew, most likely appeared in the DBC ancestor (cf. unrelated B \( \text{зали рабъ тън} \)). At Jo 5: 15 and 9: 24, D shares the \( \text{о} \) with C alone in the form \( \text{ъябкотъ} \), but although B has a jer here, its use of the demonstrative form \( \text{тль} \) instead of characteristic \( \text{тън} \) (\( \text{ъябкъ тль} \)) is evidence that the \( \text{-отъ} \) form in D and C in these two verses stems from the DBC ancestor, and that the \( \text{о} \) was later emended to \( \text{ъ} \) at some point in B’s post-CB prehistory without substituting the demonstrative form. Similarly, in Jo 21: 23, where D shares \( \text{ъяяенкотъ} \) with B while C has \( \text{ъяяенкъ тън} \), C’s variant is a post-CB emendation.

In four further instances, D alone has an \( \text{-отъ} \) or \( \text{-ось} \) variant while one or both of the two later manuscripts has a final jer followed by short-form \( \text{тъ} \) or \( \text{сь} \). Here too, the \( \text{о} \) and the short-form demonstrative clearly were features of the DBC ancestor. This is particularly obvious in those instances where D and C have \( \text{ъ} \), because this short-form demonstrative occurs only 12 times in C:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{D праяянкотъ} & \text{ Jo 7: 11 (also CB тъ)} \\
\text{D народость} & \text{ Mk 8: 2 (C also народъ съ, cf. B нардъ съn)} \\
\text{D хлёбосъ} & \text{ Jo 6: 34 (B also хлѣбъ съ, cf. C хлѣбъ сън)} \\
\text{D рабость} & \text{ Lu 12: 43 (B also рабъ тъ; cf. C рабъ тън)}
\end{align*}
\]

Three additional, albeit less obvious, reflections of the DBC antigraph that can be included here are C \( \text{ѡбразось} \), B \( \text{образь съ} \) at Mt 22: 20, from a portion of D that is now missing;\(^{13} \) D \( \text{ъяяенкотъ} \) at Jo 18: 16, where both C and B omit the demonstrative altogether; and, at Jo 12: 30, D \( \text{гласось} \), B \( \text{гласъ} \) followed by an illegible erased superscript letter, and C \( \text{глась сн} \) (for usual CB \( \text{сън} \)).

In contrast to these 45 shared occurrences, D has only 14 instances of \( \text{о} \) for etymological strong jer in D (not including each separate occurrence of D’s characteristic variant \( \text{тон} \)) that are clearly not shared by either C or B:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{пѧтокъ} & \text{ rubric to Mt 21: 4 (CB abbreviation \( \text{пѧн} \)), Mk 15: 42 (B пѧтькъ, C пѧть)} \\
\text{пѧтькъ} & \text{, Jo 19: 14, 31; пѧоуєнъ Lu 23: 54 (B пѧтькъ, C пѧа)} \\
\text{пѧентокъ} & \text{ Mk 15: 37 (an error in D; C and B have the expected acc. pl. form)}^{14} \\
\text{рѧбость} & \text{ Mt 18: 26 (C, B рѧбъ тън), Mt 24: 46 (C рѧбъ тън, B тън рѧбъ; cf. Lu 12: 43 above)} \\
\text{диѧтость} & \text{ Jo 1: 39 (with dispalatalization; CB ди扬尘 тън)}^{15} \\
\text{роѧдось} & \text{ Mk 8: 12 (B рѡд сън, C рѧдъ сън)}
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^{13}\) Cf. CB \( \text{ѡбразось} \) at Mk 12: 16, but D \( \text{обрѧзъ съ} \) (written by second D scribe).

\(^{14}\) Cf. D \( \text{начѧтъкъ} \) at Jo 8: 25, but CB \( \text{начѧтокъ} \).

\(^{15}\) Cf. D \( \text{ди扬尘ъ} \) at Lu 21: 34, but C \( \text{ди扬尘 тън} \), B mis. fol.
20

The correspondence at Mt 11: 16 between D ῶοδοςκ and the ambiguous abbreviation ῶοςκ in B’s unrelated Matthew version, however, is coincidental (cf. C ῶοςκ).

That shared occurrences of ε for etymological strong back jer outnumber the unshared ones (with the exception of τον) by more than a two-to-one ratio is strong evidence that even those occurrences in D alone likely also were present in the DBC antigraph and were replaced later in the prehistory of the CB antigraph.

3.1.2. Neutral jers

D has 34 orthographic reflections of phonological TbLT/TbLT formations for OCS TLbT/TLbT, which Koneski lists as a Macedonianism (1965: 32). This feature does not appear anywhere in either C or B, so it can be considered a later development in D’s post-DBC prehistory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Кλαμет</th>
<th>Mt 23: 16bis; Кламет</th>
<th>Кля</th>
<th>Нет</th>
<th>Mt 23: 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Μξαάν-</td>
<td>Mt 24: 27, 28: 3, Lu 10: 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μλάκ-/Μλάκ-</td>
<td>Mt 27: 24, Lu 10: 40, 26: 5, 63, Mk 5: 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κλάγο</td>
<td>fol. 34v, in portrait of St. Mark (Conev 1906: 124; this portion now missing from D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κξάνυ</td>
<td>Mk 4: 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χλαμμ</td>
<td>Lu 3: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κλάκ-/Κλάκ-</td>
<td>Lu 10: 3, Jo 10: 12bis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τλάζετε</td>
<td>Lu 11: 9, Τλάκχομομ</td>
<td>11: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σββρέζεώννες</td>
<td>Lu 14: 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μα Αιζε</td>
<td>Lu 18: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τέρμα</td>
<td>Jo 2: 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πλούτε</td>
<td>Jo 17: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πλαν</td>
<td>Jo 21: 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no instances of TbRT/TbRT in D: OCS TRβT is reanalyzed as TbRβT in Μξαάστστ for OCS Μξαάστ at Mt 24: 15, in D’s only occurrence of the word,19 and as TbRβT at Jo 21: 6 in Κξρ<γ>οςκα for OCS Κξργοσκα. Although

16 Cf., at Lu 17: 18, CB ηνοπλεμηκκσ, D-κτ σεν.
17 Cf. Μλάκ-/Μλάκ- | Mk 5: 38, Σξρέζ- | Lu 14: 29, Jo 17: 23, Πλαν- | Lu 1: 15, 23, Jo 17: 13, etc.
18 Cf. Μμώλυ- | at Lu 23: 23 and elsewhere.
19 The other locations in the Gospels, Mk 13: 14 and Lu 16: 15, are now missing from D.
Koneski lists $TbLT/TbLT$ and $TbRT/TbRT$ orthographic variants as manifestations of the development of Macedonian vocalic liquids, these phonological shapes are, of course, regularly encountered in Contemporary Standard Bulgarian phonology preceding a vowel; moreover, Stojkov notes with respect to Bulgaria that $TbLT/TbLT$ and $TbRT/TbRT$ formations are the sole reflection of neutral jers in the Panagiurisko dialect, and that full-fledged vocalic liquids are found in the Botevgrad, Elin Pelin, and other western dialects, and in eastern dialects including that of Tetevo (1993:220).

Neither does D have the shape $\Delta\kappa\rho\nu\iota$ for OCS $\Delta\kappa\pi\rho\nu\iota$, which Koneski identifies as a Macedonian feature of the late twelfth-century Ohrid Apostol, the thirteenth-century Bologne Psalter, and the twelfth or thirteenth-century Priest John Macedonian Gospel. Instead, like C and B, D consistently has the variant $\Delta\kappa\rho\nu\iota$, treating the neutral jerk in this word orthographically as a strong jerk.\(^{20}\)

### 3.2. Jusy

#### 3.2.1. Distribution

Koneski identifies as a Macedonian feature the substitution of the $jus$ major for the $jus$ minor after a palatal consonant grapheme (1965:40-42). D’s $jusy$ generally reflect the OCS nasal vowel in word roots and in case desinences; its $jus$ alternations are almost exclusively limited to personal endings on verbs, where $\alpha$ is unilaterally substituted for $\kappa$, never vice versa. The substitution of $\kappa$ for $\alpha$ is particularly consistent in -$\omega\alpha$ for the OCS third-person productive aorist ending -$\omega\iota$; Conev notes that D’s five productive aorists in -$\omega\alpha$ were all written by the second D scribe. As B also consistently uses the $jus$ major in this environment, it may have been a widespread post-OCS spelling convention that did not necessarily reflect a particular dialect; note, however, that Stojkov identifies the substitution of the front nasal vowel (or its later reflex) for the back nasal after the palatal consonants $\acute{s}$, $\acute{z}$, and $\acute{c}$ as a feature also of Thracian, Šumen, Sliven, and other Bulgarian dialects (1993:205). There are three $\alpha$-for-$\kappa$ substitutions in word roots: Mk 9: 10 $\nu\iota\kappa\lambda\lambda\iota\tau\varepsilon\iota\alpha$, Lu 23: 2 $\nu\alpha\nu\lambda\lambda\iota\theta\varepsilon\iota\alpha$ (here after palatal $\acute{c}$, and again in the aorist ending), and $\nu\zeta\kappa\tau\varepsilon\tau\iota\nu$ Jo 19: 38, which Conev attributes to D’s Scribe E (1906:71). Conversely, D has two

\(^{20}\) A non-liquid metathesis co-occurs consistently in D, C, and B, in the orthographic variants $\zeta\kappa\lambda\tau\tau\iota$ and $\zeta\kappa\lambda\lambda\iota\tau\tau\iota$ for the OCS root $sv\tau$-: DC $\zeta\kappa\lambda\lambda\iota\tau\tau\iota\iota\alpha$ Lu 17: 24 (B mis. fol.), DBC Jo 1: 5; Jo 5: 35 CB masc. nom. sg. ac. pres. part. $\zeta\kappa\lambda\tau\tau\iota\iota$ (D $\zeta\kappa\lambda\tau\tau\iota$), DBC neuter gen. sg. noun $\zeta\kappa\lambda\lambda\iota\tau\tau\iota\iota\alpha$ (DC reanalysis here as $sv\nu\nu\iota$-). Mt 13: 43 DB $\rho\kappa\kappa\iota\nu\tau\varepsilon\tau\iota\alpha$, C $\rho\kappa\kappa\iota\nu\tau\varepsilon\tau\iota\alpha$, Mt 17: 2 DB $\rho\kappa\kappa\iota\nu\tau\varepsilon\tau\iota\tau\iota\alpha$. That this feature co-occurs in C and B in their independent Matthew versions suggests that this was a widespread dialect variant of the root $sv\nu\nu\iota$-.

Koneski does not list this metathesis as a Macedonianism.
occurrences of ѧ for ѫ in word roots, one of which is shared by B:21 DB ԩԱԼԱՐԾԢ Y Lu 14: 23; D ՈՐԲԱՀԱՏԸ Mk 4: 37. Although it has no instances of ѧ representing word-initial *(j)ɛ, which Koneski also identifies as a Macedonianism (1965:41), Conev notes that D has four instances of ѧ for word-initial *(j)ɔ, a hypercorrection which too can be considered to reflect phonological leveling between the nasal vowels in an underlying dialect: Mt 11: 2 ԱԾՅԱՆՅՈՒՆԸ, Mt 17: 27 ՈՋՈՒ, Lu 1: 36 ՈՐՅՈՒ (for ոզիկա), and Lu 13: 16 ՈՋՈՒ (1906:59).

3.2.2. Non-nasal vowel letters for jusy: reflexes of nasals

D has two instances of օ的知识 representing *(ɡ)φ, which Koneski identifies as a phonological feature of some Macedonian dialects (and which is better known in medieval Central Balkan manuscripts as an orthographic Serbism): Mt 27: 38 gen. du. ԩԵԲԪԸՆԸ and Mk 6: 36 ԿՈՒԸՐԸ. Conversely, there is one occurrence of ѧ for *(u in the f. gen. du. form ԸԲԸ, but this may be simply a case misinterpretation by a copyist. Similarly, D’s օ for *(ɛ in Mt 27: 18 ԩԵԸԸԸ can be explained as an apparent anticipation of the օ in the next syllable.

Koneski identifies as an orthographic Macedonianism in 12th- and 13th-cen. manuscripts the substitution of ե for OCS ѧ, representing the sound shift of *(ɛ to ă (1965:10). D has only four instances of these: Mt 15: 32 acc. m. pl. ԭԱԴԲԸԸ, Mk 4: 5 gen. sg. ԸՄԸ, and Jo 1: 27 and 29 ԳՐԸԸ. Substitutions of է for ѧ reflect the final stage in a phonological progression in Macedonian from *(ɛ to ă to e (Koneski 1965:44-45), a sound change that is a feature of Bulgarian and Serbian also. This substitution occurs in D, however, only four times, and each time in a verb with prefix pri-. At Mt 14:12 ԪՆԸԸԸԸԸ, the third-person plural productive aorist desinence -šę is a misinterpretation of the masc. nom. past ac. part. ԪՆԸԸԸԸԸ, which occurs in the standard text. The form ԪՆԵԸԸԸԸ at Jo 8: 3 appears to be a similar confusion of aorist and past participle forms. At Mt 25: 1, the fem. nom. pl. past ac. part. has been written as ԪՆԵԸԸԸ, likely a confusion with the masc. nom. pl. form. The form ԪՆԸԸ at Jo 5: 43 appears to be a conflation of the 2Pl aorist ԪՆԸԸ and standard nonpast ԪՆԸԸԸ. The frequent substitutions in D of the pronominal form էԸ for masc. nom./acc. ѧԸ are a different matter, as the substitution of the frozen-form էԸ for ԪԸ and ѧԸ is common in western Bulgarian and Macedonian manuscripts of this period. There are two reverse substitutions of ѧ for է, likely hypercorrections: Mt 15: 19 ԱԸԸԸԸԸ and Mt 28: 19 masc. nom. pl. pres. ac. part. ԿՐԸԸԸԸ. D does not have any instances of ե for ѧ, which would reflect the progression *(ɡ > ɛ > ă (with ă also being the reflex of *(ɛ; Koneski 1965:41).

---

21 All of these, of course, are written as ѧ in C, which uses the jas minor to represent both etymological nasal vowels.
3.2.3. Jus-jer alternations

D, C, and B substitute a jer for ϫ reflecting *φ in all three instances of the OCS verb *οὐσομαι to 'to doubt'. The substitution occurs regularly both in Mark and in the three separate manuscript versions of Matthew, suggesting a widespread dialect pronunciation of this particular lexeme. Like C and B, which, as single-jer manuscripts, have no other option, D consistently uses ѫ consistently in this word as a substitution for *φ, although ϫ as would be expected as the substitute jer in a two-jer manuscript: Mt 14: 31 ѫςμὰί, Mt 28: 17 ѫςμὰία ѫς, Mk 11: 23 ѫςμὰία ϭς. D has only two occurrences of ϫ for etymological back jer, both of which can be explained as conflations of desinences: Mt 18: 15 ѫςμὰί  glyphicon, a confusion of the high-frequency first-person sg. non-past form for the noun; and ѫςμὰί ѫςμὰί Mt 14: 3, probably a perseveration.22

3.3. Reflexes of *ě

Koneski also notes as a feature of Macedonian the lowering of *ě to a following the consonant c or dz (1965: 44). Within the DBC family, D alone contains six substitutions of a for ѣ immediately following ѣ, but never following ѣ (cf. C, which frequently has ѩѩ for OCS dzělo but no instances of a for ѣ after ѣ). D’s substitutions of a for ѣ are restricted to five of the nine occurrences of the stem cělova- (D ѩѩ embarrassment - Mt 23: 7, Mk 9: 15, Lu 1: 29, 10: 4, 11: 43; cf. ѩѩ at Mk 12: 38, Lu 1: 40, 41, 20: 46) and one of the two occurrences of OCS cěn- (Mt 27: 6 ѩѩ). The adjective ѩѩ, however, is spelled only with ѣ. The variant cal- is also attested in southwestern Bulgarian dialects, including cal for OCS adjective cěb directly north of Sofia (Stojkov 1983, map 33; see also Stojkov 1993: 208).

Both D and C also substitute a for ѣ after certain non-palatal consonants in specific words, most consistently writing OCS sěmo as самo,23 which is also a feature of CSB (na sam). B’s spelling of this word vacillates, suggesting that the a here was a feature of the DBC ancestor that a copyist in B’s post-CB prehistory tried to emend. D alone has further substitutions of a for ѣ in other environments, where it appears this substitution reflects dialect pronunciations of specific words rather than a consistent sound change of *ě to a after specific consonants: Mt 27: 7 ѫςμαία, Mk 9: 7 ϡςμαία, Lu 14: 35 ϡςα (cf. CB ϡςα), John 15: 2 ϋςαςαςαςας.

22 Note also D’s substitution of ϫ for a secondary jer in 1PSg non-past Ϧςας at Jo 19: 21. This form appears more often in B. The one environment in the Gospel text for possible substitution of a for an in a Greek proper name, which Koneski lists as a Macedonianism (1965:41), is ἀλίκαςαςς at Mk 15: 21, which is now missing from D.
23 Also found in Strum. and in the Codex Suprasliensis (Blachova and Chauptova 1990:xviii).
Macedonian-type substitution of е for ё, which Koneski traces to the post-thirteenth century period (Koneski 1965:45), and, conversely, the overuse of ё for etymological *e, do not occur in D.

3.4. Dispalatalization of OCS št and žd

Koneski cites D for orthographic evidence of Macedonian dispalatalization of iotated consonants (št > st, žd > d, š > s, ě > k) across the morpheme boundary between the stem and 1PSg non-past ending of OCS i-suffix verbs (1965:88). Koneski identifies three such verb forms in D: ὑπονύτα (Mt 27: 17, Mk 8: 3, Jo 18: 39), ἔπροσκ (Lu 22: 68, also with C), and πρόχοδα (Jo 4: 15). Another such form, σκληραστήλ, appears in D at Mk 9: 45. The same dispalatalization, of course, occurs in 1PSg non-past forms in CSB also.

4. Lexical Macedonianisms

Only one lexical variant in D can be considered a probable Macedonianism: kurę for OCS kurъ, which also occurs in the Macedonian Carpinian and Dobromir gospels, as noted by Argirovski, Bicevska, Georgievski, et al. 1985. This variant is not original to D, however: it can be traced back to the DBC common source, since it occurs in the same verse locations in C (in B, it has been replaced later consistently with pětelъ; see discussion in Vakareliyska 2008 vol. II: 29). Thus the co-occurrence of kurę in D and C testifies to a historical Macedonian stratum in DBC, but not to a second Macedonian influence in the post-DBC history of D. The significance of this variant to DBC is somewhat outweighed by vrząoblъ for korъ in D, B, and C at Lu 16: 7, a lexical variant which Rusek (1974) has found in Bulgarian dialects.

5. Conclusion

As shown above, some of D’s orthographic features unquestionably reflect phonological features of Macedonian dialects. Most of these Macedonian-type orthographic features, however, and the lexical Macedonianism kurę, are shared in the same locations by one or both of D’s close later relatives C and B, indicating that they are not post-DBC innovations. Even the presence of some Macedonian-type features in D alone in certain locations is insufficient evidence that these features appeared for the first time in the post-DBC period of D’s prehistory: indeed, it is very possible that they existed in the DBC shared ancestor and then were normalized in the later common antigraph for C and B. This scenario appears especially likely because most of the

---

24 The only other occurrence in the Gospels is at Mk 15: 9, now missing from D.
Macedonian-type features in D, including the substitution of ϖγ for χ, also occur sporadically in B, albeit in different verse locations.

The one indisputably Macedonian orthographic feature of D is the occasional substitution of ϖ for ύ in strong position, but it has been demonstrated above that these substitutions were preserved from the DBC ancestor. The other Macedonian-type orthographic features of D, including its тъл/тъл formulae, reflect phonological features that can also be found in nontransitional dialects from the southwestern region of present-day Bulgaria. I have not come across any orthographic or lexical evidence yet that D itself, or even a post-DBC antigraph of D, was written in Macedonia, although DBC most likely was; therefore, at this preliminary juncture, I am not ready to characterize D as a Macedonian manuscript per se. Instead, on the basis of the evidence I have found so far, I must consider D itself to be a Bulgarian Church Slavonic manuscript that preserves a number of sporadic Macedonianisms from the ancestor source that it shares with its later close relatives B and C.
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