

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BULGARIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE

FROM INCUNABULA TO FIRST GRAMMARS,
LATE FIFTEENTH–EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

IVAN N. PETROV

Translated by
MAREK MAJER and
KATARZYNA GUCIO



The Development of the Bulgarian Literary Language

Studies in Slavic, Baltic, and Eastern European Languages and Cultures

Series Editor: Andrii Danylenko, Pace University

Editorial Board: Jan Ivar Bjørnflaten (Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages, University of Oslo), Vít Boček (Institute of the Czech Language of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Brno), Pietro U. Dini (Department of Philology, Literature, and Linguistics, University of Pisa), Jan Fellerer (Wolfson College, University of Oxford), Marc L. Greenberg (Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Kansas), Johanna Laakso (Department of Finno-Ugric Studies, University of Vienna Institute of European and Comparative Linguistic and Literary Studies), Marek Stachowski (Institute of Slavic Philology, Jagiellonian University, Cracow), Paul Wexler (Tel-Aviv University), Björn Wiemer (Institute of Slavic, Turkic and Circum-Baltic Studies, Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz)

The series *Studies in Slavic, Baltic, and Eastern European Languages and Cultures* focuses on Slavic and Baltic languages and cultures, as well as other Eastern European languages connected by common history and cultural processes. The series welcomes monographs, edited volumes, and, where appropriate, doctoral dissertations devoted to the study of Slavic, Baltic, and Eastern European languages through multifarious prisms, including but not limited to areal-typological, historical, sociolinguistic, ethnolinguistic, comparative-philological, and cultural perspectives. Books in this series will bridge the linguistic and cultural interrelations in Old Rus'—reaching out to the Middle East and even further—via the sociolinguistic diversity in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania with the convergent changes occurring today in the Circum-Baltic zone. The series is a multidisciplinary forum for furthering our knowledge about integrative processes that have been taking place in languages and cultures of Eastern Europe from the pre-modern times onward.

The Development of the Bulgarian Literary Language: From Incunabula to First Grammars, Late Fifteenth–Early Seventeenth Century, by Ivan N. Petrov

Dialectology of the Montenegrin Language, by Adnan Čirgić

Urban Multilingualism in East-Central Europe: The Polish Dialect of Late-Habsburg Lviv, by Jan Fellerer

The Evolution of the Slavic Dual: A Biolinguistic Perspective, by Tatyana G. Slobodchikoff

The Development of the Bulgarian Literary Language

From Incunabula to
First Grammars, Late Fifteenth–
Early Seventeenth Century

Ivan N. Petrov

Translated by Marek Majer and Katarzyna Gucio

LEXINGTON BOOKS
Lanham • Boulder • New York • London

Published by Lexington Books
An imprint of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
www.rowman.com

6 Tinworth Street, London SE11 5AL, United Kingdom

Copyright © 2021 The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

The book was first published by Lodz University Press (Poland).

Translated by Marek Majer (ch. 1, all quotations) and Katarzyna Gucio
(all remaining parts).

The publication of this English translation was financed by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland (National Programme for the Development of Humanities, 2019–2021, grant no. 0138/NPRH8/H21/87/2019).

Photography on the front cover by © Viktoria Marinov

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Petrov, Ivan (Philologist), author. | Majer, Marek, translator. | Gucio, Katarzyna, translator.

Title: The development of the Bulgarian literary language : from incunabula to first grammars, late fifteenth-early seventeenth century / Ivan N. Petrov ; translated by Marek Majer and Katarzyna Gucio.

Other titles: Od inkunabułów do pierwszych gramatyk. English

Description: Lanham : Lexington Books, [2021] | Series: Studies in Slavic, Baltic, and Eastern European languages and cultures | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Summary: "This book is devoted to the history of the first printed Cyrillic books and their role in the development of the Bulgarian literary language. Ivan N. Petrov presents this history in a broad context of linguistic, terminological, and source-related issues of South Slavic writings and Cyrillic printing of the Orthodox Slavs"—Provided by publisher.


Identifiers: LCCN 2020050252 (print) | LCCN 2020050253 (ebook) | ISBN 9781498586078 (cloth ; alk. paper) | ISBN 9781498586085 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Bulgarian language—History. | Cyrillic imprints—History. | Early printed books—Europe, Eastern—History.

Classification: LCC PG825 .P48713 2021 (print) | LCC PG825 (ebook) | DDC 491.8/1—c23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020050252>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020050253>

 The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Contents

Preface to the English Translation	vii
Introduction	1
1 Church Slavonic and Its Influence on Bulgarian: Conceptions of Description and Interpretation	7
2 Incunabula and Cyrillic Old Prints: Questions of Taxonomy and Nomenclature	43
3 South Slavic Cyrillic Paleotypy in the Sixteenth Century: Basic Traditions and Source Contexts	69
Conclusions	125
List of Source Text Editions	133
References	139
Further Reading	169
Index	179
About the Author	189

Preface to the English Translation

The original Polish version of this book, entitled *Od inkunabulów do pierwszych gramatyk. Konteksty rozwoju bułgarskiego języka literackiego (koniec XV—początek XVII wieku)*, was published by Lodz University Press in 2015. The monograph has since been the subject of a number of favorable reviews in various scholarly journals (Kryzia 2016; Kawecka 2016, 2019; Mičeva 2017; Cibranska-Kostova 2017; Petrov 2017; Lis-Wielgosz 2017; Ivanova 2017a; Gešev 2019). I would like to extend my gratitude to the authors of these reviews and reports.

The English translation is the work of two excellent philologists: Dr. Marek Majer and Katarzyna Gucio. The translation or adaptation of many Slavic personal names, toponyms, titles of books and manuscripts, as well as linguistic and bibliological terms often proved to be a challenging task, requiring laborious searching and difficult decisions. Wherever possible, the latter were based on existing English-language works on Slavic studies, although in many cases it was impossible to determine any established, consistent usage already in place. One of the works that provided valuable guidance here was *The Dawn of Slavic* by Alexander M. Schenker (2014). Professor Andrii Danylenko, the editor of the series in which the present book appears, likewise offered helpful feedback and suggestions in this regard. It would be pointless to present a detailed list of “policies” or “principles” that were followed, given that decisions often had to be made regarding quite specific matters. It may be remarked that those place-names that do not have established exonyms in English generally appear in their official present-day form; where the latter differs substantially from historical names in other languages, these are sometimes also provided with the toponym’s first occurrence in the text.

Besides the main body of the Polish text, the numerous citations from modern scholarly literature—which only appeared in their original form in the

book—have been translated into English too, as have the fragments quoted from source texts, appearing chiefly in chapter 3. Such Church Slavonic citations are also presented in the original, following the English translation.

To the extent it was feasible without carrying out major changes in the structure of the book, bibliographic information and references were updated across the text. Certain small inconsistencies were corrected, and some fragments were adjusted to suit the needs of an international readership. Works that are not cited directly in the text, but which were consulted during the writing of the book, have been moved to the further reading section. The latter also contains a selection of notable relevant works that have appeared since the book's publication in 2015.

Given the entirely different profile of the text, the present English edition omits the sizable annex to the original version, containing fragments of Church Slavonic sources in Polish translation. The annex—prepared by eminent Polish Paleo-Slavist and translator Professor Aleksander Naumow—presents some key source metatexts illustrating the common tradition of Cyrillic South Slavic paleotypy and the constitutive features of so-called anagraphs; most of these texts were published in Polish translation for the first time (for a survey of Naumow's prior translation output see, e.g., Kawecka, Petrov, and Skowronek 2009, 2011). Regardless of this choice, I would like to thank Professor Naumow, who not only kindly assisted me during the writing of the original version of the book—offering crucial advice on the subject matter and bibliographic guidelines—but also was supportive of the idea of publishing the monograph in English translation.

I would like to thank the editor of *Studies in Slavic, Baltic, and Eastern European Languages and Cultures*, Professor Andrii Danylenko, for making it possible for the present translation to be included in the series. Furthermore, I thank my translators—Marek Majer and Katarzyna Gucio—for the time and effort they put into the task. I thank Professors Cynthia Vakareliyska and Marc L. Greenberg for their remarks and advice on certain matters concerning the English translation. I am also grateful to Jana Hodges-Kluck and the remaining staff at Lexington Books/Rowman & Littlefield for monitoring the work on the project with a cordial and professional attitude as well as plenty of patience. I thank the National Programme for the Development of Humanities (Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland) for financing the project through a grant aimed at promoting Polish humanities abroad; I am also grateful to Dr. Zofia Brozowska from the Department of Slavic Philology, University of Lodz for her help in preparing and submitting the application for this grant. Finally, I thank Lodz University Press for issuing permission to publish the English translation of my book.



NATIONAL PROGRAMME
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMANITIES

Introduction

Diachronic linguistics traditionally distinguishes two types of description of the general (comprehensive) history of language: the so-called *internal history*, focusing on the development of the grammatical and lexical system with its various elements, and the so-called *external history*. The subject of the latter, as Barbara Oczkowska, Cracow-based expert in Slavic studies, stresses,

are the extra-linguistic causal factors of a language's evolution. The internal history of a language is identified with historical grammar, studied by means of strictly linguistic tools, while external history is subject to sociolinguistic analysis. Its interdisciplinary area of interest includes the whole range of historical, social and cultural factors that accompany the history of a given language and at the same time shape it throughout its development. (Oczkowska 2014: 483–84, cf. also EJO 2003: 237; EJP 1999: 133)

This work focuses on the external history of the Bulgarian literary language in the early Pre-National (Pre-Revival) era, which most scholars consider to be a “Transitional (Mixed) period,” on the one hand part of the late phase of the Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) tradition in the late medieval Bulgarian literature, along with simultaneous petrification processes in the field of modern normalization and codification of this tradition, and on the other hand—of the advent of the first New Bulgarian texts, whose language is characterized by a departure from this tradition. In the writing culture of South Slavs, including Bulgarians, the sixteenth century in particular is seen as a stage that opened and heralded the aforementioned Pre-National (Pre-Revival) era. One of the symptoms of this phenomenon is the gradual, evolutionary replacement of the centuries-old manuscript tradition with the then-developing printed book (by the way, both traditions coexisted at that time

and impacted each other). Therefore, the study of Slavic old prints should be an important element in the description and interpretation of the processes that led to the formation of the literary languages of the *Slavia Orthodoxa* (and not only that) in modern times. It is this period, as well as the related source and language problems, that this book addresses.

It is worth noting that over the past several years, a number of publications have come out in Poland that present not just a systematic, consolidated, synchronic description of South Slavic languages, including Bulgarian (Popova and Ivanova 2004; Popova 2009; Maldjieva 2014; Rusek 2014),¹ but also the essential aspects of their diachronic development (with regard to both internal and external history). Some of the most important titles in this field include (to list just selected monographs and textbooks) the works on Croatian by Barbara Oczkowa (2006; Croatian translation: 2010), referring, among others, to the author's earlier textbook on the history of the Serbian-Croatian language (Oczkowa 1983); a publication by two Gdańsk-based scholars dealing with certain aspects of the historical phonetics of Serbian (Paždžerski and Chacia 2014); a work on the history of the Slovenian language by Władysław Kryzia (2008), affiliated with the Universities of Silesia and Lodz; publications by Mariola Walczak-Mikołajczakowa, a Poznań-based scholar, outlining the entire linguistic history of the Bulgarians (Walczak 1998), a specific component of this history, namely the writings of Bulgarian Catholics (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004),² or specific translation processes that shaped the standard of the Bulgarian literary language in the nineteenth century (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2009); and books by Cracow-based Bulgarianist Elżbieta Solak (1997), focusing on the language of New Bulgarian translations of the Bible and the entirety of the linguistic debates and disputes that took place in Bulgaria during the Renaissance (Solak 2009). Also worth mentioning are two monographs by Lodz-based Slavists, describing certain development processes of South Slavic languages from the point of view of semantic syntax (Petrov 2007a; Kawecka 2009). Another important and valuable contribution are studies on the historical development of various Slavic languages, such as the collection of essays by Warsaw-based scholar Ewa Siatkowska (2004) or the recently published collective work by Slavists from Cracow (SJL 2011). Moreover, in the light of the subject matter of this monograph, some more recent Polish publications on history and language concerning the East Slavic languages from the *Slavia Orthodoxa* area (Rieger 1998; Bednarczuk 2010; Galster 2012) are also worth noting, as is the publication by Anna Oczko (2014), Romanianist from Cracow, devoted to the history of South Slavic borrowings in Romanian. This monograph aims to be ranked among the above-mentioned body of works.

The volume consists of three main chapters.

The first chapter discusses the key issues that concern the theory, methodology, periodization, and definition of a given section of Bulgarian language history. It explores the evolution of views on the so-called New Church Slavonic language, a phenomenon that developed on the basis of Old Church Slavonic, and its role in the shaping of medieval literary Bulgarian. The section discusses the overall history of the so-called Church Slavonic influence on Bulgarian in modern times and the degree to which its individual stages have been examined in the literature on the subject. The basic goals and research objectives are formulated.

In the second chapter, the focus is on the typology and classification of available printed source texts for the given period. As regards the general linguistic situation of the *Slavia Orthodoxa* area, of which Bulgarian is a part, the use of terms such as incunabulum, paleotype, first print, and old print is explained and commented, and with reference to the content of specific texts, the role of the so-called anagraphs is emphasized—metatexts that constitute a separate field of analysis and comparison in terms of genre and language (prefaces, afterwords, colophons). The quantitative and provenance characteristics of the preserved source base are also formulated.

The third chapter is devoted to a detailed discussion of the history of Cyrillic South Slavic paleotypy from its inception until the beginning of the seventeenth century, along with the presentation and characteristics of sources from Montenegro, Venice, Serbia, Wallachia, and others. This history is examined in reference to the much better researched history of East Slavic paleotypy, both from the territory of the First Republic of Poland and from the typographic centers of the Russian Empire. Glagolitic and Cyrillic incunabulistics is presented as the baseline context.

The final part of the volume recapitulates the observations and conclusions made in the previous chapters and postulates the need to change the outlook on the impact of Church Slavonic on Bulgarian: not, as has been done thus far, in terms of language contact, but as an immanent part of development processes that were native yet common to most South Slavs. In addition, outlined or mentioned are other contexts of the history of the Bulgarian literary language of the analyzed period that require systematic consideration or further analysis and description: the development of the medieval linguistic thought of Orthodox Slavs and the first grammatical studies, stabilization and codification processes and their linguistic consequences, and literature of non-Orthodox Slavs and other subjects.

This work would be impossible without access to sources (mainly incunabula and old prints) in book collections in several countries, and without the comprehensive literature on this subject (both older and completely new, published in recent years), often virtually unknown or unavailable in Poland.

Of course, this has been greatly facilitated by the progressive digitalization of library collections, now available online, as well as by the growing access to scholarly publications in digital form. Nevertheless, an important element of working on the book were the numerous study trips, both in Poland and abroad, which helped me to assemble extensive research materials, reflected in the list of source texts and secondary literature included in the closing part of the volume.

Queries (as well as consultations with experts) have been conducted in libraries and academic institutions in Austria (Vienna), Bulgaria (Sofia, Plovdiv, Veliko Tărnovo), Czechia (Prague), Germany (Berlin, Freiburg), Russia (St. Petersburg, Moscow), Serbia (Belgrade), Italy (Florence), and in Poland—Białystok, Supraśl, Cracow, Warsaw, Wrocław, and, of course, Łódź. The above-mentioned foreign centers also provided the required publications on the subject, although even there they were not always available. Therefore, it was necessary to use the extensive resources of American libraries—Marek Majer, who was a Ph.D. student at Harvard University, provided me with invaluable assistance, for which I am very grateful. I would also like to thank Jan Mikołaj Wolski from the University of Łódź for his constant help in accessing many Bulgarian and Macedonian publications unavailable in Poland.

Despite these efforts, given the vastness of the issues raised herein, there can obviously be no question of fully exhaustive use and presentation of the existing bibliography relating to particular issues and topics—it is rich, diverse, multifaceted, and in most cases covers about two hundred years of development of Paleo-Slavic research. Therefore, I have tried to rely on the most important, up-to-date, and, above all, monographic studies, where they exist, in which the interested reader may find a summary of the current state of research and more detailed lists of publications.

I would like to express my gratitude to the many people who have contributed to this work in various ways: first of all, they helped me to find sources and studies, but also inspired me, offered expert advice, and made critical comments during the editing and proofreading stages. First of all, I would like to mention the Łódź-based Paleo-Slavists and philologists: Georgi Minczew, Agata Kawecka, Karolina Krzeszewska, Anna Maciejewska, and Małgorzata Skowronek. I would also like to thank Wanda Stępniać-Minczewska and Jan Stradomski from the Jagiellonian University and Izabela Lis-Wielgosz from the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. Among my foreign colleagues I would like to thank Marijana Cibranska-Kostova from Sofia, Borislava Petkova from Plovdiv, Lachezar Perchekliyski from Blagoevgrad, Irina Galynina from Freiburg, Václav Čermák and Jaroslav Zítka from Prague, Alice Isabella Sullivan from Ann Arbor, Michigan, and Mary-Allen “Pasha” Johnson from

Columbus, Ohio. I must also mention my mother and sister, who have helped me many times to access publications available in Russia. I would also like to thank Professor Władysław Kryzia, who reviewed my work, and Dorota Stępień, editor from Lodz University Press, for their exceptionally thorough and patient cooperation while preparing the book for publication.

NOTES

1. Of course, because some of these works have been intended to serve mainly as textbooks, they take a largely simplified approach to the description of the analyzed or presented issues. Nevertheless, their publication in Poland is significant, especially considering the obsolescence of Franciszek Sławski's classic dissertation describing the entire linguistic system of Bulgarian (Sławski 1962).

2. There is a corresponding work by Ludwig Selimski (1999), a Bulgarist from the University of Silesia.

Chapter One

Church Slavonic and Its Influence on Bulgarian

Conceptions of Description and Interpretation

DEFINITIONS AND TERMINOLOGY: BASIC ISSUES

The existence of Church Slavonic (CS) influence as a cultural and historical-linguistic phenomenon in the southern parts of the *Slavia Orthodoxa* area is acknowledged in virtually all works dealing with the history of the Serbian and Bulgarian languages (needless to say, the role of CS was not limited to linguistic processes alone). It should immediately be pointed out, however, that the very term “Church Slavonic language”¹ has a range of possible denotations in the literature and practically requires clarification whenever it is used; this should be considered a sort of enduring methodological flaw in the field of Paleo-Slavic studies, potentially leading to misunderstandings and erroneous interpretations. The same may, in fact, be said of a number of further spinoff terms, such as “Church Slavonicism” (Pol. *cerkiewnosławizm*), “Churchism” (Pol. *cerkiewizm*), “Church language” (Pol. *cerkiewszczyzna*), “Church Russian” (Pol. *cerkiewno-ruski*), etc. In the present work, it is of course impossible to survey all of the relevant definitions used in the field—both because the literature on this issue is vast (after all, we are dealing with one of the fundamental problems of Slavic philology) and because the meaning of formally distinct terms frequently overlaps to different extents, sometimes even reaching full synonymy (e.g., “Church Slavonic of the Modern Age” [Pol. *język cerkiewnosłowiański okresu nowożytnego*] versus “New Church Slavonic” [NCS; Pol. *nowo-cerkiewno-słowiański*]). It should also be pointed out that, despite the existing traditions, such terms are sometimes applied intuitively and may hinge on particular authors’ habits or even scholarly stereotypes. As aptly noted by Russian scholar Aleksandr Gerd, many authors assume “by default” that the denotation of the term “Church Slavonic” is in principle clear, so that defining it is superfluous (Gerd 2008: 115). This is,

however, a whole separate problem in the history of Slavic studies. Thus, I shall limit myself here to indicating the few principal ways in which the term in question has been used—except in works on the history of Bulgarian, which will be treated in more detail later in this chapter.

1. The term “Church Slavonic” (Pol. *cerkiewnosłowiański*, Ru. *cerkovno-slavjanskij*, Bulg. *cărkovnoslavjanski/čerkovnoslavjanski*) may at times refer—especially in older works (e.g., Vostokov 1963, Jagić 1913, Kul’bakin 1915, etc.)—to Old Church Slavonic (OCS) (i.e., the first literary language of the Slavs), developed in the ninth century in connection with Constantine (Cyril) and Methodius’s mission to Moravia; this language is also known as “Old Slavic” (Pol. *starosłowiański*, Ru. *staroslavjanskij*) and “Old Bulgarian” (Bulg. *starobălgarski*). The ambiguity is pointed out, for example, by Petăr Ilčev, one of the authors of the Bulgarian academy grammar of OCS: “for a number of centuries no clear distinction was made between Old Bulgarian and Church Slavonic. For this reason, certain facts of Old Bulgarian grammar are presented in handbooks of Church Slavonic, while the term ‘Church Slavonic’ referring to Old Bulgarian persisted as long as up to the early twentieth century” (Gramatika 1993: 67).
2. Conversely, the term “Church Slavonic language” may be applied (and this is the most widespread usage, particularly in didactic works, although it has also percolated from certain older treatments into strictly scholarly publications) to the later, post-twelfth-century national recensions of the OCS language: Bulgarian, Serbian, Russian, etc., preserved in a vast number of manuscripts. Such an interpretation of the term “Church Slavonic” can be found on the one hand in the works of scholars such as Václav Vondrák (1912: 43–48), Nicolaas van Wijk (1957: 24–26), or André Vaillant (1952: 18–19), and on the other hand in the textbooks by Leszek Moszyński (2012: 355–357), Adam Suprun (1989), Aleksandr Sokoljanskij (2013: 330), etc., as well as, for example, in the recent *Foundations of Slavic Philology (Osnovy slavjanskij filologii)*, a two-volume guide to the discipline authored by Aleksandr Duličenko, professor of the universities in Tartu (Estonia) and Opole (Poland) (Duličenko 2011a: 521; 2011b: 442–47).
3. The practice that appears the most appropriate for the purposes of the present work is to apply the term “Church Slavonic” to a particular, crucially important cultural and linguistic phenomenon of the modern era present in the entire *Slavia Orthodoxa* area—namely, the literary and liturgical language employed by almost all Orthodox Slavs (as well as Romanians) from the middle seventeenth century onwards.² Based on the Russian recension of OCS, this language was gradually stabilized owing to the

development of Cyrillic printing (beginning with the Cracow incunabula of 1491) and codified in the subsequent centuries (especially following the publication of the first primers, lexica, and grammars, including the most important one—by Meletij Smotryč'kyj); it was later reformed in the times of Russian Patriarch Nikon in the seventeenth century and consolidated in the so-called *Elizabeth Bible*, published in Saint Petersburg in 1751. For the sake of greater precision and consistency, it is advisable here to resort to the term “New Church Slavonic” (Pol. *nowo-cerkiewno-słowiański*, Ru. *novocerkovnoslavjanskij*), also found in certain previous works. Although even this term is neither universally accepted nor chronologically unambiguous,³ it makes it possible to avoid the frequently encountered identification (or rather, terminological non-distinction) of modern CS with the language created by Cyril and Methodius, including the latter’s medieval recensions. For further discussion of the applications and usefulness of such an approach, see the further parts of this chapter.

4. Certain linguists, mostly Russian, postulate a panchronic and—so to speak—“total” (though typically Russian- or Russian-centric) approach to defining CS. This approach stems from the works by Nikita Tolstoj (1988, 1998), who mostly used the term *drevneslavjanskij* (literally “Ancient Slavic,” as opposed to the potentially synonymous *staroslavjanskij* “Old Slavic,” usually associated with the Cyrillo-Methodian epoch, as well as to *cerkovnoslavjanskij* “Church Slavonic,” avoided in Soviet times). Tolstoj’s ideas were developed by Moscow textologist and linguist Evgenij Vereščagin (1997, 2001, 2012); the scholar proposed an elaborate definition that bears quoting in its entirety, including the original layout:

“Church Slavonic is a language

[*by origin:*]

intentionally created

1. on the basis of the Solun dialect of the Proto-Slavic language,
2. through translations from Greek (= Byzantine Greek)
3. done by Cyril and Methodius as well as their successors,
[*by panchronic characteristics:*]
4. common (= unitary) for all of the “Orthodox Slavic civilization,”
5. polyfunctional (= multi-genre),
6. designed as the instrument of reflecting and developing primarily Christian (= Orthodox/ecclesiastical) culture,
7. written (= literary),
8. interacting with local vernacular speech,
[*by historical characteristics:*]
9. of the entire Pre-Secular era,

10. and in the Secular era, in Musovite Rus' (Russia), becoming—in a transformed form, with the inclusion of other resources—the Russian literary language of the Modern and Present-Day periods, and
11. retaining parts of its functions until the present time.” (Vereščagin 1997: 298)

We may add that Vereščagin’s approach, extending the application of the term “Church Slavonic language” onto the whole history of its existence—from its origins until the present—is close to that of Fëdor Ludogovskij (e.g., 2003, 2008, 2015), who studies the most recent history of this language, including the liturgical, hymnographic, and euchographic texts currently composed in it in Russia. Moreover, a panchronic reading of the term “Church Slavonic” may also be found in certain non-linguistic works important for Paleo-Slavic studies (e.g., from the domains of text criticism, literary theory, or history of literature), as is evident from the very titles of the relevant monographs and articles—see, for example, the numerous publications of Polish Slavist Aleksander Naumow (1976, 1983, 1996, 2002, 2004, 2009, 2020).

In order to eschew terminological polemics that would take us far beyond the thematic and chronological scope of the present work, it appears advisable to concentrate primarily on the third of the definitions adduced previously. Descriptive and tentative, based on findings (or—more often—introductory assumptions) available in secondary literature, it has a multifaceted and dynamic character: it reflects the various genetic, functional, geographic, and diachronic aspects determining the formal shape, communication area, and developmental processes of the linguistic system in question. Incomplete though it may be, it seems that it may serve as a future point of departure for a comprehensive description of the internal and external history of the NCS language as understood in this way—a description which would also take into account its role in the development of the languages of Orthodox Slavs in the Balkans (this is the scholarly objective, for example, of the Center of Research on the Church Slavonic Language, founded in 2009 at the Russian Language Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences⁴). There can be no doubt that the present state of research does not warrant an attempt at such a synthesis of the language’s history, although certain individual dimensions of the functioning of Church Slavic have already been investigated to various extents (or are currently being investigated) by Paleo-Slavists. Even the previous introductory definition highlights the crucial factors and areas—though others remain—whose in-depth, systematic investigation and description is a prerequisite for the proper understanding of the position and historical role of NCS in the *Slavia Orthodoxa* linguistic system. The key issues are the following:

1. the rise and development of Cyrillic printing in the South and East Slavic areas;
2. the revising and redactional activity of Maximus the Greek in the sixteenth century;
3. the development of grammatical thought among the Orthodox Slavs and the ensuing codification processes: the appearance of the first primers, abecedaries, lexica, and grammars;
4. the seventeenth-century Church reform in Russia and its impact on language;
5. the striving to stabilize canonical texts and to unify the text of the Bible in Church Slavonic and NCS; the rise of the first manuscripts and printed codices containing all of the books of the Bible;
6. the establishing of regulations determining the standards of writing texts in NCS, introduced in Russia in the eighteenth century, and their updating until the present day (on this topic, see Kraveckij and Pletneva 2001); and
7. the correlation between the local (dialectal) origin and the supranational dimension of NCS (this evokes the functional and typological similarity to OCS, from which NCS happens to derive).

As can be seen, the factors in question are primarily extralinguistic, although at the same time each of them exerted some influence on linguistic processes both in NCS itself and in the national languages with which it interacted. The graphical, phonetic, grammatical, and lexical systems of NCS were shaped and transformed at the interface of the afore-mentioned processes, so that it is largely the product of their synergy.

In the context of the previous remarks—as both illustration and proof—it is worth quoting excerpts of the entries on “Church Slavonic” from two Bulgarian encyclopedic works: 1) a lexicon devoted to Old Bulgarian literature (entry author: Tanja Laleva) and 2) the fourth volume of the monumental *Cyrillo-Methodian Encyclopedia* (entry author: Dora Mirčeva):⁵

1. “Language, Church Slavonic. According to the generally accepted point of view, this term is applied to the late Russian recension of the Old Bulgarian language, characterized by a number of phonetic peculiarities—e.g. the replacement of *o* with *u* and *e* with *ja*—under the influence of the Russian vernacular. Used as the language of the Russian Orthodox Church and of scholarly literature, it influences the formation of the Russian literary language in the eighteenth century. It is preserved until the present day as the sacred language of the Orthodox Church in Slavic countries. With the development of printing, it is disseminated extraordinarily widely not only in Russia, but also—due to the well-known political circumstances—in

Bulgaria and Serbia. It plays a significant role in the formation of literary New Bulgarian during the Revival period, as a result of which certain Old Bulgarian words and forms lost in the vernacular dialects are restored to the literary language. In scholarly literature, the term ‘Church Slavonic language’ is also used—alongside ‘Old Church Slavonic’—synonymously with the term ‘Old Bulgarian’” (SLER 2003: 157).

2. “Church Slavonic—the language of the corpus of liturgical books, used in East Orthodox liturgy, initially printed in Russia in the middle seventeenth century and employed as the sacred language in the East Orthodox zone (Bulgaria, Russia, Serbia, Romania). CS is the result of the development of the Russian recension of the Old Bulgarian language from the period of the eleventh–sixteenth centuries; this development reflects both the Bulgarian and the Russian literary languages of the Middle Ages. The final consolidation of its norms occurs in the late sixteenth—early seventeenth century in Russia with the rise of grammatical handbooks, the most important of which is the *Slavonic Grammar* (1619) by Meletij Smotryc’kyj. . . . The orthographical and phonetic evolution of CS continues until the middle seventeenth century, when a general redaction of liturgical books is carried out under Patriarch Nikon (1652–1681). . . . As regards its phonetic features as well as its orthographic norms, CS is not fully identical either with literary Old Bulgarian, with the literary language of the so-called Middle Bulgarian period, or with Old Russian” (KME IV 2003: 492–93).

Both of these definitions—which are found in relatively recent works and should therefore be expected to reflect the current state of knowledge—focus in principle on the synchronic aspect: (N)CS is depicted primarily as the end effect of systemic developmental processes and as the product of codification and reforms. The key subsystem referred to in the previous definitions is phonetics (alongside its derivative—orthography). Naturally, both these entries and various other works of this kind do also allude to the individual stages of the development and functioning of the language (the dissemination of printing, first grammars, Nikon’s reform, etc.); that being said, they scarcely offer a consistent or exhaustive periodization. The need for the latter, however—also in the context of the impact of NCS on the Slavic languages of the Modern era—is becoming more and more apparent. The necessity of establishing such a periodization was recently discussed, for example, by Bulgarian Paleo-Slavist Anna-Marija Totomanova in her collected writings on the history of the Bulgarian language (Totomanova 2009: 178; cf. also Petrov 2011).

It should also be added that some of the newer specialist encyclopedic works fail to include any entry at all that would define and describe (N)CS, even though the phenomenon in question does fall within the scope of these

publications (e.g., EBVL 1997; ESBE 2000; WS 2008; cf. also Leszka, Marinow, and Petrov 2010).

KEY LEXICOGRAPHICAL AND GRAMMATICAL WORKS

The most-analyzed and best-described aspects of the NCS language—relatively speaking—are its grammatical structure and vocabulary, mostly approached synchronically. A whole array of grammars is available, some of them more popular, some less; many of these are didactic works used in catechesis (sometimes in schools). Other works on NCS include dictionaries and descriptive grammars comparing the language's structure to that of OCS. The recent years have seen quite a number of publications of this kind, especially in the countries of the *Slavia Orthodoxa* area. A full survey is neither possible nor called for here, because many of them have no particular scholarly value. Nevertheless, it is useful to present a number of selected works which, in view of their impressive scope (dictionaries) or descriptive/analytical ambitions, may be of use for research in the field of Paleo-Slavic studies.

The vocabulary of the NCS language (not always construed identically or defined unambiguously) is primarily registered in the three most widely cited dictionaries, all authored by Orthodox priests: Russian (ca. thirty thousand words) by Grigorij D'jačenko (1900), Serbian (ca. seven thousand words) by Sava Petković (1935),⁶ and Bulgarian (ca. twenty-five thousand words, two volumes) by Atanasij Bončev; the last, posthumous edition of the latter work was recently completed by the SS. Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia (Bončev 2002, 2012). These dictionaries build on the remarkable achievements of nineteenth-century Slavic studies, including the pioneering lexicographical works of the time, such as the four-volume CS and Russian dictionary of the Russian Academy of Sciences (SCiRJ 1847) or the two-volume work by Aleksandr Vostokov (1858–1861). The history of these and other lexica published in Russia has been described in great detail in the works entitled *The History of Russian Lexicography (Istorija russoj leksikografii; IRL 2001: 127–88)* and *Slavic Lexicography (Slavjanskaja leksikografija; SL 2013: 615–45)*. It goes without saying that numerous smaller dictionaries are available too—some of them bilingual, including German (Deschler 2003), French (Deschler and Gonneau 2019; see also Deschler 2018), or Polish (Znosko 1983, 1996; cf. Kawecka, Petrov, and Skowronek 2013: 18, 2015); besides, CS and NCS vocabulary is included in the dictionaries of the local recensions of OCS currently in preparation (cf. Rodić 2005; CL 2007) as well as in historical dictionaries of the individual Slavic languages. Nonetheless, the three works mentioned previously—time-honored though they may be—

should be considered the most important ones. Finally, we should add that the afore-mentioned Center of Research on the Church Slavonic Language of the Russian Academy of Sciences has recently started publishing its multivolume *Great Dictionary of Church Slavonic of the Modern Age* (*Bol'shoj slovar' cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka Novogo vremeni*; Kraveckij and Pletneva 2016, 2019; cf. Naumow 2018).

The grammatical system of NCS has also been the subject of several treatments—some of them practical in nature, others aimed at identifying the theoretical and comparative contexts in which the system functioned (in relation to the OCS system on the one hand and the grammar of the relevant modern Slavic languages on the other hand). Works of this kind are not excessively numerous, however. Although no attempt at an exhaustive list can of course be endeavored here, it is worthwhile to mention at least a few publications notable, for example, for their being frequently cited or republished. It should be pointed out immediately that the discipline of Slavic studies has yet to produce a full, multiaspect, academic grammar of the NCS language. The reason for this is presumably the fact that Paleo-Slavists have generally displayed much more interest in the older (and especially the very oldest) phases of the literary and liturgical language of the Orthodox Slavs. Another cause may be sought in the availability of numerous grammatical works from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries (some of which should by now be viewed as primary source texts rather than didactic works); however, they do not universally discuss NCS against a clearly defined chronological background. An extensive overview of works of this sort written until the early twentieth century can be found in the first volume of the series *Encyclopedia of Slavic Philology* (*Ėnciklopedija slavjanskoj filologii*); the volume, devoted to the history of the field, was authored by Vatroslav Jagić (2003, originally published in 1910).

In the post-war period of the twentieth century, the most prominent efforts aimed at describing NCS once again come from Orthodox priests—among them the above-mentioned Atanasij Bončev, the author of the Bulgarian handbook of the language (Bončev 1952; designed chiefly for use in seminaries), as well as Alypy Gamanovich (Alipij Gamanovič), a bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia, whose US-published book (in Russian and later in English) is essentially a descriptive grammar of the NCS language transformed after Nikon's reforms in the middle seventeenth century (Gamanovič 1964, 2001).⁷ In recent years, a textbook (referred to as academic) has been published in a number of editions under the auspices of the afore-mentioned Center of Research on the Church Slavonic Language of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow, authored by Aleksandra Pletneva and Aleksandr Kraveckij (the director of the center). The book was edited by Viktor Živov, a historian of the Russian language, who also provided the

work with a short, introductory sketch of the history of CS. Several revised and supplemented editions of the book have appeared since 1996 (Pletneva and Kraveckij 2014).

An interesting work, useful in practice, is the textbook by Moscow-based Bohemist and Slavist Andrej Izotov, published in a number of (revised) editions since 1992. It features a comparison of the grammatical systems of OCS and NCS, focusing especially on the domain of morphology (with an emphasis on paradigms). The author advances a view according to which the differences between the two closely related languages range far beyond the sphere of phonetics:

It should not be thought that the modern Church Slavonic language is merely a “corrupt” Old Church Slavonic. In the course of the language’s thousand-year existence, many eminent and learned grammarians have worked hard to transform Church Slavonic into a system simultaneously harmonious and open—i.e., capable of further development and refinement. Modern Church Slavonic differs from Old Church Slavonic in many respects (sound system, endings of verb tenses and noun/adjective cases, syntax); nonetheless, it is a language that grew out of Old Church Slavonic. (Izotov 2007: 12)

It is worth underlining that Izotov’s views on this matter diverge from the opinion of many other authors, who reduce the discrepancies between OCS and NCS mainly to the sphere of orthography and pronunciation.

Next to the afore-mentioned works of a descriptive and practical nature, there of course exist many publications employing a theoretical approach to the sphere of problems surrounding CS and NCS, such as its position in the typological, genetic, sociolinguistic, or literary context of Orthodox Slavic writing; the comparison of the linguistic situation of the *Slavia Orthodoxa* and *Slavia Latina* areas; the elaboration of methodological principles for the further analysis of particular sources; etc. The principal relevant theoretical proposals will be discussed and applied further in the following; here, it is useful to mention the collected volume entitled *The Church Slavonic Language: History, Research, Study (Cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyk: istorija, issledovanie, izučenie)*, published in Moscow and largely constituting a recapitulation of the chief current research problems related to NCS (CJ 2005).

SELECTED THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL MODELS OF DESCRIBING CHURCH SLAVONIC

The field of Paleo-Slavic studies has developed numerous theoretical frameworks for deliberations on the role and position of the supra-ethnic

CS language (potentially understood in a number of different ways, as discussed previously)—both in various kinds of communication processes in the geographical/cultural *Slavia Orthodoxa* area and in the development of the individual, national Slavic languages. An exhaustive collection, critical presentation, and in-depth systematization of these views is currently an impossible task, or at least one falling far outside of the essential scope of the present monograph. Still, speaking from the point of view of the history of Slavic studies (of which the afore-mentioned deliberations are an important element), as well as taking into account the necessity of updating the theoretical and methodological perspectives of the discipline, it is no doubt useful to signal the need for such a synthesis (or at least a bibliographical guide)—even if the postulate is admittedly quite ambitious.⁸

In the light of this, it is necessary to limit our presentation to a selective and abbreviated survey of some of the more notable publications from the late twentieth and early twenty-first century (including newer works, which often summarize earlier research), systematized in a rudimentary way only; in many places, the review may inevitably seem arbitrary, disproportional or incomplete. Because tracing the evolution of theoretical investigations into the “language question” of the *Slavia Orthodoxa* area is not the primary objective of the following presentation, the works chosen are not commented upon in a chronological fashion, the more so because many ideas and methodological solutions (be it individual or—less frequently—converging around individual “research schools”) arose and developed in parallel. In the later parts of this chapter, closer attention will be paid to works dealing with Bulgarian.

The interest in the ways, principles, and history of cross-linguistic communication among medieval Orthodox Slavs—especially in the period of interest to us (fifteenth to seventeenth centuries)—has not been the domain of strictly linguistic (structural, system-oriented, or sociolinguistic) works only; this fact, of course, reflects the interdisciplinary character of Paleo-Slavic studies, as well as the interdisciplinary orientation of most scholars active in this field. Thus, the issues in question have also been dealt with by specialists in fields such as archaeography, textology, and history of literature; their insights have supplemented and facilitated—or sometimes enabled—further linguistic research. This group of works includes publications by Evgenij Vereščagin and Aleksander Naumow, already mentioned; the list could be extended with the names of scholars such as Vladimir Mošin, Krasimir Stančev, Anatolij Turilov, or Vjačeslav Zagrebin.

In 1998, a collected volume entitled *Rus' and the South Slavs (Rus' i južnye slavjane)* was published in Saint Petersburg to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Russian and Yugoslav philologist Vladimir Mošin (RJS 1998). The book featured the reprints of two of the

scholar's extensive, programmatic articles (from 1963 and 1973), devoted to the writing-related contacts between Rus' and the South Slavic world in the Middle Ages⁹; in these studies, Mošin (1998a, 1998b) touches upon issues of language typology, periodization of the contacts, as well as reciprocal inter-Slavic (Rusian-Serbian, Rusian-Bulgarian, Serbian-Bulgarian) and Balkan-Slavic influence from the tenth to the seventeenth century. For the most part, these considerations remain valid until the present day.

The editor of the volume was Russian archaeologist and Serbist Vjačeslav Zagrebin. In his own research, this scholar likewise dealt with the problems of inter-Slavic language contacts; besides, he compared the manifestations of parallel writing-related practices in the South and East Slavic areas in the Middle Ages. In connection with this, it is worth mentioning his posthumously published selected works. Next to studies on diacritic marks in Slavic source texts, the volume contains *inter alia* the article entitled "The Testimony of Medieval Slavic Scribes on the Difficulties in Translating Texts From one Slavic Language to Another" (*Svidetel'stva srednevekovyx slavjanskix piscov o trudnostjax perevoda tekstov s odnogo slavjanskogo jazyka na drugoj*). The study presents excerpts from Bulgarian, Serbian, and Rusian sources of the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries; the texts feature statements by copyists illustrating the contemporary linguistic thought in the context of translation practice (Zagrebin 2006: 25–200, 275–86).

Another author with profound accomplishments in the fields of text and source criticism of the entire *Slavia Orthodoxa* area (including the timeframe of interest here) is Russian scholar Anatolij Turilov. The recent years have seen the publication of a few books collecting his earlier studies (Turilov 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014). By formulating precise criteria for determining the date and linguistic provenance of manuscripts and old prints, as well as reconstructing the history of individual works and genres, Turilov—basing his research on the analysis of concrete source texts—strives to uncover the precise paths and stages of historical inter-Slavic writing contacts.

A scholar who contributed particularly much to developing the theory of diachronically construed Slavic (cross-)linguistic communication is Italian and American Slavist Riccardo Picchio. Among his numerous works that helped shape the way scholars think about the Slavic past are his notable studies on the social and cultural role of the (panchronically conceived) CS language, as well as on the position of the so-called language question (It. *questione della lingua*, Bulg. *văpros za ezika*, Ru. *vopros o jazyke*) in comparative research on Slavic. The most important of these contributions have been published (in translation) in three volumes of his collected works: Bulgarian (Picchio 1993), Polish (Picchio 1999), and Russian (Picchio 2003).

Drawing on discussions from the ancient, medieval, and especially humanist eras and utilizing the terms they produced (such as *dignitas* and “norm”), as well as systematically indicating Western European parallels to the relevant Slavic processes, Picchio construes the “language question” as the

persistent interest of various communities in two basic problems:

- a) Which linguistic code should become the official and/or literary language of a given society? Should state officials and members of literary circles employ the language used by the majority of the community, or should they resort to a variety that would successfully function as a traditional vehicle of religious, philosophical and poetic models?
- b) If the local linguistic heritage becomes the basis of the official and/or literary language, which parts of this heritage should be universally accepted and which ones rejected as inadequate? (Picchio 1999: 90)¹⁰

To Picchio, invoking the notions of dignity (*dignitas*) and norm, as well as medieval scholars’ attitudes to these concepts, serves as the starting point for developing a kind of sociolinguistic history of CS from the time of its inception to the eighteenth century, built around two mutually complementary ways of reconstructing its past. Namely, CS can be viewed either as 1) a closed system of the “Slavic language of Church service” (“some reality existing in isolation, functioning under the conditions of the emergence of the Slavic national languages and artificially preserved by the Orthodox Church”), or as 2) an open system of the “language of Orthodox Slavdom” (“a powerful supranational linguistic device, functioning side by side with the relevant individual languages and displaying considerable influence on their formation”) (Picchio 2003: 388). As regards the relations between CS and the Slavic national languages, the author proposes to describe them using the concept of the “isonorm”—a limit indicating the admissibility of a given local normative tendency into the general (supranational) sphere of CS usage. The sum of these isonorms, in turn, allows the delineation of the systemic boundaries of the “Church Slavonic linguistic community” on the synchronic and diachronic level (Picchio 2003: 413). It should be noted that, in his works, Picchio himself does not realize his own postulate of compiling a list of such isonorms, which would define the CS language at the various stages of its development; he rightly deems this a task for potential collaborative research in the future. Incidentally, it is evident that the genetic analysis of source texts (as well as delineating the corpora of sources for describing given parts of Slavic linguistic history) do not belong to Picchio’s central research interests; rather, the scholar focuses on the functional perspective. Nevertheless, in the context of diachronic research on Bulgarian, it is useful to point out

his thorough analyses of the *Slavo-Bulgarian History* by Paisius of Hilendar, which constitute an attempt at a preliminary test of the previously described methodology on concrete source material (Picchio 1993: 19, 601–72).¹¹

The concepts of a broad investigation into the “language question,” not only in relation to the NCS system, are developed in the two-volume *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*, edited with the help of prominent American and Italian Slavists Harvey Goldblatt, Robert Mathiesen, and Giuseppe Dell’Agata and published by Yale University (ASLQ 1984 I, 1984 II); furthermore, these issues are taken up in some of the tribute volumes offered to Riccardo Picchio, likewise co-edited by the aforementioned scholars (SSMH 1986; SOSR 2008). This is no place for a detailed discussion of the miscellaneous articles contained in these volumes; however, it is worth pointing out certain overarching claims concerning the constitutive traits and periodization of the history of CS, formulated by Robert Mathiesen of Brown University. The theses in question—largely based on the scholar’s unpublished doctoral dissertation (Mathiesen 1971)¹² as well as certain other earlier works—are laid out in the articles entitled “The Church Slavonic Language Question: An Overview (IX–XX Centuries)” and “The System and Nature of Church Slavonic Literature (Fifty Theses).” In the former contribution (ASLQ 1984 I: 45–65), Mathiesen proposes to divide the history of the language under discussion into four distinct periods: 1) “Earliest Church Slavonic,” corresponding with the activity of Cyril and Methodius in the ninth century; 2) “Early Church Slavonic,” encompassing all of the local variants—irrespective of the division into Eastern and Western liturgical tradition—up to the end of the twelfth century; 3) “Middle Church Slavonic,” only comprising the local varieties of Orthodox Slavic communities and lasting until the end of the fifteenth century; 4) “Late Church Slavonic,” likewise subsuming several local variants, again independent of religious denomination (e.g., Croats or Uniates) and lasting until the end of the eighteenth century. Another of Mathiesen’s periodization proposals highlights the fact that the CS language (at all stages of its development) is an artifact rather than an organic vernacular-based system. Accordingly, the aspect put at the forefront of the discussion is not the chronology of the rise of the various local variants, but rather the stages of deliberately applied standardization and re-standardization—the efforts of Cyril and Methodius, Patriarch Euthymius and Meletij Smotryč’kyj, respectively. Thus, the scholar writes: “In 1972 I first elaborated a theory of three major periods in the history of Church Slavonic that arose as the result of two successive, far-reaching changes in metalinguistic attitudes and beliefs. . . . I termed these periods the *Cyrillo-Methodian*, the *Euthymian* and the *Meletian*” (SOSR 2008: 175–76). It appears that a blend of these two periodizations (chronological/dialectal and

metalinguistic) can yield interesting opportunities for the reinterpretation of many aspects of Slavic diachronic linguistics; it may also find application in the analysis of particular source material.

Another group of American Slavists—associated with the University of California, Los Angeles, and represented first and foremost by Henrik Birnbaum and Dean S. Worth—has displayed more interest in describing the history of the Slavic languages (including NCS) in a directly genetic, systemic way. Overviews of their frameworks, originally laid out across numerous earlier works, can be found, for example, in the volume entitled *The Formation of the Slavonic Literary Languages* (FSL 1985), as well as in a series of Worth’s diachronic studies on Russian (e.g., Worth 1983), also in translation into this language (Worth 2006). A closer look and critical summary of the methodological and interpretational solutions offered by both Birnbaum and Worth—especially in the context of the proposals originating from the “school” of Riccardo Picchio, described previously—would merit a separate study.

Also noteworthy are the attempts at a chronologically and geographically exhaustive history of CS endeavored by Nicolina Trunte, formerly of the University of Bonn.¹³ Trunte has authored a number of scholarly syntheses in which the CS language (*Kirchenslavisch*; understood panchronically, at least on the terminological level) is on the one hand described from the time of its origins in the ninth century until its most recent textual realizations in the late twentieth century, and on the other hand—presented in all of its local variants and traditions, spanning both the geographical/cultural area of *Slavia Orthodoxa* as well as *Slavia Latina* and non-Slavic Balkan cultures. Moreover, the description covers not only the grammatical structure of the language (with special focus on the most archaic period), but also the extra-linguistic conditions of its development; in other words, both the internal and the external history of the language are included. In this context, we should mention especially Trunte’s two-volume introduction to the study of Slavic philology, entitled *Словѣньскѣи ѡзыкъ. A Practical Textbook of Church Slavonic in 30 Lessons* (*Словѣньскѣи ѡзыкъ. Ein praktisches Lehrbuch des Kirchenslavischen in 30 Lektionen*). The first part, subtitled *Old Church Slavonic* (*Altkirchenslavisch*) and originally published in 1990, has already seen five editions, not including reprints (Trunte 2005); the second volume, subtitled *Middle and New Church Slavonic* (*Mittel- und Neukirchenslavisch*), came out in 1998 and has likewise been republished and reprinted (Trunte 2014; see also 2018). Although these works are essentially textbooks and therefore display a somewhat condensed, schematic character, they nevertheless represent an original scholarly approach, evoking the general periodization used in the history of many Slavic languages: Proto-Church Slavonic

(*Urkirchenslavisch*): ninth to tenth centuries; OCS (*Altkirchenslavisch*): later tenth to twelfth centuries; Middle CS (*Mittelkirchenslavisch*): thirteenth to sixteenth centuries; NCS (*Neukirchenslavisch*): seventeenth to eighteenth centuries; and Synodal CS (*Synodalkirchenslavisch*): eighteenth century to today. Besides, the books contain a rich selection of excerpts from source texts representing the entire Slavic area.

Trunte's (2012) conceptions regarding the holistic and comparative historiography of Slavic have also found their expression in the sizable work entitled *Slavia Latina. An Introduction into the History of the Slavic Languages and Cultures of East-Central Europe* (*Slavia Latina. Eine Einführung in die Geschichte der slavischen Sprachen und Kulturen Ostmitteleuropas*). Although, again, the structure of the book and the way the problems are laid out reveal the work's primarily didactic nature, it can be considered a compendium and guide to Slavic linguistic diachrony in the geographic and historical area variously referred to as *Slavia Romana*, *Slavia Latina*, or *Slavia Catholica*.¹⁴ We may add that Trunte has been preparing another monograph of this type (of particular interest in the context of the present work) to be titled *Slavia Orthodoxa. An Introduction into the History of the Slavic Languages and Literatures of Eastern Europe with an Outline of Old Romanian* (*Slavia Orthodoxa. Eine Einführung in die Geschichte der slavischen Sprachen und Literaturen Osteuropas mit einem Abriss des Altrumänischen*) (Trunte: in preparation).¹⁵ It should also be pointed out that these publications are representative of a broader trend in Slavic studies, where a number of similar propaedeutic works have been published in the recent years (e.g., Duličenko 2011a, 2011b, 2014; Garzaniti 2019).

Attempts at devising (and applying in practice) theoretical models of the description of CS, taking into account various research perspectives—source-oriented, systemic (grammatical), sociolinguistic, ethno-linguistic, comparative, etc.—can be found in the works of many Slavists, not only linguists, even if the issues in question are not always the central focus of their research interests. Hence, the previous concise presentation of some of the approaches may be supplemented at least with a list of a number of further authors (in alphabetic order, with selective references to publications important for the purposes of the present study), such as Bulgarian Paleo-Slavist Ivan Bujukliev (especially the research on the culture and philosophy of the Bulgarian Middle Ages in a general Slavic context, e.g., Bujukliev 1992); American Polonist and Slavist David A. Frick (especially the works on the output of Meletij Smotryč'kyj and on intercultural communication in the Polish-Lithuanian state of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries); Russian Slovenist and ethno-linguist Aleksandr Gerd (especially the statistics-driven works on the typology of medieval Slavic texts and languages, e.g., Gerd 2008; Gerd and

Veder 2003); American Paleo-Slavist Harvey Goldblatt (especially the book-length analysis of the famous *History on the Letters*, the fifteenth-century metalinguistic treatise by Constantine of Kostenets—Goldblatt 1987); German Slavists Karl Gutschmidt (numerous works on the history of Bulgarian in the eighteenth to nineteenth century, as well as research on the influence of CS on Bulgarian and Serbian; e.g., Gutschmidt 1969) and Helmut Keipert (various studies on Rus(s)ian source texts as well as discussions of methodology and frameworks [Keipert 2001; 2006], especially the most recent summarizing work entitled *Kirchenslavisch-Begriffe/ Conceptions of Church Slavonic* [Keipert 2014; see also 2017; Totomanova 2019]¹⁶); Anna Kretschmer, specializing in Russian and Serbian, currently affiliated with the University of Vienna and previously with Russian, German, Swiss, Belarusian, and Polish institutions (especially her proposals regarding the methodology of comparative research on the history of Pre-Revival *Slavia Orthodoxa* literary languages, e.g., Kretschmer 1989, 1998, 2012); Russian linguist Leonid Panin (studies on the history of CS in the light of so-called linguistic textology; Panin 1995); Boris Ottokar Unbegaun, a Slavist associated with French, British, and American universities (contributions to the history of Russian and Serbian in the late Middle Ages and the early Revival period, e.g., Unbegaun 1995); and Russian philologist Viktor Živov (*inter alia* his concept of so-called hybrid languages/texts of the Middle Ages and the Revival era in South and East Slavic, developing the views of Nikita Tolstoj; Živov 1988). The list should, of course, ultimately be extended and provide the starting point for a future guide to the scholarly thought on the diachrony of the (N) CS language, as already postulated.

CHURCH SLAVONIC AND ITS INFLUENCE AS PRESENTED IN STUDIES ON BULGARIAN

The phenomenon of NCS and its role, briefly outlined previously, also finds its concretization at the theoretical and descriptive level in studies focusing on the history of the Bulgarian language (both literary—*knižoven*, and so-called spoken—*govorim*), including in the periodization models proposed in these works. From the perspective of the traditional grammatical periodization of Bulgarian (tripartite, if the pre-literary era is left out of the picture), the NCS language develops and functions during the so-called New Bulgarian period (fifteenth to nineteenth centuries), initially functioning as a catalyst (restoring traditions, enriching the abstract vocabulary, enhancing word-formation models and the repository of grammatical forms) and subsequently as an impediment (excessive archaization, dissociation from the vernacular

dialects) of the development of the literary language (or “standard language,” according to a different terminology; cf. Solak 2009: 56–57; Langston and Peti-Stantić 2014: 27). Under this framework, NCS itself is not—and cannot be—the primary object of Bulgarian-oriented research; accordingly, it falls within the domain of language contact, in this case Rus(s)ian-Bulgarian (in fact, one frequently encounters the identification of CS influence with Russian or Russian influence). This approach is adopted by the authors of all classical treatments of Bulgarian historical grammar (i.e., Benjo Conev 1984a, 1984b, 1985; Stefan Mladenov 1979; and Kiril Mirčev 1978), as illustrated in the subsequent quotes.¹⁷

In the second, posthumous volume of his *History of the Bulgarian Language (Istorija na bǎlgarskija ezik)*,¹⁸ Benjo Conev offers a concise survey of some Bulgarian and Serbian texts of the thirteenth to eighteenth centuries that display Russian influence; he comments:

At first, in the 16th century, Bulgarians and Serbs appear to recognize that they have a common literary language and when they are forced to write in the Russian recension, they seemingly apologize that they were not able to find a Serbian or Bulgarian source instead of Russian. . . . As long as the Bulgarians were separated from the outside world, they had no choice but to copy old books or to use Serbian ones. However, after Russia had built its authority among Slavs, the influence of the Russian language increased. In this way, a language develops in Bulgaria and Serbia that has Russian-Church Slavonic at its basis, but with added layers of popular speech. And since the basis is one and the same for Bulgarians and Serbs, a unitary language develops in the 18th and 19th centuries—so homogenous that it would seem one and the same for all three nations. . . . Church Slavonic influence reigns in Bulgaria throughout the whole 18th and the first part of the 19th century. (Conev 1984b: 289, 307–08)

Conversely, Stefan Mladenov expresses an opinion which on the one hand develops Conev’s views and on the other hand diverges from them considerably, especially as regards the presumed intelligibility of the CS-influenced (Bulgarian and Serbian) language:

After the collapse of their empire, the Bulgarians—subjected to double enslavement (political under the Turks and spiritual under the Greeks)—sank into a deep spiritual sleep. In the liturgy, to the extent that it was not Greek, they made use of texts printed in Serbia, Russia and elsewhere in the South, East and West Slavic (and Romanian) areas. To a Bulgarian, the unfamiliar features of the idiom of these ecclesiastical books were quite conspicuous—which only reinforced the image of Church Slavonic as seemingly having nothing in common with the everyday colloquial speech of the Bulgarians. Most of what can be found in the assorted grammars of the “Slavonic” Church language (“Adelphotes,” Zyzanij, Smotryč’kyj, Mrazović, Uževyč etc.) is scarcely relevant for

the history of the Bulgarian language. . . . Church books printed in Russia were highly widespread among Bulgarians; the Russified language of these books, on its part, exerted further influence on the New Bulgarian literary language of the damaskin era, as well as—to a lesser extent—until the late 19th century and even to the present day. Thus, we have the Slavo-Bulgarian language (*slavjano-bolgarskij jazyk*), like Slavo-Serbian in Serbia and Slavo-Russian in Rus' itself. (Mladenov 1979: 38–39, 80)

Kiril Mirčev, whose comprehensive take on the historical grammar of Bulgarian was for many years the most popular work on the subject, likewise treats the issue of NCS influence as belonging to the domain of Russian- or Russian-Bulgarian language contact:

The accretion of the Russian lexical layer in Bulgarian proceeded through a number of stages. Russian linguistic influence begins to operate to a more discernable extent back in the second half of the 18th century, along with the increasing percolation of Russian prints and manuscripts into the Bulgarian lands. Subsequently, for a long time, it settles in naturally through with the support of Church Slavonic, which—in its Russian recension—begins to gain full hegemony in the local liturgy. (Mirčev 1978: 96)

Mirčev's opinion is largely shared by French Bulgarist Jack Feuillet, who, however, dates the onset of the Russian influence to the nineteenth century. In his *Historical Grammar of Bulgarian* (*Grammaire historique du bulgare*), he writes:

The influence of Russian begins to manifest itself at the outset of the 19th century. At a time when Bulgaria lacked printing presses, books would arrive from Russia—a situation which significantly affected the written language. Here, it should be borne in mind that Russian Church Slavonic, still alive in the role of a religious idiom, allowed for the reintroduction of words belonging to the old language. (Feuillet 1999: 318)

The most recent thorough treatments of the historical grammar of Bulgarian do not deviate significantly from the afore-mentioned assessments, save for a somewhat different chronology. See the following statements:

The Bulgarian literary language of the 16th-18th centuries onwards—and especially in the 18th-19th centuries—sees the advent of a wealth of Russicisms or Church Slavonicisms, a considerable part of which had previously entered literary Russian from the Bulgarian literary language of the Pre-National period. (Ivanova-Mirčeva, Haralampiev 1999: 349)

Active literary language influence from Russian (primarily on the lexical level) begins to operate in the second half of the 17th century, at which time a great number of printed books imported from Russia are spreading in Bulgaria. This is, in essence, the starting point of a palpable influence of Russian on Bulgarian. The vehicle of this influence is Church Slavonic, the language in which the Russian books disseminated in Bulgaria were printed until as late as the 19th century. It is important to bear in mind that, by its origins, Church Slavonic is closely connected with the Old Bulgarian literary language: it is a recension of the latter, created on Rus(s)ian soil and subsequently developed and perfected for a number of centuries. Church Slavonic exercises substantial influence on the shaping of literary New Bulgarian in its nascent stage. With the help of Church Slavonic, a number of obsolete Old Bulgarian words are restored to the language. (Haralampiev 2001: 234)

Ivan Haralampiev, the afore-quoted Bulgarian language historian, also suggests another, different approach to periodization, centered around the processes of transformation and consolidation of the literary language. In one of his most recent works, he appeals to the concept developed by Dora Ivanova-Mirčeva (1987, 2003), according to whom the history of the Bulgarian literary language comprises two fundamental periods—Pre-National (*donacionalen*, mid-ninth to mid-eighteenth century) and National (*nacionalen*, mid-eighteenth century to today). Haralampiev notes that, due to different circumstances, the two periods have not been researched equally well: the National period has been described much better and in far greater detail (Haralampiev 2012: 9). Under this approach, NCS influence on Bulgarian falls within both periods: it commences in the final stages of the Pre-National period (beginning in the late sixteenth century) and continues until the early phase of the National period (ending in the mid-nineteenth century). Although any periodization is to some extent a simplified, schematic construct—a device serving to conceptualize the past in some principled way—it nevertheless imposes particular directions in the interpretation of the data; serving to delineate the identity of the object of the research and shaping the hierarchy of the problems or phenomena under analysis, it becomes a gnosiologically significant concept in its own right (cf. Alekseev 2013: 9–11). It is no different in the case of the history of literary Bulgarian, which may well be one of the reasons behind the disproportion in the research on the two proposed overarching periods of its development, pointed out by Haralampiev.

The beginning of the National period is conventionally linked to the publication of the *Slavo-Bulgarian History* by Paisius of Hilendar (1762). Some linguists also point to the appearance of the damaskins in the so-called New Bulgarian recension of the seventeenth century; see, for example, the entry on the *New Bulgarian literary language* (*Novobălgarski knižoven ezik*) in the encyclopedia of contemporary literary Bulgarian (ESBE 2000: 266; the

entry is authored by Vărban Vătov). Other proposals have been submitted too—for example, to locate the beginnings of literary New Bulgarian as late as in the first years of the nineteenth century, when Sophronius of Vratsa wrote his *Life and Sufferings* (cf. on this Venediktov 2009: 5–24); a number of further, yet different views have been formulated too. As far as the chronological stage in question is concerned—regarding both the evaluation of NCS influence and certain other phenomena pertinent to this period—Bulgarian linguistics is dominated by the approach originating chiefly from Ljubomir Andrejčin. In 1958, the scholar published an article entitled “The Role of Church Slavonic in the Formation of Contemporary Literary Bulgarian” (*Rol-jata na čerkovnoslavjanskija ezik v izgraždaneto na sāvremennija bālgarski knižoven ezik*), in which he postulates the necessity of distinguishing NCS influence from that of Russian. Accordingly, he formulates some tentative principles of identifying given Bulgarian forms as literary Church Slavonicisms (especially on the basis of assorted phonetic features; e.g., the reflexes $\rho > u$, $\epsilon > ja$, $\upsilon > o$, as well as derivational markers used to form categories such as *nomina abstracta* and *nomina agentis*: *-nie* and *-tel*), highlighting their genetic connection with the earlier Old and Middle Bulgarian tradition as well as their partial similarity to dialectal models of the Serbian recension. This interpretation allows the author to consider the Church Slavonicisms found in seventeenth- to nineteenth-century Bulgarian texts on the one hand as a “preparatory” stage, paving the way for the later Russian influence, and on the other hand as an indication of drawing on medieval Bulgarian traditions, “with no noticeable advent of some new written language” (Andrejčin 1958: 319–20).

These views were reiterated and developed in a number of Andrejčin’s later works, including in the posthumously published book entitled *From the History of our Language Building* (*Iz istorijata na našeto ezikovo stroitel-stvo*, Andrejčin 1986). His observations and conclusions provide the point of departure for many other scholars working on New Bulgarian, for example, the collective of authors behind the academy *History of the New Bulgarian Literary Language* (*Istorija na novobālgarskija knižoven ezik*, INBKE 1989: 29–35) as well as the creators of other academic handbooks—Rusin Rusinov (1980; 1999: 99–102) and Diana Ivanova (2017). These scholars, in essence, base themselves on Andrejčin’s views as regards the mechanisms of the so-called CS influence. It is worth pointing out that even here, as in the studies of Andrejčin’s predecessors mentioned before, the distinction between NCS influence and Russian influence is not always crystal-clear:

In some cases, the influence of Church Slavonic on literary New Bulgarian can hardly be told apart from that of Russian, given that the very Russian literary language—especially in the pre-Pushkin period—is closely tied to the Church

Slavonic linguistic system and norm. For this reason, even now it is still sometimes necessary to speak of “Church Slavonic/Russian” influence, insofar as Church Slavonic constitutes a Russified recension of Old Bulgarian. (INBKE 1989: 34–35)

As regards authors from outside of Bulgaria, Andrejčĭn’s approach has been discussed and commented upon to various extents, for example, by Russian Bulgarist Grigorij Venediktov (who published several volumes of collected works devoted *inter alia* to the history of literary New Bulgarian; cf. Venediktov 1981, 1990a, 1990b, 2009), Swedish Slavist Roger Gyllin (1991), Czech Bulgarist Hana Gladkova (cf. Gladkova and Likomanova 2008), and many others. In Poland, the Andrejčĭnian notions of literary New Bulgarian and the scholarly traditions (or discourse) founded upon them were recently critically analyzed by Elżbieta Solak (2009).

In view of the clearly separate status of the problem (e.g., by virtue of chronology), the afore-mentioned works will not be discussed here in more detail. It should be emphasized, however, that the attitude toward linguistic features (orthographic, lexical, and grammatical) stemming from texts representing the CS language of the Revival era may be considered a gauge of most of the significant contemporary debates and disagreements concerning the codification of literary Bulgarian. The representatives of the so-called schools traditionally identified in Bulgaria in the first quarter of the nineteenth century (CS, Slavo-Bulgarian, and New Bulgarian) and their successors likewise mostly argued over the degree to which Church Slavonicisms could be utilized and over the acceptable level of borrowings from NCS in Bulgarian texts (here, I leave aside the separate, important issue of generating the very term/construct “linguistic school” and its use for modeling facts in language history, a procedure that has been contested in certain works; cf. Solak 2009: 60–63). A record of the debates in question may be found, for example, in the collection of source texts entitled *On the Bulgarian Race and Language (Za bălgarski rod i ezik)*, published in 2007 and containing excerpts from late eighteenth- to nineteenth-century Bulgarian writings dealing with issues of language (cf. the “List of Source Text Editions”).

Although the earlier overarching period of the history of literary Bulgarian—that is, Pre-National, or Medieval—is in principle less well researched, no fewer than over a dozen of its periodizations have been proposed in the literature on the subject; a comparative survey can be found in the afore-mentioned work by Haralampiev (2012: 16–26). It is useful to review the most important of these models here briefly—some of them general, others more specific. We shall devote particular attention to the way in which they characterize the period of interest to us (which saw the onset and early stages of NCS influence); the relevant periods and subperiods are italicized.

Thus, Dora Ivanova-Mirčeva (2003: 79–80) divides the Pre-National stage of the history of Bulgarian into the following periods:

- I. Early Medieval period (nine to twelfth centuries),¹⁹ further broken down into:
 1. subperiod of the creation of the Cyrillo-Methodian language
 2. Moravian-Pannonian subperiod
 3. Old Bulgarian proper subperiod
- II. Late Medieval period (thirteenth to eighteenth centuries), with the partial coexistence of:
 - A. literary language of the Tărnovo type (thirteenth to fifteenth centuries)
 - B. literary language of the non-Tărnovo type (twelfth to fifteenth centuries),
 - C. *traditional literary language (fifteenth to eighteenth centuries)*
- III. Pre-Revival Transitional period (seventeenth and eighteenth centuries)

Ivan Gălăbov (1980: 20) proposes a dichotomous division of the entire Pre-National stage:

- I. Old Bulgarian period (mid-ninth to mid-fifteenth centuries)
- II. *Transitional period (mid-fifteenth to eighteenth centuries)*

A more elaborate model covering the full history of Bulgarian can be found in the handbook entitled *A Short History of Literary Bulgarian (Kratka istorija na bălgarskija knižoven ezik)*, published in Hungary by undeservedly forgotten Bulgarian linguist Konstantin Bosilkov. The book offers numerous thought-provoking, unconventional remarks on the history of the language. The chronological stages distinguished are the following (Bosilkov 1986: 24–26):

- I. Old Literary period, encompassing:
 1. Old Bulgarian (ninth to eleventh centuries)
 2. Middle Bulgarian (twelfth to mid-fourteenth centuries)
 3. language reformed by the Tărnovo Literary School (mid-fourteen to sixteenth centuries as well as—as a competing variant—*mid-sixteenth to mid-eighteenth centuries*)
- II. New Literary period, encompassing:
 1. *Pre-National subperiod (sixteenth to mid-eighteenth centuries)*
 2. Transitional “Slavo-Bulgarian” subperiod (mid-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries)
 3. National subperiod proper (mid-nineteenth century—today)

Haralampiev himself (2012: 24–26), pointing to the evolution of the criteria applied and summarizing the previous approaches, offers his own original solution, distinguishing the following stages in the development of literary Bulgarian:

- I. Early Old Bulgarian (mid-ninth to twelfth centuries)
- II. Classical Old Bulgarian (thirteenth to mid-fifteenth century)
- III. *Late Old Bulgarian (mid-fifteenth to sixteenth centuries)*
- IV. Early New Bulgarian (seventeenth to mid-eighteenth centuries)

The most convenient and accurate point of departure for further deliberations is to link the time of the standardization, codification, and influence of NCS with the period of the Traditional literary language (in Ivanova-Mirčeva's terminology) or Late Old Bulgarian (in Haralampiev's terminology): such a perspective allows us to consider NCS (at least in its early phases) as an immanent part of the history of the Bulgarian language, rather than as representing foreign influence.

When discussing works dealing with the external history of Bulgarian and the periodization proposals advanced in them (including the position of NCS influence), it is worthwhile to devote a few words to the core publications treating Russian-Bulgarian language contacts, corresponding in scope with the studies on inter-Slavic language interactions in the *Slavia Orthodoxa* area mentioned earlier. Particularly important for our purposes are two monographs by Bulgarian authors: *Bulgarian-Russian and Russian-Bulgarian Linguistic Connections (Bolgarsko-russkie i russko-bolgarskie jazykovye svjazi)* by Slavist and Russicist Rumjana Pavlova (1979) and *Bulgarian-Russian Literary Connections in the 17th and 18th Centuries (Bălgaro-ruski literaturni vrăzki prez XVII i XVIII v.)* by Petăr Atanasov (1986). Incidentally, both publications draw on the research tradition founded and represented by another Bulgarian Paleo-Slavist—Bonju Angelov (e.g., 1972, 1980a, 1980b).

Although Pavlova's study devotes significantly more space to the influence of the Bulgarian language and writing in Rus', one of the chapters succinctly deals with Russian-Bulgarian cultural relations in the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries. In it, the author surveys the sources testifying to the reciprocal impact (which at the time primarily operated in the direction from the north to the south of the Slavic area). She also points out—though without delving into details—how Bulgarian writing was affected by the advent of the printed book in the sixteenth century, with its intensifying development in the subsequent centuries in Moscow and in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Pavlova notes that further research into this phenomenon is necessary:

Although the penetration of Rus(s)ian prints and manuscripts into Bulgarian lands in the 15th–18th centuries has received some coverage, the scholarship is still lacking a full description of the repertoire of the Rus(s)ian book in Bulgaria. This grand and crucial task will have to be dealt with by future researchers. Still, even on the basis of the data currently at our disposal, we are able to state that a steady stream of books flowed from Russia to Bulgaria, especially from the 17th century onwards. It is impossible to imagine the Bulgarian Revival without them. (Pavlova 1979: 164–65)

An important step toward the delimitation of the corpus of sources testifying to the scale of the influence that Russian printed books wielded in Bulgaria²⁰ was made by Petăr Atanasov (who also contributed greatly to the study of the history of Cyrillic printing in the Balkans themselves, a topic to which we shall return in the later chapters). Atanasov's many painstaking investigations as well as library and archive queries culminated in his 1986 monograph, in which he presents concrete archaeographic data on borrowings from Russian old prints in contemporary Bulgarian writing. The scholar establishes that the oldest dated book of this type is the handwritten 1626 codex containing so-called Sunday teachings (Bulg. *nedelni poučeniija*), stored in the SS. Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia (NBKM 304). Atanasov identifies the basis for this manuscript—which was copied by Hieromonk Daniil, the founder of the so-called calligraphic/literary school in the Etropole Monastery—in the *Homiliary Gospel* published in 1569 in Zabłudów by Ivan Fëdorov and Pëtr Mscislavec (Atanasov 1986: 13). Further examples for the influence of Muscovite, Lesser Russian, or Vilnius old prints on the Bulgarian written tradition include, *inter alia*, seventeenth- to nineteenth-century New Bulgarian miscellanies and damaskins, compared by Atanasov with Muscovite printed prologues (this group includes the famed *Tikhonravov Damaskin*), a number of Bulgarian copies of Meletij Smotryc'kyj's grammar published in Vievis (known in Polish as Jewie and in Belarusian as Eŭe) near Vilnius in 1619, as well as the literary oeuvre of Sophronius of Vratsa.

Although no doubt in need of verification and supplementation, Atanasov's remarks can be of great use in the research on the linguistic layer of the print-determined Russian-Bulgarian contacts of the time. Some of the problems involved, especially the relationship between NCS and the language of the damaskins (representing two redactions—the “archaic,” sixteenth-century one as well as the later “New Bulgarian” one, thus called in view of its role in the shaping of the vernacular-based modern Bulgarian language) have been dealt with to varying extents by a number of scholars. We may mention authors such as Kiril Babov, who investigated seventeenth-century damaskins under this aspect (Babov 1968); Vasko Vasilev, who focused primarily on damaskins of the so-called archaic redaction (e.g., Vasilev 1987); or Alla

Gradinarova, the author of a short monographic treatment of the vocabulary of Bulgarian damaskins in the light of CS influence (Gradinarova 1997).

In this connection, one cannot fail to mention the works of Bulgarian Paleo-Slavist Borjana Velčeva as well as of Russian Bulgarist Evgenija Demina, although the NCS language and influence were neither the only nor the main subject of their research. The views of the former scholar were recently reiterated in a volume of collected works prepared in cooperation with Plovdiv-based linguist Diana Ivanova, whose publications will also be referred to later below (Velčeva and Ivanova 2010).

Demina's views on the history of the Bulgarian language in the period of interest to us are to be found primarily in the third volume of her multifaceted effort entitled *The Tikhonravov Damaskin. 17th Century Bulgarian Monument. Analysis and Text (Tixonravovskij damaskin. Bolgarskij pamjatnik XVII v. Issledovanie i tekst)*. The study spans a textological introduction (Demina 1968), a critical edition of the text (Demina 1972), and a discussion of the language of this particular text as a representative of the so-called New Bulgarian literary language, created on the basis of vernacular speech (Demina 1985). The recently published multiauthor *Dictionary of the 17th-Century Vernacular-Based Bulgarian Literary Language (On the Basis of the Text of the Tikhonravov Damaskin) (Rečnik na knižovnija bālgarski ezik na narodna osnova ot XVII vek [vārhu tekst na Tihonravovija damaskin])*, inspired by and prepared under the guidance of the Russian Slavist, can be considered the fourth volume of the series (RKBE 2012).

Also notable are the astute remarks by Konstantin Bosilkov, found in his afore-mentioned book, specifically in the chapter entitled “What is the ‘Church Slavonic Language’ in Russian Studies and Bulgarian Studies?” (*Što e „cārkovnoslavjanski ezik” v rusistikata i v bālgaristikata?*; Bosilkov 1986: 53–63). In it, the author conducts a survey of the basic features considered probative for qualifying a given form as a Church Slavonicism, applied in Bulgarian- and Russian-oriented works, respectively. These features—representing the domains of phonetics, word formation, grammar, and vocabulary—turn out to be only partially identical in the research on the two languages. Bosilkov's main claim is the following: from the perspective of Bulgarian (especially in the Pre-National [*prednacionalen*, seventeenth to mid-eighteenth centuries] and Transitional [*prehoden*, mid-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries] subperiods of the development of the New Bulgarian literary language, in accordance with his chronology), Church Slavonicisms are forms displaying (mostly phonetic) East Slavic features, whereas from the perspective of the history of the modern-age Russian language, the forms identified as Church Slavonicisms are those which—conversely—reveal South Slavic features (Bosilkov 1986: 61–62). This claim is based on

the functional comparison of a number of linguistic features, including the following:

- a) for the history of Russian:
- metathesis results: *grad, glad* versus *gorod, golod*
 - radical *-i-* versus *-’-:* *biju, piju* versus *b’ju, p’ju*
 - consonantal alternations resulting from various Common Slavic palatalization processes: *podvizat’sja* versus *podvigat’sja, prorikaju* versus *prorekaju*
 - some prefixal formants (frequently differing by metathesis results): *bez-* versus *ne-*, *vo-* versus *v-*, *pre-* versus *pere-*, *pred-* versus *pered-*, *črez-* versus *čerez-*
 - some suffixal formants: *-stvo* (*blaženstvo, estestvo*), *-stvie* (*šestvie*), *-išče* (*poprišče*)
 - some elements of compounds (often borrowed or calqued from Greek): *arxi-*, *blago-*, *bogo-*, *lže-*, *ljubo-*, *ravno-*, etc.
 - some forms of the comparative or superlative degree of adjectives: *dražajšij* versus *dorože, kratčajšij* versus *koroče, sil’nejšij* versus *sil’nee, nailučšij* versus *samyj lučšij*
 - relics of the vocative: *Bože, Carju nebesnyj*
- b) for the history of Bulgarian:
- the reflexes $u < \varrho$; $ja < \xi$; $o < \upsilon$; $e < \epsilon$
 - some prefixal formants (with a “Russian phonetic feature”): *voz-*, *von-*, *so-* (*vozbrani, vonmemъ, sogrešenie*)
 - some suffixal formants: *-stvo* (*lukavstvo*), *-stvie* (*carstvie*), *-ište* (*uročište*)
 - the same elements of compounds that were pointed out for Russian.

These observations (in fact founded on a set of features which is more extensive than presented here, but which was nevertheless compiled by the author in a tentative way and without exhaustive exemplification) compel Bosilkov to introduce a distinction between so-called genetic Church Slavonicisms, identical for all languages, and so-called typological/functional Church Slavonicisms. The former type mostly comprises features from the domains of word formation and morphology, whereas the latter type is primarily associated with phonetic phenomena (Bosilkov 1986: 56–61). It appears that this differentiation may also be utilized in describing the role of CS in the development of other Slavic languages (e.g., Serbian) as well as its history in the entire *Slavia Orthodoxa* area.

It is worth pointing out a number of more recent works by Bulgarian scholars in which the problems under discussion are treated to a greater or

lesser extent. Thus, Nadka Nikolova, a linguist from Shumen University, investigates the issue of bilingualism in Bulgarian lands in the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries; besides treating Bulgarian-Turkish and Bulgarian-Greek bilingualism, she also devotes a fair amount of space to the role of CS²¹ in the communication processes in eighteenth- to nineteenth-century Bulgaria (Nikolova 2006: 154–94). The Revival era is also the focus of another author from the same institution, Kina Vačkova, who assembles a list of criteria by which the so-called functional (as opposed to genetic) typology of the Bulgarian language of the period may be identified (Vačkova 2008). A comparative take on the history of the Bulgarian language (juxtaposed with German) as well as a revision of earlier periodization solutions (including the stages of CS influence) is offered by Bojan Vălčev of Sofia University (Vălčev 2009). Another scholar who analyzes late medieval Bulgarian linguistic history (as well as the fate of the first South Slavic printed books) in a broad European comparative context is Liliya Ilieva of Blagoevgrad, the author of *The Bulgarian Language in the Prehistory of Comparative Linguistics and in the Linguistic World of Early European Modernism (Bălgarskijat ezik v predistorijata na komparativnata lingvistika i v ezikovija svjat na rannija evropejski modernizăm, Ilieva 2011)*; we shall return to her works in chapter 3.

Of particular importance for the stage of Bulgarian linguistic history under discussion here—as well as for the question of the relation of Bulgarian to CS/NCS and to the development of printing in the Slavic countries—are the methodological stances of Bulgarian scholar Marijana Cibranska-Kostova, whose studies in the history of Slavic paleotypy as well as in diachronic linguistics may provide a theoretical base for further investigations. Her *Studies on 15th–18th Century Cyrillic Paleotypy (Etjudi vărhu kirilskata paleotipija XV–XVIII v.)*, published in 2007, contain an extensive article entitled “The Church Slavonic Printed Nomocanon and 17th–19th Century Bulgarian Literature” (*Cărkovnoslavjanskijat pečaten nomokanon i bălgarskata knižnina XVII–XIX v.*, Cibranska-Kostova 2007: 61–165). In this work—drawing on her regrettably unpublished doctoral dissertation on the language of sixteenth-century Bulgarian printed books (Cibranska-Kostova 1992)—she not only analyzes the source genre signaled in the title, but also treats the more general, basic problems of the description of the CS language as found in books printed both in Russia and in the Bulgarian lands. The following discussion constitutes a presentation and commentary on the Bulgarian linguist’s views as laid out in her afore-mentioned works; certain aspects, particularly important for the purposes of the present work, have been developed further.

In the introduction, Cibranska-Kostova notes that the period of interest to her (and to us in the present study) witnessed the simultaneous operation of three linguistic formations, all of which may be considered systems in which Bulgarian written output was created in the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries:

1. traditional Middle Bulgarian literary language
2. CS language²²
3. vernacular-based literary language

Each of these formations (idioms) can be investigated both autonomously and in interconnection with the remaining two, as a component of concrete linguistic realizations reflected in the texts of a particular period. We may add that the basic objective of such analyses is the attempt to determine the proportion in which the elements representing the individual idioms occur (“more traditional,” “more ecclesiastical,” “more vernacular” language) as well as the endeavor to identify the reasons for which a given text is saturated with the features of the particular systems (e.g., due to the author/copyist’s provenance, the textological background of the work, or the pragmatic sender-addressee assumptions of a given text/genre). Accordingly, the key analytic procedure in studies of this kind should begin with drawing a list of features (phonetic, grammatical, and lexical) delineating each of the afore-mentioned linguistic formations and projecting the arising matrix onto concrete linguistic realizations preserved in the texts under investigation. The results obtained in this way largely approximate traditionally written linguistic monographs describing particular texts, full of detailed empirical data.

Cibranska-Kostova considers it a generally acknowledged fact that the systemic formation of NCS as a formation active in the Bulgarian literary reality begins with the advent of printed books. We should point out that most works primarily invoke books originating from the East Slavic area in this context, rather than those published in the South (the process is usually referred to by the word *pronikvane*—“penetration, percolation, influx”). The paths, means, forms, and results of this influx should be described in the context of two research spheres:

- I. The rise and formation of NCS itself (this sphere involves questions of chronology, means of codification, functional scope, etc.).
- II. The position of NCS, and of the printed books composed in this language, in Bulgarian linguistic history (this sphere is concerned with the varying ways of the reception of NCS, the immediate application of imported East Slavic prints as opposed to their intermediate use—by means of copying, modification, etc.).

The former sphere is connected with the assumption that NCS is the end result of a complex of literary and linguistic processes known in the literature as the “Russian liturgical reform and redaction of sacred books” (Cibranska-Kostova 2007: 66; Ru. *knižnaja sprava*), conducted during the tenure of

Patriarch Nikon in the seventeenth century. This sphere covers research areas proper to two disciplines: 1) the sociopolitical and ecclesiastical history of the time of the reform and 2) the history of linguistic changes resulting from this reform.

In the further discussion of the extralinguistic background—nevertheless closely connected to matters of language—of the reform that led to the formation of NCS in its final shape (the one which is thought to participate in the linguistic history of Bulgarian starting in the seventeenth century), the author of the framework considers the following factors:

- a. the striving for the rapprochement with the Greek Church and for the increase of the authority of the Russian state and Church among the Orthodox nations;
- b. the utilization of the Christian population of the Ottoman Empire in its contemporary borders for the realization of the idea of an “Orthodox expansion” under Moscow’s guidance;
- c. the bridging and unification of the Russian and Greek typicon, as well as other texts, through the redaction of Russian books and adjusting their content to that of their Greek counterparts—a process seen the most clearly in the so-called *Nikon’s Service Book* of 1655 (the appearance of the Old Believers);
- d. the inclusion of “South and West Russian” (especially Kyivan) clerics in the reform effort (e.g., figures such as Arsenij Satanovs’kyj, Jepifanij Slavynec’kyj, Damaskyn Ptyc’kyj, etc.) and the use of editions originating from Kyiv, Vilnius, Ostroh, etc., in the redaction works; and
- e. drawing on earlier written traditions of Slavic (including Bulgarian and Serbian), as well as of Greek (connected with the monasteries of Mount Athos), and the use of books stemming from these sources as another model and point of reference for the redaction efforts.

The liturgical, theological, and political aspects of Nikon’s reform as well as its overall evaluation have been the topic of scholarly discussion on numerous occasions. Needless to say, these issues generally do not fall within the boundaries of the present study; the literature on the subject is, in any case, quite rich (some of the pertinent works are cited by Cibranska-Kostova), so that its exhaustive presentation would not be possible here. Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that the context of the reform, sketched previously, exposes a number of linguistically relevant aspects (e.g., the role of Lesser Russian and Belarusian old prints in the formation of the linguistic look of the reformed texts). One should also consider the fact that CS/NCS was not merely the object of the reform, but also its instrument; thus, it became a

complex and dynamic phenomenon, aggregating in itself a whole range of tendencies belonging to both East and South Slavic linguistic history.

It is the latter tendencies that become the object of Cibranska-Kostova's attention in the subsequent parts of her work. Describing the strictly linguistic layer of the reform, she highlights the following among the courses it takes:

1. the positioning of NCS at the top level of the socio-axiological system and endowing it with extraordinary prestige, emanating from the basic functional role it fulfils (i.e., serving the sacred and liturgical spheres). Thus, adhering to the norms of this language becomes synonymous with siding with “genuinely Orthodox” values; it is a demonstration of belonging to a particular type of cultural heritage;²³
2. the systemic stabilization (mostly Russification) of NCS through the transition from norming to codification; in this case, codification is to be understood not only as the existence of an authoritative grammar, but also the struggle to adhere to the norms of that grammar in the process of creating new texts (according to an alternative terminology, we may speak of analytic and synthetic codification, respectively; Zapol'skaja 2003: 19). Systematized, prescriptive grammatical treatises—a phenomenon previously unknown in Slavic writing and initially published in Russian lands—are becoming ever more popular, subject to new editions and expanding the range of their influence;
3. the sanctioning (via codification processes) of the impact of the “south-western” (i.e., genetically Belarusian and Ukrainian) type of the NCS language on the Muscovite type, referred to as the third South Slavic influence by some scholars (Ru. *tret'e južnoslavjanskoe vlijanie*²⁴; for more on this subject cf. Uspenskij 2002: 411–511). Certain orthographic and orthoepic features found in paleotypes stemming from the former areas now come to be regarded as valid also for newly composed Russian books;
4. the intensified Hellenization and archaization (understood differently than among the Old Believers) in the process of the NCS language reform; this affects the layers of morphology (paradigmatic models, word-formation calques), syntax (specific constructions), and lexis (borrowings). Hellenisms signal the elevated literary status of NCS and are the indicators of the properly normative status of the texts; and
5. the use of South Slavic traditions—stemming on the one hand from the fourteenth-century Tärnovo reform and on the other hand from the development of fifteenth-century paleotypy designed for South Slavs—in the works on the reform. Although this issue is understudied (one may even venture the statement that it remains almost completely uninvestigated), traces of references to sources such as Serbian or Venetian sixteenth-

century Cyrillic prints can be found in certain copies of the editions that followed Nikon's reform.

Taking into consideration the afore-mentioned traits of NCS, Cibranska-Kostova puts forth an extended definition of the language—one designed to determine the methodology of describing the synchronically understood NCS linguistic system across all its aspects and of tracing the key stages of its development in a diachronic and geographic perspective. Given that this definition largely corresponds to the core qualifiers of NCS formulated at the beginning of its chapter, we shall quote it here in full:

The Church Slavonic language is the result of the prolonged period of the Rusification of the first Slavic written language, proceeding in an evolutionary fashion from as early as the 10th until the 17th century. Its concrete linguistic manifestation constitutes a systemic set (codified via grammars and printing) of two principal components—the Muscovite, Greater Russian linguistic basis and the south-west Russian substrate, both of which had already adapted the historically inherited tradition of Cyrillic liturgical writing in their own right before their mutual influence. (Cibranska-Kostova 2007: 76)

It appears that this definition should attach more weight to the circumstances indicated under point 5 mentioned earlier (the role of the South Slavic basis); however, it should of course be borne in mind that only a systematic, material-based verification of falsification of the relevant claims may bring us closer to understanding (and therefore defining) the phenomenon of NCS in a better and fuller way. According to Cibranska-Kostova, the main function of the system under discussion is the adaptation of linguistic tradition (*usvojavane na tradicijata*)—that is, the blending of the old and the new; in this regard, the NCS language plays a typologically identical role in the East and South Slavic areas, whereas the process of its formation and standardization is determined by the afore-described, multidirectional tendencies.

The point of departure for the delineation of the second research sphere, pertaining to the role of NCS in the South Slavic (including Bulgarian) linguistic area, lies *inter alia* in the information concerning the East Slavic paleotypes housed in Bulgarian collections. These include the most important such book (i.e., the *Ostroh Bible* of 1580–1581), as well as certain other editions of Ivan Fëdorov and the co-publisher of his early efforts, Pëtr Mscislavec. On the basis of these data, some researchers have dated the onset of the influence of the Russian recension of NCS in the Balkans as early as the mid-sixteenth century. Importantly, however, the source base for this influence—printed books—is associated with the tradition (pre-existing in the Balkans, though waning toward the end of the sixteenth century) of

Venetian, Serbian, and Wallachian/Moldavian paleotypy catering to the Orthodox Serbs and Bulgarians, as well as Romanians. For this reason, the later, seventeenth-century NCS books of East Slavic provenance, printed in the language reformed through the activity of west Russian authors and of Patriarch Nikon, do not represent a novel literary model and do not alter the existing language situation in any dramatic way.

Cibranska-Kostova notes that the research on NCS printed books and their connections to the Bulgarian linguistic reality is usually dominated by the following two kinds of activities:

1. Source material queries, consisting in locating, systematizing, and describing NCS old prints located in Bulgarian collections. The lack of a relevant aggregated catalog, be it at the national or at the international level (save for the available catalogs of Cyrillic incunabula and paleotypes published until 1600, discussed in detail in chapter 2) hampers this task to a considerable extent. Nevertheless, based on publications of partial scope offered by numerous authors (e.g., Atanasov 1964, 1978, 1982; Dilevski 1955, 1958, 1966, 1974), it is possible to distinguish the key functional groups of NCS printed books in the South Slavic and Balkan areas (though heterogeneous and incongruous from the typological perspective):
 - a. Literature covering liturgical needs. As a result of the numerous missions, envoys and other means of cultural exchange, a non-trivial number of Muscovite and Kyivan editions reaches the Bulgarian and Serbian lands; service is celebrated according to these books in churches and monasteries in the seventeenth century. At the time, all of the more important South Slavic monasteries maintain lively mutual relationships with Russian centers.
 - b. Literature covering educational needs. Printed books are used in the didactic process; importantly, knowledge is propagated not only by clergy, but also by lay teachers and grammarians, a fact that can be gleaned from the analysis of numerous provenance marks preserved in the margins of old prints.
 - c. Printed literature serving as a model for constantly produced new manuscripts. Old prints frequently function as protographs for South Slavic authors; in the process, they not only impose their formal structure (orthography, binding, decorative elements) on manuscripts, but also direct the attention of copyists, compilers, and authors toward new redactions and translations of works significant for medieval Slavic literature.
2. Theoretical interpretations aiming to locate the language of NCS printed books within the general theory and history of literary Bulgarian. De-

spite the contributions of scholars such as Ljubomir Andrejčič or Dora Ivanova-Mirčeva to this field of research, one must agree with Cibranska-Kostova's statement that "concrete investigations in which the textology, language and socio-cultural analysis simultaneously take into account the history of a given book or text are still few in number" (Cibranska-Kostova 2007: 82).

These methodological considerations—intended to lay out the rough stages of the rise and evolution of NCS and to highlight the role of the Slavic south in these processes—will be alluded to in the later parts of the work, especially in the chapter presenting the available inventory of South Slavic printed texts of the sixteenth century. First, however, it is necessary to discuss and resolve the basic problems in the taxonomy of the relevant books. This will be the objective of chapter 2.

NOTES

1. Adam Suprun and Aleksandr Moldovan—the authors of the article *Old Church Slavonic and Church Slavonic language (Staroslavjanskij i cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyk)*, included in the multi-author volume on the Slavic languages, itself forming part of the series *Languages of the World (Jazyki mira)* published in the recent years by the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences—state that the term "Church Slavonic" was first used in 1820 by Russian scholar Aleksandr Vostokov in his *Contemplation on the Slavic Language (Rassuždenie o slavjanskom jazyke)* (Suprun and Moldovan 2017: 36).

2. Needless to say, the chronology of the introduction of this variety as the liturgical (or even literary) language, as well as of its competition with the various local recensions of OCS, was different in the individual cases. Suprun and Moldovan note that NCS is currently in use as the liturgical language in the following Orthodox Churches: Russian (Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and other countries of the former USSR), Serbian (alongside Serbian—Serbia, Montenegro), Bulgarian (alongside Bulgarian), Macedonian (alongside Macedonian), Polish (alongside Polish), Czech-Slovak (alongside Czech and Slovak), and American (alongside English); it is also employed in certain other dioceses as well as in churches of an unresolved status. Furthermore, in the past, NCS functioned as the language of the Orthodox Church and state administration in Moldavia and Wallachia (Suprun, Moldovan 2017: 37–38).

3. Other terminological proposals of this type include (in English translation) "Late Church Slavonic," "Modern Church Slavonic" (Suprun, Moldovan 2017: 37, 47–48), or "Church Slavonic of the Modern Age" (Strach 2012); cf. also the publications by Czech (and Austrian) Slavists František V. Mareš (1992, 2000: 541–72) and Václav Čermák (2008). Furthermore, certain works employ the term "Synodal

Church Slavonic” (Mathiesen 1972; Picchio 2003: 401; Pletneva and Kraveckij 2014: 20 [chapter author: Viktor Živov]), which may be understood as the final, eighteenth-century product of the development of the NCS language.

4. *Naučnyj centr po izučeniju cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka pri Sektore istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka Instituta russkogo jazyka im. V.V. Vinogradova Ros-sijskoj Akademii nauk*: http://www.ruslang.ru/centre_church-slav (accessed May 6, 2020).

5. When quoting encyclopedic works or lexica, I resolve most of the abbreviations found in them.

6. A number of reprints of the dictionaries by D’jačenko and Petković have been published. In the present work, I refer to their first editions.

7. A number of reprints of both textbooks have been published. In the present work, I refer to their first editions.

8. Incidentally, it appears that in this regard Paleo-Slavic studies are, in a way, lagging behind the synchronic subdisciplines of Slavic philology.

9. Note that, throughout the book, the terms “Middle Ages” and “Medieval” are usually used with reference to the history of the Orthodox South Slavs, where the period in question is conventionally thought to extend several centuries longer than in the West.

10. Here, the author accuses the philologists of the individual languages of a nationalist attitude toward the common linguistic legacy of the Orthodox Slavs as well as of ascribing what he sees as an exaggerated rank (“dignity”) to the local variants of the supranational CS language (Old Russian, Old Bulgarian, Old Serbian).

11. We may add that another work that invokes the concept of a common literary and communicational space of the Orthodox Slavs is the newest monograph (published in Poland) by Bulgarian and Italian scholar Krasimir Stančev, a specialist in Paleo-Slavic studies and Bulgarian (Stančev 2012).

12. I made use of an electronic version of this work, available online (in scanned form) at the website www.academia.edu (accessed May 25, 2020).

13. Trunte is currently employed at the University of Cologne. Initially (until 1994), her works were signed with the name Hartmut Trunte, subsequently—Nikolaos Trunte or Nikolaos H. Trunte, whereas since 2014 the publications have been appearing under the name Nicolina Trunte.

14. An overview and critical discussion of the various terms containing the element *Slavia* can be found in the article by Krasimir Stančev entitled *Some words on the Slavia Orthodoxa and other Slavias (Neskol’ko slov o Slavia Orthodoxa i o drugix Slavijax)* (Stančev 2012: 15–33).

15. According to the information on the website <http://nikolaos-trunte.de/wissenschaftliche-publikationen/monographien> (accessed May 11, 2020).

16. As observed by Keipert, “In our time Church Slavonic is a ‘language without native speakers,’ but not in all respects a ‘dead’ one. It is for this reason that the Slavs have given it a great variety of names, the different use of which in philological publications heavily depends on the respective linguists’ connotative purposes (e.g. national, ideological etc. interests). As a rule, the description of the language is based on the analysis of written or printed texts. Only recently have a few additional corpora

been introduced besides the well-known group of the ‘classical’ Old Church Slavonic manuscripts, which for all their merits in the history of Slavistics can give only a vague idea of the rich language tradition of Church Slavonic as a whole, since, as a means of actual (oral) communication, it can nowadays only be observed in liturgy” (Keipert 2014: 1211).

17. In the survey that follows, I exclude what is regarded as the first attempt at a comprehensive history of the Bulgarian language, penned by Polish Slavist and ethnologist Antoni Kalina (1891); the work essentially does not cover the period of interest here and focuses heavily on issues in historical dialectology.

18. As noted by Ivan Duridanov, who translated Mladenov’s work into Bulgarian, both Mladenov and Conev in fact wrote historical grammars and not histories of the language—despite what the titles of their books would suggest (Mladenov 1979: 11).

19. I represent the chronological extent of the individual periods in the same way in which it is done in the work under discussion.

20. Another scholar who worked on similar topics, especially with regard to the early Bulgarian Revival period, is Nikolaj Dilevski (1958, 1974).

21. The author prefers the Bulgarian term *čerkovnoslavjanski* over *cărkovnoslavjanski*, claiming that the denotation of the two is not fully identical in the field of Bulgarian studies (Nikolova 2006: 155).

22. The scholar uses the term *cărkovnoslavjanski ezik* (“Church Slavonic language”) in the meaning that corresponds to “New Church Slavonic language” as employed in the present work. Hence, I will consistently use the term “New Church Slavonic” in the rest of the discussion.

23. In this regard, the NCS language of the time can be said to prove the universal dimension of the debate on the sacred nature of language. Further similar examples from the life of religious communities could be cited from both the past and the present of the Slavic (as well as the non-Slavic) world.

24. I concur with Cibranska-Kostova’s assessment that the expression “third South Slavic influence” is not an overly fortunate terminological choice—it equates (at the level of scholarly nomenclature) the historical writing-related contacts of Balkan and East Slavs (the so-called first and second Slavic influence) with contacts occurring within a single (i.e., East Slavic) language group.

Chapter Two

Incunabula and Cyrillic Old Prints

Questions of Taxonomy and Nomenclature

TERMINOLOGICAL REMARKS AND SYSTEMIC PROBLEMS

The invention and dissemination of print was one of the key factors that left a lasting impact on how texts are produced, reproduced, and used, and thus had a major bearing on language development. Its civilizational and cultural significance is obvious, and a detailed elucidation of this issue would be a superfluous truism at this point. From the research perspective, one should rather focus on the current state of knowledge about the history of printing in Slavic languages in the first centuries of its existence, and in the context of this book—primarily on the history of Cyrillic printing (it is also worth mentioning—at least briefly—the beginnings of Glagolitic printing, which preceded Cyrillic by almost a decade). Recent years have brought many new comprehensive material studies in this field, but also important summarizing works and extensive catalogs of all the Slavic printed sources that have been preserved to this day, some of them in the form of multivolume series. These publications, like all scholarly undertakings of such type (e.g., inventories, catalogs, or descriptions of manuscripts), are on the one hand a summary of many years of material and interpretative research, and on the other indicate new research perspectives and revealing areas that require further investigation.

Before discussing the history of Slavic printing and related research problems, it might be worthwhile to clarify terminology, especially because ambiguous and imprecise terms may be encountered in scholarly studies on these issues. The main focus is on the systematization (classification or typology) of chronology, geography, linguistic, content, and nomenclature of the entire corpus of the oldest printed Slavic sources, especially Bulgarian.

In the description of the sources in question, terms such as *incunabulum*, *old print*, *first print*, *paleotype*, and derivatives are commonly used. However, they require clarification, which, in turn, should bring terminological and methodological consistency.

The least doubts are raised by the term *incunabulum* (Bulgarian/Russian *inkunabul*), whose etymology (Latin *in cunabulis* = “in cradle,” “in diapers”) and conventional chronological range are widely accepted in the scholarly literature. According to the authors of the *Encyclopedia of the Book* (*Encyklopedia wiedzy o książce*), this term is used “to designate prints published from the invention of printing up to and including 1500” (i.e., all printed matter from the fifteenth century; Birkenmajer, Kocowski, and Trzynadlowski 1971: 1009). Similar definitions are provided in the relevant Bulgarian encyclopedias: “books from the ‘cradle’ period of printing: from Gutenberg’s editions until the end of the 15th century” (BKE 2004: 201), Russian ones “books from the earliest, ‘cradle’ period of printing; conventionally—books published in the interval between Gutenberg’s first efforts in the 1440s and January 1st, 1501” (Nemirovskij 2007a: 390), and in the most important and highly acclaimed German bibliological lexica, which also include the terms *Wiegendrucke*, literally “cradle prints”: “all books printed through the year 1500 are collectively referred to as *incunabula*, or ‘cradle prints’ (*Wiegendrucke*). . . . Hence, in reference to early prints until 1500, it appears more appropriate to replace the largely ambiguous *incunabulum* with the term ‘cradle print’ (*Wiegendruck*), which is gaining more and more currency” (LB 1952: 350–351) or *Frühdrucke* (“early prints,” less clear in terms of chronology):

A printed work from the early days of printing; also used with reference to genre and chronology. This term, still applied in a quite inconsistent manner, mostly functions as a synonym for *incunabulum*, i.e. referring to printed works and the art of printing from their inception through the year 1500; occasionally, however, it also comprises all prints until 1520, 1530 or even 1550, or alternatively only the phase following the *incunabula* period until one of the three chronological limits mentioned above. (LGB 1991: 69)

In many studies, sources that are the subject of the present work are also labeled with a more general and much broader name in terms of chronological scope (i.e., *old print* [Bulgarian/Russian *staropečatna/ja kniga*]), although its use is not uniform in different countries and research traditions. According to the Polish specialist encyclopedia, these are

publications from the period from the invention of printing until the end of the eighteenth century (December 31, 1800), and thus also *incunabula*. In different time periods and countries, a different date was adopted to mark the end of the old print era, depending on critical dates in the history of a given state or its lit-

erature. Recently, it has been decided almost all over the world that it would be the year 1800. . . . Old prints are characterized by the manual production of all their components: paper, typography, illustrations and binding. (Birkenmajer, Kocowski, and Trzynadlowski 1971: 2225)

The Russian encyclopedia gives a similar definition, indicating discrepancies in the usage of the term: “Old print—a conventional designation for books published within a particular period of time following the rise of printing. The chronological boundaries of the application of the term ‘old print’ differ from country to country. In Russia, it has been applied to books printed in the 16th–17th (more rarely 18th) centuries; in Bulgaria—between 1806 and 1878; etc.” (Nemirovskij 2007a: 698).

The discrepancy between the use of the equivalent of the term *old print* in Russia and Bulgaria, mentioned in the previous definition, requires further clarification. As far as the history of literature and printed book in Bulgaria is concerned, it should be noted that the majority of approaches are dominated by the classification tradition (concerning various levels of systematization), which is most clearly reflected in the works of Ivan Bogdanov. In his book *Bălgarskata kniga prez vekovete (The Bulgarian Book Over the Centuries)* (Bogdanov 1978), referring to several earlier publications, a division into two basic chronological stages was introduced: “Bulgarian first prints” (*bălgarska pĕrvopeĕatna kniga*, 1508–1801) and “Bulgarian old prints” (*bălgarska staropeĕatna kniga*, 1806–1877). The author justifies the rigid criteria for separating these two stages as follows:

The first prints of Bulgarian origin occupy a distinguished place in the history of the Bulgarian book. In view of their specific characteristics, they are set apart as a distinct complex with the chronological coordinates of 1508–1801, i.e. the dates of the publication of the first and last such book, respectively.¹ Although some of them were published even after the end of the Revival period, they reflect a Pre-Revival spirit.

And one more quote:

The chronological boundaries of Bulgarian old prints cover the output published after the appearance of the last of the “first prints” and before the printing of the first book in free Bulgaria, following the liberation from Ottoman rule. Accordingly, the chronological coordinates of the period are the year 1806—the date of the publication of *Kiriakodromion, or Nedelnik (Kiriakodromion sireĕ Nedelnik)* by Sophronius of Vratsa, the first book printed in New Bulgarian—and the end of the year 1877,² i.e. the date when the last Bulgarian book was published under the conditions of Ottoman rule. (Bogdanov 1978: 182, 217–18)

The terms Bogdanov uses to describe two separate stages of development of the Bulgarian printed book do not correspond to the common terminological practice. Besides, the mere separation of these stages based on chronological criteria indicated by the author may raise serious doubts, as it refers to heterogeneous (linguistic, cultural, political) events considered to be turning points. Certainly, the choice of the term “first print” (Bulg. *pārvopečatna kniga*), which in Polish terminology should correspond to one with a different semantic field, namely *pierwodruk* (i.e., “the first edition of a work, both self-contained and not self-contained in terms of publishing,” *editio princeps* [Birkenmajer, Kocowski, and Trzynadlowski 1971: 1836]), is rather unfortunate. The term proposed by Bogdanov for the first stage certainly refers to the noun “first printer” (Bulg. *pārvopečatnik*), which applies to the precursors and initiators of printing art in Slavic countries,³ but it can be misleading, especially that in the period before 1801 many reprints were published, and the name of the proper precursors of Bulgarian printing should possibly be retained only for sixteenth-century printers. The term for the second stage (“old prints,” Bulg. *staropečatni knigi*), after 1801, is most frequently used in international scholarly literature to designate stage one, as confirmed by Polish and Russian studies cited previously.

Attempts to partially overcome the afore-mentioned shortcomings of Bogdanov’s terminological proposals have been made in more recent Bulgarian publications, although they are still mechanically applied and replicated in the literature on the subject, which will be discussed subsequently. The authors of the recently published encyclopedia of the Bulgarian book propose the following definition:

Old prints—a conventional term for books published within a particular period of time following the rise of printing in a given country. The chronological scope of the Bulgarian old prints ranges from the beginning of the 16th century, when Slavic Cyrillic printing is introduced, to the year 1878. . . . Bulgarian old prints can be divided into “first prints” and the printed output of the Revival era (in the literature, the term “Bulgarian old prints” is often used with the Revival prints in mind). . . . The Bulgarian first prints are an integral part of South Slavic book printing. . . . The upper chronological boundary of the period in which they are published is the year 1806, when the process of more frequent printing begins with Sophronius of Vratsa’s *Nedelnik*. (BKE 2004: 412)

Moreover, this encyclopedia does not have a separate entry for “first print” (*pārvopečatna kniga*).

Among the terms discussed previously, which systematize the history of the Slavic printed book in chronological terms, there is also *paleotype* (Bulgarian/Russian *paleotip*), from which the word *paleotypy* (*paleotipija*) is

derived, which—like paleography—is a philological subdiscipline, studying the oldest prints.⁴ Bogdanov does mention this term (although he virtually never uses it) (Bogdanov 1978: 164), whereas Cibranska-Kostova uses it constantly when she characterizes the South Slavic writing situation in the sixteenth century, indicating its chronological framework: from the beginning of 1501 (after incunabula) until the beginning of 1551. The author also notes that the terms “first prints” (*p̄rvopečatni knigi*) or “early prints” (*ranni pečatni knigi*) can be used alongside the terms *incunabula* and *paleotypes*; however, these terms also describe those books up to 1600 that do not fit chronologically into the group of incunabula or paleotypes (Cibranska-Kostova 2007: 9). Let us note, however, that in her works, Cibranska-Kostova does not comment on these issues in more detail, nor does she build a coherent terminological system.

It should be noted that in Polish literature the term *paleotyp* is not very widespread, as evidenced, for example, by the absence of this entry in the *Encyclopedia of the Book* cited previously (in some Polish dictionaries, it is registered as a synonym for the term *incunabulum*). The entry *paleotip* does not appear in the afore-mentioned Bulgarian encyclopedia, which, in turn, may seem rather surprising. However, it is present in the Russian encyclopedia: “Paleotypes (from Gr. *παλαιός*—‘old’ and *τύπος*—‘print’)—printed editions from the first half of the 16th century” (Nemirovskij 2007a: 561–62). Although the date marking the beginning of the use of the word *paleotype* (January 1, 1501) is understandable—albeit arbitrary and purely formal—because it separates the symbolically distinct incunabula era from later centuries, the end point (December 31, 1550) seems completely artificial and unjustified, at least with regard to the history of the Slavic book. However, taking into account the etymology of the term itself, it can be treated simply as a synonym for the Polish *starodruk*—“old print,” which has the broadest chronological scope.

Based on a critical analysis of the terminology in the field of chronology of the Slavic printed book in the scholarly literature, the following solutions have been adopted in the present work:

1. The term *incunabulum* is used in its generally accepted meaning to denote prints created only in the fifteenth century.
2. The terms “*old print*” and “*paleotype*” are treated as synonyms and used to designate any printed book published in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries.
3. The term “*first print*” in the meaning akin to the Bulgarian *p̄rvopečatna kniga* is not used; it is applied only when referring to the first edition of a work.

4. Coining a special term for the designation of manuscripts and printed books between 1806 and 1877/1878 is considered to be pointless; as regards this writing production, it is proposed to use the term “*Bulgarian Revival book / Revival literature*” (*bálgarska vǎzroždenska kniga/vǎzroždenska knižnina*), which already exists in scholarly writings covering both manuscripts and printed works from that era.
5. The term *paleotypy* is used to denote the subdiscipline that focuses on studying old books (until the end of the eighteenth century) and secondarily to denote the source base of this subdiscipline or the historical process of its creation (e.g., *Glagolitic paleotypy*, *South Slavic paleotypy*, *sixteenth-century paleotypy*, etc.).

When working with texts on the subject, including foreign-language works (whether Slavic, Western European, or American), one should be aware of some additional simplifications or terminological habits that may be the source of misunderstandings. As Evgenij Nemirovskij (2003a: 7–8) notes:

In discussions of Slavic typography, printing in Cyrillic—which began in Cracow in the 1490s—is usually tacitly implied. Meanwhile, the Slavic nations . . . had also made use of other alphabets. The first Czech book to see the light of day (according to the findings of some researchers—still within Gutenberg’s lifetime, in 1468) was printed in blackletter. In Polish lands, printing in the Latin type started in 1474. The first South Slavic printed book, published in 1483, was produced in a distinct Slavic type—Glagolitic.

In the tradition of Polish Slavic studies, this terminological problem is probably less noticeable, although for greater precision and consistency it seems better to use complex and unambiguous terms such as “Slavic Cyrillic printing.”

It should be added that Slavic printing as a whole, at the highest (and most obvious) classification level, is sometimes systematized not only on the basis of the graphic system used in it (from the 1470s—Latin type, since the 1480s—Glagolitic, and since the 1990s—Cyrillic), but also based on the confessional affiliation of the intended readership of the publication. In reference to the oldest history of the Slavic paleotypy, the division into Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant printing is particularly emphasized when it comes to Cyrillic printing (although there were also Glagolitic Protestant prints)—the use of this alphabet for the purposes of Catholic and Protestant publications, considered secondary, dates back to the sixteenth century (Pet vekova 1994: 14, 21–24, 189). Of course, the division into Orthodox, Catholic, or Protestant paleotypes is simplistic and to some extent conventional, determined by the level of our knowledge of the confessional affiliation and the publisher’s intentions, as well

as the circle of potential recipients of a given work. Nevertheless, the vast majority of Cyrillic paleotypes are classified as “Orthodox printing.”

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SOURCE BASE AND THE STATE OF ITS DESCRIPTION

In recent years, Cyrillic incunabulistics (and more broadly—paleotypy) has been enriched by a number of important studies, which should be presented in more detail. I would like to point out in advance that I am not going to include many important but partial catalogs and descriptions of individual collections, also those which are interesting due to the subject matter of this work and will be used in its subsequent sections, such as the catalog of Cyrillic prints from the fifteenth to sixteenth century intended for South Slavs and Romanians from the collection of the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg (Luk’janenko 1979). A list of all published inventories, both collective and presenting the resources of each major book collection or arranged according to a different criterion (e.g., extant incunabula or paleotypes from a specific printing press), is included in the first part of the references section at the end of this book.

Focusing on comprehensive studies, we should first of all point to three closely connected initiatives—all monumental in terms of intention and implementation, albeit as of yet not completed—by Russian bibliographer and historian Evgenij Nemirovskij, author of several hundred detailed studies and summarizing monographs on the history of printed Cyrillic books. The first of these initiatives is the multivolume *Aggregated Catalogue of Early Cyrillic Prints* (*Gesamtkatalog der Frühdrucke in kyrillischer Schrift*) published since 1996 in Baden-Baden in the series “Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana” and listing all currently known copies of the oldest Cyrillic incunabula and old prints (Nemirovskij I 1996, II 1997, III 1998, IV 2001, IV 2001, V 1999, VI 2003, VII 2007). Practically the entire first series of the catalog (nine planned volumes, out of which seven have been published so far) is intended to cover the period from the end of the fifteenth century (1491) until the first half of the sixteenth century (1547) and describes a total of seventy-seven editions (over eight hundred copies) of sixteen Slavic graphic types (Nemirovskij 2005c: 131). The catalog also includes extensive essays (in German and Russian) concerning the activities of the first Cyrillic printing houses in Europe. The description of each recorded title consists—apart from basic information and bibliographical characteristics—of a very detailed list of contents of a given book; an index of all forewords, annotations, and conclusions added to the main text; the characteristics of all copies of a given

book that have been preserved, lost, or are known only from the literature; a list of provenance records and marginalia in these copies; and an exhaustive bibliography. Moreover, each volume of the catalog concludes with an extensive synoptic listings apparatus and an album with illustrations.

In terms of chronology, a continuator of Nemirovskij's catalog, published in Germany, is the Moscow-based researcher Aleksandra Guseva, author of a two-volume collection of Cyrillic old prints from the second half of the sixteenth century (Guseva 2003), in which she describes in detail 219 editions (3,710 copies) of Cyrillic books and their fragments from twenty-seven European printing centers. This book not only systematically and thoroughly presents information about the Cyrillic paleotypes preserved to this day, currently located in 247 cities around the world, but also features—in phototypic or critical form—all additional texts found on the pages of the prints registered in the catalog: “particular attention is paid to dedications, forewords, afterwords, poems and prayers of the printers (‘laborers’), privileges and other supporting articles; they are fully reproduced in the Aggregated catalog, either in facsimile or typeset” (Guseva 2003: 10–11). It is worth noting that the language of each edition is also indicated in the catalog, with the vast majority of paleotypes representing Church Slavonic in various recensions. According to the author's findings, eighty editions can be qualified as the East Slavonic recension (in the terminology of the edition—“Church Slavonic” [*cerkovnoslavjanskij*] without any additional qualifiers), twenty-four editions as the Middle Bulgarian recension, and twenty-one as Serbian. A separate phenomenon is the so-called hybrid (mixed) language base: thirteen editions. In addition, there are Cyrillic texts printed in the so-called *prostaja mova* based on Middle Belarusian or Middle Ukrainian (thirteen), in Romanian (eleven), Croatian (eleven), in the chancery language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (four), and even Latin (one). The language of the accompanying texts is also, as a rule, Church Slavonic, with some exceptions (e.g., foreword or afterword written in *prostaja mova*, Croatian, German, Romanian, or Latin). Bilingual prints should also be noted, represented by Middle Bulgarian-Romanian books (three) as far as South Slavic paleotypes are concerned. As Guseva (2003: 11–12) stresses, “the language of the old prints was never the object of a separate linguistic investigation,” therefore these findings should be treated as preliminary in a number of cases.

In 2009, Nemirovskij began publishing a slightly modified, abbreviated, and simplified version of his catalog in Russia, as a series entitled *Slavic Editions in Cyrillic (Church Slavonic) Type 1491–2000. Inventory of Preserved Copies and Index of Literature (Slavjanske izdanija kirillovskogo [cerkovnoslavjanskogo] šrifta 1491–2000. Inventar' soxranivšixsja èkzempljarov i ukazatel' literatury)*. In this edition, in contrast to the German catalog, there

is no detailed description of the content of the editions and no more precise presentation of the state of the preserved copies and fragments (although a full list of copies and fragments together with their location and reference numbers is included). Two volumes of the series have been published so far: the first includes eighty editions from 1491–1550 (Nemirovskij 2009a), and the second (published in two parts) includes 190 editions from 1551–1600 (Nemirovskij 2011; 2012).⁵ Both volumes also rectify the data on a total of 235 editions described in the scholarly literature which, according to the author of the catalog, most probably never existed or were misidentified. The publication is preceded by an introduction on the history of Cyrillic bibliography of Slavic old prints, whereas each volume begins—as in the German catalog—with an essay outlining the history of Cyrillic printing in the period covered by the volume.⁶

It is worth noting the dynamics of Cyrillic printing development in the first centuries of its existence, characterized by Nemirovskij and Guseva (some figures in both catalogs differ, but this does not impact the overall picture). Since the mid-sixteenth century, there was more than a double increase in both the typographic production (of course, we should remember that this applies only to known editions, preserved to this day), as well as the number of printing centers producing it. Nemirovskij lists ten places where Cyrillic books were printed from 1491 to 1550: Cetinje (Montenegro),⁷ Goražde (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Cracow, Prague, Târgoviște (Romania), Venice, Vilnius, and three Serbian monastic centers: Gračanica, Mileševa, and Rujno. Over the subsequent fifty years (1551–1600) it is more than twenty cities, towns, and villages: Aleksandrovskaia Sloboda/Aleksandrov (Russia), Alba Iulia (Romania), Belgrade, Braşov (Romania), Bucharest, Venice, Vilnius, Zabłudów, Kazan, Lviv, Moscow, Nyasvizh (Belarus), Orăştie (Romania), Ostroh (Ukraine), Rome, Sebeş (Romania), Sibiu (Romania), Shkodër (Albania), Târgoviște, Tübingen or Bad Urach (Germany), Cjapina (Belarus), as well as two Serbian monasteries: Mileševa and Mrkšina crkva. This list should be expanded with three German cities: Wittenberg, Hamburg, and Frankfurt am Main, where books were published in Latin or Hebrew typeface, but with Cyrillic insertions. The largest number of editions, over sixty (32–34 percent in relation to the total Cyrillic publishing output of that period), were published in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, where the Mamonicz printing press, based in Vilnius, was the leader (over forty editions from 1574–1600). The second place in terms of the number of printed titles goes to Romanian printing houses, including those associated with the activity of the deacon named Coresi, as well as his disciples and companions (fewer than forty editions, including those printed in Cyrillic in Romanian, from 1557–1588). Third on the list is the Lesser Russian (Ukrainian) Ostroh, which in 1578–1598 published

over twenty editions, including the famous *Ostroh Bible* from 1580–1581. Finally, the second half of the sixteenth century was the time when the first printed Church Slavonic textbooks were published—abecedaries, primers, and grammars (Guseva 2003: 9–10, 1290–96; Nemirovskij 2011: 7, 535–36; 2012: 219; 2015). All these geographical, and therefore consequently dialectal, circumstances certainly had a significant impact on linguistic issues in the entire *Slavia Orthodoxa* area.

Looking at the general dynamics of the development of Cyrillic printing in a historical perspective, it might be worthwhile to supplement the preceding data with the information collected and arranged by American researcher Robert Mathiesen, already quoted in chapter 1. Based on extensive scattered data, he proposed comparative quantitative breakdowns that demonstrate that from the end of the fifteenth to the end of the eighteenth century a total of 4,997 editions printed in “Old Cyrillic” were published, which can be broken down into individual centuries as follows: fifteenth century, 8; sixteenth century, 269; seventeenth century, 1,084; eighteenth century, 3,636 (Mathiesen 1992: 15; 2004: 9).⁸ It should be added that while compiling these statistics, Mathiesen was unable to use the latest collective catalogs, which at present still do not cover the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when most of the paleotypes were published.

It seems that at present both the German catalog and the richly illustrated (which is worth emphasizing) inventory and Moscow index by Nemirovskij, as well as Guseva’s extensive study, provide the most complete picture of the source base for the comprehensive history of the Cyrillic paleotype of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

This is also the subject of Evgenij Nemirovskij’s third, likewise unfinished initiative—a synthesis of Cyrillic printing, based on as complete a source material as possible and with systematic inclusion of the existing remarkably extensive literature on the subject. Three beautifully illustrated volumes of the *History of Slavic Cyrillic Printing of the 15th–Early 17th Centuries (Istorija slavjanskogo kirillovskogo knjigopečatanija XV–načala XVII veka)* have been published so far: the first (Nemirovskij 2003a) concerns the very beginning of Cyrillic printing in the Cracow workshop of Schweipolt Fiol (1491–c. 1493), the second (published in two parts) (Nemirovskij 2005a, 2005b) describes the functioning of the first Cyrillic printing house in the South Slavic area—that of Đurađ Crnojević, in Cetinje, Montenegro (1494–1496), whereas the third (Nemirovskij 2008a) is devoted to the printing press of Monk Makarije (1508–1512), which operated in the territory of present-day Romania (Wallachia) and is considered by some researchers to have been the first Bulgarian printing house. According to the announcement (Nemirovskij 2007b, 2008b), the series will also include volumes on the Prague and Vilnius

editions of Francysk Skaryna, the Venetian printing houses of the Vukovićs, Serbian monastery printing houses, as well as the Moscow, Zabłudów, Lviv, and Ostroh editions published by Ivan Fedorov.

It is worth noting that such monumental publishing initiatives have their basis in Nemirovskij's earlier books, which include many monographs, outlines, catalogs, lexica, and encyclopedias, concerning various figures, facts, and events from the history of Slavic printed books and book studies in general.⁹ These works would not have been possible without the systematic examination of the achievements of many predecessors who studied and described Slavic old prints, and who are abundantly quoted in Nemirovskij's texts (some of these studies will be cited later).

Among the latest publications by Bulgarian researchers focusing on Cyrillic paleotypy, particularly worth mentioning is Nikolaj Teodosiev's *Catalogue of Bulgarian Printed Books 1508–1878* (*Katalog na bălgarskite pečatni knigi 1508–1878*) (Teodosiev 2007), even though the oldest sources, published until the end of the eighteenth century, only constitute a small part of the whole study (91 titles out of 2,227 recorded in the catalog), and their description as well as the author's historical-linguistic introduction are far from the thoroughness expected in such publications. The author, following in the footsteps of Bogdanov (mentioned previously), introduces a distinction between so-called first prints (*părvopečatni knigi*, 1508–1801) and old prints (*staropečatni knigi*, 1802–1878), also distinguishing periodicals in a separate section (periodical publications [*periodični izdanija*], 1842–1878). The main criterion for such a chronological division is—according to the author (who disagrees with Bogdanov in this respect)—the language of the texts described:

The language used in old Bulgarian printed editions serves as a fairly clear distinguishing feature between first prints and old prints. First prints are usually composed in (literary!) Middle Bulgarian, used in three variants: 1. Middle Bulgarian in its two redactions—Eastern and Western. 2. Middle Bulgarian, mixed with Croatian, Russian and/or Church Slavonic. 3. Middle Bulgarian, mixed with New Bulgarian and other Slavic languages. . . . In old prints, New Bulgarian dominates. Exceptions include certain liturgical books, written in Church Slavonic, as well as some authors' isolated attempts to write in some sort of modernized variant of Old or Middle Bulgarian, mixed with New Bulgarian. (Teodosiev 2007: 7, 18)

There is no doubt that the issue of language is closely related to the development of paleotypes in countries from the *Slavia Orthodoxa* area; however, based on this quote, it is evident that the author of the catalog does not strive for conceptual, terminological, and categorizing precision and does not take

into account many important aspects of language development (such as the remains of the archaicizing reform of Patriarch Euthymius or the broadly understood—in chronological and systemic terms—Serbian influence). Thus the division of sources he employs—following his predecessors—should be considered arbitrary and mechanical, as well as artificial for the overview of the history of Bulgarian printing.

Earlier sources, especially from the sixteenth century, are discussed by probably the most competent Bulgarian expert on Cyrillic old prints, Marijana Cibranska-Kostova, quoted previously many times. She is the author of two important books, among other publications: 1) a collection of studies on Cyrillic paleotypy from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century (Cibranska-Kostova 2007), which, apart from essays on Montenegrin incunabula and later Venetian editions by Jakov Krajkov, contains a monographic study on the relationship between Cyrillic old prints and the Church Slavonic language (see chapter 1); and 2) a monograph on one of the most important texts by Jakov Krajkov—a collection of prayers for various occasions (1571–1572) (Cibranska-Kostova 2013; see also Petrov 2014). Although her works are not catalogs nor descriptions of the source corpus, they may constitute an important reference not only from the material and analytical point of view, but, above all, from the perspective of research methodology.

It will be also worth mentioning here the latest multiauthor encyclopedia already referred to earlier, entitled *The Bulgarian Book (Bălgarska kniga)* (BKE 2004). Although this publication does not address historical issues fully and exhaustively (instead, it is more focused on technical issues, names, and contemporary bibliological phenomena), it may constitute an important point of reference for many issues, serving as a kind of compendium of the contemporary state of research on the Bulgarian book.

Cyrillic paleotypy has also been studied by many Yugoslav researchers, mainly Serbian, Montenegrin, and Macedonian. One of them is the Belgrade-based art historian Dejan Medaković, author of *The Graphic Aspect of Serbian Printed Books of the 15th–17th Centuries (Grafika srpskih štampanih knjiga XV–XVII veka)* (Medaković 1958), which continues to be a must-read for all researchers interested in South Slavic old prints.¹⁰ This publication contains a detailed catalog of thirty-nine known incunabula and paleotypes (called Serbian by the author) published in Montenegro, Serbia, and Venice from 1494 to 1638, with detailed characteristics of the preserved illustrations, ornaments, initials, typeface, and other aspects of the graphic design of these books. Based on the analysis of the content (mainly forewords and afterwords) and the graphic aspect of the source texts, Medaković reconstructs and characterizes many factual details, determining the mutual relationships between specific South Slavic old prints and typographic centers, and indicating

the points of convergence between the then Serbian and Romanian, Russian, and Greek printing, thus outlining the paths of mutual influence in the overall history of Cyrillic and Balkan paleotypy.

Other Serbian researchers who have contributed significantly to the research on the philological aspects of Cyrillic old prints for Serbs, Romanians, and Bulgarians include Lazar Čurčić, Katarina Mano-Zisi, Mitar Pešikan, Aleksandar Mladenović, Jasmina Grković-Major, Nadežda R. Sindik, Miroslav Lazić, and many others. I will cite the more important, detailed works by these scholars in chapter 3 of this book.

Also worth mentioning is a monograph by Macedonian Slavist Mihajlo Georgievski, entitled *Macedonian Printing (1515–1913) (Makedonskata pečatarska dejnost [1515–1913])* (Georgievski 1972), which contains a brief overview of the most important stages in the history of South Slavic Cyrillic printing houses. It should be noted, however, that this publication, although it is a kind of synthesis, is above all intended as a popularizing text and lacks any systematic analysis and interpretation of sources, not to mention the questionable and arbitrary inclusion of virtually all the artifacts of the paleotypy in question (starting with some editions by Božidar Vuković and concluding with the activity of Hristofor Žefarović) exclusively in the Macedonian cultural heritage, declared as one of the main goals of the book: “In my presentation of the printing output, I tried to give a clear idea of all that which the neighboring nations claim as their own, but which is in fact Macedonian” (Georgievski 1972: 6).

In Poland, Cyrillic printing has also often been a subject of interest to scholars, which should not come as a surprise if one considers the places where the first incunabula (along with a significant number of paleotypes and old prints) set in this typeface were published. Although the resources of Polish book collections are not the most extensive in this respect, especially in terms of the oldest prints, the interest of Polish Slavists and bibliologists in both the Cracow incunabula of Schweipolt Fiol and the subsequent Cyrillic paleotypes and old prints created in other locations in the First Republic of Poland is worth noting. Among the general works of documentary and encyclopedic character (featuring valuable and in-depth information on the subject of this volume) particularly worth mentioning is a multivolume encyclopedic and dictionary series entitled *Printers of Old Poland from the 15th to the 18th Centuries (Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku)*, published since 1959 on the initiative of and edited by Alodia Kawecka-Gryczowa and her successors,¹¹ referring to the nineteenth-century publications by Jerzy Samuel Bandtkie and Joachim Lelewel.

In the 1990s and 2000s, several catalogs and descriptions of Cyrillic paleotypes were published in Poland, with indices of the resources of individual

book collections: *Catalogue of Cyrillic Old Prints of the Castle Museum in Łańcut* (Katalog starodruków cyrylickich Muzeum Zamku w Łańcucie, Katalog 1994), *Catalogue of Supraśl Old Prints* (Katalog druków supraskich, Katalog 1996), *Catalogue of Cyrillic Prints from the 15th to 18th Centuries in the Collection of the National Library* (Katalog druków cyrylickich XV–XVIII wieku w zbiorach Biblioteki Narodowej, Katalog 2004), or—one of the most recent—*Cyrillic Orthodox Church Old Prints of the 17th–18th Centuries from the Collection of Church Institutions and Orthodox Parishes of the Lesser Poland Region* (Cyrylickie starodruki cerkiewne XVII–XVIII w. ze zbiorów instytucji kościelnych i parafii prawosławnych województwa małopolskiego, Katalog 2010) or *Catalogue of Cyrilliac* [sic] *Prints from the 16th to the 18th Centuries in the Collection of the Library of the Basilian Monastery in Warsaw* (Katalog druków cyrylicznych [sic] XVI–XVIII wieków w zbiorach biblioteki klasztoru oo. Bazylianów w Warszawie, Katalog 2013). Another important work from the point of view of documentation and sources is the monograph by Zoja Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew entitled *Cyrillic Printing from the Publishing Houses of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 16th–18th Centuries* (Druki cyrylickie z oficyn Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI–XVIII wieku) (Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew 2003), which offers a detailed review and comparison of typographic production of several publishing centers and characterizes 336 copies of prints (174 editions) from Polish and foreign collections in terms of subject matter and graphic design. Another important publication is the collective work entitled *Orthodox Publishing Houses in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth* (Prawosławne oficyny wydawnicze w Rzeczypospolitej) (Mironowicz, Pawluczuk, and Chomik 2004). It seems that all these initiatives indicate the need for a collective catalog of printed “Cyrillic Polonica,” similar to the recently compiled and published catalog of Church Slavonic manuscripts in Poland (Naumow 2004).

In conclusion of these general comments on scholarly literature, we must address the availability of the sources presented in the subsequent chapter and their editions. Except for a few exceptions, which include texts that are particularly important for all Orthodox Slavs (e.g., the *Ostroh Bible*, 1580–1581) or for the development of the national culture of individual nations (e.g., Francysk Skaryna, Ivan Fedorov), and that have critical editions and translations of accompanying additional texts (foreword, afterword, etc.) into contemporary languages, a significant part of incunabula and paleotypes only have phototypic editions, made on the basis of one (usually the most complete) copy or several preserved copies (based on a complementary compilation). Detailed bibliographical data of these editions are provided at the end of this book in the “List of Source Text Editions.” Unfortunately, however, not all interesting texts have been made available to researchers. In this context,

it is worth noting a number of important initiatives aimed at making Slavic paleotypy widely available and facilitating contact with source texts outside the direct work with book collections. First, in the recent years some libraries and institutions have implemented extensive programs for digitization and offering open access to photographs or scans of their manuscripts and printed editions. In this context, the project of the Russian State Library in Moscow, one of the biggest Cyrillic libraries in the world (about thirty thousand items; Nemirovskij 2009b: 5), is particularly significant.¹² Projects of such kind are, of course, also currently carried out in other libraries in other countries. Secondly, scanned copies are also published on digital media—CDs or DVDs. Here, the afore-mentioned Moscow library has made a particularly important contribution, releasing a DVD developed in collaboration with UNESCO, entitled *Slavic Editions in Cyrillic Type of the 15th–16th Centuries (Slavjanske izdanija kirillovskogo šrifta XV–XVI vekov)* and edited by Irina Morozova (academic consultant—Nemirovskij), featuring full texts of fifty-five Cyrillic incunabula and paleotypes from 1491–1550 (Morozova 2002).¹³

ANAGRAPHIC TEXTS IN PALEOTYPES

Research on Cyrillic Slavic paleotypy—focusing both on the linguistic aspects of old prints and their place in the history of medieval written communication among Slavs and on the history of particular printing presses, books, and genres—has an important and special source material, whose significance and unique character are emphasized in virtually all studies. This concerns additional records, the so-called metatexts, which, in relation to the main text of a given book, constitute a separate platform for analysis and comparison (dedications, forewords, afterwords, prayers of printers, colophons, etc.) in terms of genre and language. The importance and significance of these microworks, which are also a crucial part of the manuscript literature of medieval Slavs, has been recently addressed by Izabela Lis-Wielgosz, a Poznań-based Paleo-Slavist, who analyzed the models of their functioning in Old Serbian literature (Lis-Wielgosz 2013: 153–211). These metatexts form a separate—from the genological point of view—group of historical-literary and historical-linguistic sources and are marked in the subject literature with various terms, not always entirely precise and unambiguous: *records, comments, notes, inscriptions, marginalia, colophons* (Pol. *zapisy, uwagi, dopiski, inskrypcje, marginalia, kolofony*), and others. Determining the constitutive attributes of genres and the possible internal typology of these relatively small texts is, of course, a task for the historian of literature, and there is an extensive body of materials on the subject. However, this is also important

from the point of view of the history of language: it is necessary to draw up a genealogy of sources, even a simplified one, as genre to a certain extent determines the linguistic form of a given text, increasing or reducing its susceptibility to changes resulting from the evolution of language or, conversely, from the petrification of tradition.

In the majority of studies on the historical development of the Bulgarian language, the source texts analyzed in the form of codices¹⁴ are classified both based on their chronological nature (texts from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, respectively, etc. [Mirčev 1978: 15–29]) and on the basis of their content, genre, as well as linguistic and stylistic characteristics (Haralampiev 2001: 15). Based on the latter (comprehensive) criterion, two main groups of texts can be distinguished—canonical and so-called non-canonical. The first group is characterized by a direct link to the liturgical tradition of the Orthodox Church and a relatively unchanged content and arrangement of elements (examples include numerous liturgical and biblical genres—evangelia, psalters, prayer books, etc.). The second group is very diverse, including both texts on religious topics, albeit not directly related to church practice (didactic texts, apocrypha, sermons, some lives of saints), as well as volumes that contain secular texts (chronicles, letters, official documents). The general linguistic characteristics of this group of texts make it significantly distinct from the first group, because the lack of a close connection with the church canon gave writers, copyists, and printers relatively greater freedom, and the language of non-canonical texts was more easily penetrated by new forms, syntactic structures, and lexis, typical of living speech (Haralampiev 2001: 15). All of the medieval Bulgarian source texts can be divided into three parts: 1) religious texts of a canonical nature; 2) non-canonical religious texts; and 3) secular texts (cf. Petrov 2007b: 508–09). This preliminary typology, however, does not essentially cover other genres forms that appear alongside the main text.

In Bulgarian literature on Paleo-Slavic topics we find two basic terms used to denote all the microworks discussed herein: *pripiski* and *beležki* (“annotations,” “notes”). They are defined as text additions outside the principal text of a given manuscript or old print (SLER 2003: 405–06, author of the entry: Donka Petkanova; see also Stančev 1995: 106). Their internal differentiation has been described by a scholar of medieval literature and Bulgarian paleotype, Božidar Rajkov, in the introduction to the two-volume edition of these texts extracted from tenth- to eighteenth-century Bulgarian manuscripts¹⁵ (Hristova, Karadžova, and Uzunova 2003: 3–22; 2004; cf. also BKE 2004: 365–66).

First, a class of primary annotations (Bulg. *pārvični*) from the author/scribe (and therefore also the publisher/printer) of a given book is distinguished,

along with the class of secondary annotations (Bulg. *vtorični*) from third parties. This second group of additions, which is a source of valuable information about the history of the book, its changing owners, readers, or buyers, is most often described in the scholarly literature as *provenance records* (Ru. *vladel'českie zapisi*).

Rajkov's primary annotations are divided into two successive subclasses: basic (Bulg. *osnovni*) and accompanying (Bulg. *săprovoždašti*). The former includes texts of a more official and normalized character (often containing fixed formulae) (e.g., commemorating the place and time of the book's creation, the name of the copyist [printer], information about the rulers or hierarchs of those times, etc.). This subclass of additions is found in forewords, afterwords, and colophons. The second group is represented by texts in which the circumstances accompanying the work on the book may be recorded (usually the so-called *marginalia* due to the place of their placement in the book) or comments on its individual fragments (e.g., *scholia* or *glosses*).

Each of the separate classes and subclasses, namely, 1) basic primary notes, 2) accompanying primary notes, and 3) secondary notes, may be a separate subject of research as part of the external history of the language and historical grammar. It is worth noting that from the methodological point of view it is necessary to strive for terminological precision, because the frequently used interchangeable terms *inscriptions*, *colophons*, *marginalia*, *records*, etc., are different artifacts from the typological, genre, and linguistic point of view. Of course, the development of such a systematization and a complete terminological apparatus is not within the scope of this volume, which is focused primarily on the first group of annotations in the context of the history of South Slavic paleotypy. Therefore, it is worth noting one more terminological proposal presented by Cibranska-Kostova.

In her latest book on the typographic activity of Jakov Krajkov, the Bulgarian researcher introduced the term *anagraph* (Bulg. *anagraf*) to denote the basic primary notes (to use Rajkov's terminology). She considers anagraphs to be additional microtexts, located outside the principal content of a given paleotype and occurring most frequently in such genres as foreword and afterword. It should be noted that anagraphic texts can be analyzed both as forms of literary activity and as historical sources: they not only contain information about the time and place of publication of a specific old print, but also often reveal to the researcher the geographical and biographical details of the life of their authors and demonstrate the assumptions of the publishing program and communication strategy implemented by the paleotype. The structure of these concise texts is very heterogeneous and contains elements that vary in terms of their genre:

Printed forewords and afterwords unite in themselves the characteristics of diverse genres, as they may contain autobiographic aspects, exegeses, narratives, opinions or templatic formulae inherited from medieval written traditions. They are syncretic texts, corresponding to the aesthetics of the syncretic medieval worldview; however, they also constitute an intersection of medieval traditions and novel renaissance phenomena. (Cibranska-Kostova 2013: 15)

The term *anagraph* is not widely used in Slavic studies, nor is it noted in specialist Slavic lexica and bibliological encyclopedias. Based on etymological observations, carried out and verified in Greek dictionaries by Anna Maciejewska, classical philologist from the University of Lodz, it can be concluded that it refers to the verb ἀναγράφω, one of whose meanings is also “to title,” “to register,” or “add *ex post*,” whereas a related noun meaning “title” or “register” is ἀναγραφή. The etymological and word-formation analysis of the Greek word itself leads to the conclusion that a ἀνά as a prefix has a fundamental meaning “up” or “upwards,” but also “additionally” or “anew.” This is also confirmed by the Greek derivatives coined with the same formant from other verbs. In Modern Greek, the word ἀνάγραφο(ν) stands for “register.”¹⁶ Thus, the word *anagraph* proposed by Cibranska-Kostova can be considered highly convenient and semantically capacious, emphasizing also the fact that the medieval author made a specific recapitulation in relation to the content of the entire book; in comparison with other terms used in the scholarly literature it corresponds the closest to the form, content, and position in the paleotypy of texts it describes (predominantly forewords, afterwords, and colophons, defined here as a publishing and printing label). This term will therefore be used consistently in the subsequent parts of the volume.

Finally, it might be worthwhile to address the editions of anagraphic texts from South Slavic paleotypy. In general, editions of these works (in the form of photographs or transcribed text) accompany most catalogs and descriptions of Slavic old prints, supplementing information on a specific edition or its copy. They may also form part of an anthology of annotations (not necessarily just anagraphs) from manuscript and printed sources. An example of such a publication, particularly important for the history of South Slavic paleotypy, is the six-volume work by Serbian philologist Ljubomir Stojanović from the first quarter of the twentieth century, reprinted in the 1980s (Stojanović 1902a, 1903, 1905, 1923, 1925, 1926). The series by Petar Momirović (Momirović 1993, 1995, 1996, 2000, 2001, 2004) can be treated as a supplement to Stojanović’s publication. It should also be noted that it is not uncommon for anagraphs to be translated into modern languages, especially in recent decades, in order to be included in editions and scholarly studies (e.g., Pet vekova 1994: 219–31; Sindik 1996).¹⁷

CLASSIFICATION AND PERIODIZATION OF BULGARIAN PALEOTYPES

The few studies on the history of Bulgarian printed books from the incunabula era until the end of the eighteenth century indicate several parallel directions of its development. On the one hand, each of these directions creates its own tradition (and can be described and analyzed separately); on the other hand, it has various relations with other components of these complex histories, and from this perspective it should inspire contextual interpretation. The following groups of Bulgarian paleotypes are distinguished (BKE 2004: 412–13; Bogdanov 1978: 183):¹⁸

1. Romanian-Bulgarian editions from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries
2. Venetian editions from the sixteenth century
3. Bulgarian-Catholic editions from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries
4. Slavo-Bulgarian editions from the eighteenth century

The first group editions include Cyrillic old prints (only in Middle Bulgarian/Church Slavonic or with parallel text in Romanian) published in Wallachia, Transylvania, and Moldova from 1508 to 1697. Based on studies and latest catalogs, the following (albeit certainly incomplete) list of places can be compiled, indicating locations where printing houses that produced paleotypes of this group operated (in chronological order): Târgoviște, Sibiu, Brașov, Sebeș, Alba Iulia, Bucharest, Orăștie—sixteenth century; Câmpulung and the monasteries of Govora, Dealu, Suceava, Snagov—seventeenth century. Among the most important figures known by name are Hieromonk Makarije (considered by some researchers as the first Bulgarian printer; Atanasov 1959: 11–42), Deacon Coresi, Precentor Lorinț, Meletij of Macedonia, Stephen of Ohrid, Monk Moisije, and others. The last edition representing this group is considered to be the 1697 *Grammar* published in the Snagov Monastery by Hieromonk Anthim the Iberian, even though it was not the last book he published in the New Church Slavonic language. As we read in *The Orthodox Encyclopedia (Pravoslavnaja èncyklopedija)*:

Printing and typographic work became the foremost enterprise in the life of Anthim the Iberian. His name is associated with all 64 books edited in Wallachia in the years 1691–1716. Within this period, the typographies of Bucharest, Snagov, Râmnicu Vâlcea and Târgoviște saw the publication—under Anthim’s direction—of religious literature in Romanian, Greek, Church Slavonic and Serbian, as well as a number of secular editions, including the Russian *Grammar* by Meletij (Smotryc’kyj) (1697). (PE II 2000: 488–89)

The end of the Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypy is linked, on the one hand, to the emancipation of the Romanian language (as Anna Oczko writes, “The seventeenth century—the age of Romanian humanism—actually concludes the era of coexistence of the Church Slavonic and Romanian languages in the Romanian principalities”; Oczko 2014: 53), and on the other hand, with the growing spread of old prints published in the East Slavic area in the New Church Slavonic language after the reform of Patriarch Nikon (Bogdanov 1978: 176).

Editions from the second group are primarily related to the activity of the printing house founded in Venice in 1519 by Božidar Vuković, which changed owners and had a number of continuators over several decades (until 1572), and the last and only seventeenth-century Venetian book intended for Orthodox Slavs (*Psalter with Supplement*, 1638) is a reprint of one of the previous editions of the group. Chronologically, the list of Venetian publishers and printers is as follows: Bozidar Vuković, his son Vićenco Vuković, Stefan Marinović, Jakov of Kamena Reka, Jerolim Zagurović, Jakov Krajkov (also considered by some researchers to be the first Bulgarian printer—BKE 2004: 257), Giovanni Antonio Rampazetto, Bartolomeo, Marco, and Bartol Ginammi (cf. Nemirovskij 1993). Researchers emphasize that in the group of Venetian Cyrillic paleotypes, the original Slavonic work *Life of St. Petka* (Cibranska-Kostova 2013: 57) was first published in print (and reprinted several times).

The third group consists of editions related to the spread of Catholicism in the Bulgarian lands in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, printed under the aegis of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (*Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*) founded in Rome in 1622. Printing centers producing paleotypes of this group (in Latin, in the so-called Illyrian and Church Slavonic languages, in both Cyrillic and Latin typeface) operated in Rome and Austria, in Trnava (now Slovakia) and Timișoara (now Romania). Among the published authors there were, for example, such figures as Bulgarian Catholic bishops and priests Petăr Bogdan Bakšev, Filip Stanislavov, and Krăštjo Pejkić (see Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 22–24), and the paleotype of particular importance is the famous *Abagar* by Filip Stanislavov, a small collection of prayers (together with the apocryphal about King Abgar), published in the form of an amulet in Rome in 1651 and considered to be the first printed book featuring elements of New Bulgarian, corresponding to the language of the damaskins of that time (SLER 2003: 15). This book has a phototypic edition (Rajkov 1979).

The last, fourth group of paleotypes is defined as comprising the editions from 1741 to 1801, linked by the idea of the Illyrian movement and the belief in the cultural and linguistic community of the South Slavs in the face

of captivity (BKE 2004: 413). This group includes such works as the famous *Stematografija* (Vienna 1741) and two other publications by Hristofor Žefarović, a primer by Marko Teodorović (Vienna 1792), based on a similar edition by Serbian encyclopedist, writer and scholar Zaharije Orfelin (Venice 1767) (Oczkova 1983: 117–18; LJJ 2012: 314), and also *History of the Slavo-Bulgarian Nation* by Atanas Nesković (Budim 1801). The language of the works in this group is described as “a peculiar mix of New Bulgarian, Church Slavonic, . . . Russian and Serbian,” which apparently reflects their authors’ desire for a Slavic community (Bogdanov 1978: 194).

It seems that this initial classification of the source base for the history of Bulgarian paleotypy, although it includes many of its key elements, should be considered inadequate and, as a whole, cannot be a starting point for further detailed investigation. Its main shortcoming, in my view, is the anachronistic and nationalistic approach to the described sources, expressed in an arbitrary inclusion or equally arbitrary omission of certain important typographical traditions that contributed to the history of the Slavic book in the Balkans, whose component and integral part is the history of the Cyrillic Bulgarian paleotypy (or, rather, the Cyrillic paleotypy for Bulgarians). Suffice it to mention that on the one hand Cyrillic Venetian printing is included in the classification, whereas on the other, the tradition cultivated in several Serbian monasteries in the sixteenth century, often drawing on Venetian and Wallachian printing, is excluded. The arguments Bogdanov raises in his book on many occasions, focusing on justifying the Bulgarianness of the texts, are by no means convincing:

It is difficult to explain why the collaborators of Božidar Vuković (led by Hieromonk Pahomije) employ Middle Bulgarian prototypes as the basis for their 16th-century Cyrillic editions, rather than prototypes composed in Serbian Church Slavonic (*slaveno-srpski jezik*), an idiom already well-established in Serbian lands. The Bulgarian character of this complex of first prints is beyond doubt. . . . Božidar Vuković’s desire to create books both for Serbs (i.e. all South Slavic speaking the Serbo-Croatian language) and for Bulgarians . . . does not alter this situation: precisely because he is dedicated to the cause of issuing books intelligible to all, . . . he opts for the Middle Bulgarian language in its Western redaction. (Bogdanov 1978: 186)

We should also note that elsewhere the author himself criticizes Serbian or Macedonian researchers (Mihajlo Georgievski, mentioned earlier) for a similar approach: “This struggle to present the fifteenth–sixteenth century typographic activity among the South Slavs and in Romanian lands as an exclusively Serbian matter has recently found opposition from the Macedonian side. One extreme meets another” (Bogdanov 1978: 206, cf. also 164–65,

186). Even sharing Bogdanov's opinion, one must admit that he himself failed to avoid the very extremes he mentioned.

Moreover, one of the classes of Bulgarian paleotypy in that sense is constituted by Catholic writings, which include only one old print in the Church Slavonic language. This solution should also be approached with caution. First of all, treating this tradition as an unequivocally integral (and thus typologically comparable with others) part of the history of Bulgarian literature, and therefore of the history of the Bulgarian literary language, is debatable (cf. Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 40–41; Solak 2009: 57), and secondly, even if we adopt such a perspective on a deductive basis, which is, of course, possible, then just the quantitative characteristics and purpose of printed source texts of this class locate it outside the mainstream of Bulgarian paleotypic history.

It seems, therefore, that the systematization structure of the history of the Bulgarian paleotypy presented here forms an artificial, opaque, and incomplete image. Thus, Bogdanov's concepts could be treated more as a curiosity than a coherent methodological concept if it were not for the fact that the latest scholarly compendia of the Bulgarian book (BKE 2004: 412–13) and (to a lesser extent) Old Bulgarian literature (SLER 2003: 495–96) refer to them. Also the afore-mentioned Božidar Rajkov, publisher of Filip Stanislavov's *Abagar* and archaeographer specializing in Cyrillic old prints in Bulgaria (see, e.g., Rajkov 1967), in a short historical introduction to his edition refers to a similar, essentially "national" approach, although he points out the need to consider the history of the Bulgarian paleotypy in a broader context: "the first Cyrillic printed books are largely the fruit of cultural cooperation among Serbs, Romanians, and Bulgarians" (Rajkov 1979: 21).

Of course, only source and material analyses could fully confirm or challenge my criticism of this concept, but already at this moment another approach to the systematization of the source base can be suggested, one that draws on the considerations on the role and history of the Church Slavonic/New Church Slavonic language with regard to the history of the Cyrillic paleotypy of the *Slavia Orthodoxa* area, discussed in chapter 1. Based on that proposal, chapter 3 will review South Slavic old prints from the end of the fifteenth century to the beginning of the seventeenth century.

In lieu of a continuous chronological presentation, the suggested systematization entails one based (with certain exceptions) on an approach akin to that of Ivan Bogdanov, isolating specific "paths" of tradition (continuity) that include more important elements of typography, content, language, ornamentation, and other components, as well as certain aspects of the functioning of the prints analyzed. Assigning a given paleotype to a particular path is based on several premises: its place and time of publication (or its connection to

a specific printer/editor), preliminary linguistic characteristics included in catalog studies (in some rare cases, reference was made to existing language monographs on particular texts), and taking into account the content and form of anagraphs that accompany the paleotypes. This way, several principal, fundamental traditions have been isolated, and ancillary, contextual traditions have been identified, whose role and scale of influence can be considered as secondary in general or as in the period in question (subsequent centuries led to a regrouping in this regard). Glagolitic and Cyrillic incunabula have been included among the fundamental traditions as a basic starting point and reference for further presentations, even though they are not directly related to the history of the Bulgarian language. Thus, the aim was to set the history of paleotypy for Bulgarians in a broader context corresponding to the contexts of the emergence and functioning of the New Church Slavonic language, as well as to indicate the frequent moments of “intersection,” accumulation, and interaction of particular traditions (both basic and ancillary traditions).

It should be noted, however, that the presentation in chapter 3 is by no means a synthesis of the history of sixteenth-century South Slavic paleotypy, but an attempt to organize the dispersed information, observations, and facts, to arrange them into a factual and methodological whole, thus making it possible to uncover areas that are still debatable or unknown. The principal objective is to identify, isolate (inventory), and characterize the printed source base from before the first grammars, to determine the initial stages and turning points that underlie the later phenomenon, generally and commonly called the origin and influence of the New Church Slavonic language. This is the subject of chapter 3.

NOTES

1. This is a reference to, respectively, the *Service Book* by Hieromonk Makarije, published in the first Wallachian printing press (Târgoviște 1508) and the *History of the Slavo-Bulgarian Nation (Istorija slavjanobolgarskog naroda)* by Atanas Neskovič (Budim 1801).

2. I have decided to eschew Bogdanov’s arguments rejecting 1878 as the end date of the second stage of the history of the Bulgarian book, as they are irrelevant to the subject matter of the present volume.

3. “Forerunners” (Bulg. *predteči*)—this is how Petăr Atanasov describes them, including in this group Hieromonk Makarije, Jakov Krajkov, Romanian printers headed by Deacon Coresi, Meletij of Macedonia, Filip Stanislavov, and Hristofor Žefarović (Atanasov 1959: 11–117).

4. Cf. the entry for *Paläotypographie* in one of the German lexica cited previously: “The study of the historical development of types in early book printing. The first

printers thought of themselves as perfecting the art of decorative writing with the help of new technical means; as a result, the first decades of incunabula printing saw the new medium reproduce the paleographic characteristics of manuscripts in a faithful manner” (LGB 1999: 508).

5. It should be noted that the numbering of some of the same editions in the German catalog and in the Russian inventory differ slightly in several places, which reflects the evolution of their author’s research and findings.

6. Unfortunately, working with Nemirovskij’s Moscow catalog is hampered by numerous spelling and typographical errors, which often make it difficult to keep track of the facts, as information found therein needs to be verified.

7. In parentheses, I indicate the contemporary state affiliation of smaller towns and villages.

8. It should be noted that Mathiesen made his juxtapositions not for the purposes of reporting and organizing, but for a comprehensive comparison, locating the Cyrillic (and Glagolitic) Slavic paleotypy in a broader European and global context. Information on Cyrillic old prints was juxtaposed with, for example, the oldest Slavic editions in Latin and Glagolitic alphabets; to the first publications in alphabets other than Latin, Glagolitic, or Cyrillic (including Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, Armenian, Georgian, Coptic, and other publications); to first books printed in Latin alphabet in languages other than Slavic; to origins of Slavic books printed in so-called New Cyrillic (Ru. *graždanskaja azbuka*); etc. Also indicated was the territorial distribution of the first Glagolitic and, above all, Cyrillic printing presses up to the end of the eighteenth century, clearly shifting from the South to the East Slavic area in the perspective of over three centuries (Mathiesen 1992). Based on the history of books printed in original Slavic alphabets, Mathiesen proposed unconventional methodological and terminological solutions, aiming, among other things, at locating the analyzed phenomenon (or in fact its dispersed manifestations, called by the author “puzzles”) within the general system and structure of the literature and liturgical cycle of *Slavia Orthodoxa* (Mathiesen 2004).

9. Information concerning Nemirovskij’s publications can be found in his scholarly autobiography (Nemirovskij 2005c) and in selected articles (Samarin 2010). Nemirovskij’s latest works (apart from the ones presented previously), include, for example, the impressive encyclopedia on Ivan Fedorov and his era, cited earlier, which is in fact an encyclopedia of Slavic paleotypy (Nemirovskij 2007a), a jubilee publication commemorating the five hundredth anniversary of the birth of that outstanding printer, which, in addition to the description of Fedorov’s editions, includes a list of 3,389 bibliographic items on the subject from 1574 to 2010 (Nemirovskij 2010a), or the popularizing, albeit not devoid of scholarly merit, publications on the history of books from the earliest times to their contemporary digital forms (Nemirovskij 2010b, 2015a).

10. Similar studies (from the perspective of art history) on Cyrillic paleotypes from the East Slavic area include the latest work by Russian scholar Jurij Gerčuk, entitled *The Art of the Printed Book in 16th–21st Century Russia (Iskusstvo pečatnoj knigi v Rossii XVI–XXI vekov)*, in particular the chapters “The Art of the Early

Printers” (*Iskusstvo pervopečatnikov*) and “The Printed Book in Pre-Petrine Russia” (*Pečatnaja kniga v dopetrovskoj Rusi*) (Gerčuk 2014: 21–58).

11. The authors and editors of the series planned successive volumes presenting the history of Polish printing according to the geographical criterion, and because it took more time to compile individual volumes/books, the order of publication was as follows: volume five (1959): *The Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie)*; volume six (1960): *Lesser Poland—Ruthenian Lands (Małopolska—Ziemia Ruskie)*; volume four (1962): *Pomerania (Pomorze)*; volume three, part one (1977): *Greater Poland (Wielkopolska)*; volume one, part one (1983): *Lesser Poland: 15th–16th Centuries (Małopolska: wiek XV–XVI)*; volume one, part two (2000): *Lesser Poland: 17th–18th Centuries (Małopolska: wiek XVII–XVIII)*; and volume three, part two (2001): *Mazovia with Podlachia (Mazowsze z Podlasiem)* (Drukarze 1959, 1960, 1962, 1977, 1983, 2000, 2001). Volume two, devoted to printing in Silesia, has not been published as of yet.

12. Complete scanned texts of Slavic printed texts are available on the website of the RGB Digital Library, through the search engine in the “old prints” (*staropečatnye knigi*) section: <http://elibrary.rsl.ru> (accessed May 22, 2020).

13. Similar initiatives—also with regard to manuscript texts—have been undertaken in Poland, an example of which is the DVD-format *Library of Polish Medieval Monuments (Biblioteka zabytków polskiego piśmiennictwa średniowiecznego)*, published by the Institute of Polish Language and edited by Waclaw Twardzik. It includes not only photographs of the key manuscripts of the Polish language, but also their critical edition (transcription and transliteration) along with a scholarly apparatus (Library 2006).

14. Another issue is the so-called epigraphy (i.e., source texts recorded on materials other than parchment or paper). Epigrams are also sometimes called inscriptions, although this is a broader concept (Birkenmajer, Kocowski, and Trzynadlowski 1971: 673, 1011). Researchers (e.g., Božidar Rajkov) point to the need to investigate the observed typological proximity of commemorative epigrams (e.g., engraved in stone) and inscriptions in codices (Hristova, Karadžova, and Uzunova 2003: 8).

15. The publication does not include material from paleotypes.

16. Cf. also *Anagraphê*, used in German bibliography: “In Gr. (ἀναγραφὴ) entry in an index or register, or the index itself; an expression found especially in legal and official language. The a. can also denote an index of books or authors” (LGB 1987: 84).

17. See also the collective monograph by Soviet scholars, devoted to anagraphs in East Slavic paleotypes, entitled *Themes and Stylistics of Forewords and Afterwords (Tematika i stilistika predislovij i posleslovij)* and published in the series *Russian Old Print Literature (16th–First Quarter of the 18th Century) (Russkaja staropečatnaja literatura [XVI–pervaja četvert’ XVIII v.]*) (RSL 1981).

18. Ivan Bogdanov’s book illustrates each of the isolated groups of sources with absolute quantitative data, but given that this information has become significantly outdated since the publication of this monograph, it is not cited here. In fact, these data, even if current, would provide information on the state of the source base extant today, and not the real dynamics and scale of historical processes.

Chapter Three

South Slavic Cyrillic Paleotypy in the Sixteenth Century

Basic Traditions and Source Contexts

GLAGOLITIC INCUNABULA (1483–1496)

Apart from the separate issues of the beginnings of printing in Slavic lands in Latin and the onset of printing in Slavic languages using Latin typeface, it should first be noted that the advent of Slavic printed books in the South Slavic lands—notably, less than thirty years after the publication of Gutenberg’s famous *Bible* (1455)¹—is, on the one hand, associated with the oldest native Slavic alphabet, the Glagolitic alphabet, and on the other—at least hypothetically—with the then-important (though non-Slavic) cultural center in Europe, namely with Venice. As Aleksander Naumow (2011: 4) writes:

The development of multilingual, multi-alphabet and multi-religious printing is the hallmark of Venetian cultural openness. Since Johannes von Speyer (called Giovanni da Spira here) founded the first printing press in 1469, about 5,000 titles were printed in 153 printing houses by the end of the century. In the 16th century, more than 700 typographers were active in the city, publishing at least 15,000 or more titles in 150 printing houses. The presence of Slavic prints was an important element of the cultural map of the Republic. The publishing activity of Slavs (and intended for Slavs) reflects their internal religious and cultural divisions, at the same time revealing differences between Slavs and Venetians as well as the tendencies and mechanisms of their blurring.

It also seems that a presentation and attempt at condensed systematization of the most important current findings on Glagolitic incunabula, seemingly unnecessary at first glance, is needed herein not just because of the chronological order, but also because of its possible links to Cyrillic incunabula in the Balkans, which will be discussed in the following. These potential contacts have been addressed recently by Evgenij Nemirovskij (2005a: 379–80),

for example, in an extensive chapter about the beginnings of Glagolitic printing, published in a two-volume monograph devoted to the beginnings of Cyrillic printing among South Slavs.

In the catalog compiled by Russian researcher Andrej Kruming, the author of a work published in just two hundred copies (fewer than some incunabula or old prints!), entitled *Aggregated Catalogue of Old Print Editions in Glagolitic Type 1483–1812 years (Svodnyj katalog staropečatnyx izdanij glagoličeskogo šrifta 1483–1812 gg.)*, number 1 is the *Missale* published in an anonymous Glagolitic typography dated February 22, 1483—labeled with an uncertain (question mark) location “Venice?: anonymous Glagolitic typography” (here and hereafter—Kruming 1998: 2123). This is the famous (1) *Missale Romanum Glagolitice (Misal po zakonu rimskoga dvora)*—the first known Slavic book printed in the oldest Slavic alphabet. The characteristics of the extant copies of this book, its contents, and stages of research on it can be found in the aforementioned work by Nemirovskij (2005a: 380–402). The 220-folio incunabulum consists of the following parts: calendar, *propium de tempore*, *ordo missae*, *missae votivae*, *propium sanctorum*, *commune sanctorum*, the so-called sequences and ritual texts, and a colophon (folio 219v), where the year and date of publication are given, although there is no information about the geographical location. This incunabulum has been preserved to this day in several partial copies, the most complete of which (218 preserved folios out of 220) is kept in the National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg, as part of a collection purchased in 1874 from Croatian researcher Ivan Berčić (cf. also Nazor 1984: 10; Vjalova 2000). The remaining copies and fragments are kept in Croatia, the Vatican, Austria, and the United States (the only Glagolitic incunabulum in the New World). The phototypic edition of the *Missale* was published in Zagreb in 1971 (see “List of Source Text Editions”) and one of the extant Zagreb copies (National and University Library in Zagreb [Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica u Zagrebu, NSK], ref. R I-4-62b) is now available online on the library’s website.²

In reference to the research of Croatian Slavist Maria Pantelić (1967), Kruming posits that the editor of the book may have come from Istria (Kruming 1998: 21). It should be added that Pantelić’s hypothesis is shared by another well-known Croatian Paleo-Slavist and researcher of Glagolitic old prints, Anica Nazor (1984: 8–9). Unfortunately, it is not clear why two paragraphs earlier the author of the Moscow catalog suggests, albeit not without reservations, that the printing location was Venice—all the more so because there are more hypotheses on this subject. In his three-volume *Social History of the Croatian Book (Socijalna povijest knjige u Hrvata; Stipčević 2005: 14)*, Aleksandar Stipčević, Croatian book historian, summed up his doubts and debates concerning the place where the *Missale* was published:

For two centuries already, specialists have debated the important question where the *Missale* was printed. The controversy is directly related to another prominent issue, likewise still unresolved—that concerning the location of the oldest Glagolitic printing press. In the (sometimes highly bitter) discussions past and present, the assumptions put forth have often been remarkably bold, but also naive, far-fetched and unscientific—even if uttered or supported by distinguished representatives of the scholarly community. First, in 1808, Slovenian scholar Jernej Bartolomej Kopitar proposed that the *Missale* could have been printed in Rome; subsequently, in 1821, Polish philologist Michał Bobrowski hypothesized that the book had been printed in Venice. He was followed by a number of equally celebrated experts who openly pointed to Venice as the printing location (Vatroslav Jagić 1863, Matija Murko 1908, David Bogdanović 1914, Vjekoslav Štefanić 1933, Mihovil Kombol 1945 etc.). Some of them went so far as to opine that the book had “undoubtedly” been printed in Venice, although—as skilled specialists—they must have been aware that such categorical statements can only be justified by reliable archival evidence or, at the very least, firm indications. Such evidence or indications, however, are lacking—be it in Italy or in Croatia. The very fact that no clue whatsoever concerning the *Missale* has ever been discovered in the State Archives of Venice forces us to use utmost caution when speaking of this city as the potential printing location. No other Italian archive has so far yielded any document that would indicate the place where the press was located; hence, it is indeed baffling that some scholars have been so quick to transform guesswork into proven claims. As long as no document referring to our *Missale* has been found in the archives in the Vatican, Venice or elsewhere in Italy (where, incidentally, one finds data on far less notable printing endeavors), we should leave open the question concerning the printing location, rather than create new problems by unverified speculation.

It should be added that despite the afore-mentioned statement, Stipčević (2005: 15) himself suggests that the *Missale* could have been printed in Croatia.³

Doubts and debates surround the location and date of the origin of another Glagolitic incunabulum: (2) *Breviarium Romanum glagoliticum* (*Brevijar po zakonu rimskega dvora*) from circa 1491 (the colophon has not survived). The phototypic edition of this text, based on the most complete of the two preserved fragments—the copy kept in the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana in Venice (BNM, ref. 1235)—was published in 1991 (see “List of Source Text Editions”). This *Breviarium* is listed in Kruming’s (1998: 23) catalog under number 2 and is also marked with the location “Venice” followed by a question mark. Aleksander Naumow also points to this uncertainty, citing Italian and Croatian researchers (Naumow 2011: 5). Kosinj in Croatia (Nazor 1984: 10; Nemirovskij 2005a: 404; Stipčević 2005: 15–16) or Istria (Tandarić 1984: 130) are mentioned as other possible places of origin.

Another (third) Glagolitic incunabulum has a preserved colophon with the date and place of its publication, thus it is the first text of this group whose place and date of origin are certain. This is (3) Blaž Baromić's *Breviarium Romanum glagoliticum* (*Brevijar po zakonu rimskoga Dvora*), published by Andrea Torresani in Venice on March 13, 1493, which has survived in five copies and was originally misidentified in the nineteenth century as a Cyrillic incunabulum (Nazor 1997). The name of the Croatian typographer Baromić, who came from the island of Krk, is also linked to the establishment of a printing house in Senj (1494–1496 and 1507–1508), where the last two Glagolitic incunabula known today were published in the first phase of its activity. It was there that on August 7, 1494, the second *Missale* printed in Glagolitic was published: (4) *Senj missal* (*Misal po zakonu rimskoga dvora*). A reprint of this text, preserved in four incomplete copies, came out in Senj in 1994 (see the "List of Source Text Editions"). On April 25, 1496, the same printing house issued the *General Confessions*: (5) *Spovid općena/Confessionale generale*—the only surviving authorial work among the Glagolitic incunabula, a translation from the Latin text by the Italian preacher Michele Carcano, published in Venice in 1484. This edition, preserved in one copy and kept in the Franciscan monastery in Zagreb (Library of the Third Order of Saint Francis in Ksaver, Zagreb; *Knjižnica franjevac trećoredaca na Ksaveru*), has had three editions: phototypic, Cyrillic, and Latin transcriptions (see "List of Source Text Editions") (Kruming 1998: 24–28; Nemirovskij 2005a: 407–24; Nazor 1984: 11; Stipčević 2005: 16–18).

As regards the chronological and geographical scope of all the preserved and known Glagolitic old prints, according to Kruming's catalog (although the author himself points to its imperfections and deficiencies, and thus also to the prospects of possible future discoveries or amendments⁴) there are seventy-one of them altogether,⁵ including four titles known indirectly (this, of course, applies to the number of titles/editions, not copies, of which there are many more—619). Kruming also published a paper about his own catalog with supplements (Kruming 2000), where he concluded that the entire material consists of: six incunabula from the fifteenth century (including one uncertain—the so-called *The Confession [Confessionale] of Matej Bošnjak of Zadar* of July 16, 1492, allegedly published in Venice), thirteen paleotypes from the first half of the sixteenth century, sixteen (including two uncertain) old prints from the second half of the sixteenth century, eight items from the seventeenth century, twenty-seven (including one uncertain) from the eighteenth century and one from the beginning of the nineteenth century—including fourteen titles published in Venice (some incunabula with uncertain location), twenty-nine in Rome, thirteen in Tübingen, seven in Senj, six in

Rijeka, and two in Nuremberg.⁶ The author of the catalog also listed twelve editions “planned” for the sixteenth to nineteenth century, which, despite the intentions of the authors or publishers, probably never saw the light of the day, and seventy-nine items (more than in the catalog itself) misidentified in scholarly literature (mainly in terms of date or location) or non-existent (Kruming 1998: 5–6, 110–30; 2000: 191–93). Later additions to Kruming’s (2000: 193–202) catalog list four more Glagolitic old prints from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries.

The world’s second Glagolitic incunabulum (*Breviar po zakonu rimskoga dvora*), mentioned previously, was most likely published in the same year as the first dated Cyrillic incunabulum—1491, although in this case there is no doubt as to the location. In the subsequent sections of this chapter, the key stages of Cyrillic print development will be discussed.

CRACOW CYRILLIC INCUNABULA (1491–1493)

According to the current state of knowledge, it can be assumed that the inception of Cyrillic printing was motivated primarily by commercial purposes. A figure of particular historical significance was Cracow printer Schweipolt Fiol (along with his patrons Jan Turzon and Jan Tesznar), despite the fact that, as Aleksander Naumow stresses, his activity did not yield any material that would make it possible to say “anything credible about the position of Cyrillic printing in the system of the theological thought” of Orthodox Slavs (Rusek, Witkowski, and Naumow 1993: 81). Details of Fiol’s biography and the history of his printing house, reconstructed on the basis of preserved documents, have been the subject of numerous works and several monographs; there is, therefore, no need for an in-depth discussion of such information herein. It suffices to mention contemporary publications featuring a critical overview of the findings to date and disputable matters. The monographers of Fiol and his publishing house include, first, Evgenij Nemirovskij, cited many times in the present work, as well as American researcher Szczepan Karol Zimmer. The former is the author of the first comprehensive treatment of the subject (Nemirovskij 1971), whose significantly extended, supplemented, and revised version was published more than thirty years later as the first volume—under the title *The Rise of Slavic Printing (Vozniknovenie slavjanskogo knjigopečatanija)*—of the afore-mentioned series entitled *History of Slavic Cyrillic Printing* (Nemirovskij 2003a).⁷ The latter author published his monograph in 1983, criticizing many of Nemirovskij’s earlier findings and interpretations (Zimmer 1983). Factographic articles discussing the activity of the Cracow Cyrillic publishing house and its associates

can also be found in one of the volumes of the series *Printers of Old Poland (Drukarze dawnej Polski)* (Drukarze 1983: 25–39). It should be added that at the beginning of the 1990s, marking the five hundredth anniversary of the beginning of Cyrillic printing, two collective publications were issued in Poland (in Cracow and Gdańsk), containing numerous articles devoted to various aspects of Fiol's work and legacy: *The Manuscript and the Print. The Oldest Church Slavonic Prints and Their Relation to the Manuscript Tradition (Rękopis a druk. Najstarsze druki cerkiewnosłowiańskie i ich stosunek do tradycji rękopiśmiennej)* (Rusek, Witkowski, Naumow 1993) and *The 500th Anniversary of the Oldest Cyrillic Print from Schweipolt Fiol's Cracow Publishing House (1491) (Pięćsetna rocznica najstarszego druku cyrylskiego z krakowskiej oficyny Szwejpolta Fiola [1491])* (Moszyński 1994).

From the point of view of linguistic issues, the books published at Fiol's press are, of course, more important than biographical and factual details. There are four known titles:⁸

- (N: 1) *Octoechos (Oktoix)*, 1491, 172 folios, eight copies and fragments, currently kept only in Moscow and St. Petersburg
- (N: 2) *Book of Hours (Časoslov)*, 1491, 382 folios, twenty-seven copies and fragments
- (N: 3) *Lenten Triodion*, *1493, 314 folios, thirty-two copies and fragments
- (N: 4) *Flowery Triodion*, *1493, 366 folios, twenty-nine copies and fragments

It should be stressed that the chronology of the publication of these titles is debatable. The reason is the lack of preserved colophons in both triodions. Some researchers are in favor of the chronological precedence of the latter books (Zimmer 1983; Wronkowska-Dimitrowa 2010: 21–22).

Unfortunately, none of the Cracow Cyrillic incunabula has been published so far, so we do not have any phototypic or even more critical editions. Apart from direct work with book collections, these sources are available in the Moscow digital edition and online versions discussed in the previous chapter.

Research on the language of Fiol's incunabula focuses primarily on determining the provenance of their manuscript base and demonstrating which systemic features (pointing to South Slavic or East Slavic background) are reflected on different levels of the language of the first printed Cyrillic books, and to what extent. A comprehensive solution to this problem is important not just for textual reasons, but also for determining the role printed books from the east later played in the development of South Slavic languages. South Slavic background as one of the stratification elements involved in the formation of the New Church Slavonic language was discussed by Cibranska-Kosztova (2007: 75–76), whose views I have presented in more detail in chapter 1.

In this context, particularly valuable are the findings of Cracow-based Slavist Wanda Stępnia-Minczewska. Over the course of a dozen or so years, she has published a series of articles that address the problems of the linguistic provenance of Fiol's hypothetical prototypes, mainly (though not only) on the example of his *Book of Hours* (Stępnia-Minczewska 1990, 1994, 2000a, 2000b, 2001, 2007). It should be noted that none of these works has been recorded in the extensive bibliographic indices of scholarly literature, compiled for each incunabulum and included in Nemirovskij's (2009a: 191–214) Moscow catalog (Nemirovskij).

A comprehensive analysis of another Cracow incunabulum, the *Flowery Triodion*, has been carried out by Mirosława Wronkowska-Dimitrowa, a Bydgoszcz-based researcher and author of a detailed philological and linguistic study of this text preceded by nearly twenty articles (Wronkowska-Dimitrowa 2010; see also the bibliography therein), based on the analysis of two typographic variants of this edition, kept in Polish book collections (National Library in Warsaw: ref. Inc. F. 1350, microfilm 69903, and the National Museum in Cracow: Inc. 24792/XV.12).⁹ Apart from a detailed description of the book's composition, Wronkowska-Dimitrowa examines the key linguistic features of the text on four levels: 1) paleography and typography (including the shape of letters, accents and breathing marks, abbreviations), 2) spelling, phonetics and phonology (including the effects of Common Slavic processes and the continuants of certain elements of the vowel and consonant subsystems of the Common Slavic and Old Church Slavonic languages), 3) inflection and syntax (e.g., declension of nouns, adjectives, and pronouns, conjugation, the preterite tense system, some participles), and 4) lexis (discussed against the background of the earlier manuscript tradition of individual genres in the *Triodion*).

The conclusions of both Polish researchers unequivocally link Fiol's Cracow incunabula with the South Slavic language background.

CETINJE CYRILLIC INCUNABULA (1494–1495)

The first and only Cyrillic incunabula in the South Slavic area appeared in what is now Montenegro—in the printing house of Voivode Đurađ Crnojević, who was probably inspired by his father Ivan. Compared to the Cracow incunabula, the Montenegrin publications are much better researched and described, although in the scholarly literature there are divergent opinions on the activity of this first Cyrillic printing shop in the Balkans. They concern both the place where the printing house operated and the number of titles it yielded, and finally the identity and later fate of the printer, a monk named

Makarije, known to us from extant colophons. Evgenij Nemirovskij's second monograph from the afore-mentioned series of publications on the beginnings of the Slavic Cyrillic print, entitled *The Beginnings of Printing Among the South Slavs (Načalo knjigopečatanija u južnyx slavjan)*, can be considered a summary of these and many other discussions and findings (Nemirovskij 2005a, 2005b). Preceded by several earlier studies by this author,¹⁰ it is an extended and revised version of his 1996 book, published in the Serbian language (Nemirovskij 1996). Summarizing works also include the jubilee volume issued in Serbia, entitled *Five Centuries of Serbian Printing 1494–1994 (Pet vekova srpskog štamparstva 1494–1994)*, the main part of which, apart from overview articles, anagraphic texts, and a paleotypic album,¹¹ is an encyclopedic dictionary entitled *Lexicon of Serbian Church Slavonic Printing (Leksikon srpskoslovenskog štamparstva)* by Mitar Pešikan, featuring several dozen entries and much broader in scope than the Montenegrin incunabula (Pet vekova 1994), several publications by the then director of the National Library in Montenegro, Dušan Martinović (e.g., 1994a, 1994b), as well as a number of other collective works (see their detailed presentation in Nemirovskij 2005a: 143–63).

As far as the location of Crnojević's printing house is concerned, there has been a debate among scholars, sparked by the incomplete source data: only one incunabulum published in this printing shop (N: 7) explicitly indicates the place of publication "in Cetinje" (folio 348v): на ЦѢТИНЮ. Speculations about the remaining books first pointed to Venice as the place of their printing, and then to the Montenegrin fortress Obod. The latter proposal provoked a heated discussion among scholars, especially in the nineteenth century, focused on the so-called Obod problem (Serb. *obodsko pitanje*). Nemirovskij described it in detail and commented on it, like the vast majority of the contemporary researchers categorically rejecting any suggestion of a different location of the printing house than Cetinje: "There are currently no reasons whatsoever to assume that Đurađ Crnojević's printing press operated at any other location than Cetinje—be it in Obod or in Venice" (Nemirovskij 2005a: 438–45; see also Pešikan 1994: 152–53).

The number of titles published in the Montenegrin publishing house is also a matter of debate. Nemirovskij enumerates and describes only four books—in his opinion certain—which are listed in his catalogs under numbers (5) to (8):

(N: 5) *Octoechos (Oktoix)*, (tones I–IV), January 4, 1494, 270 folios, eighty-two copies and fragments

(N: 6) *Octoechos (Oktoix)* (tones V–VIII), *1494, *272 folios, only three incomplete copies and fragments

(N: 7) *Psalter with Supplement*, September 22, 1495, 348 folios, thirty-one copies and fragments

(N: 8) *Prayer Book (Trebnik)*, *1495, *312 folios, four incomplete copies and fragments

It is worth noting that, unlike the Cracow incunabula, each of these texts has had a phototypic edition (see the “List of Source Text Editions”), and full scans of these books are available both on the DVD (Morozova) released in Moscow and on the websites of the Russian State Library in Moscow (with the exception of text No. 6: *Octoechos (Oktoix)* [tones V–VIII], which is not available at the library; the DVD contains a scan of the phototypic edition of 1973). The National Library of Serbia now offers some texts of the Cetinje incunabula on its website.¹²

In the Cetinje editions, extensive anagraphs appear for the first time (preserved only in the first (N: 5) and third (N: 7) incunabula from this group). These are the oldest works of this type in the history of the Cyrillic paleotypy (except for short Cracow colophons), which consist of a foreword and an afterword (along with a colophon) to the *Octoechos* and an afterword (also along with a colophon) to the *Psalter with Supplement*. In the former of these anagraphs, the name of the owner of the printing shop appears for the first time (later repeated in both afterwords):

Since God, revered in Trinity, elected that His Church should be filled with diverse books, and I, God-protected Lord Đurađ Crnojević, pious in Christ, saw that the churches were stripped of holy books, as they had been plundered and devastated by the children of Hagar because of our sins—thus, aided by the Holy Ghost and burning with love towards God’s churches, I wrote this soul-saving book, the *Octoechos*.

Понеже в Троици покланѣемѣи Бгъ блгоизволи испълнити свою цркъвь разлѣчнѣными книгами видѣвъ азъ въ Хд Бга блговѣрныи и Блнь хранили гнь Гюргъ Църноевыи цркъвы празды стыхъ книгъ грѣхъ ради нашихъ разхищеніемъ и раздраніемъ ягаранскыхъ ведъ възрѣвновахъ поспѣшеніемъ Сгго Дха и любовію къ бжтвеннымъ црквамъ и написахъ сѣю дшеспенсю книгу ѿсмогленыкъ. (folio 2v)

Whereas both forewords mention the printer Makarije:

In the days of my pious, Christ-loving, God-protected Lord Đurađ Crnojević, at his command, I, humble Hieromonk Makarije of Crna Gora, wrote these books in the time of the most reverend Kir Vavila, Metropolitan of Zeta.

въ дни блгочестиваго и хлюбиваго и Бгчль хранимаго гна ми Гюрга Църноевика и повѣленіемъ его азъ смеркннѣи и сценнымъ линиѣмъ Макариѣ ѿп

Урѣніе Горы съписахъ сіе книги при всѣхъ священномъ митрополитѣ Зетскѣмъ кѣрь
Вавѣлѣ. (*Psalter with Supplement*, folio 348v)

The language of the Montenegrin incunabula has so far not been the subject of a comprehensive monographic description; a separate study has only been devoted to the *Psalter* (Grković-Mejdžor 1993). An essay based thereon (and on other smaller studies), which discusses the lexis, spelling, some morphological features, division of words (this innovative feature distinguishes the Cetinje incunabula from the Cracow incunabula), the system of abbreviations, and the accentuation of the first of the Cetinje texts (*Octoechos*, tones I–IV) can also be found in the two-volume monograph by Nemirovskij. The distinguishing features of Crnojević’s edition, characteristic also for the whole broadly understood Serbian paleotypic tradition (and the then manuscript tradition), include the lack of graphemes for nasal vowels (compared to the Cracow incunabula, where only *а* occurs, and Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypes, where diacritics for both *juses* are used [Nemirovskij 2008a: 181]), the presence of only the front *jer*, as well as the mixing of the norms of the Raška and Resava recensions.

Although there is little doubt among researchers of Slavic literature and printing as to the four titles listed earlier, other editions mentioned in the scholarly literature are controversial. Nemirovskij addresses this issue in a chapter entitled “Lost and Legendary Editions” (*Nesoxranivšiesja i legendarnye izdanija*) (Nemirovskij 2005b: 485–504), listing the following titles: *Miscellany* (1495), *Octoechos* (1492), and the so-called *Cetinje Tetraevangelium* (differently dated by researchers).

ROMANIAN-BULGARIAN PALEOTYPY: STAGE I (1508–1512)

The era of the paleotypy intended for Bulgarians (and, of course, for other ethnic groups professing Orthodoxy in the Balkans) begins in the first decade of the sixteenth century and is associated with three paleotypes published from 1508 to 1512, most likely in Târgoviște in Wallachia (the Romanian historical land of Țara Românească, and more precisely its eastern part of Muntenia). There are three known paleotypes from that printing house:

- (N: 9) *Service Book* (*Služebnik*), November 10, 1508, 128 folios, ten copies and fragments
- (N: 10) *Octoechos* (*Oktoix*), August 26, 1510, two hundred folios, only two copies
- (N: 11) *Tetraevangelium*, July 26, 1512, 293 folios, twenty-three copies and fragments

Although the first Cyrillic printing shop in Wallachia is referenced by numerous researchers of the history of the Bulgarian book and Bulgarian language (e.g., Atanasov 1959: 11–42; Bogdanov 1978: 168–70, 184; Velčeva and Ivanova 2010), the first and only monograph devoted to it, entitled *The Beginnings of Printing in Wallachia (Načalo knjigopečatanija v Valaxii)*, appeared in Russia as the third volume of a series devoted to the beginnings of Cyrillic printing in the world (Nemirovskij 2008a).¹³ As in the case of the previous two volumes of the series devoted to the Cyrillic incunabula, in his richly illustrated book Nemirovskij discusses in detail the history of the finding of each of the paleotypes from that printing shop, and meticulously describes the development of research both on the editions themselves as well as on the disputed issues of the location of the printing shop or the printer associated with them. He also focuses on the historical, political, technical, and cultural circumstances in which the printing house was built, discusses the manuscript tradition preceding the event, and then describes each of the paleotypes in detail in terms of form (characteristics of the parchment, paper, and type, printing organization, ornamentation) and content (main text and anagraphs), along with all its copies known today and the provenance records left on them, which he also publishes. He also provides an extensive description of the language aspect of the texts, which is rather significant for the present research, although he seems to treat this part of his study only as preliminary observations or partial findings based on the existing literature (the author himself often stresses that he is not a linguist; Nemirovskij 2008a: 185, 524, 586). It should be noted that he compares forms derived from the Wallachian paleotypes to the grammar of the New Church Slavonic language by Alypy Gamanovič (1964), and not to the grammars that describe the earlier period. He also presents information about the history of the printing house in the years after the last paleotype was published.

Of course, the paleotypes from the Târgoviște printing house (and later Romanian-Bulgarian old prints) were of interest to several Romanian scholars, such as the bibliographer Ioan C. Bianu, who, together with Nerva Hodoș, compiled a monumental series entitled *Old Romanian Bibliography (Bibliografia românească veche) (1508–1830)* (BRV 1903, 1910, 1912–1934),¹⁴ completed and further supplemented after the authors' death (BRV 1944, 1968, 1973, 2000, 2004, 2010), where there were articles devoted, among others, to the Slavic Cyrillic book in Romanian lands. Another important contributor is Petre P. Panaitescu, publisher of the oldest Wallachian-Bulgarian paleotype from 1508 (see “List of Source Text Editions”).¹⁵ Also published is the last paleotype from Târgoviște, and at the same time the first printed text of the Gospel in the Church Slavonic language (the edition was edited in the German series *Biblia Slavica*—see “List of Source Text Editions”). Both

old prints, like the Cyrillic incunabula, are also available in digital form (see chapter 2), with the exception of the extremely rare *Octoechos* of 1510.¹⁶

In the debates on the first Romanian-Bulgarian printing press, two questions arise. One concerns the printer. Afterwords with colophons added to all three editions mention a certain Monk Makarije, namesake of the Cetinje printer: “The one working on this was the humble Monk and Priest Makarije” *тpоудѣжесѧ семѣ сѧвѣренїи мнѣх и сѣценникѣ Макаріѣ* (*Service Book* 1508, folio 128); “I, servant of Christ, Hieromonk Makarije, worked on this and we produced these books” *азѣ х̄ѣ рабѣ сѣценноннокѣ Макаріѣ тpѣдѣхсе ѡ семѣ и сѣвѣрѣшихомѣ сїѣ книги* (*Octoechos* 1510, folio 200v), *азѣ х̄ѣу рабѣ сѣценноннокѣ Макаріѣ тpѣдѣхсе ѡ семѣ и сѣвѣрѣшихомѣ сїѣ книги* (*Gospel* 1512, folio 290v). The same texts also contain information about three Wallachian rulers, successors of Hospodar Radu IV the Great, under whose reign the books came out. These are Mihnea I the Bad (*їѡ Мнѣнѣ*), Vlad V the Young (*їѡ Влѣдѣ*), and Neagoe V Basarab (*їѡ Басараба*). The last two anagrams were written in the name of these rulers.

The fact that the Cetinje and Romanian printers shared the name has given rise to various hypotheses identifying the latter with the Montenegrin Makarije or rejecting such suggestions, and disputes on this subject remain unresolved to this day; the issue is discussed, e.g., by Nemirovskij (2008a: 115–25; 2009a: 71–77). Based on the analysis of differences in the printing technique of paleotypes from both centers, Bulgarian researchers consider the Wallachian printer to be a different person than the Montenegrin typographer: “Judging by all . . . artistic and technical indications, it appears that Hieromonk Makarije of Muntenia should be identified not with the Montenegrin printer, but with another, new individual, with strong links to the Bulgarian language and Bulgarian artistic traditions” (Atanasov 1959: 42). Serbian scholars tend to assume that the two monks were actually the same person (Pešikan 1994: 139; Curccio 2008: 335), as does Aleksander Naumow (Rusek, Witkowski, and Naumow 1993: 82). Evidence in support of such view includes, for example, significant textual convergences in the preserved anagrams (e.g., the calques from the Montenegrin foreword in the Wallachian afterwords). Nemirovskij (2009a: 77), on the other hand, believes that the arguments in favor of both positions are balanced and at present it is impossible to solve the “the question of Monk Makarije.” It seems that a consistent comparative linguistic analysis of the old prints from both centers (supplementing the bibliographical and textual conclusions already formulated in the writings on the subject) could bring us closer to a clear answer to this question.

The second debatable issue concerns the location of the printing house. The editions themselves lack any information on this subject, and the dominating belief (albeit one not shared by all scholars) that it was Târgoviște (reflected

even in the popular nomenclature of such texts: *Târgoviște Gospel* of 1512 [*Târgoviștko Četirievangelie* 1512]) did not appear in scholarly writings until the second half of the nineteenth century. In addition, a number of other suggestions have been made, in particular linking the printing workshops to larger Romanian monasteries: Câmpulung, Dealu, Govora, Snagov, and others (cf. Nemirovskij 2008a: 126–28). However, such hypotheses have failed to find many supporters.

There is no doubt that the most important paleotype of the first Wallachian typography is the *Târgoviște Gospel* of 1512. For one thing, it is the first printed Gospel text (Petrov 2016) in the *Slavia Orthodoxa* (the hypothesis that such a book had been published in Cetinje is not confirmed in the preserved sources). Secondly, this paleotype had a great impact on the further development of South Slavic printing, both in Romania and Serbia:

For many decades, the *Gospel of 1512* was meticulously copied in the South Slavic lands, both in handwriting and in print. The Wallachian edition served as the original for the tetraevangelia printed in 1537 in Rujno Monastery, in 1552 in Belgrade and in 1562 in Mrkšina crkva Monastery. It was also used in the preparation of further gospels printed on Wallachian territory. It should be pointed out that the successive printers copied not only the text but also the ornamentation of the 1512 edition. (Nemirovskij 2009a: 84)

The results of linguistic and textological research on this paleotype have been published in several studies by Diana Ivanova (2002: 58–107; Velčeva, Ivanova 2010: 52–73, 78–87). In these works, the author uses the method of chronological projection of linguistic traits of the studied paleotype onto South and East Slavic evangelical manuscripts that preceded its appearance (including the famous so-called *Gennadij Bible* of 1499—the first collection of all biblical texts for the whole *Slavia Orthodoxa* area), as well as onto later, both South and East, printed gospel and biblical codices (including the most important ones: the *Ostroh Bible* of 1580/1581 and the *Moscow Bible* of 1663 based on it, as well as the *Elizabeth Bible* of 1751). The conclusions of these comparisons concern the history of the development of the Slavic biblical text itself and the role of the South Slavic component in the development of the New Church Slavonic language:

The analysis of the text and linguistic means shows that the later Church Slavonic translations are not isolated either from the old manuscript tradition or from the previous printed books. . . . The influence of the 16th-century Bulgarian printed book on the younger Church Slavonic translations printed in the late 16th and the 17th–18th centuries in Russia and Ukraine is an evident phenomenon. Phonetically transformed and redacted, they returned to Bulgaria and were diffused widely. (Ivanova 2002: 96)

After the last paleotype was published in 1512, Cyrillic typographic activity in Romania ceased for more than thirty years. The second stage in the development of this tradition dates back to the mid-sixteenth century and is linked to the work of the continuator of the Serbian printing tradition, Dimitrije Ljubavić, who settled in Târgoviște, and Filip Moldoveanul of Sibiu. This period is an illustration of the—signaled earlier—intersection of Slavic paleotypic traditions in the Balkans in the sixteenth century, which also affected the development of the language.

The third stage, closing the history of Romanian-Bulgarian printing, lasted from 1557 to 1588. The most active figure of that era was the Romanian Deacon Coresi. However, prior to his activity, the long and accomplished paleotypic Venetian tradition developed in the South Slavic area, along with the Serbian tradition, both of which will be presented later in this chapter.

CYRILLIC PALEOTYPY IN VENICE (1519–1638)

The longest-operating and most prolific printing house that produced Cyrillic books intended for South Slavs was founded in 1519 in Venice by Božidar Vuković of Podgorica (other forms of his name in studies and sources include *Božidar Vuković od Đurića Podgoričanin*, *Božidar Vuković Zećanin*,¹⁷ *Dionisius a Vetula*, *Dionisio dalla/della Vecchia*), which, following the death of its founder, passed into the hands of his son Vićenco. Then, with periods of several years' inactivity, its tradition was continued by Stefan Marinović, Jakov of Kamena Reka, Jerolim Zagurović, Jakov Krajkov, Giovanni Antonio Rampazetto, and Marco and Bartol Ginammi until 1638. Despite its importance and long history, Venetian typography (or even the publishing house) has so far not been a subject of a complete monograph. Practically the same can be said about the activity of its individual owners and publishers. The only exceptions are some aspects of the work by Vuković and his successors (e.g., graphic design and ornamentation of Venetian paleotypes, examined by Dejan Medaković; 1958). Apart from lexica and encyclopedias, a comprehensive (but also abbreviated) look at the history of this most productive printing house of the sixteenth century is found in articles by Aleksander Naumow (2011), Monika Fin (2012) or essays by Evgenij Nemirovskij (IV 2001: 7–73, 103–65; VI 2003: 7–149; 2009a: 97–112, 136–50, 171–75; 2011: 9–10, 12, 19–26, 28–32). It is also worth mentioning the separate catalog by the Russian researcher, in which all the paleotypes representing the Venetian tradition are described (Nemirovskij 1993).

Only a handful of Venetian paleotypes have been published as phototypic editions, which will be noted in the relevant places in the following. In ad-

dition, scans of some of these texts are included in the Moscow CD (Morozova), and some of them are available online on the websites of the Russian State Library in Moscow, Digital Matica Srpska Library in Novi Sad,¹⁸ Digital National Library of Serbia,¹⁹ and the SS. Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia.²⁰

Božidar Vuković (1519–1521, 1536–1540)

Two periods or cycles can be distinguished in the history of the printing house and its founder and first owner: 1519–1521 (at that time he cooperated with a monk from Montenegro named Pahomije) and 1536–1539 (when he was accompanied by the monks Moisiije from the town of Budimlja and Genadije and Teodosije from the monastery of Mileševa). During these two cycles several impressive books were published in total (their number varies from seven to ten, depending on the classification of paleotypes published in parts and on different dates adopted for some prints), preserved in the largest number of copies (excluding the *Ostroh Bible* of 1581) (Nemirovskij 2009a: 97–112, 136–50; Naumow 2011: 10; Pet vekova 1994: 76–77, 85–92) compared to all Cyrillic paleotypes.

The following paleotypes were published during the first period of the printing house's operation (1519–1521):

(N: 24) *Psalter*, April 7, 1519, 160 folios, six copies

(N: 26) *Service Book (Služebnik)*, July 7, 1519, 240 folios, ninety-six copies and fragments

(N: 37) *Prayer Book / Miscellany (Sbornik)*: the so-called travel prayer book, March 6, 1520, 176 folios, the only copy of this edition, kept in the National Library of Serbia, burned down during the bombing of Belgrade on April 6, 1941 (Nemirovskij 1993: 29; IV 2001: 305)

(N: 38) *Psalter with Supplement*, October 12, 1520, 352 folios, fifty-one copies and fragments

(N: 40)²¹ *Prayer Book / Miscellany (Sbornik)*, *1521, 272 folios, nine copies (extended version of the *Prayer Book* of March 6, 1520 [N: 37])

In many studies, the last item (as well as its earlier variant marked in Nemirovskij's catalogs with number 37) is dated 1527, which is the subject of recurrent debates among archaeographers (this may be due to the misidentification of this Cyrillic paleotype with the Glagolitic edition published in Venice in 1527 in the printing house of Andrea Torresano de Asula (Kruming 1998: 35–36 [No. 11]; Nemirovskij 2009a: 108). The *Prayer Book* itself represents a peculiar macro-genre of the sixteenth-century paleotypy, namely a

small-format *book for travelers* (cf. Naumow 2011: 18–19; Novaković 1877 uses the Serbian term *zbornik za putnike*), which can be considered a unique indicator of the Cyrillic paleotype tradition in Venice. As Nemirovskij writes,

As regards their contents, Božidar Vuković's prayer books/miscellanies are a unique phenomenon in the entire Slavic written legacy. Manuscripts of such makeup are not known to scholarship. The miscellany published in Venice on March 6th, 1520 gave rise to a particular tradition, upheld across the entire 16th century. Božidar himself published this book at least three times (in 1520, around 1521, and in 1536), expanding its volume and broadening its contents from edition to edition. His son Vićenco published similar miscellanies in 1547 and 1560. Jakov of Kamena Reka, who used the typographic materials of the Vuković enterprise, issued a related—though not quite analogous—miscellany in the year 1566. This same label can be applied to the book *Various Occasions* (*Različnye potrebiti*), a miscellany printed in 1572 by Jakov Krajkov of Sofia. Except for Venice, no miscellanies of this type have ever been published anywhere.²² (Nemirovskij 2009a: 109)

Speaking of Cyrillic travel books published in Venice, it is worth stressing they are considered first printed editions of Bulgarian writers' original works. These include, first, a short variant of the *Life of St. Petka* by Patriarch Euthymius (Житиѣ и жизнь прѣподѣвныѣ мѣреѣ наше Петкы), and also, although in this case the matter is much more controversial, the *Prayer to the Mother of God* attributed to Peter Chernorizets. These issues have been raised again recently by the linguist from Blagoevgrad, Lilia Ilieva (Ilieva 2011: 153–56; 2012: 29–30) and Marijana Cibranska-Kostova, quoted in chapter 1 (Cibranska-Kostova 2007: 33–59; see also Kenanov 2009), who also presented the general history and main genre features of Cyrillic travel books printed in Venice, emphasizing that the last paleotype from this group (in the form of a reprint) appeared in Venice in 1597 (Cibranska-Kostova 2013: 38–40).

A distinctive feature of Vuković's paleotypes, not just in the first stage of his activity, is the extensive anagraphy (foreword and afterword) with valuable information about the circumstances of the publisher's life and work, as well as about the contexts (historical, religious, and personal), locating these editions in the communication space of the Orthodox Slavs in the Balkans at the time (Naumow 2016). At this point let us quote the key sentence from the afterword to the *Prayer Book* (miscellany), replicated in both its short and extended editions:

Having arrived in Venice, I saw that the Franks [Italians], the Greeks, and other nations were setting divine scriptures for printing. I felt the urge to set our books—Serbian and Bulgarian—in the presses in the same way too.

И дошъдшоу ми въ градѣ Венетіани видѣхъ съставляющіихъ въжѣтвнаа писаніа на тинарехъ, Фроуги же, и гръкы и иніе ездыкы. Желаніемъ въждехъ и наша сръвськаа же и вьлгарскаа такожде на тинарехъ съставити. (1520, folio 174v; 1521, folio 270v)

This declaration, as well as the unclear nationality of some of the successive printers who worked in the publishing house founded by Vuković (see the following), have been the reason for a number of scholarly interpretations aimed at proving that the Venetian Cyrillic paleotypic tradition belongs (often exclusively) to the writing heritage of Serbia, Bulgaria, Montenegro, or Macedonia. In my opinion, such an approach, anachronistic and methodologically flawed, has also often affected the way the language of Venetian paleotypes is analyzed.

In the second period of Božidar Vuković's activity (1536–1540), characterized by a large number of printed books (we can deduce this from the number of preserved copies), other texts were published:

- (N: 64) *Prayer Book* (miscellany), April 26, 1536, 312 folios, seven copies and fragments; (extended version of the *Prayer Book* of 1521 [N: 40], which, in turn, is an extended version of the *Prayer Book* of March 6, 1520 [N: 37])
- (N: 65) *Octoechos (Oktoix)* (tones V–VIII), July 27, 1537, 162 folios, 142 copies and fragments
- (N: 67) *Festal Menaion (Mineja)*, January 19, 1538, 432 folios, 231 copies and fragments
- (N: 69)²³ *Prayer Book (Trebник)*, *1538–1540, 280 folios, fifty-seven copies and fragments

Vuković's publishing output was not limited to the Slavic diaspora in Venice, but also extended beyond South Slavic, Romanian, and Balkan areas. Božidar's younger brother, Gaspar Vuković, likely played an important role in that broad distribution, selling their books in cities such as Dubrovnik and Belgrade, Vidin and Nikopol, which at that time belonged to the Ottoman Empire. Venetian titles were also published in the East Slavic area, as evidenced by borrowings from Venetian anagraphs in afterwords to books published by Ivan Fedorov or fragments of Venetian ornamentation used in Vilnius paleotypes printed by the Mamoniczs (PE X 2005: 21–23, author of the entry *Vukoviči*: Anatolij Turilov; Nemirovskij 2007a: 301–02). Vuković's contacts with Serbian monasteries were also close: “As regards the distribution of these books, Vuković maintained ties to his homeland, especially to Mileševa Monastery and other monasteries in the Scutari (Shkodër) area. Books printed at his press were disseminated not only by Serbian churches,

but also across the entire East Slavic area, as far as to the coast of the Baltic Sea” (Fin 2012: 84).

Vićenco Vuković (1546–1547, 1554–1561)

After Božidar’s death, his son Vićenco (*Vicenzo della Vecchia, Vincitius a Vetula*) took over the Venetian printing press and reprinted its previous editions. As Naumow (2011: 13; see also Nemirovskij 2009a: 171–75; 2011: 9–10) writes, “these books were set anew, the text being copied from previous editions, but since Vićenco had no experts in the old Church language and liturgy, they are not free from errors. There were five reprints with new dates in 1546–1561, and it is possible—albeit unlikely—that unchanged ‘reprints’ of the original editions were also printed.” Petăr Atanasov (1959: 53) voices a similar opinion about the language of Vićenco’s (and Božidar’s) paleotypes. Vincenzo’s dated editions, comprising three reissues of Božidar’s editions and two further reprints of these reissues, are as follows:

- (N: 75) *Psalter with Supplement*, 1546, 308 folios, seventy-three copies and fragments (reissue of the 1520 *Psalter* [N: 38])
- (N: 77) *Prayer Book / Miscellany (Sbornik)*, June 1, 1547, 312 folios, twenty-six copies and fragments (reissue of the 1536 *Prayer Book* [N: 64])
- (N: 84; G: 4) *Service Book (Služebnik)*, 1554, 240 folios, 152 copies and fragments (reissue of the 1519 *Service Book* [N: 26])
- (N: 93; G: 11) *Prayer Book / Miscellany (Sbornik)*, June 1, 1560, 312 folios, fifteen copies and fragments (reprint of the 1547 *Prayer Book* [N: 77])
- (N: 100; G: 21) *Psalter with Supplement*, 1561, 284 folios, thirty-two copies and fragments (reprint of the 1546 *Psalter* [N: 75])

In the 1546 *Psalter* (N: 75), there is an important anagraph on the 1–2 folios, entitled *The Epistle of Lord Vićenco Vuković* (Єписѣтола господина Виѣнцо Вукѣовика), in which the son of the first Venetian printer pays homage to his deceased father and explains the reasons why he decided to continue his work. The same text was also included in the 1561 *Psalter* (N: 100). Anagraphic texts in all reissues and reprints remain substantially unchanged except for colophons where the date and name of the new publisher is updated.

Vićenco Vuković may be associated with yet another paleotype, repeating one of Božidar’s earlier editions:

- (N: 102; G: 14) *Octoechos (Oktoix)* (tones V–VIII), *1560–1561, 162 folios, forty-five copies and fragments (reissue of the 1537 *Octoechos* [N: 65])

In this case, however, the exact attribution and date is made difficult by the fact that the book information was not changed in the colophon. Various dates have been suggested for this book, the most frequent being the early 1560s (especially 1560–1561) (Pešikan 1994: 161–62). A similar problem with attribution applies to two anonymous reissues of the 1554 *Service Book* (N: 84), which, however, are more frequently associated with one of Vićenco Vuković’s successors—Jerolim Zagurović from Kotor, Montenegro (see the following):

(N: 135; G: 51) *Service Book (Služebnik)*, *1570, 240 folios, seventy-three copies and fragments (reprint of the 1554 *Service Book* [N: 84])

(N: 167; G: 52) *Service Book (Služebnik)*, *1570/1580, 240 folios, twenty-eight copies and fragments (reprint of the 1554 *Service Book* [N: 84])

In the 1560s, Vićenco withdrew from publishing activity and started to rent typographic materials to other people.

Stefan Marinović (1561–1563)

The first to follow in Vuković’s footsteps was Stefan, the publisher of two Triodions:

(N: 95; G: 15) *Lenten Triodion*, January 6, 1561, 256 folios, eighty-four copies and fragments

(N: 109; G: 27) *Flowery Triodion*, December 24, 1563, 224 folios, eighty-eight copies and fragments

In the anagraphs, the printer calls himself “Stefan from the city of Scutari” (СТЕФАНЪ ѿ града Скѣара), today’s Shkodër, Albania (*Lenten Triodion* 1561, folios 256–56v), “Stefan of Scutari” (СТЕФАНЪ ѿ Скѣара) (*Flowery Triodion* 1563, folio 223), and the name Marinović (questioned by some researchers) may be established on the basis of the author’s provenance record (the so-called donor’s record or dedication record) preserved on one of the copies of the first paleotype and dated June 12, 1565:

This soul-saving book, called the Triodion, was donated to the church of Christ’s holy and glorious Bishop and miracle worker Nicholas, called Ivanovac, on the Bistrica river, near the great church of the Serbian Patriarchate in Peć, by Stefan Marinović, servant of those pious in Christ, from the God-protected city of Scutari, during the time of Elder Kir Roman. And let this book not be taken away from this holy church by anyone.

Гію доушеспасенію книгѣ, зовем триход, приложи храмоу светаго и славнаго архієрѣка и чудотворца Христова Николае, зовем Ивановца, на рѣцѣ Бистрице, влизь великыє црквы сръвскіє Петріархіє, иже в Пеке в Христа благовѣрніихъ рак Стѣфан Мариновикъ ѿ богохранимаго града Скадра а при старцѣ квр Романѣ. И да вѣде сіа книга ѿ сего светаго храма неѡемленю [sic!] никым. (Stojanović 1923: 64–65 [nr 6325]; Nemirovskij 2011: 12)

It has still not been established where the second *Triodion* was printed. According to the colophon, the book came out “in Macedonian lands, in [my] homeland, in the city of Skenderi” вѣ странахъ македонскихъ вѣ оупуево [sic!] вѣ граде Скендери (folio 223v), which allows us to assume that Stefan published his second book outside Venice. However, Aleksander Naumow considers this as a rather deliberate mystification: “The whole story about moving the workshop to Shkodër and printing only one book there looks like a hoax intended to bypass the Venetian bureaucracy and church supervision, or perhaps even Vićenco’s claims; if so, it would be the first—but not last—case in the history of Cyrillic printing of giving a false address” (Naumow 2011: 16). Moreover, the afterword of this paleotype was printed in 1580 in the Romanian town of Sebeş as an anagraph accompanying Deacon Coresi’s *Festal Menaion* (N: 160; G: 75).

The triodion, available online at the Matica Srpska Library, was edited as a phototypic publication by Jelena Đurović in Cetinje in 2012 (see “List of Source Text Editions”).

Jakov of Kamena Reka, Jerolim Zagurović, Jakov Krajkov (1566–1572)

The subsequent stage in the history of Cyrillic printing in Venice is associated with three names known from sources: Jakov of Kamena Reka (near Kyustendil in western Bulgaria), Jerolim Zagurović from Kotor in Montenegro, and Jakov Krajkov, who described himself as “from Sofia.” The identity of the two men named Jakov is still debated in Paleo-Slavic studies. Recently, Cibranska-Kostova voiced her opinion, rightly pointing out that researchers are quite clearly divided regarding this matter: most scholars from outside Bulgaria believe Jakov of Kamena Reka and Jakov Krajkov to be two different people, whereas the majority of Bulgarian specialists maintain that it was one and the same figure. In this context, Cibranska-Kostova (2013: 32–33) also drew attention to the works of some scholars (e.g., Mihajlo Georgievski, quoted in the previous chapter), which provide arguments in support of the Macedonian origin of Jakov of Kamena Reka.

The views of Bulgarian scholars, also shared by Cibranska-Kostova herself, are illustrated by the entry “*Jakov Krajkov*” from the latest Bulgarian bibliographical encyclopedia (author of the entry: Petăr Parižkov):

Krajkov, Jakov (16th century)—the first Bulgarian publisher, editor, printer, font-maker, artist/designer, illustrator, and engraver. Born in the village of Kamenna Reka, Kyustendil Province, he was educated as a copyist in Osogovo Monastery and in Sofia, where he familiarized himself with the traditions of the existing literary school. He acquired editing, correcting, and typesetting skills at Gračanica monastery; subsequently, he worked in Venice as a printer and publisher. Having mastered the craft well, in 1566 he bought the Slavic printing press belonging to Vičenco, son of Božidar Vuković. . . . Krajkov’s editions are characterized by high typographic refinement and original artistic design, as well as by the elegance and harmony of the Cyrillic fonts produced by him. (BKE 2004: 257).

As regards the reconstructed information on the life of Jakov, Evgenij Nemirovskij (2011: 24) says categorically: “All these statements are a mere figment of the imagination; they are not supported by any actual data.”

The nobleman Jerolim Zagurović from a Catholic Kotor family, featured in the anagraphs of two paleotypes alongside Jakov Krajkov, is not a subject of controversy. Some researchers attribute to him the anonymous reissues and reprints of the *Octoechos* (N: 102) and *Service Book* (N: 135; N: 167: see previous discussion) (Pešikan 1994: 195–96; Nemirovskij 2011: 25), whereas others tend to associate these editions with Jakov Krajkov (Atanasov 1980: 99–102; 145–50).

In the period discussed herein, from 1566 to 1572, four Cyrillic paleotypes were published in Venice, signed by:

–Jakov of Kamena Reka:

(N: 120; G: 37) *Book of Hours (Časoslovec)*, August 30, 1566, 268 folios, nineteen copies and fragments

–Jerolim Zagurović and Jakov Krajkov:

(N: 130; G: 46) *Psalter with Supplement*, 1569–1570, 276 folios, fifty-five copies and fragments

(N: 133; G: 50) *Prayer Book (Trebnik)*, 1570, 282 folios, fifty-five copies and fragments

–Jakov Krajkov:

(N: 138; G: 54) *Prayer Book / Miscellany for Various Occasions (РАЗЪЛАННІЕ ПИТОКІИ)*, 1572, 128 folios, four copies and fragments²⁴

All these paleotypes have been analyzed and described by two monographers of Jakov Krajkov: Petăr Atanasov, who in 1980 published a book devoted mainly to typographical and printing aspects and ornamentation, entitled *Jakov Krajkov. Writer, Publisher, Graphic Designer of the 16th Century* (*Jakov Krajkov. Knjižovnik. Izdatel. Grafik. XVI v.*; Atanasov 1980), and Marijana Cibranska-Kostova, who in turn focused primarily on the content and language of two editions: the 1570 *Prayer Book* (Cibranska-Kostova 1992) and the 1572 *Prayer Book* (*Miscellany*) (Cibranska-Kostova 2013). The latter item (the rarest in terms of the number of copies preserved) was also published phototypically in 2014 (see “List of Source Text Editions”).²⁵

Stefan Paštrović, Hieromonk Sava, Giovanni Antonio Rampazetto (1597)

Two more editions representing the Cyrillic paleotypy of Venice date from the end of the sixteenth century, namely:

(N: 244; G: 151) *Prayer Book* (so-called little miscellany), May 19, 1597, 152 folios, four copies and fragments

(N: 245; G: 152) *Primer/Abecedary* (*Bukvar'/Azbuka*), May 25, 1597, four folios, two copies and fragments

The former of these books, discovered in the mid-nineteenth century thanks to Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, bears the same printing characteristics as Vuković’s output, although it is inferior in terms of quality and is described only as a reflection of the earlier tradition (Pešikan 1994: 126; Nemirovskij 2011: 28–29). The anagraph (afterword and colophon) contains information about three persons that made the edition possible: Iguмен Stefan, Monk Sava, and Giovanni Antonio Rampazetto (“With the blessing of Lord Iguмен Stefan the Hieromonk, I, Hieromonk Sava of Dečani Monastery, a sinner and the smallest among monks, worked on this” *СѢ БЛАСВЕНІЕМЪ ГНА ІГОУМЕНА СТЕФАНА ЕРОМОНАХА. ТРОУДИ СЕ Ѡ СЕМЬ АЗЪ ГРѢШНИ И МЕНШІИ ВЪ ИНОЦѢ ЕРОМОНАХЪ САВА Ѡ МОНАСТІРА ДЕЧАНИ. . . . In Venetia Appresso Gio. Antonio Rampazetto,*” folios 150v–51).

The second edition by Sava (and probably also Rampazetto) became the first South Slavic primer/abecedary. It is the only paleotype from the south of the Orthodox Slavic region from the period until the end of the sixteenth century that can be counted among texts with metalinguistic content (cf. also Nemirovskij 2015: 122–26). This extremely rare (currently only two preserved copies)²⁶ old print has a phototypical edition (see “List of Source Text Editions”). It consists of:

1. a list of Cyrillic letters (folio 1), in which thirty-eight graphemes are placed; only the front *jer* is used to denote the reduced vowels: ѡ
2. tables for learning to read by syllables (folios 1–2), in which each of the twenty-four consonants used in the exercise is written six times in combination with one of the six vowels used: а, е, и, о, ѣ, and ѡ
3. list of letters with their names (folios 2–2v)
4. four prayers (folios 2v–4)
5. list of letters with their numerical value (folio 4)
6. colophon (folio 4v), which reads: “With the blessing of Igumen Stefan the Hieromonk, Sava, the smallest among monks, worked on this . . . in Venice” (СѢ БЛАВЕНІЕМЪ ПРѢПОУМЕНА СТЕФАНА ЕРОМОНАХА. ТРОУДИСЕ Ѡ СЕМЬ МЕНШИ ВЪ ИНОЦѢ САВА . . . ОУ БИЕЦІЕ)

As Ilieva (2011: 164–65; 2012: 36) emphasizes,

An extraordinarily important aspect of Monk Sava’s abecedary is the fact that it is practically the only extant source to convey some information on the pronunciation of written texts of the Orthodox South Slavs in the 15th–16th centuries. As can be seen in the examples, only six letters used for marking vowels had a specific phonetic value. . . . The high literary style of the period was connected with the pronunciation of six vowels, with the [single] *jer* vowel reflecting the etymological *jer*s.

There is no doubt that it would be useful to carry out a comparative analysis of this short paleotype with East Slavic editions similar in terms of their genre, first of all with primers published by Ivan Fedorov or Lavrentij Zyzanij (Tustanovs’kyj) and with similar paleotypes for non-Orthodox Slavs published (mainly in German cities) by Slovenian printer Primož Trubar (Sazonova 2003: 1242–44; Kryzia 2008: 45–49).

Bartolomeo, Marco, and Bartol Ginammi (1638)

The last manifestation of the typographical tradition initiated by the Vukovićs is the seventeenth-century reissue of the *Psalter* published in 1569–1570 by Jerolim Zagurović with the *Supplement* (N: 130). For chronological reasons, this paleotype is not listed in Nemirovskij’s collective catalogs nor in Guseva’s catalog. It is listed, however, in addition to the catalogs of individual libraries, as the last entry (under no. 28) in the second part of the first volume of the *Montenegrin Bibliography* (*Crnogorska bibliografija*), compiled by Nemirovskij (1993: 195–96):

Psalter with Supplement, 1638, 276 folios, thirty-four copies and fragments

In the foreword to the paleotype, referring to the foreword from Zagurović's edition, we find the following information:

Lord Marco Ginami, book dealer from Mercerie in Venice, saw that the holy churches lacked godly books, since those produced earlier by his [spiritual] parents—Voivode Đurađ Crnojević and Lord Božidar—were insufficient. For this reason, he came to the city of Venice and found the old workshop of his parents—Bartolomeo—and assembled them into one, so that the writings of the predecessors would be renewed and that the holy churches would be filled with various books. Thus, he implores all of you: remember Lord Marco in your prayers, as well as Bartolo Ginami, Marco's son, of the city called Venice, of Mercerie. And I was appointed to do this work by Lord Marco.

Господињь Марко Гинами книгариь у Млетъцие у Марцари виде єтїе црквы
вскоуднѣ бжствєнїе книги ѡже недостатъчна быше преждє ут родителѣи
его воевода Гюрга Црньовыка и господина Божидара и того ради прядѣ въ
Вѣнетъскыи градь и вкрѣтѣ стары кѣпари ут родителъ его Бартоломеа и
сѣстави ихъ в єдина іако да вѣноветсе старихъ писъмєна и да испльнетсе єтїе
црквы разлѣчнѣи книгамїи и того ради моли всєхъ васъ поменуѣте господина
Марка въ млтвахъ и Бартоло Гинама, Марковъ синь ут мєста зовомъ Венециа
у Марьцарини и ут господина Марка поставлїиь вєхъ на сїє дєло. (folios 1–1v)

Marco Ginammi, his father Bartolomeo and his son Bartol, mentioned in this anagraph, founded a dynasty of Venetian publishers named Alberti-Ginammi, printing in both Latin and Cyrillic alphabets and publishing works by writers from Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, and Bosnia (Medaković 1958: 39–40; Pešikan 1994: 113–14; Fin 2012: 85). *The Italian Biographical Dictionary* (*Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, volume 55, author of the entry: Lucinda Spera) states that the total typographical output of the Ginammi family spanning over several decades of the seventeenth century was comprised of more than 170 titles, including at least twenty-four books in the Slavic language:

The publication of texts in Slavonic was a rather widespread activity in Venice, practiced for decades by the Ginammi printing press. Not much is known concerning the nature of these works, in part certainly religious. Between 1638 and 1657, the Ginammi produced at least 24 editions, among them a fine *Psalter* (1638) in red and black; the latter reproduces the *Psalter* by Slavonic printer Jerolim Zagurović, whose shop was taken over by the Ginammi at the end of the 16th century.²⁷

Italian researcher Maria C. Napoli wrote a monograph describing the activity of the Ginammi publishing house: *Book Printing in 16th-Century Italy. The Printing House of Marco Ginammi (L'impresa del libro nell'Italia del Seicento. La bottega di Marco Ginammi*, Napoli 1990).

SERBIAN PALEOTYPY (1519–1566)

Printing Shops of the Ljubavić Family (1519–1523)

Almost simultaneously with the launch of Vuković's Venetian printing house (according to some researchers—even earlier), the so-called Goražde printing house (Serb. *Goraždanska štamparija*) began to publish its output. It was founded by a monk named Božidar, also known as Božidar Ljubavić Goraždanin, who died before the first book from this printing shop was published (*Service Book* 1519), as indicated by a remembrance printed at the bottom of the folio 32v: “Lord, remember your servant Božidar” *ПОМЕНИИ ГИ РАКА СВОЕГО БОЖИДАРА*. The printing house most probably started its activity in Venice, but later was moved to Slavic areas.

Due to the similarity of names, connections with Venice, and the profile of activity, past researchers often confused Božidar Ljubavić with Božidar Vuković:

Both presses arose in Venice. However, while one of them remained in Italy and functioned there for over 100 years, passing from one owner to another, the other one was relocated to Goražde—a town in what is now the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The founders and proprietors of both workshops had one and the same name—Božidar. The publishing output of the two presses was largely similar; both of them issued a *Psalter* and a *Service Book* at the same time. For these reasons, older bibliographers failed to distinguish the two Božidars and their editions; they spoke of one press instead of two. Ignorant authors continue to do so even in our times. (Nemirovskij IV 2001: 103)

In addition to Božidar the elder, the names of two brothers (perhaps the sons of Božidar, born before he became a monk) are associated with the printing house in Goražde: Đurđo (Đuro) and Teodor Ljubavić, the former of whom also died prior to the release of the first book published in this printing house, which we know from another remembrance printed on the folios of the first paleotype: “Lord, remember your servant Đuro” (*ПОМЕНИИ ГИ РАКА СВОЕГО ДУРА*, 1519 *Service Book*, folio 33), as well as from the extensive afterword, written for the most part on behalf of Đuro. The final part of this famous anagraph (along with the colophon), entitled “Đuro Ljubavić's supplication to the reverend priests” (*МЛНІЕ ГОУРА ЛОУКАВИКА КА ЧАСНІИ ПРЪЗВЪТРО*, folio 97), in turn, is a statement by Teodor, who informs: “and death came [upon him] suddenly in the year 7027 [1519], in the month of March, on the second day; memory eternal to him” (*И ПРИДЕ ВЪНЪЗАПОУ СЪМРТЬ ВЪ ЛЪТТО 7̄ 0̄ 2̄ 7̄ [1519] М̄ЦА М̄Р̄ Б̄ ДАНЫ ЕМЪ ЖЕ ВОУДИ ВЪУНАА ПАМЕТЬ*, folio 102). Thus, Teodor Ljubavić is considered to be the main typographer.

The question of where the first book was published remains debatable, and some researchers do not exclude the possibility that it might have been printed (at least in part) in Venice, where the brothers prepared the typeface for their workshop and where Đurađ died (Pešikan 1994: 92–93, 137; Nemirovskij 2009a: 114). Out of the three paleotypes published in the Goražde printing shop, the location (Goražde on the Drina, nowadays the southeastern part of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, right next to the border with Republika Srpska) is given only in the colophons of the last two, and the complete and accurate information on this subject appears only in the third edition: “the one who worked on this was humble Monk and Priest Teodor, at the church of Saint George, great martyr of Christ, on the Drina river” (ТРОУДИ ЖЕ СЕ Ѡ СКАМЪ САРКРЕНІИ МНИХЪ И СЦЕННИКЪ ФЕОДОРЪ ПРИ ХРАМОУ СТОГО ВЕЛИКОМНИКА ХВА ГЕѠ НА РЪЦЕ ДРИНЕ, the 1521 *Psalter*, 352v); “These holy books, called the Prayer Book, were begun at the church of Saint George, great martyr of Christ, in the town of Goražde on the Drina river” (Почеше се сѣ сѣтѣне книги глѣемне млитвникъ при храмоу сѣтаго великомника Хва ГеѠрѣга [sic!] въ мѣсте Горажде на рѣце Дринѣ, the 1523 *Prayer Book*, 296v). The entire output of this printing house is as follows:

- (N: 25) *Service Book (Služebnik)*, July 1, 1519, 104 folios, twenty-seven copies and fragments
 (N: 39)²⁸ *Psalter with Supplement*, October 25, 1521, 352 folios, ten copies
 (N: 62) *Prayer book (Trebnik)*, October 21, 1523, 296 folios, seven copies and fragments

Until recently, the Goražde printing house was relatively poorly researched, and the breakthrough was the interdisciplinary project entitled “The European Capital of Culture” carried out by the University of Eastern Sarajevo together with the National Library of Serbia, titled *Goraždanska štamparija 1519–1523 / The Goražde Printing House 1519–1523* (headed by Dragan Barać and Miroslav Pantić), the outcome of which were phototypic editions of all three of the Goražde paleotypes (see “List of Source Text Editions”) and a volume of studies (Barać 2008a).²⁹ The volume contains three papers discussing the phonetic and graphic aspects of the paleotypes from that publishing house (Grbić 2008; Skorić 2008; Mano-Zisi 2008), whereas a comprehensive study and description of their language, especially in relation to other sixteenth-century Cyrillic old prints (also belonging to other paleotypic traditions), has yet to be published.

It is worth noting that the printing activity of the Ljubavić family is an example of the intersection of three paleotypic traditions: started probably in

close connection with Venice, it was continued in Romanian (Wallachian) lands by the grandson of Božidar, Dimitrije Ljubavić (the Logothete), who in 1545 founded a printing house in Târgoviște, where two more books were published. It is highly probable that the Serbian monk Moisiĵe, who had previously accompanied Božidar Vuković in Venice in the second stage of his activity, cooperated with Dimitrije Ljubavić. Such an interpretation is possible due to the analysis of the content of colophons and anagraphic records from some books that were published by both printing houses (Nemirovskij 2009a: 166–67). Thus, the printing output of the Ljubavić family is, on the one hand, part of the history of the sixteenth-century Cyrillic paleotypy for all South Slavs (Venice, Goražde, Târgoviște), and, on the other, it becomes a link between the oldest printing center in Wallachia (1508–1512) and later printing houses in Romania. This is the history of the transmission and multi-level evolution of typographic, printing, textual, and, consequently, linguistic patterns common to the Cyrillic-reading South Slavs: “Considering the dissemination of the books from Goražde, the mobility of the press itself and its influence on Cyrillic printing, one arrives at a fresh perspective, revealing an extensive and entirely novel 16th-century cultural relation on the line Venice–Goražde–Târgoviște” (Barać 2008a: 60).

Serbian Monastic Printing Shops (1537–1566)

Four Serbian monastery printing shops occupy an important place in the history of sixteenth-century Cyrillic paleotypy in the South Slavic area, although their typographic output was by no means abundant: Rujno, Gračanica, Mileševa, and Mrkšina crkva. The activity of these printing shops is discussed in one of the monographs by Evgenij Nemirovskij (Nemirovskij 1995a), as well as in the introductions to his two catalogs (Nemirovskij VII 2007: 7–156; 2009a: 150–65; 2011: 10–13). There is also a number of detailed publications by Serbian researchers (or published in the Serbian language) (e.g., Štamparstvo 1987; Šalipurović 1972; Mano-Zisi 1994; Nemirovskij 1997a).

Rujno (1537)

The first Serbian monastic printing shop was founded in 1536–1537 and published only one book (phototypic edition from 1987—see “List of Source Text Editions”):

(N: 66) *Tetraevangelium*, 1537, 302 folios, five copies and fragments³⁰

The location of the edition is determined on the basis of the data from the colophon (folio 302v): “In the monastery by the name of Rujanski, at the

foot of the mountain by the name of Ponikve, on the river by the name of Bioska, in the village by the name of Vrutci, near the church of Saint George, victorious great martyr of Christ” (Въ свителѣи глѡ рѣіаінциѣи пѡд пѡдкрѡііаніе планѣ глѡѡтѣе пониквѣи на рѣци глѣтѣе вѣлскѡа на селѣ глѡтѣе вѣштци прѣ храмѣ стѣго и славнога великомѹнника и повѣдоносца Хѡа геѡргіа), although it does pose certain problems. The monastery with the church of St. George in Rujno is not mentioned in any known documents or preserved manuscripts—perhaps it was small and existed for a relatively short period. Similarly, the information concerning the publisher of the book, a monk named Teodosije, also mentioned in the colophon, is scarce, if not outright non-existent. The same name is associated with Božidar Vuković’s *Octoechos* (N: 65), published in Venice in the same year, but there is no indication that the two monks were the same person. Nemirovskij stresses that, first, the distance between the monastery and Venice was considerable, and second—this argument being much more important—the Venetian edition is an example of printing craftsmanship, whereas the *Rujno Gospel* must have been produced by a typographer who was only learning the art of printing (Nemirovskij 1995a: 7). Serbian scholar Mitar Pešikan is of a similar opinion: “Of all of our old printing workshops, this one was the least proficient in the contemporary printing technology” (Pet vekova 1994: 177).

A detailed analysis of the preserved copies, focusing on the typographical characteristics of the book, its typeface and font size, as well as on the graphic design and few ornamental elements, entitles Slavic book historians to claim that Teodosije from the monastery in Rujno must have used the Wallachian Gospel published in 1512 in Târgoviște (N: 11):

There can be no doubt that Teodosije had in his hands the Wallachian *Gospel of 1512*, from which he copied some of his headpieces. The content of both editions is identical. . . . That being said, the orthography in them is different: in the Wallachian edition, we find a Bulgarian orthography with its characteristic *jus* letters, and in the Rujno one—a Serbian orthography without the *juses*. (Nemirovskij VII 2007: 109–10)

Let us add that the *Rujno Gospel* of 1537 is the second of the three known Cyrillic paleotypes from the first half of the sixteenth century containing the texts of the four Gospels (unless the 1546 edition by Filip Moldoveanu, which will be discussed subsequently, is considered a mere reissue of the Wallachian edition of 1512). In the second half of the century, there were already more than ten such editions.

Gračanica (1539)

The second Serbian monastic printing center was located in the Gračanica monastery (in Kosovo and Metohija), operating since the beginning of the fourteenth century. The monastery and its library were destroyed by the Turks in the 1380s, but over the following two centuries the scriptorium was reconstructed; it flourished in the sixteenth century. This era is associated with Metropolitan Nikanor, considered the man behind the idea to set up a printing house in this monastery. The printing house in the Gračanica monastery published only one book:

(N: 68)³¹ *Octoechos (Oktoix)* (tones V–VIII), 1539, 224 folios, twelve copies and fragments

In a short foreword to the book, written in the name of Metropolitan Nikanor and referencing the foreword to the Cetinje *Octoechos* of 1494 (N: 5), the name of the printer is revealed as Dimitrije. No prior Cyrillic incunabula or paleotypes mention that name, and the reference in the discussed book is so laconic that we do not even know whether Dimitrije was a clergyman or a lay person. Serbian researcher Radoslav Grujić identified Dimitrije of Gračanica with the grandson of Božidar Ljubavić (on his initiative a printing house was established in Goražde), Dimitrije the Logothete, associated with two paleotypes published in Târgoviște between 1545 and 1547 (N: 72 and N: 76) (Grujić 1936). However, Nemirovskij (1995a: 43; VII 2007: 113) doubts that and voices his reservations by arguing that the two printing houses used a completely different typeface, not to mention that there is no sufficient evidence in anagraphic texts of the compared paleotypes. The same researcher, based on the analysis of provenance records from copies (directly extant or described in various sources) and their current location, suggests that the Gračanica *Octoechos* had the following range of distribution: Mount Athos, southern and northern Serbia, Vojvodina, and Bulgaria (Nemirovskij VII 2007: 119).

Mileševa (1544–1546, 1557)

The third monastic printing center in Serbia is Mileševa, located near the town of Prijepolje (southwestern Serbia). The scriptorium of this monastery played a significant role in the history of Serbian and—more broadly—South Slavic literature, and persons associated with it are mentioned in the anagraphs of several prior Cyrillic paleotypes. Božidar the elder lived in the monastery

of Mileševa, and it was on his initiative that the printing activity of the Ljubavić family (Venice, Goražde, Târgoviște) started: his name appears in the afterword to the first book published by the Ljubavićs, *Service Book* of 1519 (N: 25). Associates of Božidar Vuković in Venice also had ties with the Mileševa monastery (this applies at least to a monk named Genadije), especially in the second phase of the Vuković printing house: “By the order of Lord Božidar the Voivode, we worked on these writings—the humble Hieromonks Teodosije and Genadije, paraecclesiarch of the monastery of Saint Sava of Serbia which is in Mileševa, hailing from the town of Prijepolje” (Повелѣніемъ г҃на вождара воеводѣ трѡудихомѡе ѡ сїихъ писанїи сличренны въ иноцехъ сщ҃енныци феѡдосїе и генадїе параіеклїсїархъ монастыра ст҃го савгы сръвскаго иже ю҃сѣ въ милѣшевы ѡу҃ствомъ же ѡ мѣста приѡполя, *Octoechos* of 1537, folio 160v).

This correlation also occurred in the opposite direction: the establishment of a printing house in the Mileševa monastery on the initiative of Igumen Daniil was conditioned by his contacts with Venice, from where types and patterns of ornaments and decorative elements were brought (Nemirovskij VII 2007: 128). We learn about it from the afterword to the first book published in the monastery (this afterword is almost identical to the one in the second book published in Mileševa). The first book is:

(N: 70) *Psalter with Supplement* (the so-called first), October 30, 1544, 350 folios, twenty-four copies and fragments

Here is an excerpt from the afterword:

I, Hieromonk Daniil, humble Igumen of Mileševa [monastery], together with all brethren in the Lord, desired to embark on the effort to found a printing press in the Monastery of the Ascension of the Lord. And we sent our brethren in the Lord—Hieromonk Nikanor and Hieromonk Sava, along with Hieromonk Mardarije, Igumen of Banjska [monastery]—to the Italian lands, to the world-famous city of Venice; and from there they brought everything that was needed, and we arranged this press as well as we could, and we set this soul-saving book, the Psalter.

азъ сличренїи игоумень милешевскїи Даниїль іеромонахъ и съ бѣми ѡ Гї вратїами въжелѣхѡ трѡудюльзне юже съставити форми въ монастыри ст҃го възнѣнїа Гїна и послахѡ ѡ Гї вратїю нашуѡ Никанора іеромонаха и Савоу іеромонаха въ страни Італскїе и съ игоуменьѡ ваньскыль Мардарїемъ іеромонахѡ въ мирословествоующїи градъ Венетїю и вса недсотьнаа ѡтоуѡ принесоше и съставихѡ сїе типаре юлико възмогохоль постигнуѡти и списахоль дшепользные книги сїе фалтири. (folio 349)

In the subsequent part of the anagraph we find the information that the monks Mardarije and Teodor were involved in the production of the first Mileševa paleotype, the latter identified by some researchers with Teodor Ljubavić from the Goražde printing house (Stojanović 1905: 436; Nemirovskij 1995a: 71; VII 2007: 131). It is also worth mentioning that in the afterword to the book, following the example of Vuković's Venetian editions (including *Psalter with Supplement* of 1520, N: 38), a new term is used, denoting typographic letters: **типарѣ**. This and a few other terms associated with the publishing process in the South Slavic lands in the sixteenth century have been recently discussed by Marijana Cibranska-Kostova (2013: 19–20), whose analysis has shown that:

The rhetoric models of the first editions by Vuković the father recur in practically all of the ensuing Venetian Cyrillic prints, as well as in the output of the local Balkan monastery shops under their influence; this includes the fixed phrasing **съставити типарѣ, типари ог изънѣсти, принѣсти типари**. . . . It is evident that the lexeme **типарѣ** should be analyzed as deriving from the Greek noun τύπος “strike, press; mark, impression, stamp; depiction, sculpture, image, representation.” . . . The choice of the Slavic printers was influenced by the Greek paleotypy of Venice, from where they sourced many of their textual and engraving models.

The 1544 *Psalter with Supplement* largely copies Vuković's 1520 edition, especially as regards the format of the book, its spelling and accentuation, and ways of abbreviating words or writing supralinear signs (Pet vekova 1994: 142). Still, there are some discrepancies between the two editions, such as the arrangement of content and addition of anagraphic texts (afterwords), which—although also nearly identical—differ in terms of obvious factual details (Nemirovskij VII 2007: 145).

Assuming that Teodor of Goražde and Teodor of Mileševa monastery were the same person and considering the potential age of the printer, it is clear why two other men, Milan and Damian, were involved in the development of the subsequent Mileševa paleotype: “Damian the Dyak, and Milan, of Crna Zagora, from the place called Obna, which is near the great river called Sava” (Діацькь Даміанъ и миланъ ꙗко црквиѣ загоры оу места нарицаемаго швна, юже юстъ влызь великіе рѣкы глѣміе савѣк, folio 360). The data for this paleotype are as follows:

(N: 74)³² *Prayer Book (Trebnik)*, September 20, 1546, 364 folios, twenty-one copies and fragments

This is the fourth—chronologically—Cyrillic paleotype containing the text of the *Prayer Book*; previous editions were published in Cetinje (*1495, N: 8), Goražde (1523, N: 62), and Venice (*1540, N: 69). These editions differ in terms of the order of the individual prayers, and the Goražde *Prayer Book* (1523) is considered the closest to the Mileševa paleotype.

The so-called Mileševa First *Psalter with Supplement* (1544) and the *Prayer Book* (1546) were made by the first printing house in this monastery, whose activity was followed by an eleven-year hiatus (during which the publishing activity of the Vukovići in Venice was revived by Vićenco, son of Božidar). Some scholarly sources mention and reference other editions that allegedly came out of the first printing house in the Mileševa monastery (e.g., two editions of *Octoechos*); however, given the lack of source evidence or obvious errors that have been since corrected, these titles should be considered legends (Nemirovskij 1995a: 72–73; VII 2007: 132).

Although the head of the monastery was still the same Igumen Daniil, the subsequent stage is described as the second Mileševa printing house, due to the complete change in printing techniques (typeface and initials, this time likely copied from the 1495 Cetinje *Psalter*). Only one book was printed there:

(N: 88; G: 7) *Psalter with Supplement* (the so-called second), November 4, 1557, 294 folios, sixteen copies and fragments

It is worth noting that this is not a simple reissue of the 1544 Mileševa *Psalter*, but rather a completely new edition. Most likely, other people worked on the book than on earlier editions of the so-called first printing house, although their names are not mentioned in the afterword. At the same time, the text contains references to archbishop Makarije Sokolović, who in 1557 became the first patriarch in Peć, as well as Suleiman the Great, sultan of the Ottoman Empire in 1520–1566 (Pet vekova 1994: 143, 170, 228; Nemirovskij 1995a: 109–10; 2011: 10–12).

Belgrade, Mrkšina crkva (1552, 1562–1566)

Before we present the activity of the last Serbian monastery printing house and the printer named Mardarije associated with it, one mysterious edition should be mentioned, which appeared in an unknown, most likely South Slavic (probably Serbian) printing house and is only partially extant in two copies, currently stored in Belgrade and Novi Sad:

(N: 78) *Psalter*, *1550, over eighty folios, two copies and fragments

The typeface used to print this psalter is unlike in any other known Cyrillic paleotype, although some typographical parallels can be found between this and Vuković's Venetian editions (Pet vekova 1994: 175–77).

In the second half of the sixteenth century, apart from the so-called second Mileševa printing house, two more Serbian printing shops operated, both associated with the printer Mardarije. One is known in sources as the so-called Belgrade printing house, which published only one book:

(N: 82; G: 2) *Tetraevangelium*, August 4, 1552, 212 folios, sixty copies and fragments

This impressive item has been preserved in a large number of copies, and in 2000 it was published in a photographic edition (see “List of Source Text Editions”). The afterword to the book tells us that the printing house was founded by Prince Radiša Dmitrović (by some researchers considered to be the son of Dimitrije the Logothete, the great-grandson of Božidar of Goražde [cf. Medaković 1958: 54–55]), who, however, did not live to see the results of his work. After his death, Trojan Gundulić from Dubrovnik took over, and in turn engaged the monk Mardarije from the Mrkšina crkva monastery:

I, servant of Christ, Radiša Dmitrović . . . set the letters on the presses. And suddenly the harsh hour of death came, and [He] accepted my soul, and after my death these forms remained at my home. And subsequently I, Trojan Gundulić of the great city of Dubrovnik, after the passing of Prince Radiša, was forced to relocate these forms; so I took them and moved them to my home. . . . By the order of Lord Trojan Gundulić, I—a sinner, most wretched and smallest among monks, Hieromonk Mardarije, from the monastery called Mrkšina crkva, which is near Crna Gora—worked on this.

Язь ХѢ ракъ Радиша Дмитровиць . . . съставихъ слова на типарехъ и вънезапѣ
принде грѣдѣи часъ смръты и възеть дѣхъ мои и по смръти мои оставихъ сѣ
форми въ домѣ моемъ. По сихъ же азь Троянъ Гоундоулиць ѿ великаго града
Дѣрвоника по прѣставленіи княза Радише поноужденъ выхъ въ еже принести сѣ
форми и възехъ и принесохъ въ домъ мои форми сѣ . . . Повелѣнїемъ господина
Трояна Гоундѣлика трѣдихсе ѡ селъ писанїи азь грѣшныи много шканичѣши и
мънши въ иноцѣхъ їеримонахъ Мардарїе ѿ монастыра глѣмаго Мръкшина цѣква
иже юѣ вьызь Чръніе Гори. (folios 211v–12)

As was the case with many of the afore-mentioned paleotypes, creators of the *Belgrade Gospel* also modeled their work on their predecessors. Based on a preliminary analysis of the graphic and ornamental features and some of the characteristics of the language of the text (mainly graphic and phonetic), it has been proposed that Mardarije must have used the

Wallachian-Bulgarian *Tetraevangelium* published in Târgoviște in 1512 (N: 11). It might be worth mentioning that one of other potential models for the *Belgrade Gospel* is the so-called *Cetinje Gospel*, the existence of which is questioned by some researchers. Let us quote in this context the opinion of Serbian scholar Mitar Pešikan (1994: 213), referring primarily to the linguistic aspect:

Is the text of the *Belgrade Tetraevangelium* a Serbian Church Slavonic transcription of the Bulgarian Church Slavonic text of Makarije's 1512 edition, or did Crnojević's *Tetraevangelium* serve . . . as the model for both? As regards the *Belgrade Tetraevangelium*, the issue can be verified empirically: the possibility that a transcription from one recension to another at that time would have been entirely flawless (i.e. with no deviation from the target norm, conditioned by the Bulgarian Church Slavonic original) is merely theoretical, no matter how skilled and reliable the adapter would have been.

The *Belgrade Gospel* was reprinted ten years later in a monastery called Mrkšina crkva, most probably by the same printer Mardarije. This printing house, which concludes the history of Cyrillic printing in the sixteenth century in Serbian lands, published two books in total:

(N: 104; G: 24) *Tetraevangelium*, June 24, 1562, 212 folios, thirty-nine copies
(N: 121; G: 38) *Flowery Triodion*, September 1, 1566, 218 folios, fifty-six copies and fragments

The name Mrkšina crkva does not appear in any other source—neither in books, nor in documents, nor in the Slavic and Turkish archives—except for the three paleotypes listed previously, which is very rare for the literature of medieval Slavs. Therefore, many hypotheses have been formulated in the scholarly writings concerning the location of said monastery, whose concise description, based on many detailed publications, can be found, for example, in the monograph by Nemirovskij (1995a: 122–26). Based on the name used in the afterword: “near Crna Gora” (влызьь Урьніѣ Гори), some researchers located the monastery in Montenegro, although this assumption failed to gain significant support. Others, based on folk stories, locate the monastery north of the town of Užice (now Zlatibor District), on the border with Bosnia and Herzegovina. Another hypothesis points to the village of Pambukovica near the city of Valjevo (western Serbia), and it is based on testimonies of a journalistic nature. There have also been attempts to link the place where the monastery was located with similarly sounding personal names (e.g., Prince Mrkša, who ruled several villages in western Serbia in the second half of the fifteenth century).

Compared to the controversy that surrounds the location of the monastery, the information about the printer himself, Mardarije, is presented in more detail. From the afterword to the *Tetraevangelium* (1562), we learn that he hailed from areas on the river Drina, separating Serbia from Bosnia: “and I come from near the river called Drina” (аз же ѿчувствомъ ѿ реке рекоміе Дрина, folio 211v), and that during the printing of the *Flowery Triodion* (1566) he was already advanced in age: “For I recalled my old age, that my hour of death was coming, and that our life is not overly long. . . . And the ones working here were Priest Živko, sinner and servant of God, and Dyak Radulj, servant of God” (Понѣже съмысли ѿрѣме старѣти моее тако врѣме смрътнѣе приближаѣсе и житіе наше немного врѣменно . . . Трѣудижесе здѣ грѣшнїи ракъ Божїи попо Живко и ракъ Божїи діакъ Радѣуль, folios 217v–18). According to Nemirovskij (1995a: 127), the names of the associates who helped him compile his last book (Priest Živko and Dyak Radulj) may also point to Mardarije’s Wallachian-Bulgarian connections or inspirations.

It should be noted that each of the Serbian monastic printing houses (as well as the printing shop in Belgrade) operated for a relatively short time, which makes them significantly different from, for example, the Vuković printing house in Venice. After the last book was published in the Mrkšina crkva monastery in 1566, printing in Serbian lands was not continued until after liberation from the Turkish oppression, and the subsequent book was printed in Belgrade only in 1832. Until then, the demand for basic liturgical books (*Gospel*, *Psalter*, *Octoechos*, *Triodion*, *Prayer Book*), published in the sixteenth century in the printing houses presented previously, had to be met from other sources. In this context, in particular with regard to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Russian and Ukrainian publishing houses are listed, as well as presses operating in Venice, Vienna, or Buda (Nemirovskij 1995b: 173–75). It is worth noting, however, that also in the Balkans, and especially in the Wallachian-Romanian region, the Cyrillic printing industry continued to develop and operate actively: “The second half of the 16th century saw a steep decline in the activity of the presses working in Venice and in Serbian monasteries. At the same time, however, the productivity of workshops functioning in the lands of today’s Romania increased” (Nemirovskij 2011: 7–8). The subsequent stages of paleotypy in Romanian lands will be discussed in the following.

ROMANIAN-BULGARIAN PALEOTYPY: STAGE II (1545–1554)

Dimitrije Ljubavić (1545–1547)

After the first Cyrillic printing house in Wallachia (whose editions from 1508 to 1512 have already been discussed) ceased to operate, and after a longer

hiatus, Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypy did not begin to develop again until the mid-sixteenth century, and the first old prints preserved from this second stage are associated with Dimitrije the Logothete, who in 1545 founded a printing house in Târgoviște, where two books were published:

(N: 72)³³ *Prayer Book (Trebnik)*, January 10, 1545, 297 folios, nine copies and fragments

(N: 76) *Apostle*, March 18, 1547, 268 folios, sixteen copies and fragments

Most researchers consider Dimitrije Ljubavić, mentioned by the printer Moisiye in the anagraph to the *Prayer Book*: “I, Moisiye, a sinner and the smallest among hieromonks, worked on this edition using the matrices of Dimitar Ljubavić. . . . In the capital city of Târgoviște” (Язь грѣшныи и мьнши въ сщєнноинокоухъ Моиси трѹдихъ се ѡ семь писанїю съ мадрами Димитра Любавикѣ Бѣ настѡлныи градь Тръгѡвище, folio 297)—as a representative of the afore-mentioned family of founders of the printing house in Gorazde. He could have been the son of Đuro or Teodor and the grandson of Božidar Ljubavić, and his possible, though uncertain, connection to the Gračanica monastery has also been pointed out. It is also conceivable that Monk Moisiye, who worked for Dimitrije, was previously associated with Božidar Vuković’s Venetian printing house in the second stage of its activity (Nemirovskij 2009a: 166). All these circumstances make Dimitrije’s printing house an example of the intersection and combination of several paleotypic traditions in the Balkans.

Another text published by the second Cyrillic printing house in Târgoviște is the *Apostle*—the first book of this type printed in the Balkans (the previous Cyrillic *Apostle* was published in Vilnius by Francysk Skaryna in 1525—cf. below). The recent archaeographic analysis of this text, in which two typographical variants—Wallachian and Moldavian—are discussed, has been carried out by Serbian archaeographer Miroslav Lazić (Lazić 2014).

Filip Pictor Moldoveanu (the Moldavian) (1544–1554)

Simultaneously with the printing house of Ljubavić’s grandson in Romania, Filip Pictor Moldoveanu (the Moldavian) ran his own printing shop in the Transylvanian town of Sibiu (Hermannstadt), where circa 1544 he published a most likely Lutheran catechism printed in Cyrillic in the Romanian language (N: 71)³⁴ (it has not survived), as well as a Slavonic Gospel, virtually a literal reprint of the Gospel published in 1512 by Monk Makarije in the Wallachian town of Târgoviște (cf. previous, N: 11):

(N: 73)³⁵ *Tetraevangelium*, June 22, 1546, three hundred folios, three copies and fragments

Several years later another paleotype was published in the same city:

(N: 81; G: 1) *Tetraevangelium*, 1551–1554, 128 folios, two copies and fragments

This book, preserved in fragments, contains a parallel printed text of the Gospel in the Church Slavonic and Romanian languages. Due to the lack of data, it is impossible to determine the printer, and a large group of Romanian scholars associate him with Deacon Coresi. However, in their latest catalogs Nemirovskij and Guseva point to Filip Pictor (Nemirovskij 2011: 8, 73; Guseva 2003: 25), which would mean that this text can be included in both stage II and stage III of Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypy. The date and location of this old print have not been fully established either. The text appears in a phototypic edition, based on a copy from St. Petersburg (see “List of Source Text Editions”).

ROMANIAN-BULGARIAN PALEOTYPY: STAGE III (1557–1588)

Unlike the Venetian and Serbian traditions, the history of Cyrillic Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypy, which in its third stage is the longest-running successive tradition (the first and second stages can be regarded as somewhat isolated in terms of the source legacy), is most poorly studied and described. There is no scholarly synthesis of the subject; in fact, not even a complete list of the extant sources has been compiled. Although Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypes from the second half of the sixteenth century are listed in the collective catalogs compiled by Guseva and Nemirovskij, it is this group of South Slavic old prints that shows the most uncertainties or gaps in the basic data, as well as the most discrepancies in the detailed studies. Moreover, it seems that there is another significant shortcoming in the scarce studies on the subject under discussion: namely the fact that Slavic scholars make insufficient use of research on Cyrillic paleotypy in Romanian lands carried out by Romanian and Hungarian experts. Although these publications mainly focus on Cyrillic old prints in Romanian rather than Slavonic, they may be a valuable source of observation and interpretation due to their similarity and sometimes even convergence of problems, revealing an additional, non-Slavic context of the history of Cyrillic printing in the South Slavic area.

In terms of quantity, Romanian-Bulgarian old prints from the second half of the sixteenth century constitute the largest group of South Slavic paleotypes. Published in several different cities of Wallachia, Moldova, and Transylvania and being—despite their large numbers—products secondary to the earlier (and later parallel) Venetian tradition, they are associated (mostly, but universally) with Deacon Coresi.

Deacon Coresi (1557–1583)

Relatively little is known and written about the deacon named Coresi. Apart from a handful of volumes in the series *Bibliografia românească veche*, initiated by Ioan Bianu, recent works devoted to the printer include the monograph by Romanian linguists Ion Gheție and Alexandru Mareș, entitled *Deacon Coresi and the Triumph of Writing in Romanian (Diaconul Coresi și izbânda scrisului în limba română; Gheție and Mareș 1994)*, and the unpublished doctoral thesis by archaeographer Adela Otilia Urs of Cluj-Napoca, entitled *Deacon Coresi. A Monograph and Anthology of Texts (Diaconul Coresi. Monografie și antologie de texte*,³⁶ Urs 2009), as well as a series of her bibliographic articles under the common title *Istoriografia coresiană* (Urs 2012a, 2012b, 2012c).

The typographer Deacon Coresi, who probably hailed from Târgoviște, printed in a number of cities (mentioned in some of the texts, as well as in catalogs and studies); they are, successively, Brașov, Târgoviște, Alba Iulia, and Sebeș. He had many associates and disciples, whose names (as well as many other factual details) are verified in anagraphs. With time, he passed his printing workshop to his son, also deacon, named Șerban (Sazonova 2003: 1247–48).

It is worth noting that all Cyrillic paleotypes originating from Romanian lands can be divided into three language groups: 1) printed in Church Slavonic (according to most studies—Middle Bulgarian with Wallachian or Moldovan elements), 2) printed in Romanian (sometimes with chapter titles in Church Slavonic), and 3) printed (sometimes in parallel) in both languages. In this volume, attention is focused exclusively on the available paleotypes from the first group, but editions of the third group will also be noted. Unlike in the case of the Venetian or Serbian old prints, the number of extant copies of Bulgarian-Romanian paleotypes is much scarcer, their physical condition is worse (we often find missing folios), and anagraphic texts are not always preserved.

The first old print that mentions the name Coresi was published in the village of Brașov in Transylvania:

(N: 87; G: 6) *Octoechos (Oktoix)*, January 14, 1557, 166 folios, four copies and fragments

The afterword to this text, printed only in Slavonic, reads: “By the command of mayor Hanăș Begner, judge of Brașov, I, Oprea the Logothete, servant of Christ, and Deacon Coresi worked on this and we wrote these books” (Повелѣніемъ жьпань Ханьшь Бѣгнерь соудцоу брашевскомъ азъ Хѣ равъ Опрѣ логотеть и дѣаконъ Кореси трѣдихъ ѡ семъ и съписахъ сѣ книги, folio 165).

Coresi’s subsequent edition, which also features illustrations for the first time, was published in Târgoviște:

(N: 89; G: 8) *Flowery Triodion*, July 30, 1558, 364 folios, eight copies and fragments

The anagraph records the names of Wallachian hospodars Pătrașcu the Good (Pătrașcu cel Bun) and Mircea the Shepherd (Mircea Ciobanul), during whose reign this paleotype was created:

These books were begun in the days of Voivode Io(an) Pătrașcu, memory eternal to him; and these books were finished by the command of Christ-loving, God-protected, most bright Io(an) Mircea, pious in Christ, the great Voivode and ruler of all Hungaro-Wallachian lands and on the Danube, the son of the great and most good Lord Radu the Voivode. I, servant of Christ, Deacon Coresi, worked on this and wrote these books with the help of my 10 apprentices.

Повешесе сѣ стѣла книги въ дны Іюнь Петрашко воевода вѣчна емѣ память и съвршишесе сѣ книги повеленіемъ въ Хѣ Бѣ блговѣрнаго и хѣлюбиваго и бѣохранимаго и прѣсвѣтлаго гсѣдара Іѡ Мирца великаго воеводы въ сее земли Оугровлахѣтской и по дѣнавію снѣ великаго и прѣдобраго Іѡ Радла воеводы. Язъ Хѣ равъ дѣаконъ Кореси трѣдихъ ѡ семъ и съписахъ сѣ книги и съсѣ Іѡ ученикъ моихъ. (folio 364v)

After Martin Luther’s catechism was published again in Brașov in 1559 or 1560 (which sparked debates about Coresi’s religious affiliation [Nemirovskij 2011: 46; Urs 2007]), as well as the Romanian Nomocanon of 1560–1562 and the Romanian Gospel of 1561³⁷ (all these paleotypes were published in Cyrillic), the deacon published his subsequent paleotype in Slavonic:

(N: 106; G: 17) *Gospel*, October 13, 1562, 242 folios, eight copies and fragments

The text of the afterword refers to the anagraphs of the *1512 Gospel* and the first Venice editions of 1519 and 1520 (Atanasov 1959: 64), and a dyak named Tudor (Тодуръ) is mentioned alongside Coresi.

Between 1556 and 1583 (presumably the date of his death), Coresi published several old prints in both Slavonic and Romanian (as well as several bilingual books). Slavonic texts are preserved in the following well-known editions published in Braşov:

- (N: 122; G: 40) *Apostle*, December 15, 1566,³⁸ 320 folios, five copies and fragments, paleotype in Romanian and Church Slavonic
 (N 125; G: 41) *Festal Menaion (Mineja)*, December 6, 1568, 244 folios, eight copies and fragments³⁹
 (N: 128) *Service Book (Služebnik)*, c. 1568, 277 folios, one copy⁴⁰
 (N: 134; G: 44) *Psalter*, c. 1568/1570, 161 folios, two copies and fragments
 (N: 140; G: 55) *Psalter with Supplement*, ca. 1572/1573, 296 folios, two copies and fragments
 (N: 148; G: 63) *Psalter*, c. 1576, 148 folios, two copies and fragments
 (N: 150; G: 65) *Psalter*, 1577, 316 folios, two copies and fragments, paleotype in Church Slavonic and Romanian,⁴¹
 (N: 156; G: 71) *Psalter*, c. 1578, 337 folios, two copies and fragments, paleotype in Church Slavonic and Romanian

As regards a certain group of texts associated with Coresi, writings on the subject indicate—on par with Braşov—another possible location of their publication—Sebeş (southern Transylvania, central Romania):

- (N: 142; G: 56) *Octoechos (Oktoix)* (tones I–IV), October 20, 1574, 214 folios, six copies and fragments
 (N: 145; G: 61) *Octoechos (Oktoix)* (tones V–VIII), August 23, 1575, 202 folios, eleven copies and fragments
 (N: 151; G: 66) *Psalter with Supplement*, 1577, 172 folios, four copies and fragments,
 (N: 153; G: 68) *Lenten Triodion*, March 26, 1578, 292 folios, thirteen copies and fragments
 (N: 158; G: 74) *Gospel*, 1579, 206 folios, thirteen copies and fragments
 (N: 165; G: 78) *Psalter*, c. 1580, 156 folios, one copy
 (N: 180; G: 90) *Tetraevangelium*, c. 1583, 202 folios, four copies and fragments

Some of Deacon Coresi's editions are unambiguously associated with the city of Sebeş:

(N: 160; G: 75) *Festal Menaion (Mineja)*, November 11, 1580, 468 k, twenty-six copies and fragments

It is worth noting that the last of the listed old prints, in which the name of the city of Sebeş does not appear, contains an extensive anagraph compared to other editions in this group, which is a reprint of the afterword from the *Flowery Triodion* published in 1563 by Stefan Marinović of Scutari (N: 109; G: 27). This fact is an important (albeit not the only one, of course) piece of evidence for the intersection of the Venetian and Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypic tradition in the sixteenth century.

Moreover, in some studies (e.g., Urs 2009) the Braşov printing house of Dyak Kalin—who collaborated with Hanăş Begner, mentioned in the anagraph of one of Coresi's paleotypes (N: 87; G: 6)—is mentioned as a separate establishment. Kalin is associated with one old print listed in catalogs, namely *Tetraevangelium*, published on September 1, 1565 (N: 116), but the book is now considered lost. Due to the coincidence of the place of publication and the name of the patron, Begner, it cannot be ruled out that it was published in cooperation with Deacon Coresi at the same printing house (Atanasov 1959: 65).

Dyak Lorinț (1567–1579)

Working parallel with Coresi, although most likely independently of him, was another Romanian typographer, known from the sources as Dyak Lorinț. Several paleotypes are identified with his activity, some of which are also attributed to Coresi. Three can now be considered certain, the first of which was published in Braşov:

(N: 123; G: 39) *Octoechos (Oktoix)* (tones V–VIII), June 20, 1567, 196 folios, three copies and fragments

Two more books were published in the Transylvanian town of Alba Iulia, also known as Belgrade (Romanian: Bălgrad), and are connected with the thirty-year privilege granted to the printer by the prince and then voivode of Transylvania, Christopher Báthory:

(N: 155; G: 70) *Octoechos (Oktoix)*, 1578, 204 folios, five copies and fragments

(N: 157; G: 73) *Tetraevangelium*, May 16, 1579, 211 folios, four copies and fragments

The privilege in question is described in the anagraph of the second item: “By the command of great Voivode Christopher Báthory, I, Dyak Lorint̃ worked on this and wrote these books, called the *Tetraevangelium*, . . . in the city of Belgrade [Alba Iulia]. On the strength of [the privilege of] great Voivode Christopher Báthory, it is prohibited to print this for 30 years”
 ПОВЕЛѢНІЕМЪ ВЕЛИКАГО ВОЕВОДА БАТІРЬ КРИЦОВЪ АЗЪ ЛВРИНЦЪ ДІАКЪ ТРОУДИХСА
 О СЕМЬ И ИСПИСАХЪ КНИГИ СІЕ ГЛ҃ЕЛІИ ТЕТРОЕВ҃ЛІЕ . . . ВЪ ГРАДЬ БЕЛ҃Г҃РА. И СЪ
 ВЛАСТІЮ ВЕЛИКАГО ВОЕВОДА БАТІРЬ КРИЦОВЪ ЗА .Л. ЛѢТЬ ДА НЕ СЛ҃КЕТЬ НА ТИПАРЬ
 (due to the incompleteness of the paleotype, its multiple pagination and numbering, the folio number remains unknown; Guseva 2003: 532).

Hieromonk Lavrentie (1582)

Another of the Romanian-Bulgarian printers was Hieromonk Lavrentie, founder of the monastery of St. John the Baptist on the Colentina River near Bucharest. His activity in that center yielded two editions of the Gospel, known in Bulgarian as *Lavrentievoto četirievangelie* (*Lavrentie's Tetraevangelium*) (in Russian, the name *Buxarestskoe evangelie* [*Bucharest Gospel*] is used). The authors of the collective catalogs describe this paleotype as two separate books:

(N: 173; G: 86) *Tetraevangelium*, 1582, 218 folios, ten copies and fragments
 (N: 175; G: 88⁴²) *Tetraevangelium*, after 1582, over 240 folios, four copies and fragments

More recent detailed archaeological and linguistic studies (e.g., Mano-Zisi 2003) in principle speak of two editions of the same text and call for their parallel analysis. The most up-to-date information can be found in one of the articles by Diana Ivanova, in which the author gives the total number of copies of the *1582 Gospel* now known: nineteen (thirteen copies of the first and six of the second edition, respectively; Ivanova 2013: 27).

The anagraph informs the reader about the circumstances under which the item was created:

I, Hieromonk Lavrentie . . . wrote this soul-saving book of the Four Gospels . . . in the days of our pious and Christ-loving Hospodar Io(an) Alexandru the Voivode, and of Bishop Kir Eutimie. For this reason, I, Hieromonk Lavrentie, servant of Christ and the smallest among monks, with my apprentice Jovan, worked near the city of Bucharest, on the river Colentina, and we created a monastery [with] a church of the holy prophet and forerunner John the Baptist, and we organized this printing workshop in it. We worked for 10 years until

we produced the forms and matrices, and I began first-hand, and I wrote these divine scriptures of the Tetraevangelium, beneficial for the soul

азъ ꙗерѣонахъ Лаврентіе . . . написахъ сіа дѣше сѣснажа книгѣ ѡтороклѣговѣстїе . . . въ дни благо ѡтївола и Хѣ любовнола гпѣдини нашемѣ Іѡвѣ Ялигандрѣ вонвода при архїерен кѣрь влѣцѣ Евфѣе сего ради азъ Хѣ рабъ и менши въ иноцѣ ꙗеромонахъ Лаврентїе и съ ѡученикѣ мой Іѡванъ трѡудїмосе влѣзь гѣда Боѡрещъ на рече Колентина и сътворихѣ монастирѣ хрѣстаго прѣрока прѣтечѣ крѣтителѣ Іѡвана и въ не сътворихѣ типари сіе трѣдихѣ „Г, лѣтъ дондеже съставихѣ Фѡурме и мадаре и почухъ прѣва роука и съписахъ дѣше пользніе сіе вѣтъвнїе кнѣгы тетрѡевлї. (folio 217v)

Comparing the language of the *Bucharest Gospel* (both editions) with the first printed Romanian-Bulgarian edition of the *1512 Gospel* (N: 11) as well as with contemporary and subsequent East Slavic editions, Ivanova indicates that among the many language peculiarities of this text there are a number of New Bulgarian innovations characteristic of the East Bulgarian dialects of Moesia (see Stojkov 2002: 101–05). These are, however, sporadic phenomena, occurring against the background of numerous Tărnovo and Resavian features: “As regards language and orthography, the Tărnovo norm is mostly stable, but in *Lavrentie’s Tetraevangelium* one also notices the percolation of certain elements of the Resavian (or West Bulgarian) type; furthermore, one finds—albeit sporadically—phenomena reflecting vernacular speech (chiefly at the phonetic and morphological level)” (Ivanova 2002: 32, 38).

It should be added that some Romanian studies associate Monk Lavrentie with another Cyrillic paleotype—with the text of the *Psalter*: “Lavrentie, a hieromonk printer from Wallachia, second half of the sixteenth century, with the help of his apprentice Iovan (Ioan). He founded a printing press in the Colentina (Plumbuita) Monastery by Bucharest (1573), which saw the printing of a *Tetraevangelium* in two editions (ca. 1582) and a *Psalter*, both in the Church Slavonic language. The editions were circulated widely in the Orthodox Slavic countries” (Păcurariu 2002: 244). However, this edition is not recorded in any of the current catalogs of Cyrillic old prints from the sixteenth century.

Deacon Șerban (1582–1588)

The history of sixteenth-century Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypy is concluded by the activity of Coresi’s son, also a deacon, named Șerban. His name appears in three paleotypes. The first of these is the Romanian edition of the *Historical Palea*, which was published in the town of Orăștie, Transylvania

in 1582 (N: 171; G: 84). As for the Church Slavonic language, the printer published two editions of the Service Book, printed in Braşov:

(N: 191; G: 103) *Service Book (Služebnik)*, September 25, 1587/1588, 106 folios, four copies and fragments

(N: 197; G: 106) *Service Book (Služebnik)*, *1588, 278 folios, three copies and fragments

A short anagraph (afterword and colophon) in the former book provides information about the place of publication, the printer, and the corrector who helped him in his work: “In the wonderful city of Braşov. I, sinful Şerban, son of Deacon Coresi, and the corrector, Miha the Priest, from the same city of Braşov” (въ дивный гѣдъ Брашовъ азъ грѣшны Шербанъ снѣ діакѣ Кореси и справникъ попь Миха ѿ тойжде гѣдъ Брашевскы, folio 105). Based on the available information on the preserved source texts, it should be stated that the publication of the last two books by Deacon Şerban marks a break in the tradition of Cyrillic paleotypy in Transylvanian, Wallachian, and Moldavian lands (i.e., the tradition of Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypy); its revival did not take place until 1635 (cf. Sazonova 2003: 1248).

EAST SLAVIC CYRILLIC PALEOTYPY— GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

In the sixteenth century, parallel to the tradition of Cyrillic paleotypy for South Slavs described earlier, printing also developed in the East Slavic area. This tradition (consisting of several trends), especially in the second half of the century, gradually became dominant and determined not only the models of printing art, but also the approach of authors to language issues. It is in the east that the first Church Slavonic primers and abecedaries are published, along with the first lexica and grammar books, and the Church Slavonic body of biblical books is printed in its entirety for the first time. The flourishing of East Slavic paleotypy is one of the constitutive stages of the formation and shaping of the New Church Slavonic language (see chapter 1), in which South Slavic old prints also played their role. In this case, therefore, we can speak of a contextual interaction between literature and language variants in two directions: elements representing different southern traditions (Venetian, Serbian, or Romanian-Bulgarian) could have been taken into account—to varying degrees—in the making of East Slavic paleotypes, which in turn became an important part of the writing tradition and linguistic reflection of the South Slavs in the following decades and centuries. With this in mind, the final part

of this chapter will provide a brief presentation of the main components of the sixteenth-century East Slavic paleotypic tradition, which, it should be noted, is much better researched and described than South Slavic printing. Outlining this context makes it possible to compare the dynamics and scale of parallel traditions in the East and the South.

The oldest history (until the beginning of the seventeenth century) of East Slavic Cyrillic paleotypy intended for Orthodox Slavs is attested to by old prints that arose as a result of the typographical activity of various centers and several printers. Based on the available catalogs and studies, the most important stages (traditions) of the process can be identified⁴³ as follows:

- typographic activity of Francysk Skaryna (Prague, Vilnius, 1517–1525)
- anonymous typographic activity (Moscow, *1553–1565)
- typographic activity of Ivan Fedorov (Moscow, Zabłudów, Lviv, Ostroh, 1564–1581)
- typographic activity of Moscow printers after Ivan Fedorov left Moscow and the establishment of the Moscow Print Yard (1568–)
- typographical activity of Lviv (1591–1594) and Ostroh (*1583–1612) printers after Ivan Fedorov left those centers
- typographical activity of printers from Vilnius: the Mamonicz printing house (1574–1624), Vasil' Haraburda's printing house (*1580–1582) and the printing house of the Brotherhood of the Holy Trinity/Holy Spirit (1595)

The earliest center of Cyrillic East Slavic paleotypy was the first printing workshop set up by Francysk Skaryna of Polack, translator of the Bible and poet, operating from 1517 to 1519 in Prague. Then, in the 1520s, he moved his typographic activity to Vilnius and opened a second printing shop (1522–1525). There is a wealth of scholarly and general-public writings on the subject of Skaryna's life and work (including fiction), citing which is, for obvious reasons, neither possible nor necessary. It gave way to a subdiscipline of sorts, dubbed "Skaryna studies" (*skorinovedenie*), and the description of its achievements can be found, for example, in the numerous jubilee editions from the turn of the 1980s and 1990s (on this subject see, e.g., Nemirovskij 1990a; 2009a: 90–97, 122–36). Skaryna's works have also been edited in numerous phototypic reproductions and several critical editions, including the already mentioned German series of Slavic biblical translations, *Biblia Slavica* (see "List of Source Text Editions"). Basic information on Skaryna can also be found in a number of Polish studies (e.g., Drukarze 1959: 224–30; Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew 2003: 17–32). One of the volumes of the Gniezno-Cracow series, *Library of European Spirituality (Biblioteka Duchowości*

Europejskiej), compiled by Mariola Walczak-Mikołajczakowa and Aleksander Naumow, is already dedicated to him. Apart from the biographical information about the Belarusian translator and editor of the Bible, it also includes his foreword and afterword to the Bible and works illustrating his hymnographic and euchographic work (BDE 2007; see also Petrov 2010).

Francysk Skaryna was the translator and publisher of the so-called *Rusian Bible* (Біблія Руска)—a body of twenty-three books of the Old Testament with forewords and afterwords (anagraphs), printed successively in Prague in twenty volumes (according to Nemirovskij's catalogs: [N: 14–N: 23] and [N: 27–N: 36]). This body consists of (in the order of publication): Psalter, Job, Proverbs, Sirach, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Wisdom, four Kings (1–2 Samuel and 1–2 Kings), Joshua, Judith, Judges, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Ruth, Esther, Lamentations of Jeremiah, and Daniel.

Hymnography and euchography, in turn, are represented in the so-called Vilnius *Small Travel Book* (Писаныя рэчы в сени Малой подорожної книжце) (1522), which some researchers describe as one work, whereas others consider it a collection of separate publications (cf. Nemirovskij 1990a: 439). The book consists of the *Psalter* (N: 41); *Book of Hours* (*Časoslovec*) (N: 42); eight akathists and eight canons (N: 43–N: 58): in honor of the Holy Sepulcher, in honor of the Holy Archangels, in honor of John the Baptist, in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in honor of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, in honor of St. Nicholas the Miracle-Worker, in honor of the Holy Cross, in honor of the Name of the Lord; *Šestodnevec* (N: 59); *Penance Canon* (N: 60); and *Paschalia* (N: 61). Skaryna's biblical interests found another expression in his last Vilnius edition of 1525, which includes a translation of Acts and Epistles (N: 63) (Naumow 2013).

Despite the great interest in Skaryna's translation and writing legacy, the issues of the language of his work, as well as the problems of determining the sources he used, are still not sufficiently researched, as rightly pointed out by Bulgarian linguist Iskra Hristova-Somova (2009, 37). Speaking about the language of Skaryna's printed books, one cannot, of course, overlook the issue of the language situation in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at that time, which was marked by the so-called *prostaja mova* (Ruthenian), variously defined as regards its details, but always placed in opposition to the traditional Church Slavonic language. Both implementations of this opposition find their reflection in Skaryna's works. As Walczak-Mikołajczakowa notes in a short essay on his language, "Skaryna's 'Slavic language written in Rusian words' is not easily assessed and qualified. Regarded by some as Middle Belarusian [Ruthenian], it is not a uniform and identical phenomenon in all the texts written by the Ruthenian" (BDE 2007: 30). And although the issue of *prostaja mova* and its functional and systemic relationship with other Slavic and

non-Slavic languages of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is not directly related to the South Slavic area, it is worth remembering, if only because of the role played by Middle Ukrainian and Middle Belarusian dialects in the creation of the first Church Slavonic grammars at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century, later used in the Balkans (cf., e.g., Bednarczuk 2010; Rabus 2008; Uspenskij 2002: 388–408; Temčinas 2017; Citko 2019).

The next stage of Cyrillic East Slavic printing is marked by the output of the anonymous Moscow printing shop operating in the second half of the sixteenth century (c. 1553–1565). Most of the basic data about this establishment is based on assumptions, because the first paleotypes that came out in Moscow provide virtually no information about the time and place of their publication, nor do they contain anagraphs that would help identify their authors. At present, we have seven editions printed in five different typefaces, dated by most researchers to the 1550s and 1560s. The order in which the individual titles were published is also debated; Evgenij Nemirovskij, the monographer of this first Russian printing house (Nemirovskij 1964), advocates the following sequence: (N: 83; G: 3; *1553/1554) *narrow-type Tetraevangelium (uzkošriftnoe Četveroevangelie)*; (N: 85; G: 5; *1555/1556) *Lenten Triodion*; (N: 86; G: 34; *1556) *Flowery Triodion*; (N: 90; G: 9; *1558/1559) *middle-type Tetraevangelium (srednešriftnoe Četveroevangelie)*; (N: 92; G: 10; *1559/1560) *middle-type Psalter (srednešriftnaja Psaltr')*; (N: 115; G: 30; *1563/1564) *wide-type Tetraevangelium (širokošriftnoe Četveroevangelie)*; (N: 119; G: 33; *1564/1565) *wide-type Psalter (širokošriftnaja Psaltr')*. Some scholars have hypothesized that the founder of the first printing shop in Moscow was a priest from the Kremlin named Sylvester (Nemirovskij 2011: 38).

The subsequent history of East Slavic printing is mainly the history of the typographic work of Ivan Fedorov, often called the forerunner and initiator of Russian, Belarusian, and Ukrainian printing. Hundreds of dissertations and studies have been written on this subject, in a way summarized in the already quoted extensive encyclopedia entitled *Ivan Fedorov and His Age (Ivan Fëdorov i ego èpoxa)* and a detailed bibliography by Evgenij Nemirovskij (2007a, 2010a). Sometimes the mutual influences of the legacy of this printer and the writings of the South Slavs are also emphasized (Atanasov 1986: 13–26; Botvinnik 1986).

In the activity of Ivan Fedorov, which resulted in over ten currently known paleotypes (in the studies, the number varies from eleven to fourteen; only the most important of them will be listed here), four stages can be distinguished based on the respective locations. He began his activity in Moscow (accompanied by Pëtr Timofeevič Mstislavec), where the following old prints were published: *Apostle* (N: 113; G: 31; 1564) and *Book of Hours* (N:

117; G: 35; 1565). The second stage (1568–1572) is associated with the establishment of a Cyrillic printing house in Zabłudów, to which Ivan Fedorov and Pětr Mstislavec were invited by Hetman Grzegorz Chodkiewicz/Ryhor Xadkevič (Łabyncew, Szczawińska 1995; Naumow 2002: 223–32). Two paleotypes were published in Zabłudów: *Didactic Gospel* (N: 129; G: 47; 1569) and *Psalter with Supplement* (N: 131; G: 48; 1570). Pětr Mstislavec, who had left for Vilnius by then, was not involved in the work on the latter book, whereas Ivan Fedorov moved to Lviv at the end of 1572 and the third stage of his printing activity is linked to this city. In Lviv, first the second edition of the *Apostle* was published (N: 141; G: 57; 1574), and then—also in 1574—a text important for the subject matter of the present volume, namely the first edition of a school textbook on Church Slavonic grammar entitled *Abecedary of the Book of Eight Parts, i.e. Grammar* [Азбѣска ѿ книги осмоучастныа, сирѣчь грамматикии] (N: 143; G: 58, folio 40), also called an abecedary or primer (Ru. *azbuka*, *bukvar'*). This became the basis for tens of later East (and perhaps indirectly also South) Slavic works representing this genre. Currently only two preserved copies of this paleotype are known (see Nemirovskij 2015).

The last and most fruitful stage of Ivan Fedorov's printing work (1575–1581) is associated with Ostroh in Volhynia, and the Academy which operated there from the last quarter of the sixteenth century. The printer came there at the invitation of prince and magnate Kostantyn Vasyľ Ostroz'kyj. First, he published a revised and supplemented edition of the *Abecedary* (N: 154; G: 69, 72; 1578), which included, among other elements, parallel Greek-Slavonic readings and the polemical treatise *On the Letters* attributed to Monk Hrabăr. With regard to the subject matter of this book, it is also worth noting a certain biographical detail of the period mentioned in the studies: “In the period between June 1578 and March 1579, Ivan Fedorov embarked on a journey to Serbia and Bulgaria. Distant echoes of this voyage are preserved in a document from the archives of Lviv” (Nemirovskij 2011: 44). After his return from the Balkans to Ostroh, Ivan Fedorov published, for example, the *Psalter* and *New Testament* (N: 161; G: 77; 1580), as well as his most important and at the same time his last work—the first complete printed Bible in the Church Slavonic language, the so-called *Ostroh Bible* (N: 170; G: 83), dated from 1580 to 1581 due to discrepancies in the dates on some of the copies. This edition (currently around 370 preserved copies and fragments are known) played an extremely important role in the whole *Slavia Orthodoxa* area—it was on its basis that later Church Slavonic editions of the biblical text were compiled: the *Moscow Bible* (Moscow 1663) and the *Elizabeth Bible* (St. Petersburg 1751). The latter, with minor editorial correc-

tions, is still used today in the liturgical practice of most Orthodox Slavs (see also Mathiesen 1981a; Kraveckij and Pletneva 2001: 15).⁴⁴

Started by an anonymous printing shop and later by Ivan Fedorov, Moscow printing developed thanks to the activity of Nikita (Nikifor) Taras'ev and Neveža Timofeev, and later his son Andronik and grandson Ivan (although their familial ties are sometimes questioned). Among the most important Russian paleotypes that were published at the turn of the 1560s and 1570s, two editions of the *Psalter* should be mentioned: the first (N: 126; G: 42; 1568) published in Moscow, and the second (N: 149; G: 64; 1577) published in Alexandrov Kremlin (Ru. *Aleksandrovskaia sloboda*) due to the political events in the Russian Empire at that time (the so-called *oprichnina*).

In a way, the activity of first Moscow printers was the beginning of a broader undertaking, known in history as the Moscow Print Yard (*Moskovskij pečatnyj dvor*), which was composed of several workshops and operated until the beginning of the eighteenth century, when it was transformed into the synodal printing house (Nemirovskij 1997b: 25–43; 2007a: 519–20). Along with Ukrainian old prints, the ample output of the Chamber forms the core of the printed Orthodox Slavic sources from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which circulated in the South Slavic and Romanian lands and are now also found in the major Bulgarian book collections (Bozukov 1994: 285; Kirilova 2015: 7–8). Six paleotypes that researchers associate with the activities of the Chamber were completed at the end of the sixteenth century: *Lenten Triodion* (N: 199; G: 109; 1589); *Flowery Triodion* (N: 203; G: 115; 1591); *Octoechos* (N: 217–218; G: 128; 1594); *Apostle* (N: 246; G.: 153; 1597), also known as the first Cyrillic old print whose afterword contains the information about the number of copies (1050); *Book of Hours* (N: 253; G: 162; 1598); and the twice published *Menaion* (N: 263, 265; G: 167, 169; 1600) (Nemirovskij 2011: 54–55).

In the sixteenth century and in later times, the tradition of Cyrillic printing initiated by Ivan Fedorov was also continued in Lviv and Ostroh. In this context, particularly significant is the printing house of the Lviv Stauropegion Brotherhood, which operated until the beginning of the twentieth century and where, in the last decade of the sixteenth century (1591–1594), several paleotypes were published. One of them was the Greek-Slavonic grammar entitled *Adelphotos. Grammar of the Correct Use of the Helleno-Slavonic Language, of the Perfect Art of the Eight Parts of Speech* (ΑΔΕΛΦΟΤΗΣ. Γραμματικὴ δὲ βρογλαγολιβεαγο ελινσλοβενσκαγο ιαζυκα. Σὺβερσσηναγο ισκξςτβα οσμη υαστει σλοβα) (N: 205; G: 116; 182 folios, 1591). Preserved to the present day in seventy-five copies, it was of utmost significance for the development of the Slavic linguistic thought and the codification of the Church Slavonic language (see “List of Source Text Editions”). Ostroh also remained a thriving

publishing center, whose activity, carried out mainly by the disciples of Ivan Fedorov, continued until 1612 (Nemirovskij 2007a: 557). At least a dozen or so old prints were published there, including several abecedaries, largely replicating Ivan Fedorov's editions of from 1574 and 1578 (without any indication as to the time and place of publication), communiqués and letters of patriarchs and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, as well as polemical treatises and writings of the Church Fathers (Nemirovskij 2011: 55–56).

In the beginning of the 1570s, Vilnius became another important center of Cyrillic printing. Involved in the making of first old prints from that period was Ivan Fedorov's collaborator, Pëtr Timofeevič Mstislavec, who had parted with his associate after the publication of the *Didactic Gospel* of 1569 in Zabłudów. The anagraphs of the preserved Vilnius old prints inform us, in turn, that after moving to the new location Pëtr Mstislavec from the very beginning cooperated there with Kuźma and Łukasz Mamonicz, founders of the largest Cyrillic printing shop at the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which operated until 1624.⁴⁵ Although the attribution of some preserved old prints is sometimes disputed, researchers unanimously point out that the whole substantial output of the Mamonicz printing house is a significant contribution to the development of Slavic paleotypy (intended not only for Orthodox Slavs), as reflected in about eighty-five editions in the Church Slavonic, Ruthenian, Latin, and Polish languages (Nemirovskij 2001: 51). Based on the changes in the managerial staff of the Mamonicz printing house, Zoja Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew, Polish monographer of Cyrillic printing published in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, distinguishes and describes three stages in its activity: 1574 to 1576, 1583 to 1604, and 1604 to 1624, respectively (Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew 2003: 53–79). Among the considerable achievements of this publishing house (by the end of the sixteenth century over forty Cyrillic prints were published), let us list just a few: a small *Grammar of the Slavonic Language* (Граматыка [sic!] словенська языка) (N: 188; G: 100; fourteen folios, October 8, 1586), now extant in two copies (this is the famous grammatical treatise *On the Eight Parts of Speech* translated from Greek; Jagić 1968: 335–42, 959–60); several editions (1588, *1592–1593, *1594–1595) of the Statute of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (N: 198; G: 107; N: 210; G: 121; N: 221; G: 131), whose language and subsequent editions have recently been examined in detail by Cracow philologist Vladimir Mjakišev (2008, 2014); several different editions of an abecedary, also called “grammar” (N: 216; G: 126; *1593 and N: 229; G: 139; *1595, as well as 1618 and 1621—cf. (Nemirovskij 2015: 121–22, 130–35, 138–43) and the so-called *Vilnius folios for the Ostroh Bible* (N: 230; G: 138; *1595).

Compared to the Mamonicz's extensive activity, the legacy of Vasil' Haraburda's printing house, which operated only during the hiatus of the largest publishing house in Vilnius at that time, seems quite modest (Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew 2003: 80–84). Two old prints were published by Haraburda's workshop: *Didactic Gospel* based on the 1569 edition of the *Zabludów Bible* (N: 163; G: 87; *1580–1582) and *Ocotechos* (N: 172; G: 85; 1582).

The last sixteenth-century Cyrillic printing house in Vilnius that produced books intended for Orthodox Slavs was founded by the Brotherhood operating at the Holy Trinity Church (until 1609), and then, when most of the Orthodox churches in the city were taken over by the Uniates, at the Church of the Holy Spirit (hence the two different names of the same Brotherhood). At the beginning of the seventeenth century (1611), a branch of this printing house was launched in Vievis. Researchers disagree as to the exact timeframe of this operation, suggesting either 1595 to 1702 (Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew 2003: 100) or 1596 to 1646 (Nemirovskij 2011: 53). This printing shop, which yielded over seventy books in total, had particular merits in publishing linguistic works on Church Slavonic important for the whole *Slavia Orthodoxa* area, of a descriptive, prescriptive (textbook), and, in consequence, codificational and normative character. Three texts in particular are among the basic and most important paleotypes representing this type of literature (see also "List of Source Text Editions"):

1. The first systematic grammatical exposition of Church Slavonic, entitled *Slavonic Grammar, or the Perfect Art of the Eight Parts of Speech and Other Needs, Newly Set* (Грамматика словенска. Съвършенна искусство осни частий слова и ины нѣдѣны. Новѣ съставлена) by Lavrentij Zyzanij-Tustanovs'kij (N: 233; G: 142; ninety-six folios, Vilnius, February 12, 1596, thirteen copies), referring to the Lviv grammar of 1591
2. *Abecedary* by the same writer (N: 237; G: 149; forty-four folios, Vilnius 1596, twelve copies and fragments), the completely original part of which (folios 5–38) is *Lexis, i.e. Words, Briefly Collected and Interpreted from the Slavonic Language into the Plain Russian Dialect* (Лексис сирѣчь реченїа въ кратѣцѣ събранны и из словѣскаго языка на просты Рѣскїй дїлѣтѣхъ истолкованы), a lexicon considered the first printed dictionary of the Church Slavonic language (Stankiewicz 1984: 151–52; Nemirovskij 2015: 111–19)
3. Meletij Smotryc'kyj's famous *Slavonic Grammar with Correct Syntax* (Грамматіки Славенскїа правилое Сунтагма, Vievis, 1619), which became the basis for many other later grammatical studies and also had a number of subsequent editions both in the East Slavic area (Moscow 1648, 1721) and in the Balkans and the South Slavic area (including Snagov

1697, Râmnicu Vâlcea 1755), where it was also copied by hand (Bulič 1904: 179; Dilevski 1985; Mathiesen 1981b; Mečkovskaja 1984: 44–45)

This brief or even schematic overview of East Slavic paleotypic traditions demonstrates the source context for the development of the Bulgarian language. Although geographically distant, this context is undoubtedly close linguistically and culturally, and, from the point of view of later influences in the South Slavic area, extremely important.

NOTES

1. The bibliography on the origins of printed books in Europe is so extensive that I will confine myself here to a few recent, synoptic works that are also important for the development of printing in the Slavic countries (Nemirovskij 2000a, 2001, 2003b, 2010b; Febrve and Martin 2014: 303–14).

2. <http://db.nsk.hr/HeritageDetails.aspx?id=866> (accessed May 22, 2020).

3. Joanna Rapacka (1997: 59) mentions the “disputed place of publication” of the *Missale*, whereas Aleksander Naumow, in the afore-mentioned extensive article devoted to Slavic printing in Venice (Naumow 2011), does not address the problem—he does not even mention this incunabulum. Evgenij Nemirovskij, in turn, only states in one of his latest works: “The first Glagolitic printed book—the *Missale Romanum Glagoliticæ*—was published on February 22nd, 1483 in Venice (according to some scholars) or in the Dalmatian village of Kosinj (according to others)” (Nemirovskij 2009a: 47), although elsewhere (Nemirovskij 2005a: 402) he supports Venice quite categorically and unequivocally.

4. For example, the catalog of Glagolitic and Cyrillic old prints published almost at the same time in the Czech book collections (Sokolová 1997) includes many copies of Glagolitic paleotypes from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries not taken into account by Kruming (cf. Nemirovskij 2000c: 235–36).

5. Previous publications systematizing this area of source texts pointed out by Kruming include Kukuljević (1860) listing forty-three Glagolitic editions, Šafárik (1864–1865) listing forty-two editions, and Kruming (1977), where fifty-seven editions are listed.

6. In the context of these data, it is worth citing Kruming’s statement on the chronological boundary between the “old” and the “new” printed Glagolitic book: “From the mid-19th century (1853, to be precise) onwards, Glagolitic prints were published in cities that had no prior tradition of Glagolitic typography (Prague, Zagreb etc.). As a rule, these youngest publications constituted philological editions of older manuscript texts (publications by Ivan Berčić, Ivan Kukuljević, Vatroslav Jagić etc.). Later, in Rome (as well as in Glavotok in Dalmatia), liturgical works were published from time to time, composed in a markedly archaicized Church Slavonic (Croatian recension). The practical application which these editions found was next to none, and they were never disseminated to any significant extent. . . . The completion of the publica-

tion of these books—which may be classified as old prints—coincides with a major hiatus in Glagolitic printing in Rome [from 1791 to 1881—IP] as well as its definite halt in Venice [1812]” (Kruming 1998: 4). Let us add that the data Nemirovskij cites are somewhat more modest: “History has confined the Glagolitic type to a strictly limited field of application: it was used by Slavs inhabiting the eastern shores of the Adriatic Sea. We know of a rough total of 60 books and leaflets printed in Glagolitic in the 15th–18th centuries” (Nemirovskij 2009a: 47).

7. Based on this publication, Nemirovskij later wrote an essay titled “Schweipolt Fiol and the Beginnings of Cyrillic Printing” (*Švajpol't Fiol' i načalo kirillovskogo knjigopečatanija*), included in the introduction to the Moscow version of his inventory/catalog (Nemirovskij 2009a: 47–57) and referring to the extensive fragments of the introduction to the German catalog, entitled *The Beginnings of Cyrillic Printing* (*Der Beginn des kyrillischen Buchdrucks*; Nemirovskij 1996 I: 7–47, especially 12–29). It should also be noted that even in the 1970s, Nemirovskij published an index and a description of all known copies of the books from the Cracow publishing house (Nemirovskij 1979).

8. Here and hereafter I cite ordinal numbers (in brackets), titles and information about the number of copies of the discussed incunabula and paleotypes (excluding the ones that were lost, destroyed during World War II, or known only from scholarly sources) that have survived, following Nemirovskij’s catalogs. For some editions, the more recent Russian catalog (N) lists more copies than the earlier German one. For paleotypes published in the second half of the sixteenth century, the basic data have been cross-referenced with Guseva’s catalog, based on which I also cite the ordinal numbers of the described entities (G). “*” indicates data that are reconstructed or uncertain.

9. According to Nemirovskij’s inventory, there are a few more copies and fragments of this incunabulum in Poland: in the Jagiellonian Library in Cracow (ref. 3590), in the Library of the Catholic University of Lublin (ref. XV.206), in the Library of the Ossoliński National Institute in Wrocław (ref. 194561), and in the Library of the University of Wrocław (ref. XV.F.547 and XV.F.1218) (cf. Nemirovskij 2009a: 214).

10. As in the case of Fiol’s Cracow publishing house, on the basis of his earlier publications Nemirovskij wrote an essay entitled “The Beginnings of Cyrillic Printing among the South Slavs” (*Načalo kirillovskogo knjigopečatanija u južnyx slavjan*), included in the introduction to the Moscow version of his catalog/inventory (Nemirovskij 2009a: 57–70) and referring to the extensive fragments of the introduction preceding the German catalog *Der Beginn des kyrillischen Buchdrucks* (Nemirovskij I 1996: 7–47, especially 30–42). Among earlier important works of this author on the subject in question, particularly worth mentioning is the study devoted to Đurađ Crnojević’s 1494–1496 editions in the first part of volume 1 of the previously mentioned series entitled *Montenegrin Bibliography 1494–1994* (*Crnogorska bibliografija 1494–1994*), published by the National Library of Montenegro (Nacionalna biblioteka Crne Gore “Đurđe Crnojević”) in Cetinje (Nemirovskij 1989). Let us add that Nemirovskij is also the author of the second part of the first volume of the afore-mentioned series, devoted to the subsequent history of Cyrillic prints,

produced—as the authors of the series have it—for Montenegrins (although not exclusively) in Venice from 1519 to 1638 (Nemirovskij 1993). The publication is available online on the website of the National Library of Montenegro: www.nbeg-digitalnabibliografija.me/bibliografija_cetinje (accessed April 28, 2020).

11. Equivalent of the so-called paleographic albums.
12. <https://digitalna.nb.rs/> (accessed on May 22, 2020).
13. Extensive essays on the same subject can also be found in both catalogs of the same author: Nemirovskij II (1997a: 7–49, 55–96) and *The First Wallachian Printing Press (Pervaja valaškaja tipografija)* (Nemirovskij 2009a: 70–87).
14. This publication is also available in an online scanned version on the website of the Romanian National Retrospective Bibliography (Bibliografia națională retrospectivă): www.biblad.ro/bnr/brv.php (accessed on May 22, 2020).
15. Other works by Romanian researchers are discussed in Nemirovskij’s (2008a: 21–38) monograph. For more recent publications see, for example, the series of monographs by Archimandrite Veniamin Micle (Micle 2008a, 2008b, 2010a, 2010b, 2011, 2012a, 2012b).
16. Some of the oldest and more recent Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypes are also available, for example, on the website of the Library of the Romanian Academy (Biblioteca Academiei Romane) of the Bucharest Digital Library (Biblioteca Digitală a Bucureștilor): www.digibuc.ro, collection “Opera tipografică românească (1508–1830)” (accessed July 9, 2020).
17. Similarly, as in the case of a number of other publishing houses (e.g., in Cetinje), Bogdanov considers such spelling of the printer’s name to be unjustified Serbianization and postulates using *Božidar Vukovik* instead (Bogdanov 1978: 207). N. Teodosiev also uses such spelling (Teodosiev 2007).
18. <http://digital.bms.rs/ebiblioteka/publications/index/collection:4> (accessed May 22, 2020).
19. <https://digitalna.nb.rs/> (accessed May 22, 2020).
20. www.nationallibrary.bg/: collection of Slavonic Cyrillic old printed books (accessed July 9, 2020).
21. In Nemirovskij’s German catalog, this paleotype is listed under number 39.
22. It is worth noting that the so-called *Little Travel Book* (Писанныи речѣи в сѣи Малои подорожнѣи книжцѣ) published in 1522 by Francysk Skaryna in Vilnius is, according to some researchers, an example of a different type of a book for travelers, based on East Slavic models, although it also bears some parallels with Venetian editions (Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew 2003: 27; BDE 2007: 27).
23. In Nemirovskij’s German catalog, this paleotype can be found under number 68.
24. Cibranska-Kostova questions the number of preserved copies of this book listed in the catalogs of Nemirovskij and Guseva, correcting and supplementing those data based on direct examination of the paleotypes and recent scholarly publications (Cibranska-Kostova 2013: 42–43). It should be noted, however, that, following other specialists, the Bulgarian researcher believes one of the copies best known from scholarly writings (no. 411 from the Archives of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts) to have been destroyed during the Second World War, whereas it was

described (no. 35) in the mid-1980s (Mano-Zisi 1984/1985: 309–10; see also Petrov 2014: 314).

25. Scans of other paleotypes of this group can be found online on the websites of Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian libraries.

26. Nemirovskij's catalog notes one more, albeit smaller (two folios), edition of Monk Sava's primer/abecedary: May 19, 1597 (N: 243). The only copy of this edition was destroyed during the bombing of Belgrade in 1941 (Nemirovskij 2012: 124). Guseva includes this paleotype (she dates it May 20, 1597) in the index of works known only from intermediary sources (Guseva 2003: 1204).

27. The dictionary is available online at http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/marco-ginammi_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/ (accessed April 26, 2020).

28. This paleotype is listed under number 40 in Nemirovskij's German catalog.

29. Information of the project is also available online on the website: <https://gorazdanskastamparija.rs.ba/> (accessed on July 9, 2020).

30. The only full copy is kept at the National Museum in Prague (ref. 64 A 14), on whose basis a phototype edition was prepared.

31. This paleotype is listed under number 69 in Nemirovskij's German catalog.

32. This paleotype is listed under number 73 in Nemirovskij's German catalog.

33. This paleotype is listed under number 71 in Nemirovskij's German catalog.

34. This paleotype is not listed in Nemirovskij's German catalog.

35. This paleotype is listed under number 72 in Nemirovskij's German catalog.

36. An English-language summary of the work is available on the website of the Postgraduate School of the Institute of History of the Romanian Academy in Cluj-Napoca (Institutul de Istorie "George Barițiu" din Cluj-Napoca al Academiei Române), http://scoaladoctorala.history-cluj.ro/Doctorate/doctorat_urs/Rezumat_Urs.pdf (accessed May 22, 2020).

37. Let us note that Atanasov (1959: 64) considers this item to be the first of the group of Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypes, completely ignoring the previous two, although they are listed in Bianu's *Bibliography* (BRV 1944: 3–6, no. 3, and BRV 1903: 3–143, no. 9, respectively).

38. Guseva (2003: 329) dates the book to 1567/1568.

39. Guseva's catalog identifies the language of the paleotype as "Serbian Church Slavonic" (Guseva 2003: 330).

40. The existence of such a dated text is uncertain, and some researchers identify this paleotype with the edition (or editions) of Coresi's son, Șerban, completed in 1587/1588 (N: 191 and N: 197; G: 103) (see Nemirovskij 2011: 235; Guseva 2003: 1216).

41. Guseva provides the following summary of the afterward attached to the old print: "Afterword: from the printer, Deacon Coresi (in Romanian). It states that all nations have the Word of God available in their languages, while only Romanians do not. Turning to priests, the printer informs that he issued the Psalter for them, having translated the text into Romanian from a Serbian edition. In the final part, he asks his readers for a blessing and records the year of the printing of the Psalter" (Guseva 2003: 501).

42. Guseva believes that the second edition of the Gospel by Monk Lavrentie was published in Braşov.

43. I exclude those manifestations of East Slavic Cyrillic paleotypy that represent printing intended for non-Orthodox Slavs (Catholics and, above all, Protestants—Calvinists or Arians). Sixteenth-century printers from this group include Szymon/Symon Budny (Nieśwież/Nyasvizh, 1562) and Vasil' Cjapinski-Amel'janovič (Cjapina, *1580). See, for example, Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew (2003: 32–38, 47–53) and Nemirovskij (2007a: 27–274, 737–39; 2011: 47, 49).

44. For the latest works on the Lviv and Ostroh stages of Ivan Fedorov's activity, as well as on the history of Cyrillic printing in Ukraine, see, for example, the series of over a dozen popular monographic publications by Moscow researchers Jurij Labyncew and Larisa Ščavinskaja published since 2006 (2006, 2007, 2007a, 2008, 2010, 2010a, 2011, 2014, 2014a), available on the website of the Moscow Library of Ukrainian Literature (www.mosbul.ru/hukrbook.shtml) until 2017, when the library (and the site) was definitively closed by the Russian authorities.

45. Other of Mstislavec's associates, such as Ivan and Zinovij (Zjanon) Zarèckija, are also mentioned in the sources.

Conclusions

When recapitulating the research perspective proposed in this book and presented in the previous chapters, it should be stressed once again that it has not, by definition, been intended as a structural analysis. Rather, the main objectives included the attempts to:

- define or redefine the key concepts and terms used to describe the analyzed period of the history of the Bulgarian language, envisaged not as an isolated system of grammatical evolution—and not even as a system subject to various external influences throughout its history—but as an integral part of broader historical and literary (and consequently also linguistic) contexts common to the whole *Slavia Orthodoxa* area.
- critically review the discussions and research positions as well as verify them in close connection with the source texts, mostly examined *de visu* (i.e., working directly with the old prints or with the existing copies and phototypic editions).
- delineate and characterize a possibly exhaustive complete corpus of printed source texts attesting to the contextual conditions of the development of Bulgarian during the period in question (irrespective of whether we assume that their language represents one of the several literary idioms of the time or if we adopt the position that they only reflect the development of the non-vernacular (New) Church Slavonic language (or hybrid language).

Subsequent stages of the work, in my opinion, should be diachronic in character, that is, focusing not only on recording the phonetic, grammatical, or lexical facts and phenomena of a given paleotype, text, genre, or center (so-called synchrony in diachrony), but also on the dynamics of the historical changes reflected in them. Such research can only be carried out by means

of a multidimensional internal (i.e., within the indicated group of texts) and external (i.e., in reference to other types of literature) comparative analysis of the language of paleotypes of the *Slavia Orthodoxa*, that is, Cyrillic paleotype relevant to the Orthodox Slavs and displaying a confirmed tradition or parallel traditions. Of course, in the research to date, such comparisons have been made to a greater or lesser extent; however, they have often been of ad hoc significance and are used sporadically for the purpose of interpreting individual forms only (or—less frequently—particular language processes).

The main directions of potential comparisons and systematic juxtapositions should be as follows:

- confrontation of the language of paleotypes representing a given tradition (both the basic text and the anagraphs), followed by a confrontation of the language of different paleotypic traditions
- confrontation of the language of the basic text of a given paleotype with the language of its anagraphs
- confrontation of anagraphic texts from paleotypes of different traditions
- confrontation of the language of paleotypes with the language of the relevant manuscript tradition, in reference to both the basic and the anagraphic texts

Of course, these are not all of the possible levels of comparison, but only the most important and fundamental types necessary for the systematic diachronic analysis of the confrontations. From the point of view of methodology, it seems necessary to separate them, as it minimizes the risk of randomness or arbitrariness in the selection of sources, which frequently happens in historical linguistic studies. As regards the subject matter of the present work, from a point of view reaching beyond grammatical, it may be interesting to compare the Cyrillic Orthodox old prints with Cyrillic paleotype traditions (contexts) intended for Catholics and Protestants in the South Slavic area which existed and developed in parallel in the sixteenth century associated with figures such as Giorgio dei Rusconi (printing shop in Venice, 1512), Primož Trubar (printing shop in Bad Urach, 1561–1565), Ambrosio Corso (printing shop in Venice, 1571), Domenico Basa (printing shop in Rome, 1582–1583), Camillo Zanetti (printing shop in Venice, 1583), and others.

An accurate selection and confrontation of source texts will bring researchers closer to answering the key questions about the development of the (New) Church Slavonic linguistic system with reference to the development of national languages, including, of course, Bulgarian. This will make it possible, among other things, to verify the list of criteria considered to be manifestations of local traditions, as well as to make the periodization proposals more exact.

The need to distinguish separate subperiods in the history of the New Church Slavonic language—postulated by some Slavists—was signaled in chapter 1 of the present volume. The latter's chronological scope, that is, from incunabula to the first grammars, can be considered as the first fundamental stage (subperiod) of its development. The extant source texts clearly show that the final stage of the first subperiod of Cyrillic Slavic paleotypy as defined previously (i.e., the last quarter of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century) coincided with an increased interest of printers and their patrons in compiling and publishing textbooks and books of a prescriptive/normative character: primers, lexica, and grammars. These works form a separate tradition, corresponding not only with the remaining paleotypes parallel to them, but also constituting a continuation of the development of medieval philological thought. They refer, quite obviously, to earlier important treatises and reflections on language (in manuscript form), whose fragments and travesties were often used by the authors of the first alphabet primers and grammars. To be sure, the dissemination of this New Church Slavonic grammatical tradition (and its influence on the linguistic shape of all contemporary writings of the Orthodox Slavs) in the East and South Slavic areas occurred mainly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; from that point of view it opened a new stage in the history of the relevant languages. Nevertheless, it is worth remembering that its beginning was largely determined by the achievements of its predecessors. The latter's observations and assumptions, in turn, had to be related to the dynamics of the complex communication and linguistic processes reflected in sixteenth-century Cyrillic paleotypes, which inevitably enforced—first at the local, then at the supranational level—the normalization of writing and the codification of principles. As rightly emphasized by Nina Mečkovskaja, Belarusian student of the oldest East Slavic grammars (sixteenth and seventeenth century):

The first grammar or grammatical article (dealing with the grammatical structure of a given language, i.e. its morphology and syntax) is never the preliminary, but rather some ensuing, resultant stage in the history of a philological tradition. Initial grammatical knowledge arises during the transition from the level of separate empirical linguistic observations to the level of a deeper, more abstract and more systematic apprehension of linguistic facts. Despite its abstract character, grammatical knowledge belongs to the domain of linguistics proper, as opposed to the (generally speculative) logical or philosophical deliberations on connections between things, concepts and words, on the nature of names, on analogy and anomaly in language, or (at a later stage) on sacred languages, etc. For this reason, grammars occupy a special position in a given grammatical tradition: concentrating in themselves the most specialized (properly linguistic) and systematic knowledge about the language, they constitute the most meaningful output of the tradition. (Mečkovskaja 1984: 32; 1986)

A detailed and comprehensive analysis of the first Church Slavonic linguistic treatises and grammars, which may be the subject of many separate studies, is beyond the scope of this volume. Incidentally, various aspects of this issue have already been addressed by numerous Paleo-Slavists. Therefore, at this point, I will confine myself to presenting a general outline of the source text dimension of this historical and linguistic context, which is undoubtedly also important for the development of the Bulgarian literary language in the Pre-Revival era.

The basic source base for the study and description of the “pre-grammatical” philological tradition of Orthodox Slavs was first defined and presented by Vatroslav Jagić. His extensive (almost a thousand pages long) thesis entitled *Discourse on the Church Slavonic Language in South Slavic and Russian Antiquities (Rassuždenija južnoslavjanskoj i ruskoj stariny o cerkovno-slavjanskom jazyke)* appeared in the first volume of the series *Research on the Russian Language (Issledovanija po ruskomu jazyku)*, published in 1885 to 1895 in St. Petersburg by the Department of Russian Language and Literature of the Imperial Academy of Sciences. This dissertation was reprinted in 1896 in Berlin, under the title *Codex Slovenicus Rerum Grammaticarum*, and its reprint was published in Munich in 1968 (Jagić 1968). The author intended this study to be the first part of a detailed, annotated anthology of the source texts in question, including manuscripts devoted to the Church Slavonic language (both in theoretical and practical terms) written in the period before the first attempts at a systematic approach to grammatical issues (recalling the modern sense of the term). The second part, unfortunately never completed, was intended to present the grammatical works influenced by the first printed textbooks from the end of the sixteenth century (Jagić 1968: 950–51).

In his nine chapters, Jagić lists and cites the following works—most of them of fundamental meaning for Paleo-Slavic studies—which form the basis of the oldest tradition of Slavic philological thought (this list may be expanded, of course):

1. fragments of the so-called *Pannonian Legends: Vita Constantini* and *Vita Methodii*, as well as fragments of the *Old Russian Tale of Bygone Years*
2. treatise *On the Letters (O pismenexъ)* by Monk Hrabăr
3. *Prologue* to John the Exarch’s translation of *Theology* by John of Damascus
4. treatise *On the Eight Parts of Speech*
5. treatise *History on the Letters* by Constantine of Kostenets—long and short redaction
6. grammatical works by Maximus the Greek
7. several dozen minor texts concerning grammar
8. *Donatus (Ars grammatica)* translated by Dmitrij Gerasimov

9. the so-called *Simple (or Straight) Speech (Prostoslovija)* by Starets Evdokim from the sixteenth century

Other manuscripts that may be an important addition to Jagić's list, including medieval Slavic works of a lexicographic and grammatical character, are discussed, for example, in the following works (to list just a few selected titles): *The Origins of Russian Grammatical Thought (U istokov ruskoj grammatičeskoj mysli)* by Petr Kuznecov (1958); *Russian Lexicography of the Medieval Era (Russkaja leksikografija èpoxi Srednevekov'ja)* by Ludmila Kovtun (1963); *Middle Ukrainian Lexicography in its Relations to Russian and Belarusian (Staro-ukraïns'ka leksykohrafija v ii zv'jazkax z rosijs'koju ta bilorus'koju)*, *Middle Ukrainian Lexicography (Staroukrainskaja leksikografija)*, and *Linguistics in 14th–17th Century Ukraine (Movoznavstvo na Ukraïni v XIV–XVII st.)* by Vasyľ Nimčuk (1980, 1981, 1985); *Middle Belarusian Grammars: On the Problem of General Philological Continuity (Starabelaruskija hramatyki: da problemy ahul'nařilalahičnaj čèlasnasci)* by Alena Jaskevič (2001); and many others. See also the entry *Grammatical works (Gramatičeski säčinenija)* in the *Cyrillo-Methodian Encyclopedia (KME I 1985: 530–34; author of the entry: Ivan Dobrev)* and the synoptic articles devoted to medieval Slavs in the collective volume from the series *History of Language Studies (Istorija lingvističeskix učenij; ILU 1991: 125–254)*.

As for the later period from the era of printed books, it is also necessary to note two further publications. The first one is the highly useful bibliographic index by Edward Stankiewicz, American Slavist with Polish roots from Yale University; the book (Stankiewicz 1984) lists most Slavic grammars and dictionaries published until 1850. The second one is the most recent monograph by Evgenij Nemirovskij (2015), which provides a detailed discussion of twenty-one editions of printed abecedaries or primers (so-called first reading and writing aids, Ru. *načal'nye učebniki gramoty*) from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, based on the famous paleotype by Ivan Fedorov (the first Cyrillic old print of this kind) published in Lviv in 1574.

The development of Bulgarian grammatical thought and tradition in the Revival era, inseparably linked to the earlier New Church Slavonic history of linguistic codification and normalization, is the subject of the comprehensive monograph by Bulgarian historian and language theoretician Bojan Vălčev (2008). This work presents and analyzes twenty-nine grammars (mainly, but not only, nineteenth-century Bulgarian ones), also including works, for example, by Meletij Smotryč'kyj, Abraham Mrazović, and Vuk Karadžić. It is worth noting that already at the level of the sources that were selected, this publication indicates the position of the New Church Slavonic language in

the linguistic history of Bulgarian (and—more broadly—in the South Slavic languages). Thus, it may contribute significantly to the discussion on the ways of theoretical presentation and interpretation of the so-called Church Slavonic influence.

Chapter 1 of the present work mentions two basic types (and historical stages) of the normalization of the Church Slavonic language identified by the historians of Slavic linguistic thought: on the one hand, medieval normalization and textological codification, synthetic in nature (correcting specific texts by enforcing the rules considered correct), and on the other hand, modern normalization and grammatical codification, analytic in nature (identifying, formulating, and striving to observe certain abstract rules). It may be said with full certainty that—from the chronological point of view—the turning point marking the gradual transition from medieval to modern philological/linguistic reflection falls on the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The publication of the first printed Church Slavonic grammars, which constituted a set of historical, cultural, literary, and linguistic events separating these two stages, was preceded by the development of the sixteenth-century Slavic Cyrillic paleotypy in the South and East Slavic areas (presented in chapters 2 and especially 3); from this point of view, it summarizes this tradition in a way. In addition, the beginning of this new stage saw the onset of certain complex processes, generally and commonly referred to Church Slavonic influence on the South Slavic languages. Of course, the chosen methodological perspective ought to lead to the determining and thorough analysis of the further stages and turning points of this phenomenon, encompassing not only Bulgarian but also Serbian linguistic history (cf. Mladenović 1989; Unbegaun 1995; Albijanić 2010; Tolstoj 2004; Ivić 2014, 2017), also in a comparative perspective. It should be noted that there are already some studies that cover this area, such as, for example, the monographs by Tärnovo-based Slavist Cenka Ivanova (2003, 2004).

Every diachronic structural analysis of language requires the prior determination and proper selection of the source corpus in order to avoid the risk of distorting the image due to using erroneous or random excerpts. Note that this image is already somewhat inaccurate from the outset, in view of the condition of the extant sources and their immanently incomplete representativeness; the latter usually fails to reflect the whole system in terms of the degree of attestation of specific formal components or content elements (cf. Petrov 2007a: 9–10). The selection of these sources should, in turn, follow from the previous findings concerning the external history of language (conceptual and theoretical, but also genological, dialectal, periodical, etc.), so that these findings can be verified and corrected after the grammatical analysis of the material, and the analysis itself is not merely a fragmentary contribution. It

seems that this is the only way to find the right and necessary balance between empiricism and theory, and to avoid fulfilling the diagnosis of Russian medievalist Dmitrij Bulanin (2012: 429–30):

Paleo-Slavic studies are suffocating from the deficiency of reflection and drowning in empiricism. Without a unifying conception of the historical past of a given nation, its very history is non-existent. The lack of historiosophical thinking renders historical research into playing with a mosaic; the historical process itself lines up into fancy, random patterns, no less dazzling than images in a kaleidoscope—but, just as in this magical device, immediately falling to pieces at the slightest touch.

The present book, then, can be treated as an attempt to orientate the scholarly reflection on the examined period of the history of the Bulgarian language in a way that would make it possible, at least to a small degree, to overcome the afore-mentioned methodological deficiencies of Paleo-Slavic studies.

List of Source Text Editions

AGGREGATED DIGITAL EDITIONS

- Morozova, Irina V. 2002. *Slavjanskije izdanija kirillovskoga šrifta XV–XVI vekov*. Moskva: Russian State Library (electronic publication on DVD).
Slavonic Bibles Online. 1998. <http://primarysources.brillonline.com/browse/slavonic-bibles>. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

GLAGOLITIC INCUNABULA

- Misal po zakonu rimskoga dvora, Prvotisak: godine 1483, Pretisak*, edited by Ivo Frangeš et al., Zagreb: Liber, Mladost, 1971.
Brevijar po zakonu rimskoga dvora, 1491 (faksimilna reprodukcija), edited by Anica Nazor. Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske, 1991.
Senjski glagoljski misal 1494 (faksimilni pretisak), edited by Milan Moguš and Anica Nazor. Zagreb, 1994.
Milčetić, I. 1890. “Prilozi za literaturu hrvatskih glagoljskih spomenika.” *Starine* (Zagreb): 80–83 (edition of the *Spovid općena, Senj 1496* in Cyrillic transcription).
Spovid općena, Senj 1496 (faksimilirano izdanje), edited by Anica Nazor and B. Fučić. Senj, 1978.
Spovid općena, Senj 1496 (latinička transkripcija), edited by Anica Nazor. Senj, 1979.

CRACOW CYRILLIC INCUNABULA

No editions.

CETINJE CYRILLIC INCUNABULA

Oktoih prvoglasnik Đurđa Crnojevića 1494. Fototipsko izdanje u čast petstogodišnjice štampane knjige u Crnoj Gori. Cetinje, 1987.

Oktoih od petog do osmog glasa iz štamparije Đurđa Crnojevića. Beograd, 1973.

Oktoih petoglasnik. Izdanje Đurđa Crnojevića 1494, edited by Milanka Ubiparip, Miroslav Lazić, and Milena Martinović. Cetinje, Beograd, Dečani, 2014.

Psaltir s posljedovanjem Đurđa Crnojevića 1494, edited by D. Martinović. Cetinje, 1986.

Molitvenik Đurđa Crnojevića 1495/96. Fototipske izdanje. Podgorica, Cetinje, 1993.

ROMANIAN-BULGARIAN PALEOTYPY IN TÂRGOVIȘTE

Liturghierul lui Macarie (1508), edited by P. P. Panaitescu. București, 1961.

Das Tetraevangelium des Makarije aus dem Jahre 1512. Der erste kirchenslavische Evangeliendruck, Faksimile-Ausgabe, edited by Heinz Miklas et al. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1999 (Biblia Slavica, IV Südslavische Bibeln 1).

PALEOTYPY OF FRANCYSK SKARYNA

Biblija. Faksimil'nae ųzanųlenne Biblii, vydadzenaj Francyskam Skarynaju ų 1517–1519 hodach, ų 3 tomach. Minsk, 1990–1991.

Franciscus Skaryna, Biblia ruska. Apostol, Wilna 1525. Paderborn, 2002 (Biblia Slavica, III Ostslavische Bibeln 1).

CYRILLIC PALEOTYPY IN VENICE

Triod Posni. Štamparija Boųidara Vukovića Podgoričanina, Venecija 1561, edited by J. Đurović. Cetinje, 2012.

Jakov Krajkov, Sbornik "Razliĉni potrebi" (Kniga za pĀtnika), Faksimilno izdanje, Biblioteka Ambroziana S.Q.V.I.41/Jacov Krajkov, Libro per varie occorrenze (Libro del viaggiatore), Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana S.Q.V.I. 41, edizione facsimile, edited by Aksinija Dųurova. Sofija, 2014.

Prvi srpski bukvar inoka Save, Venecija 1597, edited by M. Bleĉić. Beograd, 1991.

PALEOTYPY OF THE LJUBAVIĆ FAMILY IN GORAųDE

Liturgija 1519. Fototipsko izdanje, edited by Katarina Mano-Zisi. Beograd, Istoĉno Sarajevo, 2008.

Psaltir s posledovanjem 1521. Fototipsko izdanje, edited by Katarina Mano-Zisi. Beograd, Istočno Sarajevo, 2008.

Molitvenik 1523. Fototipsko izdanje, edited by Katarina Mano-Zisi. Beograd, Istočno Sarajevo, 2008.

SERBIAN MONASTIC PRINTING SHOPS

Rujno: *Rujansko Četvoroevanđelje. Fototipski deo*, edited by Laza Čurčić and Katarina Mano-Zisi. Beograd, 1987.

Gračanica: no editions.

Mileševa: no editions.

Belgrad: *Beogradsko Četvoroevanđelje 1552. Fototipsko izdanje*, edited by Katarina Mano-Zisi. Beograd, 2000.

Mrkšina crkva: no editions.

ROMANIAN-BULGARIAN PALEOTYPY

Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu (1551–1553), edited by Emil Petrovici and Lajos Demény, București, 1971.

Lucrul apostolesc. Apostolul. Tipărit de diaconul Coresi in Brașov la 1563, edited by Ioan Bianu. București, 1930.

Coresi Psaltirea slavo-română (1577) în comparație cu Psaltirile Coresiene din 1570 și 1589, edited by Stela Toma. București, 1976.

Psaltirea publicata românesce la 1577 de diaconul Coresi, edited by B. Retriceicu. București, 1881.

Catechismul românesc dela 1560 “Întrebare creștinească”, edited by Ioan Bianu. București, 1925.

Pravila sfinților apostoli tipărită de diaconul Coresi in Brașov între 1570–80 (fragment), edited by Ioan Bianu. București, 1925.

Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi Brașov 1560–1561, comparat cu Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Mănăstirea 1574, edited by Florica Dimitrescu. București, 1963.

Palia de la Orăștie 1581–1582, text facsimile, edited by Viorica Pamfil. București, 1963.

MOSCOW ANONYMOUS TYPOGRAPHY

No editions.

PALEOTYPY OF IVAN FEDOROV

- Orationes Lingua et Caractere Moscoviticae*. Bruxelles, 1967.
- Ivan Fedorov's Primer of 1574*. Fascimile edition with commentary by Roman Jakobson and appendix by William A. Jackson. Cambridge, MA, 1955.
- Ivan Fedorov's Primer of 1574*. Fascimile edition with commentary by Roman Jakobson and appendix by William A. Jackson. *Harvard Library Bulletin* 9/1955: 5–45.
- Grammatika Ivana Fedorova*. Kyiv, 1964.
- Ivan Fedorov. Azbuka*, edited by G. V. Karpjuk. Moskva, 1974.
- Bukvar Ivana Fedorova*. Kyiv, 1975.
- Ivan Fedorov. Azbuka*, edited by G. V. Karpjuk. Moskva, 1977.
- Ivan Fedorovs griechisch-russisch Kirchenslawisches Lesebuch von 1578 und der Gothaer Bukvar' von 1578/1580*, edited by Helmut Grasshoff and John Simmons. Berlin, 1969.
- Ostrožskaja azbuka Ivana Fedorova 1578*, edited by Evgenij L. Nemirowskij. Moskva: Kniga, 1983.
- Biblija, sireč knigi Vetxago i Novago Zaveta po jazyku slavensku*. Moskva, Leningrad, 1988.

LVIV PALEOTYPY

- Adelphotos. Die erste gedruckte griechisch-kirchenslawische Grammatik, Lemberg 1591*, edited by Olexa Horbatsh. Frankfurt am Main: Kubon & Sagner, 1973 (Specimina Philologiae Slavicae 2).
- ΑΔΕΛΦΟΤΗΣ. Die erste gedruckte griechisch-kirchenslawische Grammatik, Lemberg 1591*, edited by Olexa Horbatsh. Second edition. München: Otto Sagner, 1988 (Specimina Philologiae Slavicae 76).

VILNIUS PALEOTYPY

- Statut Vjalikaha knjazstva Litoŭskaha 1588: tĕksty, davednik, kamentaryi*. Minsk, 1989. *Molity na vsju sedmicu Kirilla Turovskoho*. In “Napoj rosoju blahodati . . . ,” edited by Jurij A. Labyncaŭ, 95–234. Minsk, 1992.
- Lavrentij Zyzanij. Hramatyka sloven'ska*. Kyiv, 1980.
- Lavrentij Zizanij. Grammatika Slovenska. Wilna 1596*, edited by Gerd Freidhof. Second edition. Frankfurt am Main, München: Kubon und Sagner, 1980 (First edition: 1972) (Specimina Philologiae Slavicae 26).
- Grammatiki Lavrentija Zizaniija i Meletija Smotrickogo*, edited by E. A. Kuz'minova. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 2000.
- Leksys Lavrentija Zyzaniija. Synonima slavenorusskaja*, edited by Vasyľ V. Nimčuk. Kyiv, 1964.

- Meletij Smotryc'kyj, Hrammatiki slavenskija pravilnoe syntagma, Jevje 1619. Kirchenslavische Grammatik*, edited by Olexa Horbatsh. Frankfurt am Main, München: Kubon & Sagner, 1974. (Specimina Philologiae Slavicae 4).
- Meletij Smotrickij, Grammatiki slavenskija pravilnoe sintagma*, edited by V. V. Nimčuk, Kyiv, 1979.
- Starabelaruskija leksikony*, edited by Alena A. Jaskevič. Minsk: Universitëckae, 1992.
- Evanhelle 1575 hoda: pomnik slavjanskaha knihadruku XVI stahoddzja: z elektron-nym dadatkam*, edited by Alena I. Citavec. Minsk: Belaruskaja navuka, 2017.

BULGARIAN WRITINGS DEALING WITH ISSUES OF LANGUAGE

- Za bălgarski rod i ezik. Văzroždenskite knižovnici za bălgarskija knižoven ezik*, edited by Rusin Rusinov. Veliko Tărnovo: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij," 2007.

References

- Aćimović, Dragoljub, Milivoje Đorđević, et al., eds. 1987. *Štamparstvo u Užičkom kraju (1537–1987). Povodom 450 godina Rujanske štamparije*. Titovo Užice: Dimitrije Tucović.
- Albijić, Aleksandar. 1983. "The advent and demise of Serbian Church Slavic." In *From Los Angeles to Kiev. Papers on the occasion of The Ninth International Congress of Slavists, Kiev, September 1983*, edited by Vladimir Markov and Dean S. Worth, 9–18. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers ("UCLA Slavic Studies" 7).
- . 2010. *Prilozi o srpskom predvukovskom književnom jeziku*. Translated by Jasmina Grković-Mejdžor. Beograd–Novi Sad: Zavod za udžbenike/Matica Srpska.
- Andrejčin, Ljubomir. 1958. "Roljata na čerkovnoslavjanskija ezik v izgraždaneto na sávremiennija bǎlgarski knižoven ezik." *Bǎlgarski ezik* (Sofia), 4–5: 309–20.
- . 1986. *Iz istorijata na našeto ezikovo stroitelstvo*. Second edition. Sofija: Narodna prosveta (First edition: 1977).
- Angelov, Bonju. 1972. *Iz istorijata na rusko-bǎlgarskite literaturni vrǎzki*. Volume 1. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo.
- . 1980a. *Iz istorijata na rusko-bǎlgarskite literaturni vrǎzki*. Volume 2. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo.
- . 1980b. *Rusko-južnoslavjanski knižovni vrǎzki*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bǎlgarskata akademija na naukite.
- ASLQ 1984 I: Picchio, Riccardo, and Harvey Goldblatt, eds. *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*. Volume 1: *Church Slavonic–South Slavic–West Slavic*. New Haven, CT: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies (Yale Russian and East European Publications 4-a).
- ASLQ 1984 II: Picchio, Riccardo, and Harvey Goldblatt, eds. *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*. Volume 2: *East Slavic*. New Haven, CT: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies (Yale Russian and East European Publications 4-b).
- Atanasov, Petyr. 1959. *Načalo na bǎlarskoto knigopečatane*. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo.
- . 1964. "Ruskata pečatna kniga v Bǎlgarija." *Ezik i literatura* (Sofija) 3: 75–79.

- . 1978. “Moskovskite staropečatni prolozi i Bălgarskoto nacionalno vŕazŕadane.” *Istoričeski pregled* (Sofija) 2: 60–62.
- . 1980. *Jakov Krajkov. Kniŕovnik. Izdatel. Grafik. XVI v.* Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo.
- . 1982. “Ruskite staropečatni knigi v Rilskija manastir.” *Starobălgarska literatura* (Sofija) 12: 82–100.
- . 1986. *Bălgaro-ruski literaturni vŕŕzki prez XVII i XVIII v.* Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Babov, Kiril. 1968. “Ezikăt na damaskinite i vŕprosăt za čerkovnoslavjanskoto i ruskoto vlijanie vŕrxu bălgarskija kniŕovnen ezik.” In *Slavistični izsledvanija*, edited by Ivan Lekov et al., 167–186. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Badalić, Josip. 1966. *Jugoslavica usque ad annum MDC. Bibliographie der südslawischen Frühdrucke*. Second edition. Baden-Baden: Librairie Heitz (First edition: 1959) (“Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana” II).
- Barać, Dragan, ed. 2008a. *Goraŕdanska štamparija 1519–1523/The Goraŕde Printing House 1519–1523*. Beograd–Istočno Sarajevo: National Library of Serbia.
- . 2008b. *Kratka istorija knjige*. Beograd: Nolit.
- BDE 2007: Naumow, Aleksander, and Mariola Wlaczak-Mikołajczakowa, eds. *Franciszek Skoryna z Połocka. Œycie i pisma*. Gniezno: Collegium Europaeum Gnesnense. (“Biblioteka Duchowości Europejskiej” 3).
- BDE 2013a: Naumow, Aleksander, ed. *Święci Konstantyn-Cyryl i Metody. Patroni Wschodu i Zachodu*. Volume I: *Apostołowie Słowian w dawnej Europie*. Kraków: Collegium Columbinum (“Biblioteka Duchowości Europejskiej” 5/I).
- BDE 2013b: Naumow, Aleksander, ed. *Święci Konstantyn-Cyryl i Metody. Patroni Wschodu i Zachodu*. Volume II: *Apostołowie Słowian w nowoŕytniej Europie*. Kraków: Collegium Columbinum (“Biblioteka Duchowości Europejskiej” 5/II).
- Bednarczuk, Leszek. 2010. *Językowy obraz Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*. Kraków: Lexis.
- Biblioteka 2006: Twardzik, Waclaw, ed. *Biblioteka zabytków polskiego piśmiennictwa średniowiecznego*. Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN (electronic publication on DVD).
- Birkenmajer, Aleksander, Bronisław Kocowski, and Jan Trzynadłowski. 1971. *Encyklopedia wiedzy o ksiąŕce*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- BKE 2004: Gergova, Ani, ed. *Bălgarska kniga. Enciklopedija*. Sofija, Moskva: Pensoft.
- BLJPP 1992: Demina, Evgenija I., ed. *Bolgarskij literaturnyj jazyk predvozroŕdenčeskogo perioda*. Moskva: Institut slavjanovedenija i balkanistiki.
- Bobrik, Marina A. 1990. “Predstavlenija o pravil’nosti teksta i jazyka v istorii kniŕnoj spravy v Rossii (ot XI do XVIII v.).” *Voprosy jazykoznanija* (Moskva) 4: 61–85.
- Bogdanov, Ivan. 1963. “Bălgarski pŕvopečatni knigi ot XVI–XVIII vv.” *Godišnik na Bălgarskija bibliografski institut* (Sofija) IX: 85–123.
- . 1978. *Bălgarskata kniga prez vekovete*. Sofija: Narodna prosveta.
- . 1999. *Trinadeset veka bălgarska literatura. Săbitija, avtori, proizvedenija, bibliografija, sinhronen repertoar*. Volume 1: *Stara bălgarska literatura. Li-*

- teratura na *Vázraždáneto. 681–1878*. Second edition. Sofija: Marin Drinov (First edition: 1983).
- Bončev, Atanasij. 1952. *Čárkovnoslavjanska gramatika sás sbornik ot obrazci za prevod i Rečnik na čárkovnoslavjanskija ezik*. Sofija: Vjara, nádežda i ljubov (a number of reprints of the book have been published).
- . 2002. *Rečnik na čárkovnoslavjanskija ezik*. Volume I: *A–O*. Sofija: Narodna biblioteka “Sv. Sv. Kiril i Metodij.”
- . 2012. *Rečnik na čárkovnoslavjanskija ezik*. Volume II: *P–Ja*. Sofija: Nacionalna biblioteka “Sv. Sv. Kiril i Metodij.”
- Bosilkov, Konstantin. 1986. *Kratka istorija na bálgarskija knižoven ezik*. Szeged: Universitas Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae.
- Bošnjak, Mladen. 1968. *A Study of Slavic Incunabula*, München: Kubon & Sagner.
- . 1970. *Slavenska inkunabulistika*. Zagreb: Mladost.
- Botvinnik, M. B. 1986. “Bołgáro-vostočnoslavjanskije knižnye svjazi (Azbuka Ivana Fedorova i drevnebołgarskaja literatura).” In *Istorija knigi, knižnogo dela i bibliografii v Belorussii*, edited by I. A. Konikova, 108–17. Minsk: Akademija nauk Belorusskoj SSR.
- Bozukova, Maja. 1992. “Pripiskite v čárkovnoslavjanskite staropečatni knigi kato iztočnik na svedenija za sádbata na knigata.” *Bálgarska kniga* (Sofija) 12: 17–20.
- Bozukova, Maja. 1994. “Opis na ruskite i ukrainskite kirilski pečatni knigi ot XVIII vek v Narodnata biblioteka “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij.”” *Izvestija na Narodnata biblioteka “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij”* (Sofija) 22 (28): 285–324.
- BRV 1903: Bianu, Ioan, and Nerva Hodoș. *Bibliografia românească veche 1508–1830*. Volume 1: *1508–1716*. București: Stamlimmentul Grafic j. v. socec.
- BRV 1910: Bianu, Ioan, and Nerva Hodoș. *Bibliografia românească veche 1508–1830*. Volume 2: *1716–1808*. București: Atelierele Socec & co., soc. anonimă.
- BRV 1912–1934: Bianu, Ioan, and Nerva Hodoș. *Bibliografia românească veche 1508–1830*. Volume 3: *1809–1830*. București: Atelierele Socec & co., soc. anonimă.
- BRV 1944: Bianu, Ioan, and Dan Simonescu. *Bibliografia românească veche 1508–1830*. Volume 4: *Adăogiri și indreptări*. București: Atelierele Socec & co., soc. anonimă.
- BRV 1968: Bianu, Ioan, Nerva Hodoș, and Dan Simonescu, *Bibliografia românească veche 1508–1830*. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint (reprint of BRV 1903, 1910, 1912–1931, 1944).
- BRV 1973: Poenaru, Daniela. *Contribuții la bibliografia românească veche*. Târgoviște: Muzeul Județean Dîmbovița.
- BRV 2000: Râpă-Buicliu, Dan. *Bibliografia românească veche. Additamenta I (1536–1830)*. Galați: Alma Galați.
- BRV 2004: Croitoru, Carmen, et al. *Bibliografia românească veche: îmbogățită și actualizată*. București: CIMEC.
- BRV 2010: Râpă-Buicliu, Dan. “Bibliografia românească veche. Corrigenda. (Tipăriturile macariene).” *Danubius* (Galați) 28: 225–44.
- Bujukliev, Ivan. 1992. *Ezikovata kultura na bálgarskoto srednovekovie*. Sofija: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Ohridski.”

- Bulanin, Dmitrij, et al., ed. 2012. *Slovar' knižnikov i knižnosti Drevnej Rusi*. Volume 2: *Vtoraja polovina XIV–XVI v.* Part 3: *Bibliografičeskie dopolnenija*. Priloženje. Sankt-Peterburg: Dmitrij Bulanin.
- Bulič, Sergej. 1904. *Očerki istorii jazykoznanija v Rossii*. Volume I: (XIII v.–1825 g.). Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija M. Merkuševa (reprint: Moskva 2011, 2018).
- BV XV 1993: Hristova, Borjana, ed. *Bălgarskijat petnadeseti vek. Sbornik s dokladi za bălgarskata obšta i kulturna istorija prez XV vek*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Narodnata biblioteka "Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij."
- BV XVI 1996: Hristova, Borjana, ed. *Bălgarskijat šestnadeseti vek. Sbornik s dokladi za bălgarskata obšta i kulturna istorija prez XVI vek*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Narodnata biblioteka "Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij."
- Čermák, Václav. 2008. "K pojetí nové církevní slovanštiny v areálu Slavia orthodoxa a Slavia Latina." *Slavia. Časopis pro slovanskou filologii* (Prague), 77, 1–3: 29–39.
- Cibranska, Marijana. 1992. *Ezikăt na pečatnite knigi ot XVI v. (po material na Molitvenika ot 1570 g.)*. *Avtoreferat na disertacija za prisăždane na naučnata stepen "Kandidat na filologičeskite nauki."* Sofija.
- Cibranska-Kostova, Marijana. 2007. *Etjudi vărhu kirilskata paleotipija XV–XVIII vek*. Sofija: Gutenberg.
- . 2013. *Sbornikăt "Različni potrebi" na Jakov Krajkov meždju Venecija i Balkanite prez XVI vek*. Sofija: Valentin Trajanov.
- . 2017. "Po puti slavjanskoj pečatnoj knigi na Balkanax i v Jugo-Vostočnoj Evrope" (Along the way of the Slavic printed book in the Balkans and Southeastern Europe). *Scripta & e-Scripta: The Journal of Interdisciplinary Mediaeval Studies* (Sofia) 16–17: 360–64.
- Citko, Lilia. 2019. *Piśmiennictwo i nazewnictwo starobiałoruskie na ziemiach Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Wybrane problemy*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku.
- CJ 2005: Bugaeva, I.V., ed. *Cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyk: istorija, issledovanie, izučenie*. Moskva: PSTGU.
- CL 2007. Čermák, Václav, ed. *Církevněslovanská lexikografie 2006*. Praha: Euroslavica.
- Conev, Benjo. 1910. *Opis na răkopisite i staropečatnite knigi na Narodnata biblioteka v Sofija*. Volume 1. Sofija: Dăržavna pečatnica.
- . 1984a. *Istorija na bălgarskija ezik*. Volume 1, part A: *Obšta čast*. Third edition (reprint). Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo (First edition: 1919; second edition: 1940).
- . 1984b. *Istorija na bălgarskija ezik*. Volume 2, part A: *Obšta čast*, part B: *Specialni časti*. Second edition (reprint) Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo (First edition: 1934).
- . 1985. *Istorija na bălgarskija ezik*. Volume 3, part B: *Specialni časti*. Second edition. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo (First edition: 1937).
- Čurčić, Lazar. 2008. "Goraždanska štamparija u Trgovištu u Rumunji." In [Barać 2008a], 335–61.
- Demina, Evgenija. 1968. *Tixonravovskij damaskin. Bolgarskij pamjatnik XVII v. Issledovanie i tekst*. Volume I: *Filologičeskoe vvedenie v izučenie bolgarskix damaskinov*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Bolgarskoj akademii nauk.

- . 1972. *Tixonravovskij damaskin. Bolgarskij pamjatnik XVII v. Issledovanie i tekst*. Volume II: *Paleografičeskoe opisanie i tekst*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Bolgarskoj akademii nauk.
- . 1985. *Tixonravovskij damaskin. Bolgarskij pamjatnik XVII v. Issledovanie i tekst*. Volume III: *Tixonravovskij damaskin kak pamjatnik knižnogo bolgarskogo jazyka XVII v. na narodnoj osnove*. Sofija: Izdatel'stvo Bolgarskoj akademii nauk.
- Deschler, Jean-Paul. 2003. *Kleines Wörterbuch der Kirchenslavischen Sprache. Wortschatz der gebräuchlichsten liturgischen Texte mit deutscher Übersetzung*. Third edition. München: Otto Sagner (First edition: 1987; second edition: 1988) (“Slavistische Beiträge” 425).
- . 2018. *Manuel du slaven liturgique*. Volume I. *Grammaire*. Third edition. Paris: Institut d'études slaves (first edition: 1995, second edition: 2002).
- Deschler, Jean-Paul, and Pierre Gonneau. 2019. *Manuel du slaven liturgique*. Volume II. *Dictionnaire slaven-français*. Second edition. Paris: Institut d'études slaves (first edition: 2003).
- Dilevski [Dylevskij], Nikolaj. 1955. “Redki ruski pečatni knigi v bälgarskite knigohranilišta ot epohata na Vázraždaneto.” *Bälgarski ezik* (Sofija) 4: 319–35.
- . 1958. “Grammatika Meletija Smotrickogo u bolgar v èpoxu ix vozroždenija.” *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* (Leningrad) XIV: 461–73.
- . 1966. “Russkie i ukrainskie rukopisi i staropečatnye knigi v bolgarskix knigoxraniliščax.” In *Issledovanija istočnikov po istorii russkogo jazyka i pis'mennosti*, Moskva, s. 210–23.
- . 1974. *Ryl'skij monastyr' i Rossija-Ukraina v XVI–XVII vekax*, second edition. Sofija: Sinodalno izdatelstvo (First edition: 1946).
- D'jačenko, Grigorij. 1900 *Polnyj cerkovno-slavjanskij slovar' (s vneseniem v nego važnejšix drevne-russkix slov i vyraženij)*. Moskva (a number of reprints of the book have been published).
- Dragolova, Lidija, and Maja Bozukova. 1994. “Pripiski v slavjanskite staropečatni knigi XV–XVII v., sähranjavani v Narodnata biblioteka “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij.” *Izvestija na Narodnata biblioteka “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij”* (Sofija) 22 (28): 325–45.
- Drukarze 1959: Kawecka-Gryczowa, Alodia, Krystyna Korotajowa, and Wojciech Krajewski, eds. *Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku*. Volume 5: *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Drukarze 1960: Kawecka-Gryczowa, Alodia, Krystyna Korotajowa, and Wojciech Krajewski, eds. *Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku*. Volume 6: *Małopolska–ziemie ruskie*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Drukarze 1962: Kawecka-Gryczowa, Alodia, Krystyna Korotajowa, eds. 1962. *Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku*. Volume 4: *Pomorze*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Drukarze 1977: Kawecka-Gryczowa, Alodia, Krystyna Korotajowa, and Jan Sójka, eds. *Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku*. Volume 3, part 1: *Wielkopolska*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Drukarze 1983: Kawecka-Gryczowa, Alodia, ed. *Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku*. Volume 1, part 1: *Małopolska: wiek XV–XVI*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

- Drukarze 2000: Pirożyński, Jan, ed. *Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku*. Volume 1, part 2: *Małopolska: wiek XVII–XVIII*, 1: A–K, 2: L–Ż i drukarnie żydowskie. Kraków: PAU.
- Drukarze 2001: Korotajowa, Krystyna, and Joanna Krauze-Karpińska, eds. *Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku*. Volume 3, part 2: *Mazowsze z Podlasiem*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IBL.
- Duličenko, Aleksandr D. 2011a. *Osnovy slavjanskoj filologii*. Volume I: *Istoriko-ětnografičeskaja i etnolingvističeskaja problematika*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.
- . 2011b. *Osnovy slavjanskoj filologii*. Volume II: *Lingvističeskaja problematika*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.
- . 2014. *Vvedenie v slavjanskuju filologiju*. Second edition. Moskva: Flinta (First edition: 2012).
- EBVL 1997: Radev, Ivan, ed. *Enciklopedija na bǎlgarskata vǎzroždenska literatura*. Veliko Tǎrnovo: Abagar.
- EJO 2003: Polański, Kazimierz, ed. 2003. *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*. Third edition. Wrocław: Ossolineum (First edition: 1993; second edition: 1999).
- EJP 1999: Urbańczyk, Stanisław, et al., eds. 1999. *Encyklopedia języka polskiego*. Third edition. Wrocław: Ossolineum (First edition: 1978; second edition: 1992).
- ESBE 2000: Rusinov, Rusin, and Stanjo Georgiev, ed. *Enciklopedija na sǎvremen-nija bǎlgarski ezik*. Veliko Tǎrnovo: Abagar.
- Febvre, Lucien, and Henri-Jean Martin. 2014. *Narodziny książki*, translated by Anna Kocot and Maria Wodzyńska-Walicka. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego (the title of the original: *L'apparition du livre*. Paris: Albin Michel, first edition: 1958; second edition: 1971; third edition: 1999).
- Feuillet, Jack. 1999. *Grammaire historique du bulgare*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves (Second edition: *Grammaire historique de la langue bulgare*. 2019).
- Filkova, Penka. 2008. "Cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyk i ego lokal'nye raznovidnosti (XVII–XVIII vv.)." In *V tǎrsene na smisǎla i invarianta. Sbornik v čest na 80-godišnjinata na prof. Dina S. Staniševa*, edited by Janko Bǎčvarov, Margarita Vilarova, and Jordanka Trifonova, 386–96. Sofija: "Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski."
- Fin, Monika. 2012. "Venecija i srpska knjiga." *Glas biblioteke* (Čačak) 19: 79–100.
- FSL 1985: Stone, Gerald, and Dean S. Worth, eds. 1985. *The Formation of the Slavonic Literary Languages*. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers (UCLA Slavic Studies 11).
- Gagarina, D. A., and S. I. Kornienko. 2009. "Rukopisnye i staropečatnye kirilličeskie knigi v Internetie." *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Istorija* (Perm') 3 (10): 112–18.
- Gǎlǎbov, Ivan. 1980. *Starobǎlgarski ezik s uvod v slavjanskoto ezikoznanie*. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Galster, Irena. 2012. *Zarys gramatyki historycznej języka rosyjskiego*. Second additional edition. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN (First edition: 1982; second edition: 1998).
- Gamanovič (Gamanovich), Alipij (Alypy). 1964. *Grammatika cerkovno-slavjanskogo jazyka*. First edition. Jordanville, NY: Holy Trinity Monaster (a number of reprints of the book have been published).

- . 2001. *Grammar of the Church Slavonic Language*, translated by Archpriest John Shaw. Jordanville, NY: Holy Trinity Monaster.
- Garzaniti, Marcello. 2019. *Gli slavi. Storia, culture e lingue dalle origini ai nostri giorni*. A cura di Francesca Romoli, con la collaborazione di Alberto Alberti et al. Second edition. Roma: Carocci (First edition: 2013).
- Georgievski, Mihajlo. 1972. *Makedonskata pečatarska dejnost (1515–1913)*. Skopje: Misla.
- Gerčuk, Jurij Ja. 2014. *Iskusstvo pečatnoj knigi v Rossii XVI–XX vekov*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'skij dom "Kolo."
- Gerd, Aleksandr, and William Veder. 2003. *Cerkovnoslavjanskije teksty i cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyk*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta.
- Gerd, Aleksandr. 2008. *Lingvističeskaja tipologija drevneslavjanskix tekstov*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta.
- Gešev, Valentin. 2019. "Novo izsledvane vărhu rannite inkunabuli v konteksta na bălgarskata knižovnoezikova istorija" (A New Study of Early Incunabula in the Context of the Bulgarian Book and Language History). *Ezik i literatura. Naučno filologičesko spisanie* (Language and Literature. Philological Academic Journal) (Sofia) 1–2: 175–78.
- Gheție, Ion, and Alexandru Mareș. 1994. *Diaconul Coresi și izbânda scrisului în limba română*. București: Editura Minerva.
- Gladkova, Hana, and Iskra Likomanova. 2008. *Jazykovaja situacija: istoki i perspektivy (bolgarsko-češskie paraleli)*. Second edition. Praha: Karolinum (First edition: 2002).
- Goldblatt, Harvey. 1987. *Orthography and Orthodoxy: Constantine Kostenecki's Treatise on the Letters*. Firenze: Le Lettere.
- Gradinarova, Alla. 1997. *O knižnoj leksike v jazyke staršix novobolgarskix damaskinov v svjazi s problemoj cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazykovogo vlijanija*. Sofija: Sofijski universitet "Sv. Kliment Ohridski."
- Gramatika 1993: Duridanov, Ivan. *Gramatika na starobălgarskija ezik. Fonetika, morfologija, sintaksis*. Second edition. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata akademija na naukite (First edition: 1991).
- Grbić, Dušica. 2008. "Ortografske odlike goraždanskog *Psaltira* s posledovanjem iz 1521. godine." In [Barać 2008a], 225–64.
- Grković-Mejdžor, Jasmina. 1993. *Jezik "Psaltira" iz štamparije Crnojevića*. Podgorica: Crnogorska akademija nauka i umjetnosti.
- Grujić, Radoslav M. 1936. "Prva štamparija u Južnoj Srbiji 1539 godine na Kosovom Polju u manastiru Gračanici." *Glasnik Skopskog naučnog društva* (Skoplje) 15–16: 81–96.
- Guseva, Aleksandra A. 2003. *Izdanija kirillovskogo šrifta vtoroj poloviny XVI veka. Svodnyj katalog*. Volume 1–2. Moskva: Indrik.
- Gutschmidt, Karl. 1969. "O roli cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka v formirovanii sovremennyx bolgarskogo i serbskogo literaturnyx jazykov," translated by A. K. Košelev. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* (Moskva) 6: 71–82.
- Gyllin, Roger. 1991. *The Genesis of the Modern Bulgarian Literary Language*. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell.

- Haralampiev, Ivan. 2001. *Istoričeska gramatika na bālgarskija ezik*. Veliko Tārnovo: Faber.
- . 2012. *Lekcii po istorija na bālgarskija knižoven ezik do Vāzraždāneto*. Veliko Tārnovo: Faber.
- Hristova, Borjana, Darinka Karadžova, and Elena Uzunova. 2003. *Beležki na bālgarskite knižovnici*. Volume 1: *X–XV vek*. Sofija: Narodna biblioteka “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij.”
- . 2004. *Beležki na bālgarskite knižovnici*. Volume 2: *XVI–XVIII vek*. Sofija: Narodna biblioteka “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij.”
- Hristova-Šomova, Iskra. 2009. “Kniga Iova v perevode Franciska Skoriny.” In *Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne*. Volume 4, edited by Marzanna Kuczyńska, Wanda Stępniać-Minczewska, and Jan Stradomski, 37–71. Kraków: Scriptum.
- Ilieva, Lilija. 2011. *Bālgarskij ezik v predistorijata na komparativnata lingvistika i v ezikovija svjat na rannija evropejski modernizām*. Blagoevgrad: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Neofit Rilski.”
- . 2012. “Gutenbergovata revolucija i pravoslavnite južni slavjani: kulturni i ezikovi naglasi.” *Balkanističen forum* (Blagoevgrad) 2: 28–38.
- ILU 1991: Desnickaja, A. V., ed. *Istorija lingvističeskix učenij*. Volume 4. *Pozdnee Srednevekov’e*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka.
- INBKE 1989: Georgieva, Elena, Stojan Žerev, and Valentin Stankov, eds. *Istorija na novobālgarskija knižoven ezik*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bālgarskata akademija na naukite.
- IRL 2001: Sorokoletov, F. P., ed. *Istorija ruskoj leksikografii*. Second edition. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka (First edition: 1998).
- Ivanova, Cenka. 2003. *Štrihi kām balkanskija Vavilon. Bālgarsko-srābski knižnoezikovi otnošenija XVIII–XIX vek*. Veliko Tārnovo: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij.”
- . 2004. *Blizki i različni. Južnoslavjanski ezikovi proeckii*. Veliko Tārnovo: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij.”
- Ivanova, Diana. 2002. *Tradicija i priemstvenost v novobālgarskite prevodi na Evangelieto. Tekstologija i ezik*. Plovdiv: Prizma.
- . 2008–2017. *Nedopisani stranici ot istorijata na bālgarskija knižoven ezik*. Volumes 1–2. Plovdiv: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Paisij Hilendarski.”
- . 2013. “Južnoslavjanskite pečatni knigi ot XVI vek i pātjat kām okončatelnata cārkovnoslavjanska kodifikacija na biblejskija (evangelski) tekst.” In *Slavjanska filologija 25. Sbornik, posveten na XV slavističen kongres v Minsk*, 24–46. Sofija: Marin Drinov.
- . 2017. *Istorija na novobālgarskija knižoven ezik*. Second edition. Plovdiv. (First edition: 2012).
- . 2017a. [review of: Petrov 2015] *Slavjanski dialozi* (Plovdiv) XIV 19: 135–43.
- Ivanova, Najda. 2000. *Istorija na srābskija i hārvatskija knižoven ezik*. Sofija: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Ohridski.”
- Ivanova-Mirčeva, Dora, and Ivan Haralampiev. 1999. *Istorija na bālgarskija ezik*. Veliko Tārnovo: Faber.

- Ivanova-Mirčeva, Dora. 1987. *Văprosi na bălgarskija knižoven ezik do Văzraždaneto (IX–X do XVIII vek)*. Sofija: Narodna prosveta.
- . 2003. *Bălgarskijat knižoven ezik (IX–X do XVIII v.)*. Veliko Tărnovo: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij.”
- Ivić, Pavle. 2014. *Pregled istorije srpskog jezika*, edited by Aleksandar Mladenović. Second edition. Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića (First edition: 1998).
- . 2017. *Serbskij narod i ego jazyk*. Moskva: Indrik (original versions: *Srpski narod i njegov jezik*. Belgrade 1971, 1986, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad 2001).
- Izotov, Andrej I. 2007. *Staroslavjanskij i cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyki. Grammatika, upražnenija, teksty*. Third edition. Moskva: IOSO RAO (First edition: 1992; second edition: 2001).
- Jagić, Vatroslav. 1913. *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Kirchenslavischen Sprache*. Second edition. Berlin: Weidmann (First edition: Vienna 1900).
- . 1968. *Codex Slovenicus Rerum Grammaticarum*. München: Wilhelm Fink (“Slavische Propyläen” 25, reprint of the edition: Saint Petersburg, 1885–1895 and Berlin, 1896).
- . 2003. *Istorija slavjanskoj filologii*. Moskva: Indrik (“Ėnciklopedija slavjanskoj filologii” 1) (reprint, first edition: Sankt-Peterburg 1910; second edition: Leipzig 1967).
- Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew, Zoja. 2003. *Druki cyrylickie z oficyn Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI–XVIII wieku*. Olsztyn: University of Warmia and Mazury Press.
- Jaskevič, Alena A. 2001. *Starabelaruskija hramatyki: da prablemy ahul’nafilalahi-čnaj čelasnasci*. Second edition. Minsk: Belaruskaja navuka (First edition: 1996).
- Kalina, Antoni. 1891. “Studyja nad historyją języka bułgarskiego.” *Rozprawy i Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń Wydziału Filologicznego Akademii Umiejętności* (Kraków), part 1: XIV: 163–547, part 2: XV: 396–600.
- Karataev, Ivan. 1861. *Xronologičeskaja rospis’ slavjanskix knig, napečatannyx kirillovskimi bukvami. 1491–1730*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk.
- . 1872. *Bibliografičeskija zametki o staro-slavjanskix pečatnyx izdanijax 1491–1730*. Sankt-Peterburg.
- . 1883. *Opisanie slavjano-russkix knig, napečatannyx kirillovskimi bukvami*. Volume 1: *s 1491 po 1652 g.* Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk (“Sbornik Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj akademii nauk” XXXIV 2) (a number of reprints of the book have been published).
- Katalog 1994: Witkowski, Wiesław, ed. 1994. *Katalog starodruków cyrylickich Muzeum Zamku w Łańcucie*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.
- Katalog 1996: Cubrzyńska-Leonarczyk, Maria. 1996. *Katalog druków supraskich*. Warszawa: Biblioteka Narodowa.
- Katalog 2004: Żurawińska, Zofia, and Zoja Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew, eds. 2004. *Katalog druków cyrylickich XV–XVIII wieku w zbiorach Biblioteki Narodowej*. Warszawa: Biblioteka Narodowa.

- Katalog 2010: Dubec, Roman, ed. 2010. *Cyrylickie starodruki cerkiewne XVII–XVIII w. ze zbiorów instytucji kościelnych i parafii prawosławnych województwa małopolskiego*. Gorlice: Diecezjalny Ośrodek Kultury Prawosławnej “Elpis.”
- Katalog 2013: Lepak, Roman, ed. 2013. *Katalog druków cyrylicznych XVI–XVIII wieków w zbiorach biblioteki klasztoru oo. Bazylianów w Warszawie*. Warszawa: Bazyliada (Bazylikańskie Studia Historyczne 3).
- Kawecka, Agata. 2009. *Określoność/nieokreśloność w rozwoju języka bułgarskiego i serbskiego*. Łódź: Pictor.
- . 2016. [review of: Petrov 2015] *Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe* (Łódź) 6: 425–26.
- . 2019. “Na nowo o historii języka” (Once more on the history of language). *Orbis Linguarum* (Blagoevgrad) XVII 1: 179–81.
- Kawecka, Agata, Ivan Petrov, and Małgorzata Skowronek. 2009. “Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski (cz. 1).” *Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne* (Kraków) 4: 247–73.
- . 2010. “Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski (cz. 2).” *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Litteraria Rossica* (Łódź) 3: 175–93.
- . 2011. “Z problematyki przekładu starej literatury kręgu Slavia Orthodoxa na język polski (cz. 4).” *Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne* (Kraków) 6: 309–25.
- . 2013. “Old Church Slavonic—Polish Textbooks, Grammars and Dictionaries.” *Palaeobulgarica/Starobălgaristika* (Sofia) XXXVII 4: 3–20.
- . 2015. “Z warsztatu paleoslawisty-tłumacza: polskojęzyczne pomoce naukowe i opracowania leksykograficzne.” *Roczniki Humanistyczne TN KUL. Seria: Słowianoznawstwo* (Lublin) 7: 147–75.
- Keipert, Helmut. 2001. “Kirchenslavisch als Konstrukt.” *Slavia. Časopis pro slovan-skou filologii* (Prague), 70, 3–4: 371–81.
- . 2006. “Cerkovnoslavjanskij in verordnetem Vergessen.” In *Jezikovna predanost. Akademiku prof. dr. Jožetu Toporišiču ob 80-letnici*, edited by M. Jesenšek and Z. Zorko, 129–45. Maribor: Slavistično društvo.
- . 2014. “Kirchenslavish-Begriffe/Conceptions of Church Slavonic.” In: Gutschmidt, Karl, Sebastian Kempgen, Tilman Berger, and Peter Kosta, eds. *Die slavischen Sprachen/The Slavic Languages. Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung/An International Handbook of their Structure, their History and their Investigation*. Volume 2, 1211–52. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- . 2017. “Cerkovnoslavjanskij: krug ponjatij,” translated by Marina Bobrik. *Slověne. International Journal of Slavic Studies* (Moscow), 1: 8–75.
- Kenanov, Dimităr. 2009. “Žitija i službi na sv. Petka Tărnovska v staropečatnite slavjanski knigi.” In *Biblioteki. Četene. Komunikacii. Sedma nacionalna konferencija*, 57–65. Veliko Tărново: Universitetsko izdatelstvo.

- Kirilova, Rosica. 2015. *Opis na slavjanskite kirilski pečatni knigi ot XVII vek vāv fonda "Staropečatni, redki i cenni knigi" na Nacionalnata biblioteka "Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij."* Sofija: Nacionalna biblioteka "Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij."
- Klassovskij, Vladimir. 2017. *Grammatika slavjano-cerkovnogogo jazyka novogo perioda*. Tenth edition. Sankt-Peterburg–Moskva: URSS (First edition: 1857; second edition: 1867; third edition: 1879; fourth edition: 1881; fifth edition: 1887; sixth edition: 1892; seventh edition: 2005; eighth edition: 2010; ninth edition: 2012).
- KME I 1985: Dinekov, Petār, ed. *Kirilo-Methodievska enciklopedija*. Volume I: A–Z. Sofija: Bālgarska akademija na naukite.
- KME II 1995: Dinekov, Petār, ed. *Kirilo-Methodievska enciklopedija*. Volume II: I–O. Sofija: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski."
- KME III 2003: Graševa, Liljana, ed. *Kirilo-Methodievska enciklopedija*. Volume III: P–S. Sofija: Marin Drinov.
- KME IV 2003: Graševa, Liljana, ed. *Kirilo-Methodievska enciklopedija*. Volume IV: T–Ja, Dopālнение. Sofija: Marin Drinov.
- Kovtun, Ljudmila S. 1963. *Russkaja leksikografija èpoxi Srednevekov'ja*. Moskva–Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- . 1975. *Leksikografija v Moskovskoj Rusi XVI–načala XVII v.* Leningrad: Nauka.
- Kraveckij, Aleksandr G., and Aleksandra A. Pletneva. 2001. *Istorija cerkovno-slavjanskogo jazyka v Rossii. Konec XIX–XX v.*, Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.
- Kraveckij Aleksandr G., and Aleksandra A. Pletneva, eds. 2016. *Bol'soj slovar' cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka Novogo vremeni*. Volume I, A–B. Moskva: Sloviri XXI veka.
- . 2019. *Bol'soj slovar' cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka Novogo vremeni*. Volume II, V. Moskva: AST-Press.
- Kretschmer [Krečmer], Anna. 1989. *Zur Methodik der Untersuchung älterer slavischer schriftsprachlicher Texte (am Beispiel des slavenoserbischen Schrifttums)*. München: Otto Sagner ("Slavistische Beiträge" 241).
- . 1998. "Sravnitel'naja istorija slavjanskix literaturnyx jazykov: voprosy metodologii." *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta* (Moskva) 9/3: 48–59.
- . 2012. "Voprosy metodologii issledovanija dostandartnojazykovoju (slavjanskou) pis'mennosti." In *Sovremennye napravlenija issledovanija i prepodavanija slavjanskix jazykov*, edited by Elena N. Rudenko and Elena S. Surkova, 113–21. Minsk.
- Kruming, Andrej. 1977. "Predvaritel'nyj spisok staropečatnyx izdanij glagoličeskogo šrifta XV–XVIII vv." In *V pomošč' sostaviteljam Svodnogo kataloga staropečatnyx izdanij kirillovskogo i glagoličeskogo šriftov: metodičeskie ukazanija*. Volume 2, edited by Evgenij L. Nemirovskij. Moskva: Gosudarstvennaja biblioteka SSSR imeni V. I. Lenina.
- . 1998. *Svodnyj katalog staropečatnyx izdanij glagoličeskogo šrifta 1483–1812 gg.* Moskva: Rossijskaja gosudarstvennaja biblioteka (wrong date on the title page: 1992).

- . 2000. "Svodnyj katalog staropečatnyx izdanij glagoličeskogo šrifta 1483–1812 gg. (Avtoreferat i dopolnenija)." *Slovo: časopis Staroslavenskoga instituta* (Zagreb) 50: 191–203.
- Kryzia, Władysław. 2008. *Słoweński, Słoweńcy, Słowenia. Zarys historii języka i kształtowania się świadomości narodowej*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- . 2016. "Ważny wkład w badania nad paleotypią południowosłowiańską" (An important contribution to the study of South Slavic palaeotypes. *Slavia Meridionalis* (Warsaw) 16: 615–19.
- Kujew, Kujō. 1950. *Konstantyn Kostenecki w literaturze bułgarskiej i serbskiej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Studium Słowiańskiego Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Kukuljević, Ivan. 1860. *Bibliografija hrvatska*. Volume 1: *Tiskane knjige*. Zagreb: Brzotisak Dragutina Albrechta (Bibliografija jugoslavenska 1).
- Kul'bakin, Stepan M. 1915. *Grammatika cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka po drevnejšim pamjatnikam*. Petrograd: Otdelenie ruskago jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj akademii nauk (Ėnciklopedija slavjanskoj filologii 10) (reprint: Leipzig 1977; second edition: Moskva 2005; third edition: Moskva 2013).
- Kuznecov, Petr. 1958. *U istokov rusckoj grammatičeskoj mysli*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR (reprint: 2018).
- Labyncev, Jurij [Łabyńcew], and Larisa Ščavinskaja [Szczawińska]. 1995. *W mieście zwanym Zabłudowem*, translated by Mikołaj Hajduk. Białystok: Orthdruk.
- Labyncev, Jurij, and Larisa Ščavinskaja. 2006. "*Drukowano v . . . Lavre Kievopečarskoj*." Moskva: Biblioteka ukraińskiej literatury.
- . 2007. *Pervaja v Ukraine (Tipografija Kievo-Mogiljanskoj akademii)*. Moskva: Biblioteka ukraińskiej literatury.
- . 2007a. "*Napečatana . . . Ivanom Fedorovym . . . Moskvitinom*." Moskva: Biblioteka ukraińskiej literatury.
- . 2008. *Knižnoe nasledie Ostrožskoj akademii v kul'ture Moskvy i Rossii*. Moskva: Biblioteka ukraińskiej literatury.
- . 2010. *Pervency knigopečatanija*. Moskva: Biblioteka ukraińskiej literatury.
- . 2010a. *Jaroslav Isaevič – istorik ukraińskiej knižnoj kul'tury*. Moskva: Biblioteka ukraińskiej literatury.
- . 2011. "*V leto . . . 1661*." Moskva: Biblioteka ukraińskiej literatury.
- . 2014. *L'vovskaja povest' Ivana Fedorova*. Moskva: Biblioteka ukraińskiej literatury.
- . 2014a. *L'vovsko-ostrožskie bukvari i azbuka Ivana Fedorova*. Moskva: Biblioteka ukraińskiej literatury.
- Langston, Keith, and Anita Peti-Stantić. 2014. *Language Planning and National Identity in Croatia*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lazić, Miroslav A. 2013. "Između patriotizma, pobožnosti i trgovine: motivi izdavačke delatnosti Božidara Vukovića." *Arheografski prilozi* (Beograd) 35: 49–101.
- . 2014. "Prilog poznavanju štamparstva Dimitrija Ljubavića. Izdanja Apostola iz 1547. godine u svetlu primeraka iz Biblioteke manastira Hilandara." *Arheografski prilozi* (Beograd) 36: 93–113.

- LB 1952: Kirchner, Joachim, ed. *Lexikon des Buchwesens*. Volume 1: A–K. Stuttgart: Hiersemann.
- LB 1953: Kirchner, Joachim, ed. *Lexikon des Buchwesens*. Volume 2: L–Z. Stuttgart: Hiersemann.
- LB 1955–1956: Kirchner, Joachim, ed. *Lexikon des Buchwesens*. Volume 3, parts 1–2: *Abbildungen. Bilderatlas zum Buchwesen*. Stuttgart: Hiersemann.
- Leszka, Mirosław, Kirył Marinow, and Ivan Petrov. 2010. “O próbie unowoczeńnienia ‘Słownika Starożytności Słowiańskich’ słów kilka (uwagi na marginesie książki ‘Wczesna Słowiańszczyzna. Przewodnik po dziejach i literaturze przedmiotu,’ t. 1–2, pod red. A. Wędzkiego, Sławistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, Warszawa 2008, ss. 787 + 287).” *Byzantinoslovaca* (Bratislava) III: 144–54.
- LGB 1987: Corsten Severin, Günther Pflug, and Friedrich Adolf Schmidt-Künsemüller, eds. *Lexikon des gesamten Buchwesens*. Second edition. Volume I: A–Buch. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann (First edition: 1935–1937).
- LGB 1991: Corsten Severin, Günther Pflug, and Friedrich Adolf Schmidt-Künsemüller, eds. *Lexikon des gesamten Buchwesens*. Second edition. Volume III: *Fotochemigrafische Verfahren – Institut für Buchmarktforschung*. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann (First edition: 1935–1937).
- LGB 1999: Corsten Severin, Stephan Füssel, and Günther Pflug, eds. *Lexikon des gesamten Buchwesens*. Second edition. Volume V: M–Photon. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann (First edition: 1935–1937).
- Lis-Wielgosz, Izabela. 2013. *O trwałości znaczeń. Siedemnastowieczna literatura serbska w służbie tradycji*. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.
- . 2017. “Paleotypia południowosłowiańska—opis, perspektywa, przekład” (South Slavic paleotyping: Description, perspective, translation). *Roczniki Humanistyczne* (Humanities Annals) *TN KUL. Seria: Słowianoznawstwo* (Slavic Studies) (Lublin) 7 LXV: 163–68.
- LJL 2012: Il’ina, Galina Ja., ed. *Leksikon južnoslavjanskix literatur*. Moskva: Indrik.
- Łuczak, Arleta. 2014. “Najstarsze słowiańskie przekłady Biblii w niemieckiej serii ‘Biblia Slavica.’” *Nauka* 2: 135–50.
- Ludogovskij, Fedor B. 2003. “Sovremennyj cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyk: obosnovanie suščestvovanija i opredelenie ponjatija.” *Slavjanskij vestnik* (Moskva) 1: 106–19.
- . 2008. “Cerkovnoslavjanskij i nacional’nye literaturnye jazyki v slavjanskix pravoslavnyx cerkvjax v konce XX–načale XXI vv.” In *Literaturnye jazyki v kontekste kul’tury slavjan*, edited by Grigorij K. Venediktov, 209–38. Moskva: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN.
- . 2015. *Struktura i poëtika cerkovnoslavjanskix akafistov*. Moskva: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN.
- Luk’janenko, V. I., ed. 1979. *Izdanija kirilličeskoj pečati XV–XVII vv. dlja južnyx slavjan i rumyn: katalog knig iz sobranij Gosudarstvennoj Publichnoj biblioteki im. M.E. Saltykova-Ščedrina*. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennaja publichnaja biblioteka.
- . 1993. *Izdanija kirilličeskoj pečati XV–XVI vv. (1491–1600). Katalog knig iz sobranija Gosudarstvennoj Publichnoj biblioteki*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel’stvo Rossijskoj nacional’noj biblioteki.

- Maldjieva, Viara. 2014. *Praktyczna gramatyka języka bułgarskiego dla polskich studentów*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika (*Bългария e malka, no hubava*, part 2).
- Mano-Zisi, Katarina. 1984/1985. "Stare ćiriličke štampane knjige u Arhivu Srpske Akademije nauka i umetnosti." *Arheografski prilozi* (Beograd) 6–7: 291–317.
- . 1994. *Mileševsko štamparstvo 1544–1557. 450 godina od osnivanja štamparije u manastiru Mileševi*. Prijepolje.
- . 2003. "Štampano "Četvorjevanđelje" Monaha Lavrentija. (Drugo izdanje, posle 1582. godine)." *Arheografski prilozi* (Beograd) 25: 239–51.
- . 2008. "Grafika goraždanskix knjiga." In [Barać 2008a] 287–308.
- Mareš, František V. 1992. "The New Russian Church Slavonic and its relation to Greek." In: Tachiaos, Anthoni-Emil N., ed. *The Legacy of Saints Cyril and Methodius to Kiev and Moscow*. Thessaloniki: Hellenic Association for Slavic Studies.
- . 2000. *Cyrlometodějská tradice a slavistika*. Praha: Torst.
- Marinković, Borivoje. 1988. *Bibliografija o našem ćiriličkom štamparstvu, štamparijama i knjigama XV, XVI i XVII stoleća*. Volume 1: *Mnih Makarije ot Črnije Gori (XV–XVI)*. Cetinje: Centralna narodna biblioteka "Đurđe Crnojević."
- . 1989a. *Bibliografija o našem ćiriličkom štamparstvu, štamparijama i knjigama XV, XVI i XVII stoleća*. Volume 2: *Božidar i Vičenco Vuković (XVI)*. Cetinje: Centralna narodna biblioteka "Đurđe Crnojević."
- . 1989b. *Bibliografija o našem ćiriličkom štamparstvu, štamparijama i knjigama XV, XVI i XVII stoleća*. Volume 3: *Sledbenici Božidara i Vičenca Vukovića*. Cetinje: Centralna narodna biblioteka "Đurđe Crnojević."
- . 1991. *Bibliografija o našem ćiriličkom štamparstvu, štamparijama i knjigama XV, XVI i XVII stoleća*. Volume 4 (part 1): *Od Goražde do Mrkšine crkve (XVI), (Goražde, Rujno, Gračanica, Mileševa)*. Cetinje: Centralna narodna biblioteka "Đurđe Crnojević."
- . 1992. *Bibliografija o našem ćiriličkom štamparstvu, štamparijama i knjigama XV, XVI i XVII stoleća*. Volume 4 (part 2): *Od Goražde do Mrkšine crkve (Beograd, Mrkšina crkva, Dopune)*. Cetinje: Centralna narodna biblioteka "Đurđe Crnojević."
- Martinović, Dušan. 1994a. *Crna Gora u Gutenbergovoj galaksiji*. Podgorica.
- . 1994b. *Pola milenijuma štampane knjige u Crnoj Gori*. Podgorica.
- Mathiesen, Robert. 1972. *The Inflectional Morphology of the Synodal Church Slavonic Verb*. Columbia University Ph.D. dissertation, New York, NY.
- . 1978. "The Determination of Norms (A Problem in the Diachronic Study of Church Slavonic)." In: Birnbaum Henrik. *American Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists (Zagreb and Ljubljana, September 3–9, 1978)*. Volume 1: *Linguistics and Poetics*, 483–94. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers.
- . 1979. "Later Church Slavonic and National Literary Languages." *Polata knjigopisnaja. An Information Bulletin Devoted to the Study of Early Slavic Books, Texts and Literatures* (Nijmegen) 2: 56–60.
- . 1981a. "The Making of the Ostrih Bible." *Harvard Library Bulletin* XXIX 1: 71–110.

- . 1981b. “Two Contributions to the Bibliography of Meletij Smotryc’kyj.” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* V 1: 230–44.
- . 1987. “Some Methodological Problems in Describing Old East Slavic Cyrillic Manuscripts and Printed Books.” *Polata knigopisnaja. An Information Bulletin Devoted to the Study of Early Slavic Books, Texts and Literatures* (Nijmegen) 17–18: 130–43.
- . 1992. “Cyrillic and Glagolitic Printing and the Eisenstein Thesis.” *Solanus. International Journal for Russian & East European Bibliographic, Library & Publishing Studies. New Series* (London) 6: 3–26.
- . 2004. “Cosmology and the Puzzle of Early Printing in Old Cyrillic.” *Solanus. International Journal for Russian & East European Bibliographic, Library & Publishing Studies. New Series* (London) 18: 5–27.
- Mečkovskaja, Nina B. 1984. *Rannie vostočnoslavjanskije grammatiki*. Minsk: Izdatel’stvo “Universitetskoe.”
- . 1986. *Koncepcii i metody grammatik XVI–XVII vekov kak èlementa knižnopiš’mennoj kul’tury vostočnogo slavjanstva. Avtoreferat dissertacii na soiskanie učenoj stepeni doktora filologičeskix nauk*. Minsk: Belorusskij gosudarstvennyj universitet.
- . 1998. *Jazyk i religija. Lekcii po filologii i istorii religij*. Moskva: Fair.
- Medaković, Dejan 1958. *Grafika srpskih štampanih knjiga XV–XVII veka*. Beograd: Naučno delo.
- Mičeva, Vanja. 2017. *Bălgarski ezik* (Sofia) LXIV 1: 100–06.
- Micle, Veniamin Archim. 2008a. *Ieromonahul Macarie, tipograf român (1508–1512)*. Mănăstirea Bistrița olteană.
- . 2008b. *Tipograful Macarie și locul tipografiei sale*. Mănăstirea Bistrița olteană.
- . 2010a. *Octoihul ieromonahului Macarie. 1510–2010*. Sfânta Mănăstirea Bistrița, Eparhia Râmnicului.
- . 2010b. *Macarie tipograful. Aniversare*. Sfânta Mănăstirea Bistrița, Eparhia Râmnicului.
- . 2011. *Introducerea tiparului la români*. Sfânta Mănăstirea Bistrița, Eparhia Râmnicului.
- . 2012a. *Macarie tipograful. Confirmaarea ipotezei bistrițene*. Sfânta Mănăstirea Bistrița. Eparhia Râmnicului.
- . 2012b. *Ecouri macariene*. Sfânta Mănăstirea Bistrița, Eparhia Râmnicului.
- Minčeva, Bojana. 2013. *Opis na slavjanskite kirilski pečatni knigi ot XIX vek, săhranjavani v kolekcijata “Staropečatni knigi, redki i cenni izdanija” na Nacionalnata biblioteka “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij.”* Sofija: Nacionalna biblioteka “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij.”
- Mirčev. Kiril. 1978. *Istoričeska gramatika na bălgarskija ezik*. Third edition. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo (First edition: 1958; second edition: 1963).
- Mironowicz, Aleksander, Urszula Pawluczuk, and Piotr Chomik, eds. 2004. *Prawosławne oficyny wydawnicze w Rzeczypospolitej*. Białystok: University of Białystok Press.
- Mjakišev, Vladimir. 2008. *Jazyk Litovskogo Statuta 1588 goda*. Kraków: Lexis.

- . 2014. *Kirilličeskie izdanija Litovskogo Statuta 1588 goda*. Kraków: Lexis.
- Mladenov, Stefan. 1979. *Istorija na bǎlgarskija ezik*, translated and edited by Ivan Duridanov. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bǎlgarskata akademija na naukite (the original: *Geschichte der bulgarischen Sprache*. Berlin–Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter 1929).
- Mladenović, Aleksandar. 1989. *Slavenosrpski jezik. Studije i članci*. Novi Sad: Književna zajednica Novog Sada.
- Momirović, Petar. 1993. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi iz Vojvodine*. Volume 1, Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- . 1995. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi iz Vojvodine*. Volume 2, Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- . 1996. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi iz Vojvodine*. Volume 3, Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- . 2000. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi iz Vojvodine*. Volume 4, Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- . 2001. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi iz Vojvodine*. Volume 5, Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- . 2004. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi iz Vojvodine*. Volume 6, Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Mošin, Vladimir A. 1998a. “O periodizaciji rusko-južnoslavjanskix literaturnyx svjazej X–XV vv.” In *RJS 1998*: 7–113.
- . 1998b. “XVII vek kako prelomna epoxa vo istorijata na literaturnoto tvoreštvo vo slovenskiot svet.” In *RJS 1998*: 114–21.
- Moszyński, Leszek, ed. 1994. *Pięćsetna rocznica najstarszego druku cyrylskiego z krakowskiej oficyny Sz wajppol ta Fiola (1491). Materiały trzeciej Gdańskiej sesji Cyrylometodejskiej 17 I 1991*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- Moszyński, Leszek. 2012. *Wstęp do filologii słowiańskiej*. Second additional edition. Warszawa: PWN (First edition: 1984; second edition: 2006).
- Napoli, Maria C. 1990. *L'impresa del libro nell'Italia del Seicento. La bottega di Marco Ginammi*. Napoli: Guida editori.
- Naumow, Aleksander. 1976. *Apokryfy w systemie literatury cerkiewnosłowiańskiej*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- . 1983. *Biblia w strukturze artystycznej utworów cerkiewnosłowiańskich*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.
- . 1993. “Teologiczny aspekt druku (na materiale najstarszych wydań cerkiewnosłowiańskich).” *Wiadomości Polskiego Autokefalicznego Kościoła Prawosławnego* (Warszawa) 2: 9–18.
- . 1996. *Wiara i historia. Z dziejów literatury cerkiewnosłowiańskiej na ziemiach polsko-litewskich*. Kraków: Instytut Filologii Słowiańskiej Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego (“Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne” 1).
- . 2002. *Domus divisa. Studia nad literaturą ruską w I. Rzeczypospolitej*. Kraków: Collegium Columbinum.
- . 2004. *Idea, immagine, testo. Studi sulla letteratura slavo-ecclesiastica*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- . 2009. *Staro i novo. Studije o književnosti pravoslavnih Slovena*. Niš: Centar za crkvene studije.

- . 2011. “Słowiańskie drukarstwo renesansowe w ‘sławnym mieście weneckim.’” *Pamiętnik Słowiański* (Kraków) LXI: 3–23.
- . 2013. “Apostol Franciska Skoriny i ego sud’by.” In *Slavjanskij Apostol. Istorija teksta i jazyk*, edited by Marina Bobrik, 185–94. München, Berlin, Washington, DC: Otto Sagner.
- . 2016. “Kwestie teologiczne w przedmowach i posłowiach wydań Bożidara Vukovicia.” *Latopisy Akademii Supraskiej* (Białystok) 7: 37–49.
- . 2018. “Cennoe leksikografičeskoe posobie.” *Palaeobulgarica* (Sofija) XLII 1: 162–64.
- . 2020. *Ideja – obraz – tekst. Issledovanija po cerkovnoslavjanskoj literature*. Moskva: Indrik.
- Nazor, Anica. 1984. “Tiskana glagoljska knjiga od prvotiska Misala 1483 do Brozićeva brevijara 1561.” *Slovo: časopis Staroslavenskoga instituta* (Zagreb) 34: 7–16.
- . 1997. “Hrvatski glagoljski brevijar iz 1493. godine čitavo stoljeće opisivan kao ćirilski časoslov (Breviarium slavicum).” *Slovo: časopis Staroslavenskoga instituta* (Zagreb) 43–44: 232–40.
- Nedeljković, Olga. 1988. “Jazykovye urovni i xarakternye čerty diglossii v srednevekovyx tekstax pravoslavnyx slavjan.” In *American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists* (Sofia, 1988). *Linguistics*, edited by Alexander M. Schenker, 265–300. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- Nemirovskij I 1996: Nemirovskij, Evgenij L. *Gesamtkatalog der Frühdrucke in kyrillischer Schrift*. Volume 1: *Inkunabeln*. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner (Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana CXL).
- Nemirovskij II 1997: Nemirovskij, Evgenij L. *Gesamtkatalog der Frühdrucke in kyrillischer Schrift*. Volume 2: *Die Druckereien des Makarije in der Walachei und von Giorgio Rusconi in Venedig*. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner (Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana CLII).
- Nemirovskij III 1998: Nemirovskij, Evgenij L. *Gesamtkatalog der Frühdrucke in kyrillischer Schrift*. Volume 3: *Die Prager Druckerei von Francisk Skorina*. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner (Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana CLV).
- Nemirovskij IV 2001: Nemirovskij, Evgenij L. *Gesamtkatalog der Frühdrucke in kyrillischer Schrift*. Volume 4: *Die Druckerei von Božidar Vuković in Venedig*. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner (Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana CLXX).
- Nemirovskij V 1999: Nemirovskij, Evgenij L. *Gesamtkatalog der Frühdrucke in kyrillischer Schrift*. Volume 5: *Die Druckerei von Francisk Skorina in Wilna*. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner (Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana CLXXI).
- Nemirovskij VI 2003: Nemirovskij, Evgenij L. *Gesamtkatalog der Frühdrucke in kyrillischer Schrift*. Volume 6: *Die zweite Druckerei von Božidar Vuković in Venedig*. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner (Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana CLXXXVII).
- Nemirovskij VII 2007: Nemirovskij, Evgenij L. *Gesamtkatalog der Frühdrucke in kyrillischer Schrift*. Volume 7: *Die Klosterdruckereien in Rujno und Gračanica*. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner (Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana CCVII).

- Nemirovskij, Evgenij L. 1964. *Vozniknovenie knigopečatanija v Moskve. Ivan Fedorov*. Moskva: Kniga.
- . 1971. *Načalo slavjanskogo knigopečatanija*. Moskva: Kniga.
- . 1974. *Načalo knigopečatanija na Ukraine: Ivan Fedorov*. Moskva: Kniga.
- . 1975. *Načalo knigopečatanija v Moskve i na Ukraine: žizn' i dejatel'nost' pervopečatnika Ivana Fedorova. Ukazatel' literatury 1574–1974*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennaja biblioteka SSSR.
- . 1978. *Načalo knigopečatanija v Belorussii i Litve. Žizn' i dejatel'nost' Franciska Skoriny: opisane izdanij i ukazatel' literatury 1517–1977*. Moskva Gosudarstvennaja biblioteka SSSR.
- . 1979. *Opisanije izdanij tipografii Švajpolta Fiola*. Moskva: Academy of Sciences of USSR, 1979.
- . 1979a. *Ivan Fedorov v Belorussii*. Moskva: Kniga.
- . 1983a. *Po sledam pervopečatnika: pamjati pervopečatnika Ivana Fedorova v god 400-letija so dnja ego smerti*. Moskva: Sovremennik.
- . 1983b. *Pervopečatnik Ivan Fedorov: opisane izdanij i ukazatel' literatury o žizni i dejatel'nosti*. Lviv: Akademija nauk Ukrainskoj SSR.
- . 1985. *Ivan Fedorov, okolo 1510–1583*. Moskva: Nauka.
- . 1989. *Izdanja Đurđa Crnojevića 1494–1496*. Cetinje: Centralna narodna biblioteka SR Crne Gore (Crnogorska bibliografija 1494–1994. Volume 1, part 1).
- . 1990a. *Francisk Skorina. Žizn' i dejatel'nost' belorusskogo prosvetitelja*. Minsk: Mastackaja litaratura.
- . 1990b. *Po sledam Franciska Skoriny: dokumental'naja povest'*. Minsk: Belarus.
- . 1991. *Putešestvie k istokam russkogo knigopečatanija*. Moskva: Prosveščenie.
- . 1993. *Izdanja Božidara i Vičenca Vukovića, Stefana Marinovića, Jakova od Kamene Reke, Jerolima Zagurovića, Jakova Krajkova, Đovania Antonia Rampaceta, Marka i Bartolomea Đinamija 1519–1638*. Cetinje: Centralna narodna biblioteka SR Crne Gore (Crnogorska bibliografija 1494–1994. Volume 1, part 2).
- . 1993a. “Pervye slavjanske miniatjurnye izdanija.” *Kniga–issledovanija i materialy* (Moskva) 65: 67–82.
- . 1995a. *Serbskie monastyrskie tipografii 16 veka*. Moskva: Rossijskaja gosudarstvennaja biblioteka.
- . 1995b. *Der slawische Buchdruck in kyrillischer Schrift im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert: Kurzer Arbis (Slavjanskoe knigopečatanie kirillovskim šrifom v XV–XVI vekax: kratkij očerk)*. Moskva: Russian State Library.
- . 1996. *Počeci štamparstva u Crnoj Gori (1492–1496)*. Cetinje: Centralna narodna biblioteka Crne Gore (Istorija ćirilickog štamparstva u južnix slovena 1).
- . 1997a. *Prva i druga štamparija manastira Mileševe*. Prijepolje: Muzej u Prijepolju.
- . 1997b. *Anisim Mixajlov Radiševskij (okolo 1560–okolo 1631)*. Moskva: Nauka.
- . 2000a. *Izobretenie Ioganna Gutenberga: iz istorii knigopečatanija. Texničke skie aspekty. K 600-letiju so dnja roždenija Ioganna Gutenberga*. Moskva: Nauka.

- . 2000b. *Pervye slavjanskije miniatjurnye izdanija*. Moskva: Izdatel'skaja grupa Ja. N. Kostjuk, A. P. Lavrenko.
- . 2000c. Review on: Sokolová 1997. *Slovo: časopis Staroslavenskoga instituta* (Zagreb) 50: 233–38.
- . 2001. *Iogann Gutenberg. Okolo 1399–1468*. Moskva: HGS.
- . 2003a. *Istorija slavjanskogo kirillovskogo knjigopečatanija XV–načala XVII veka*. Volume I: *Voznikovenie slavjanskogo knjigopečatanija*. Moskva: Nauka.
- . 2003b. *Gutenberg und der älteste Buchdruck in Selbstzeugnissen: Chrestomathie und Bibliographie 1454–1550*. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner. (Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana CCII).
- . 2004. *Velikij pervopečatnik: dokumental'naja povest' o Ivane Fedorove i o poiskax i naxodkax učenyx, izučavšix ego žizn' i dejatel'nost'*. Moskva: Moskovskij izdatel'sko-poligrafičeskij kolledž.
- . 2005a. *Istorija slavjanskogo kirillovskogo knjigopečatanija XV–načala XVII veka*. Volume II: *Načalo knjigopečatanija u južnyx slavjan*. Part 1: *Istočniki i istoriografija. Predposylki*. Moskva: Nauka.
- . 2005b. *Istorija slavjanskogo kirillovskogo knjigopečatanija XV–načala XVII veka*. Volume II: *Načalo knjigopečatanija u južnyx slavjan*. Part 2: *Izdanija pervoj černogorskoj tipografii*. Moskva: Nauka.
- . 2005c. *Stranicy vospominanij. Avtobiobibliografija: k 80-letiju so dnja roždenija*, edited by V. I. Vasil'ev, Moskva: Nauka.
- . 2007a. *Ivan Fedorov i ego èpoxa: ènciklopedija*. Moskva: Ènciklopedija (there are two dates on the front page of the book: 2007 and 2010).
- . 2007b. “Monografičeskaja serija ‘Istorija slavjanskogo kirillovskogo knjigopečatanija XV–načala XVII veka.’ Itogi i perspektivy.” In *Grani knižnoj kul'tury*, edited by V. I. Vasil'ev, 57–70. Moskva: Nauka.
- . 2008a. *Istorija slavjanskogo kirillovskogo knjigopečatanija XV–načala XVII veka*. Volume III: *Načalo knjigopečatanija v Valaxii*. Moskva: Nauka.
- . 2008b. “Novyj trud o Franciske Skorine.” In *Kniga–istočnik kul'tury: problemy i metody issledovanija*, edited by N. J. Berezkina, 230–32. Moskva, Minsk: Nauka.
- . 2009a. *Slavjanskije izdanija kirillovskogo (cerkovnoslavjanskogo) šrifta 1491–2000. Inventar' soxranivšixsja èkzempljarov i ukazatel' literatury*. Volume I: *1491–1550*. Moskva: Znak.
- . 2009b. *Knigi kirillovskoj pečati 1491–1550. Katalog*. Moskva: Paškov dom.
- . 2009c. *Knigi kirillovskoj pečati 1551–1600. Katalog* (with Elena A. Emel'janova). Moskva: Paškov dom.
- . 2010a. *Ivan Fedorov. Načalo knjigopečatanija na Rusi. Opisanie izdanij i ukazatel' literatury*. Moskva: Paškov dom.
- . 2010b. *Bol'shaja kniga o knige*. Moskva: Vremja.
- . 2011. *Slavjanskije izdanija kirillovskogo (cerkovnoslavjanskogo) šrifta 1491–2000. Inventar' soxranivšixsja èkzempljarov i ukazatel' literatury*. Volume II, part 1: *1551–1592*. Moskva: Znak.

- . 2012. *Slavjanske izdanija kirillovskogo (cerkovnoslavjanskogo) šrifta 1491–2000. Inventar' soxranivšixsja èkzempljarov i ukazatel' literatury*. Volume II, part 2: 1593–1600. Moskva: Rukopisnye pamjatniki Drevnej Rusi.
- . 2015. *Azbuki Ivana Fiodorova, ego učenikov i posledovatelej*. Pjatigorsk: Sneg.
- . 2015a. *Knigi izmenivšie mir*, edited by Julija Šustova. Volume I–II. Pjati-gorsk: Sneg.
- Nikolova, Nadka. 2006. *Bilingvizmät v bälgarskite zemi prez XV–XIX vek*. Šumen: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Episkop Konstantin Preslavski."
- Nimčuk, Vasyľ. 1980. *Staro-ukrains'ka leksykohrafija v ü'zv'jazkach z rosij's'koju ta bilorus'koju*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- . 1981. *Staroukrainskaja leksikografija. Avtoreferat na soiskanie učenoj stepeni doktora filologičeskix nauk*. Kyiv: Akademija nauk Ukrainskoj SSR.
- . 1985. *Movoznavstvo na Ukraïni v XIV–XVII st*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Novaković, Stojan. 1877. "Božidara Vukovića zbornici za putnike." *Glasnik srpskog učenog društva* (Beograd) 45: 129–67.
- Oczko, Anna. 2014. *Rumuńska Słowiańszczyzna. Zapożyczenia południowosłowiańskie w języku rumuńskim w XVI i XVII wieku*. Kraków: Collegium Columbinum.
- Oczkova, Barbara. 1983. *Zarys historii języka serbsko-chorwackiego*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.
- . 2006. *Chorwaci i ich język. Z dziejów kodyfikacji normy literackiej*. Kraków: Lexis.
- . 2010. *Hrvati i njihov jezik: iz povijesti kodificiranja književnojezične norme*, translated by Neda Pintarić. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- . 2014. "O kolejnym projekcie periodyzacji chorwackiego języka literackiego." In *Studia Borysiana. Etymologica, diachronica, slavica. W 75. rocznicę urodzin profesora Wiesława Borysia*, edited by Mariola Jakubowicz, and Beata Raszewska-Żurek. Warszawa: Instytut Sławistyki PAN.
- Păcurariu, Mircea. 2002. *Dicționarul teologilor români*. Second edition. București: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Panin, Leonid G. 1995. *Istorija cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka i lingvističeskaja tekstologija*. Novosibirsk: Novosibirskij gosudarstvennyj universitet.
- Pantelić, Marija. 1967. "Prvotisak glagoljskog Misala iz 1483. prema Misalu kneza Novaka iz 1368." *Radovi Staroslovenskog instituta* (Zagreb) 6: 5–108.
- Pavlova, Rumjana. 1979. *Bolgarsko-russkie i russko-bolgarskie jazykovye svjazi*. Sofija: Narodna prosveta.
- Paždjerski, Dušan-Vladislav, and Ewelina Chacia. 2014. *Zarys fonetyki języka serbskiego: szkic historyczny, dialekty, akcenty*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- PE II 2010: *Pravoslavnaja ènciklopedija*. Volume II: *Aleksij, čelovek Božij–Anfim Anxial'skij*. Moskva: Cerkovno-naučnyj centr "Pravoslavnaja Ènciklopedija."
- PE X 2005: *Pravoslavnaja ènciklopedija*. Volume X: *Vtorozakonie–Georgij*. Moskva: Cerkovno-naučnyj centr "Pravoslavnaja Ènciklopedija."
- Pešikan, Mitar. 1994. "Leksikon srpskoslavenskog štamparstva." In *Pet vekova srpskog štamparstva 1494–1994. Razdoblje srpskoslovenske štampe XV–XVII v.*,

- edited by Miroslav Pantić et al., 71–218. Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Matica srpska.
- Pet vekova 1994: Pantić, Miroslav et al., eds. *Pet vekova srpskog štamparstva 1494–1994. Razdoblje srpskoslovenske štampe XV–XVII v.* Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Matica srpska.
- Petković, Sava. 1935. *Rečnik crkvenoslovenskoga jezika*. Sremski Karlovci: Srpska manastirska štamparija u Sremskim Karlovcima (a number of reprints of the book have been published).
- Petrov, Ivan P. 2017. “Nov pogled kām istorijata na bālgarskija knižoven ezik: meždu inkunabulite i pārvite gramatiki” (A new look at the history of the Bulgarian literary language: between incunabula and the first grammars). *Palaeobulgaria* (Sofia) XLI 2: 84–96.
- Petrov, Ivan. 2007a. *Wyrażanie struktur polipredykatywnych w rozwoju języka bułgarskiego*. Łódź: Lodz University Press.
- . 2007b. “Średniowieczne bułgarskie kodeksy o treści mieszanej: obszary pogranicza.” In *Pogranicza*, edited by Danuta Kowalska, 507–14. Łódź: Archidiecezjalne Wydawnictwo Łódzkie.
- . 2010. [review of: BDE 2007]. *Fundamenta Europaea* (Poznań–Humań) VIII/IX: 114–17.
- . 2011. [review of: Totomanova 2009]. *Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe* (Łódź) 1: 236–38.
- . 2014. [review of: Tsibranska-Kostova 2013]. *Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe* (Łódź) 4: 311–15.
- . 2015. *Od inkunabulów do pierwszych gramatyk. Konteksty rozwoju bułgarskiego języka literackiego (koniec XV–początek XVII wieku)*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- . 2016. “Izdaniya biblejskix tekstov v južnoslavjanskoj kirillovskoj staropečatnoj tradicii XVI veka.” *Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe* (Łódź) 6: 143–55.
- Picchio, Riccardo. 1993. *Pravoslavnoto slavjanstvo i starobālgarskata kulturna tradicija*, translated by Alda Giambelluca-Kossova, Sofija: Universitetsko Izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Ohridski.”
- . 1999. *Studia z filologii słowiańskiej i polskiej*, translated by Beata Badyńska-Lipowczan, Andrzej Łyda, and Anna Matkowska. Krakow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności (“Rozprawy Wydziału Filologicznego PAU,” LXXII).
- . 2003. *Slavia Orthodoxa. Literatura i jazyk*, translated by Olga Belova, et al. Moskva: Znak.
- Plavšić, Lazar. 1959. *Srpske štamparije: od kraja XV do sredine XIX veka*. Beograd: Udruženje grafičkih preduzeća Jugoslavije.
- Pletneva, Aleksandra A., and Aleksandr G. Kraveckij. 2014. *Cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyk*. Sixth edition. Moskva: Ast-Press (First edition: 1996; second edition: 2001; third edition: 2005; fourth edition: 2006; fifth edition: 2012).

- Popov, Konstantin. 1985. *Iz istorijata na bälgarskija knižoven ezik*. Sofija: Bälgarska akademija na naukite.
- Popova [Popowa], Venče [Wencze]. 2009. *Zwięzła gramatyka języka bułgarskiego*. Second edition. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna (First edition: 1972).
- Popova, Venče, and Diana Ivanova. 2004. *Zwięzła gramatyka języka bułgarskiego*. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.
- PSDS 1999: Demina, Evgenija I., ed. *Problemy slavjanskoj diaxroničeskoj sociolingvistikoi. Dinamika literaturno-jazykovej normy*. Moskva: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN.
- Rabus, Achim. 2008. *Die Sprache ostslavischer geistlicher Gesänge im kulturellen Kontext*. Freiburg i. Br.: Weiher ("Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris. Fontes et Dissertationes" LII).
- Rajkov, Božidar, ed. 1979. *Abagar na Filip Stanislavov. Rim 1651. Fototipno izdanje*. Sofija: Narodna prosveta.
- Rajkov, Božidar. 1967. "Opis na slavjanskite staropečatni knigi ot XV i XVI vek v Narodna biblioteka 'Kiril i Metodij' – Sofija." *Izvestija na Narodnata biblioteka "Kiril i Metodij"* (Sofija) 7 (13): 225–54.
- Rapacka, Joanna. 1993. *Dawna literatura serbska i chorwacka. Zarys dziejów*. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.
- . 1997. *Leksykon tradycji chorwackich*. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.
- Remnëva, Marina L. 2003. *Puti razvitija ruskogo literaturnogo jazyka XI–XVII vv*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.
- Remnjova, Marina. 2006. *Pätišta na razvitie na ruskija knižoven ezik prez XI–XVII vek*, translated by Zoja Koteva. Sofija: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski."
- Rieger, Janusz. 1998. *Z dziejów języka rosyjskiego*. Second edition. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne (First edition: 1989).
- RJS 1998: Zagrebin, Vjačeslav M., ed. *Rus' i južnye slavjane. Sbornik statej k 100-letiju so dnja roždenija V.A. Mošina (1894–1987)*. Sankt-Peterburg: Aleteja.
- RKBE 2012: Demina, Evgenija I., ed. *Rečnik na knižovnija bälgarski ezik na narodna osnova ot XVII vek (värhu tekst na Tihonravovija damaskin)*. Sofija: Valentin Trajanov.
- Rodič, N. 2005. "Staroslavjanske, cerkovnoslavjanske slovari i slovari izvodov staroslavjanskogo jazyka v XIX i XX vekax," translated by L. K. Gavrjušina. In CJ 2005: 105–14.
- RSL 1981: Robinson, A. E., ed. *Russkaja staropečatnaja literatura (XVI–pervaja četvert' XVIII v.)*. Volume 3: *Tematika i stilistika predislovij i posleslovij*, edited by A. S. Demin. Moskva: Nauka.
- RSL 1982: Robinson, A. E., ed. *Russkaja staropečatnaja literatura (XVI–pervaja četvert' XVIII v.)*. Volume 4: *Simeon Polockij i ego knigoizdatel'skaja dejatal'nost'*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Rusek, Jerzy, Wiesław Witkowski, and Aleksander Naumow, eds. 1993. *Rękopis a druk. Najstarsze druki cerkiewnosłowiańskie i ich stosunek do tradycji rękopi-*

- śmiennej. Materiały z sesji (Kraków, 7–10 XI 1991)*. Kraków: Instytut Filologii Słowiańskiej UJ.
- Rusek, Zbigniew. 2014. *Zarys gramatyki języka bułgarskiego*. Kraków: Andrzej Nowosad ABC.
- Rusinov, Rusin. 1980. *Učebnik po istorija na novobalgarskija knižoven ezik*. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo
- . 1999. *Istorija na novobalgarskija knižoven ezik*. Third edition. Veliko Tärnovo: Abagar (First edition: Veliko Tärnovo 1976; second edition: Sofija 1984).
- Šafárik [Šafarik], Pavol J. 1846: “O drevneslavjanskix, imenno kirillovskix tipografijax v južnoslavjanskix zemljax i priležaščix im krajax, t.e. v Serbii, Bosne, Gercegovine, Černoj gore, Venecii, Valaxii i Sedmigradii, v XV, XVI i XVII stol.,” translated by O. Bodjanskij. *Čtenija v Imperatorskom obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskix pri Moskovskom universitete* (Moskva) 3: 17–27.
- . 1864–1865. *Geschichte der südslawischen Litteratur*. Volumes 1–3. Prag: Verlag von Firedrich Tempsky.
- Šalipurović, Vukoman. 1972. *Mileševska štamparija (1544–1557)*. Pripolje: Polimlje.
- Samarin, A. Ju., and L. I. Fursenko. 2010. “Neutomimyj truženik knigovedenija” *Bibliografija* 2: 137–49.
- Sazonova, Lidija I. 2003. “Knigi kirilličeskoj pečati vo vtoroj polovine XVI veka meždu Rimom i Moskvvoj.” In Guseva 2003: 1242–70.
- Schenker, Alexander M. 2014. *The Dawn of Slavic*. Second edition. New Haven, CT, London: Yale University Press (First edition: 1995).
- Schmitz, Werner. 1977. *Südslavicher Buchdruck in Venedig (16.–18. Jahrhundert)*. *Untersuchungen und Bibliographie*. Giessen: Wilhelm Schmitz.
- SCiRJ 1847: *Slovar’ cerkovno-slavjanskogo i russkogo jazyka*. Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija Nauk.
- Selimski, Ludwig. 1999. *Hristijanskite imena u balgarskite katolici. Problemi na usvojavaneto*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Siatkowska, Ewa M. 2004. *Szkice z dziejów literackich języków słowiańskich*. Warszawa: Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawskie.
- Sindik, Nadežda R. 1994. “Značaj starih predgovora i pogovora za književnu istoriju.” In *Crnojevića štamparija i staro štamparstvo. Radovi sa naučnog skupa, Cetinje 11. i 12. maja 1989. godine*, 49–56. Podgorica.
- . 1995. *Smerni sveštenik mnix Makarije ot Černije Gori*. Podgorica.
- . ed. 1996. *Izdavači, štampari, prepisivači*. Cetinje: Obod (“Književnost Crne Gore od XII–XIX vijeka” 4).
- SJL 2011: Oczkova, Barbara, Elżbieta Szczepańska, and Tomasz Kwoka, eds. *Słowiańskie języki literackie. Rys historyczny*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Škorić, Katica. 2008. “Fonetske odlike *Psaltira s posledovanjem Goraždanske štamparije (1521)*.” In [Barač 2008a], 265–86.
- SL 2013: Černyševa, M. I., ed. *Slavjanskaja leksikografija*. Moskva: Azbukovnik.
- Sławski, Franciszek. 1962. *Gramatyka języka bułgarskiego*. Second edition. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN (First edition: 1953).

- SLER 2003: Petkanova, Donka, ed. *Starobǎlgarska literatura. Enciklopedičen rečnik*. Second edition. Sofija: Abagar (First edition: 1992).
- SLJENV 1998: Venediktov, G. K., ed. *Slavjanskije literaturnye jazyki ėpoxi nacional' nogo vozroždenija*. Moskva: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN.
- SLFLD 1980: Schenker, Alexander, and Edward Stankiewicz, eds. *The Slavic Literary Languages: Formation and Development*. New Haven, CT: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies (Yale Russian and East European Publications, 1).
- Sokoljanskij, Aleksandr A. 2013. *Vvedenie v slavjanskuju filologiju*. Second edition. Moskva: Akademija (First edition: 2004).
- Sokolová, Františka. 1997. *Cyrilské a hlaholské staré tisky v českých knihovnách*. Praha: Slovanská knihovna.
- Solak, Elzbieta. 1997. *Nowobułgarska Biblia i jej język*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- . 2009. *Znaki szczególnie. Językowe i wokółjęzykowe problemy bułgarskiego Odrodzenia*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- SOSR 2008: Goldblatt, Harvey, et al., ed. *Slavia Orthodoxa & Slavia Romana, essays presented to Riccardo Picchio*. New Haven, CT: The MacMilan Center for International & Area Studies at Yale, 2008. (Yale Russian and East European Publications 15).
- Spera, Lucinda 2001. "Ginammi, Marco." In *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*. Volume 55. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana.
- SS/SL 2009: Kempgen, Sebastian, Peter Kosta, Tilman Berger, and Karl Gutschmidt, eds. *Die slavischen Sprachen / The Slavic Languages. Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung/An International Handbook of their Structure, their History and their Investigation*. Volume 2, Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft/Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science [HSK] 32.1).
- SS/SL 2014: Gutschmidt, Karl, Sebastian Kempgen, Tilman Berger, and Peter Kosta, eds. *Die slavischen Sprachen/The Slavic Languages. Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung/An International Handbook of their Structure, their History and their Investigation*. Volume 2, Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter Mouton (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science [HSK] 32.2).
- SSMH 1986: Colucci, Michele, Giuseppe Dell'Agata, and Harvey Goldblatt, eds. *Studia Slavica Mediaevalia et Humanistica Riccardo Picchio dicata*. Volumes I–II. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1986.
- Štamparska 1986: Milović, Jevto M., ed. *Štamparska i književna djelatnost Božidara Vukovića Podgoričanina*. Titograd: Crnogorska akademija nauka i umjetnosti.
- Stančev, Krasimir. 1995. *Stilistika i žanrovete na starobǎlgarskata literatura*. Second edition. Sofija: Prosveta (First edition: 1985).
- . 2012. *Issledovanija v oblasti literatury pravoslavnogo slavjanstva*. Kraków: Scriptum ("Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne" 7).

- Stankiewicz, Edward. 1984. *Grammars and Dictionaries of the Slavic Languages from the Middle Ages up to 1850. An Annotated Bibliography*. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers.
- Starčević, Velimir. 2011. *Staro srpsko knjižarstvo*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Stępniać-Minczewska, Wanda. 1990. "Přavite kirilski tekstove, izlezli ot pečatnicata na Švajpolt Fiol." *Palaeobulgarica/Starobălgaristika* (Sofia) XIV 2: 96–102.
- . 1994. "Krakov – ljułka na kirilskoto knigopečatane." *Palaeobulgarica/Starobălgaristika* (Sofia) XVIII 3: 99–101.
- . 2000a. "O niektórych osobliwościach leksykalnych w Czasosłowie Szwajpolta Fiola." In *Săkrovišće sloves'noe. Studia slavistyczne ofiarowane prof. Jerzemu Ruskowi na 70. urodziny*, edited by Wanda Stępniać-Minczewska, and Wiesław Boryś, 205–08. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- . 2000b. "Cerkiewnosłowiańskie księgi liturgiczne w drukarni Szwajpolta Fiola." In *Inspiracje chrześcijańskie w kulturze Europy. Materiały z konferencji (11–14 maja 1999 r.)*. Volume 1, edited by Ewa Woźniak, 213–20. Łódź: Archidiecezjalne Wydawnictwo Łódzkie.
- . 2001. "Piśmiennictwo Świętej Góry Athos a pierwsze druki cyrylickie." In *Idee chrześcijańskie w życiu Europejczyka. Język. Piśmiennictwo. Sztuki plastyczne. Obyczaje. Materiały z konferencji (15–17 maja 2000 r.)*. Volume 1, edited by Anetta Ceglińska, and Zdzisława Staszewska, 405–19. Łódź: Archidiecezjalne Wydawnictwo Łódzkie.
- . 2007. "O voznikovenii slavjanskogo kirillovskogo knigopečatanija–tipografija Šfajpolta Fiolja v Krakove v XV veke," translated by Ivan N. Petrov. In *Byzantium, New Peoples, New Powers: The Byzantino-Slav Contact Zone From The Ninth To The Fifteenth Century*, edited by Miliana Kaimakamova, Maciej Salamon, and Małgorzata Smorağ Różycka, 357–66. Cracow: Uniwersytet Jagielloński ("Byzantina Et Slavica Cracoviensia" V).
- Stipčević, Aleksandar. 2004. *Socijalna povijest knjige u Hrvata*. Volume I: *Srednji vijek*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- . 2005. *Socijalna povijest knjige u Hrvata*. Volume II: *Od glagoljskog prvotiska (1483) do hrvatskoga narodnog preporoda (1835)*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- . 2008. *Socijalna povijest knjige u Hrvata*. Volume III: *Od početka hrvatskoga narodnog preporoda (1835) do danas*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Stojkov, Stojko. 2002. *Bălgarska dialektologija*. Fourth edition. Sofija: Marin Drinov (First edition: 1962; second edition: 1968; third edition: 1993).
- Stojanović, Ljubomir. 1902a. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi*. Volume 1. Beograd: Državna štamparija kraljevine Srbije (reprint: Beograd 1982).
- . 1902b. *Stare srpske štamparije*. Beograd: Nova električna štamparija Petra Jockovića.
- . 1903. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi*. Volume 2. Beograd: Državna štamparija kraljevine Srbije (reprint: Beograd 1983).
- . 1905. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi*. Volume 3. Beograd: Državna štamparija kraljevine Srbije (reprint: Beograd 1984).
- . 1923. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi*. Volume 4. Sremski Karlovci: Srpska manastirska štamparija (reprint: Beograd 1986).

- . 1925. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi*. Volume 5. Sremski Karolci: Srpska manastirska štamparija (reprint: Beograd 1987).
- . 1926. *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi*. Volume 6. Sremski Karolci: Srpska manastirska štamparija (reprint: Beograd 1987).
- Strach, Stanisław. 2012. *Składnia języka cerkiewnosłowiańskiego okresu nowożytnego z podręcznym słownikiem cerkiewnosłowiańsko-polskim*. Zabkowice Śląskie: Orthdruk.
- Suprun, Adam E. 1989. *Vvedenie v slavjanskiju filologiju*, second edition. Minsk: Vyšėjšaja škola (First edition: 1981).
- Suprun, Adam E., and Aleksandr M. Moldovan. 2017. *Staroslavjanskij i cerkvnoslavjanskij jazyk*. In *Jazyki mira. Slavjanske jazyki*, edited by Aleksandr M. Moldovan, Sergej S. Skorvid, Andrej A. Kibrik, et al., 36–76. Second edition. Sankt-Peterburg: Nestor-Istorija. (First edition: Moscow 2005).
- Szwat-Gyłybowa, Grażyna, ed. 2011. *Leksykon tradycji bułgarskiej*. Warszawa: Sławistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.
- Szymański, Tadeusz, ed. 1990. *Kształtowanie się nowobułgarskiego języka literackiego (do roku 1878)*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Szymański, Tadeusz. 2003. *Ze studiów nad słownictwem słowiańskim*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej.
- Tandarić, Josip. 1984. “Hrvatskoglagoljski tiskani brevijar iz 1491.” *Slovo: časopis Staroslavenskoga instituta* (Zagreb) 34: 125–57.
- Temčinās, Sergejus. 2017. “Języki kultury ruskiej w Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej.” In *Między Wschodem a Zachodem. Prawosławie i unia*, edited by Marzanna Kuczyńska, 81–120. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego (“Kultura Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej w dialogu z Europą. Hermeneutyka wartości” XI).
- Teodosiev, Nikolaj. 2007. *Katalog na bālgarskite pečatni knigi 1508–1878*. Sofija: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.
- Tolstoj, Nikita. 1988. *Istorija i struktura slavjanskix literaturnyx jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- . 1997. *Izbrannye trudy*. Volume I: *Slavjanskaja leksikologija i semasiologija*. Moskva: Jazyki ruskoj kul’tury.
- . 1998. *Izbrannye trudy*. Volume II: *Slavjanskaja literaturno-jazykovaja situacija*. Moskva: Jazyki ruskoj kul’tury.
- . 1999. *Izbrannye trudy*. Volume III: *Očerki po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniu*. Moskva: Jazyki ruskoj kul’tury.
- . 2004. *Studije i članci iz istorije srpskog književnog jezika*, translated by Ljudmila Joksimović. Beograd–Novi Sad: Zavod za udžbenike/Matica Srpska.
- Totomanova, Anna-Marija. 2009. *Iz istorijata na bālgarskija ezik. Sbornik statii*. Sofija: PAM Publishing Company.
- . 2014. “Edinstvoto na bālgarskija knižoven i neknížoven ezik prez X–XI vek.” In *Ephata na bālgarskija car Samuil. Ezik i pismenost*, by Kazimir Popkonstantinov, and A. M. Totomanova, 79–173. Sofija: Marin Drinov.
- . 2019. “Izkustven konstrukt li e Kirilo-Methodievijat starobālgarski ezik?” *Palaebulgarica* (Sofija) XLIII 3: 3–12.

- Trunte, Nicolina. 2014. *Slavenskij jazyk. Lehrbuch des Kirchenslavischen in 30 Lektionen. Zugleich eine Einführung in die slavische Philologie*. Volume 2: *Mittel- und Neukirchenslavisch*. Second edition. München, Berlin, Washington, DC: Otto Sagner. DC (First edition: 1998 and 2001) ("Slavistische Beiträge," Band 494).
- . 2018. *Kirchenslavisch in 14 Lektionen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz ("Slavistische Beiträge," Band 264, Studienhilfen 19).
- . In preparation. *Slavia Orthodoxa. Eine Einführung in die Geschichte der slavischen Sprachen und Literaturen Osteuropas mit einem Abriss des Altrömischen*.
- Trunte, Nikolaos H. 2005. *Slověnskŕi jazyk. Ein praktisches Lehrbuch des Kirchenslavischen in 30 Lektionen. Zugleich eine Einführung in die slavische Philologie*. Volume 1: *Altkirchenslavisch*. Additional fifth edition. München: Otto Sagner (First edition: 1990; second edition: 1991; third edition: 1992; fourth edition: 1994 and 1997; fifth edition: 2003) ("Slavistische Beiträge," Band 264, Studienhilfen 1).
- . 2012. *Slavia Latina. Eine Einführung in die Geschichte der slavischen Sprachen und Literaturen Ostmitteleuropas*. München, Berlin: Otto Sagner ("Slavistische Beiträge," Band 482, Studienhilfen 17).
- Turilov, Anatolij A. 2010. *Slavia Cyrillomethodiana: Istočnikovedenje istorii i kul'tury južnyx slavjan i Drevnej Rusi. Mežslavjanskije kul'turnye svjazi epoxi srednevekovja*. Moskva: Znak.
- . 2011. *Ot Kirilla Filosofo do Konstantina Kosteneckogo i Vasilija Sofijanina. Istorija i kul'tura slavjan IX–XVII vv*. Moskva: Indrik.
- . 2012. *Mežslavjanskije kul'turnye svjazi èpoxi srednevekov'ja i istočnikovedenie istorii i kul'tury slavjan. Ètjudy i xarakteristiki*. Moskva: Znak.
- . 2014. *Studije iz slovenskog i srpskog Srednjeg veka / Issledovanija po srednevekovoj slavistike i serbistike*. Beograd: Čigoja štampa.
- Unbegaun, Boris. 1995. *Počeci književnog jezika kod Srba*, translated by Mihajlo Popović. Beograd: Vukova zadužbina. Matica Srpska. Orfelin (the original: *Les débuts de la langue littéraire chez les Serbes*. Paris 1935).
- Urs, Adela Otilia. 2007. "Coresi și prozelitismul luteran." Școala Ardeleană (Oradea) II: 276–84.
- . 2009. *Diaconul Coresi. Monografie și antologie de texte (Deacon Coresi. A Monograph and an Antology of Texts). The Summary of the Ph.D. Thesis*, coordinator Ioan Chindriș. Cluj-Napoca: Institutul de Istorie "George Barițiu," Romanian Academy.
- . 2012a. "Istoriografia coresiană. Partea I: Bibliografia tipăriturilor coresiene." *Revista Transilvania* (Sibiu) 4: 57–61.
- . 2012b. "Istoriografia coresiană. Partea a II-a. Bibliografia vieții și a activității diaconului Coresi." *Revista Transilvania* (Sibiu) 8: 50–55.
- . 2012c. "Istoriografia coresiană. Partea a III-a. Bibliografia aspectelor lingvistice ale tipăriturilor coresiene." *Revista Transilvania* (Sibiu) 9: 28–32.
- Uspenskij, Boris A. 2002. *Istorija ruskogo literaturnogo jazyka (XI–XVII vv.)*. Third edition. Moskva: Aspekt-Press (First edition: München 1987; second edition: Budapest 1988).

- Vačkova, Kina. 2008. *Tipologična karakteristika na bálgarskija knižoven ezik (Vázroždenski period)*. Šumen: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Episkop Konstantin Preslavski."
- Vaillant, André. 1952. *Rukovodstvo po staroslavjanskomu jazyku*, translated by V. V. Borodič. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo inostrannoj literatury (the original: *Manuel du vieux slave*. Paris 1948, 1964).
- Válčev, Bojan. 2008. *Vázroždenskite gramatiki na bálgarskija ezik (Bulgarian Language Grammar Textbooks from the Revival Period)*. Sofija: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.
- . 2009. *Ot istorijata na bálgarskija knižoven ezik kám teorijata na knižovnite ezici*. Sofija: Oksiart.
- Van Wijk, Nicolaus. 1957. *Istorija staroslavjanskogo jazyka*, translated by V. V. Borodič. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo inostrannoj literatury (the original: *Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache*. Berlin, Leipzig 1931).
- Vasilev, Vasko. 1987. "Novi i stari elementi v arhaičnite damaskini." In *Vtori meždunaroden kongres po bálgaristika. Dokladi*. Volume 2, edited by Dora Ivanova-Mirčeva, and Ekaterina Dogramadžieva, 202–08. Sofija: Bálgarska akademija na naukite.
- Velčeva, Borjana, and Diana Ivanova. 2010. "I ot zazorjavaneto trágva denjat . . ." *Izsledvanija várhu priemstvenostta v razvoja na bálgarskija knižoven ezik*. Plovdiv: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Paisij Hilendarski."
- Venediktov, Grigorij K. 1981. *Iz istorii sovremennogo bolgarskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bálgarskata akademija na naukite.
- . 1990a. *Bolgarskij literaturnyj jazyk èpoxi Vozroždenija. Problemy normalizacii i vybora dialektnoj osnovy*. Moskva: Nauka.
- . 1990b. *Bálgaristični studii*, translated by Ralica Cojnska. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo.
- . 2009. *Issledovanija po lingvističeskoj bolgaristike*. Moskva: Institut slavianovedennija RAN.
- Vereščagin, Evgenij M. 1997. *Istorija voznikovenija drevnego obščeslavjanskogo literaturnogo jazyka. Perevodčeskaja dejatel'nost' Kirilla i Mefodija i ix učениkov*. Moskva: Martis (reprint: Moskva, Berlin 2014).
- . 2001. *Cerkovnoslavjanskaja knižnost' na Rusi. Lingvotekstologičeskie razyskanija*. Moskva: Indrik (reprint: Moskva, Berlin 2014).
- . 2012. *Kirillo-Mefodievskoe knižnoe nasledie. Mež"jazykovye, mežkul'turnye, mežvremennye i meždisciplinarnye razyskanija*. Moskva: Indrik.
- Vialova, Svetlana O. 2000. *Glagoličeskie fragmenty Ivana Berčiča v Rossijskoj nacional'noj biblioteke*. Volume 1: *Opisanie, predislovie, korrektura*. Volume 2: *Faksimile*. Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Vondrák, Václav. 1912. *Alt kirchenslavische Grammatik*. Second edition. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung (First edition: 1910).
- Vostokov, Aleksandr. X. 1858–1861. *Slovar' cerkovno-slavjanskogo jazyka*. Volumes 1–2. Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaja akademija nauk.
- . 1863. *Grammatika cerkovno-slavjanskogo jazyka izložennaja po drevnejšim onago pis'mennym pamjatnikam*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj aka-

- demii nauk (reprint: Leipzig, Köln, Wien: Böhlau 1980, Slavistische Forschungen 29; Moskva 2012).
- Walczak, Mariola. 1998. *Język piśmiennictwa bułgarskiego. Zarys dziejów*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Walczak-Mikołajczakowa, Mariola. 2004. *Piśmiennictwo katolickie w Bułgarii. Język utworów II połowy XVIII wieku*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- . 2009. *Bułgarski Ezop*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Wątróbska, Halina. 2010. *Słownik staro-cerkiewno-rusko-polski*. Kraków: WAM.
- Worth, Dean S. 1983. *The Origins of Russian Grammar. Notes of the state of Russian philology before the advent of printed grammars*. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers (UCLA Slavic Studies 5).
- Worth [Vort], Dean [Din] S. 2006. *Očerki po russoj filologii*, translated by K. Bogatyrev. Moskva: Indrik.
- Wronkowska-Dimitrowa, Mirosława. 2010. *Triod kwietny z krakowskiej oficyny Sz wajpolta Fiola (1491 r.). Studium filologiczno-językowe pierwszego cyrylicznego triodu drukowanego*. Bydgoszcz: Casimir the Great University Press.
- WS 2008: Wędzki, Andrzej, ed. *Wczesna Słowiańszczyzna. Przewodnik po dziejach i literaturze przedmiotu*. Volumes 1–2. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.
- Wynar, Lubomyr. 1962. *History of Early Ukrainian Printing, 1491–1600*. Denver: University of Denver.
- Zagrebin, Vjačeslav M. 2006. *Issledovanija pamjatnikov južno-slavjanskoj i drevne-russkoj pis'mennosti*. Moskva, Sankt-Peterburg: Al'jans-Arxeo.
- Zapol'skaja Natal'ja N. 2003. "Obščij" slavjanskij literaturnyj jazyk: tipologija lingvističeskoj refleksii. Moskva: Indrik.
- Zapol'skaja Natal'ja N., ed. 1999. *Ėvoljucija grammatičeskoj mysli slavjan XIV–XVIII vv.* Moskva: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN.
- Zernova, Antonina. 1958. *Knigi kirillovskoj pečati, izdannye v Moskve v XVI–XVII vekax. Svodnyj katalog*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennaja biblioteka SSSR.
- Zimmer, Szczepan K. 1983. *The Beginning of Cyrillic Printing—Cracow, 1491. From the Orthodox Past in Poland*. New York: Columbia University Press (East European Monographs 136).
- Znosko, Aleksy. 1983. *Mały słownik wyrazów starocerkiewno-słowiańskich i terminologii cerkiewno-teologicznej*. Warszawa: Chrześcijańska Akademia Teologiczna.
- . 1996. *Słownik cerkiewnosłowiańsko-polski*, edited by Stanisław Strach. Białystok: Prawosławna Diecezja Białostocko-Gdańska.
- Živov, Viktor M. 1988. "Roľ" ruskogo cerkovnoslavjanskogo v istorii slavjanskix literaturnyx jazykov." In *Aktual'nye problemy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija*, edited by K. V. Gorškova and G. A. Xaburgaev, 49–98. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.

Further Reading

- Alekseev, Anatolij A., ed. 2017. *Slavjanskaja Biblija v èpoxu rannego knigopečatanija. K 510-letiju sozdanija biblejskogo sbornika Matfeja Desjatogo*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo Puškinskogo Doma.
- Alexeev, Anatolij A. 2009. "Biblia Slavica." *Russkij jazyk v naučnom osveščeenii* 2 (18): 250–60.
- . 2013. *Očerki i ètjudy po istorii literaturnogo jazyka v Rossii*. Sankt-Peterburg: Peterburgskoje lingvističeskoje obščestvo.
- Ambrosiani, Per. 2015. "Recently Identified Cyrillic Incunabula in Sweden." In *Knigam bo jest neiščetnaja glubina. Essays in Honour of Irina Lysén*, edited by Hanne Martine Eckhoff, and Tomas Rosén, 14–23. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- . 2016. "Slaviska kyrilliska och glagolitiska krigsbyten i svenska bibliotek: proveniensbeskrivningar i databasen 'Cyrillic and Glagolitic Books and Manuscripts in Sweden.'" In *Bevara för framtiden: texter från en seminarieriserie om specialsamlingar*, edited by Peter Sjökvist, 95–111. Uppsala: Uppsala universitetsbibliotek.
- Andelković, Vladimir. 2018. *Staro srpsko izdavaštvo 1494–1918*. Beograd: Art Press.
- . 2019. *Venecijanski izdavači srpskih knjiga 1519–1824 / Editori veneziani dei libri serbi 1519–1824*. Beograd: Art Press.
- Anuškin, A. I. 1962. *Vo slavnom meste Vilenskom. Očerki iz istorii knigopečatanija*. Moskva: Iskusstvo.
- Balickij, Ivan I. 1982. *Materialy dlja istorii slavjanskogo jazykoznanija*. München: Otto Sagner. (First edition: Kyiv 1876) ("Specimina Philologiae Slavicae" 44).
- Beljakova, Elena V., Ljudmila V. Moškova, Tat'jana A. Oparina. 2017. *Kormčaja kniga: ot rukopisnoj tradicii k pervomu pečatnomu izdaniju*. Moskva, Sankt-Peterburg: Centr gumanitarnyx iniciativ.
- Bjarozkina, Natal'ja Ju. 2000. *Historyja knihadrukavannja Belarusi (XVI–pačatak XX st.)*. Second edition. Minsk: Belaruskaja navuka (First edition: 1998).
- Bjelaković, Isidora, Irena Cvetković Teofilović, and Aleksandar Milanović. 2017. *Rečnik slavenosrpskog jezika. Ogljedna sveska*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

- Bogatyrev, Sergey, ed. 2017. *The Journeys of Ivan Fedorov: New Perspectives on Early Cyrillic Printing*. *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 51 (2–3) (special issue). Ferdinand Schöningh (online: <https://brill.com/view/journals/css/51/2-3/css.51.issue-2-3.xml>).
- Bojović, Dragiša, ed. 2018. *Božidar Vuković i srpska knjiga u Veneciji*. *Crkvene Studije* (Niš) 15 (special part of the issue).
- Bounatirou, Elias. 2020. “Church Slavic, Recensions of.” In *Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics Online*, edited by Marc L. Greenberg, Lenore A. Grenoble et al. Leiden and Boston: Brill. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2589-6229_ESLO_COM_032050.
- Cejtlin, Ralja M. 1958. *Kratkij očerk istorii ruskoj leksikografii (slovari russkogo jazyka)*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Ministerstva prosvješćenija RSFSR.
- Cičenienė, Rima. 2018. “Mir rukopisnoj i pečatnoj knigi Velikogo knjažestva Litovskogo v XVI–XVII vv.: svjazi i peresečenija.” *Slavistica Vilnensis* (Vilnius) 63: 59–87.
- Cleminson, Ralph, Christine Thomas, Dilyana Radoslavova, and Andrej Voznesenskij. 2000. *Cyrillic Books Printed before 1701 in British and Irish Collections: A Union Catalogue*. London: The British Library.
- Čolova, Cvetana. 2013. *Obrazovanieto v srednovekovna Bălgarija*. Sofija: Nov bălgarski universitet.
- Danylenko, Andrii, and Motoki Nomachi, eds. 2019. *Slavic on the Language Map of Europe. Historical and Areal-Typological Dimensions*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Deletant, Dennis. 1975. “A Survey of Rumanian Presses and Printing in the Sixteenth Century.” *The Slavonic and East European Review* (London) 53 (131): 161–74.
- . 1982. “Rumanian Presses and Printing in the Seventeenth Century: I.” *The Slavonic and East European Review* (London) 60 (4): 481–99.
- . 1983. “Rumanian Presses and Printing in the Seventeenth Century: II.” *The Slavonic and East European Review* (London) 61 (4): 481–511.
- Dell'Agata, Giuseppe. 2014. *Bălgaristični izsledvanija*. Sofija: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Ohridski.”
- Földvári, Sándor. 2000–2001. “Cirill liturgikus könyvek provenienciális kérdései. Hodinka Antal koncepciója az újabb kutatások tükrében” (Provenance of the Old Printed Cyrillic Books Being Held in Church Libraries of the Former Hungarian Kingdom: Anton Hodinka's Conception Evaluated on the Base of the Latest Researches). *Könyv és Könyvtár* (Debrecen) XXII–XXIII: 193–209.
- . 2011. “A Magyar Királyság szláv etnikumú ortodox parókiáinak liturgikus-könyv im-portja:–mint a keleti s nyugati kereszténység korájúkori kapcsolatainak tükrözője” (Provenance of the Old Printed Liturgical Books, Held in the Orthodox Parishes in the Former Hungarian Kingdom: As Witnesses of the Contacts Between the Western and Eastern Christianity). In *Magyarország és a Balkán vallási és társadalmi kapcsolatai: Tanulmánykötet Ohridi Szent Naum halálának 1100 évfordulója emlékére*, edited by Toso Doncsev, Krisztina Menyhárt, and Imre Tóth, 192–207. Budapest: Bolgár Kulturális Fórum.

- . 2014. “Cross-cultural Contacts between the Serbs Lived [sic!] in the Former Hungarian Kingdom and West-Ukrainian Territories—As Reflected in the Import of the Liturgical Books.” In *A Kárpát-medence, a magyarság és Bizánc*, edited by Terézia Olajos, 43–59. Szeged: Szegedi Tudományegyetem.
- Franklin, Simon. 2019. *The Russian Graphosphere, 1450–1850*. Cambridge–New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Frick, David A. 1995. *Meletij Smotryc’kyj*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute Publications.
- . 2005. *Rus’ Restored: Selected Writings of Meletij Smotryc’kyj (1610–1630)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. English Translations, Volume 7.
- Georgiev, Lăčezar. 2014. *Stranici ot istorijata na knigata. Knigoizdavane i pečatni komunikacii na Balkanite i v Evropa*. Veliko Tărnovo: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij.”
- Gerd, Aleksandr S. 1998. *Cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyk. Lingvističeskie aspekty*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel’stvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta.
- Gergova, Ani. 2018. *Knjižovnostta na Bălgarskoto vărždane*. Sofija: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Ohridski.”
- Getka, Joanna, 2017. *U progu modernizacji. Ruskojęzyczne drukarstwo bazylikańskie XVIII wieku*. Warszawa: Katedra Studiów Interkulturowych Europy Środkowo Wschodniej, Uniwersytet Warszawski.
- Goldblatt, Harvey. 2019. *Studies on the Medieval and Premodern Literary Civilization of Russia and Ukraine*. Volume 1–2. Kraków: Scriptum (“Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne” 15).
- Granberg, Antoaneta, and Mirja Varpio. 2009. *Church Slavonic Books in Sweden. Gothenburg and Skara. Catalogue*. Göteborg: University of Gothenburg.
- Granberg, Antoaneta. 2014. “Early Cyrillic Printed Books in Swedish Libraries: Investigation and New Data.” *Scripta & e-Scripta* (Sofija) 13: 25–38.
- Hill, Peter. 1992. “Language Standardization in the South Slavonic Area.” *Sociolinguistica* 6: 108–50.
- Hristova-Filkova, Penka. 1963. *Iz istorijata na rusko-bălgarskite ezikovi vrăzki*. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Hruša, Aljaksandr, ed. 2017. *Francysk Skaryna: asoba, dziejnasc’, spadčyna*. Minsk: Belaruskaja navuka.
- . 2019. *Francysk Skaryna: novyja dasledavanni*. Minsk: Belaruskaja navuka.
- Ilieva, Lilija, and Andrej Bobev, eds. 2020. *Za osemte časti na rečta*, translated by Lăčezar Perčeklijski. Blagoevgrad: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Neofit Rilski.”
- Ilieva, Lilija, and Kamen Dimitrov, eds. 2020. *Čerznorizec Hrabăr. Za bukvite*, introduction and translation by Lăčezar Perčeklijski and Ivan Dobrev. Blagoevgrad: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Neofit Rilski.”
- Ivanova, Desislava. 1999. “Elementi na pripiskata.” *Marginalii* (Šumen) 1: 49–83.
- . 2003. *Slavjanski marginalni tekstove. Avtoreferat na disertacija za prisăždane na naučnata i obrazovatelna stepen “doktor.”* Šumen: Šumenski universitet “Episkop Konstantin Preslavski.”

- . 2013. “Paratekstovi aspekti v izdaniyata na d-r Francisk Skorina.” In *In honorem I. Triantafullo. Jubileen sbornik v čest na 60-godišninata na prof. d.fil. n. Hristo Trendafilov*, edited by Veselin Panajotov, 543–49. Šumen: Naučen centăr “Preslavska knižovna škola.”
- . 2016. “Slavjanskata staropečatna kniga.” *Limes Slavicus* (Shumen) 1: 270–79.
- Ivanova, Diana, ed. 2016. *Teoretični i metodologični problemi na bālgarskata istoričeska lingvistika (Predvāzraždane i Vāzraždane)*. Plovdivski universitet “Paisij Hilendarski”—Naučni trudove. *Filologija* (Plovdiv). Volume 54, book 1, part A. (special part of the issue).
- Jančić, Svetlana, ed. 2014. *Between tradition and innovation. 520 years since the first Cyrillic book printed in Serbian Church Slavonic. Exhibition catalog*. Belgrade: Narodna biblioteka Srbije.
- Jerkov, Janja et al., eds. 2020. *Terzo Incontro Cirillo-Methodiano a Ca’ Foscari—Culture e libri del mondo Slavo a Venezia. Recherche slavistiche. Nuova serie* (Rome) 3 (63) (special part of the issue).
- Kaliganov, Igor. 2006. *Vekov svjazujuščaja nit’ (voprosy istorii i poëtiki slavjanskix literatur i kul’tur)*. Moskva: Inženier.
- . 2015. *Problemy istorii i kul’tury slavjanskix narodov*. Moskva: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN.
- Kapetanović, Amir, ed. 2018. *The Oldest Linguistic Attestations and Texts in the Slavic Languages*. Vienna: Holzhausen.
- Kasinec, Edward. 1984. *Slavic Books and Bookmen. Papers and Essays*. New York: Russica Publishers.
- Kempgen, Sebastian, and Vittorio Springfield Tomelleri, eds. 2019. *Slavic Alphabets and Identities*. Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press. (Bamberger Beiträge zur Linguistik 19).
- Kirilova, Rosica. 2013. *Pripiski v bālgarskite staropečatni knigi (1806–1878)*. Volume 1: 1806–1850. Sofija: Nacionalna biblioteka “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij.”
- Knoll, Vladislav. 2018. “Limba slavonă și slavonismele în context românesc.” *Romanoslavica* (București) LIII 4: 61–78.
- . 2019a. *Církevní slovanština v pozdním středověku*. Praha: Scriptorium.
- . 2019b. “Changes in the Church Slavonic in the 14th–15th Centuries.” *Slavia—časopis pro slovanskou filologii* (Prague) LXXXVIII (3): 252–79.
- Končarević, Ksenija, Slobodanka Perkućin, Marija Marković, and Mitra Reljić. 2016. *Istorija ruskog književnog jezika (crkvenoslovensko-ruska preplitanja)*. Beograd: Jasen.
- Kondrat’ev, Jurij A. 2012. *Cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyk. Fonetika. Grafika. Orfografija. Puntuacija*. Sankt-Peterburg: Renome.
- . 2013. *Cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyk. Morfologija*. Volume 1. Sankt-Peterburg: Renome.
- . 2015. *Cerkovnoslavjanskij jazyk. Morfologija*. Volume 2. Sankt-Peterburg: Renome.
- Krejčí, Pavel. 2014. *Přehled vývoje jihoslovanských spisovných jazyků (od 9. do počátku 19. století)*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

- Kuczyńska, Marzanna, ed. 2016. *Dawna cyrylicka książka drukowana: twórcy i czytelnicy*. Białystok: Fundacja "Oikonomos" ("Latopisy Akademii Supraskiej" 7).
- Kurianowicz, Małgorzata. 2012. "Początki drukowanej Biblii słowiańskiej na terenie Rusi Moskiewskiej." *Acta Polono-Ruthenica* (Olsztyn) XVII: 27–35.
- . 2015. *Język cerkiewnosłowiański redakcji ruskiej drukowanych przekładów Dobrej Nowiny. Fonetyka, fleksja imienna i werbalna*. Białystok: Alter Studio.
- Lazić, Miroslav A. 2016. "Serbian printed book decoration in the 15th and 16th centuries: centres and creative production." In *Sacral Art of the Serbian Lands in the Middle Ages*, edited by Dragan Vojvodić and Danica Popović, 485–93. Belgrade: Serbian National Committee of Byzantine Studies.
- . 2018a. "Venice and Editions of Early Serbian Printed Books." *Thesaurismata* (Venice) 48: 161–92.
- . 2018b. "Od Božidara Vukovića do Dionizija dela Vekije: identitet i pseudonim u kulturi ranog modernog doba." In *Scala Paradisi. Akademiku Dimitriju Bogdanoviću u spomen*, edited by Anatolij A. Turilov et al., 165–86. Beograd: Srpska Akademija nauka i umetnosti.
- . 2018c. "O vremenu štampanja cetinjskog Oktoihia petoglasnika: prilog hronologiji izdanja štamparije Crnojevića." *Biblionet* (Novi Sad) 7–9 June: 115–33.
- Leber, Taisiya. 2018. "Migraciji pečatnikov i tipografij v 'transosmanskom' kontekste ranego Novogo vremena." In *Istorija knižnoj kul'tury XV–XX veka*. Part 2, edited by Džamilja N. Ramazanova, 5–20. Moskva: Paškov Dom.
- . 2020. "Female patronage of book printing in the Transottoman context." *Učenyje zapiski Novgorodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni Jaroslava Mudrogo* (Velikij Novgorod) 5 (30): [https://doi.org/10.34680/2411-7951.2020.5\(30\).20](https://doi.org/10.34680/2411-7951.2020.5(30).20).
- Lekov, Dončo, ed. 2014. *Enciklopedija na Bălgarskoto vāzražđane v tri toma*. Volume 1: A–J. Sofija: Marin Drinov.
- Lewaszkiwicz, Tadeusz. 1992. "Rola kontaktów językowych we wstępnym okresie formowania się słowiańskich języków literackich (na tle ogólniejszym)." *Z Polskich Studiów Slawistycznych* (Warszawa) VIII: 133–38.
- . 2011. "Tendencje integracyjne/unifikacyjne i dezintegracyjne w historii języków słowiańskich." In *Lingvokul'turnoe prostranstvo sovremennoj Evropy čerez prizmu malyx i bol'six jazykov*, 124–36. Tartu: ("Humaniora: Slavica Tartuensia" IX).
- Lukin, Pavel E. 2001. *Pis'mena i pravoslavie. Istoriko-filologičeskoe issledovanie „Skazanja o pis'menax” Konstantina Filosofa Kosteneckogo*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- . 2013. *Slavjane na Balkanax v Srednevekov'e. Očerki istorii i kul'tury*. Moskva: Indrik.
- MacRobert, Mary C. 1998. "Church Slavonic." In: Price, Glanville, ed. *The Encyclopedia of the Languages of Europe*, 85–87. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 2005. "Church Slavonic." In *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, edited by Keith Brown, second edition, 417–18. Elsevier (First edition: Pergamon/Aberdeen University Press, 1994).

- Miltenova, Anisava, and Igor Kaliganov, eds. 2020. *Maršruti na knjižovno občuvane između iztočnite i južnite slavjani (XI-XX vek)*. Sofia: Bojan Penev.
- Milutinović, Milan., ed. 1984. *Stara srpska rukopisna i štampana knjiga*. Beograd: Narodna biblioteka Srbije.
- Mirčeva, Elka. 1995. "Rusko-balgarski literaturni i ezikovi vrázki prez XVII–XVIII vek." *Proglas* (Veliko Tärnovo) 1: 3–10.
- Moroz, Andrej B. 2016. *Učebnik cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Granat.
- Murdarov, Vladko. 2002. *Iz istorijata na novobalgarskija knižoven ezik i na naukata za nego*. Sofija: Prosveta.
- Nikolov, Nikola. 2000. *Balgarskoto literaturoznanie prez vekovete. Poetika, nauka za slovesnostta, literaturoznanie*. Veliko Tärnovo: Abagar.
- Ohijenko, Ivan [Ogijenko, Iwan]. 1929. "Język cerkiewno-słowiański na Litwie i w Polsce w ww. XV–XVIII." *Prace Filologiczne* (Warsaw) XIV: 525–43.
- . 1994. *Istorija ukrains'kogo drukarstva*. Kyiv: Lybid' (reprint, originally published in 1925).
- Ostapczuk, Jerzy. 2016. "Typological classification of the Cyrillic manuscripts and early printed books with the Gospel texts." *Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe* (Łódź) 6: 129–41.
- . 2017. "Stare druki tetraewangelii lwowskich i ich miejsce wśród innych cyrylickich ksiąg z tekstem Dobrej Nowiny." In *Ośrodku kultury dawnej Słowiańszczyzny i ich znaczenie dziejowe*, edited by Marzanna Kuczyńska, and Jan Stradomski, 129–48. Kraków: Scriptum ("Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne" 12).
- . 2018. "Tekstologija kirilličeskix staropečatnyx bogoslužebnyx Četveroevangelij srednebolgarskogo i serbskogo izvodov i ix otnošenje k rukopisnoj tradicii (Evangelie ot Marka, začala 1-9)." *Slověne. International Journal of Slavic Studies* (Moskva) 7 (2): 62–73.
- . 2019a. "Cyrillic Early Printed Tetragospels of Middle Bulgarian and Serbian Redactions." *Slavia-časopis pro slovanskou filologii* (Prah) 88 (4): 315–29.
- . 2019b. "Predislovie Feofilakta Bolgarskogo k Evangeliju ot Matfeja v kirilličeskix staropečatnyx Četveroevangelijax iz Brašova (1561/62 g.) i Buxaresta (1582 i posle 1582 g.) i ix otnošenje k rukopisnoj tradicii." In *Trinadcatye Zagrebinskie Čtenija*, edited by Žanna Levšina, 315–29. Sankt-Peterburg: Rossijskaja nacional'naja biblioteka.
- Panajotov, Veselin. 2005. "Vážgledät na B. Rajkov za marginaliite i negovoto vlijanie värchu dnešnite publikacii." *Marginalii* (Šumen) 2: 73–95.
- Pelusi, Simonetta. 2000. "Il libro liturgico veneziano per serbi e croati fra Quattro e Cinquecento." In *Le civiltà del libro e la stampa a Venezia. Testi sacri ebraici, cristiani, islamici dal Quattrocento al Settecento*, edited by Simonetta Pelusi, 43–52. Padova: Poligrafo.
- . 2005. "Libri e stampatori a Venezia: un ponte verso i Balcani." In *Ponti e frontiere*, edited by A. Bonifacio, 61–78. Venezia: EditGraf.
- . 2015. "Dal libro a stampa al manoscritto: I frammenti slavi della Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana di Venezia." In *Studi Cirillometodiani. Nel 1150° anniversario della missione tra gli Slavi dei santi Cirillo e Metodio*, edited by Krassimir

- Stantchev and Giorgio Ziffer, 255–59. Milano: Biblioteca Ambrosiana–Bulzoni Editore.
- . 2017. “Edin neizvesten fragment ot ‘Različnie potrebi’ na Jakov Krajkov vāv venecianskata Biblioteka Marciana i njakoi problemi okolo tova izdanie.” *Starobālgarska literatura* (Sofija) 55–56: 156–66.
- Picchio, Riccardo, and Harvey Goldblatt. 2008. “Guidelines to the study of the literary civilization of Orthodox Slavdom.” In *Miscellanea Slavica. Sbornik statej k 70-letiju Borisa Andreeviča Uspenskogo*, edited by Fēdor B. Uspenskij, 66–85. Moskva: Indrik.
- Počinskaja, Irina V. 2012. *Knigopečatanie Moskovskogo gosudarstva vtoroj poloviny XVI–načala XVII vekov v otečestvennoj istoriografii: koncepcii, problemy, gipotezy*. Ekaterinburg: Volot.
- Počinskaja, Irina V., Petr I. Mangilev, and Natal’ja V. Anufrieva. 2010. *Rukopisnye i staropečatnye knigi kirilličeskoj tradicii: izučenie, opisanie, xranenie*. Ekaterinburg: Izdatel’stvo Ural’skogo universiteta
- Polimirova, Marija. 2007. “Slavjanski kirilski pečatni knigi ot XVI–XIX v., sāchranjavani v Centāra za slavjano-vizantijski proučvanija “Ivan Dujčev” kām SU “Sv. Kliment Ochridski (katalog).” *Godišnik na SU “Sv. Kliment Ochridski”* (Sofija) 97 (16): 279–589.
- Požar, Sandra. 2016. “Rumunjska redakcija crkvenoslavenskoga jezika.” In *Meandrima hrvatskoga glagoljaštva. Zbornik posvećen akademiku Stjepanu Damjanoviću o 70. rođendanu*, edited by Tanja Kuštović, and Mateo Žagar, 439–58. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Pozdeeva, Irina V. 1996. *Church Slavonic, Glagolitic and Petrine Civil Script Printed Books in the New York Public Library. A Preliminary Catalog*. New York.
- . 2016a. *Čelovek, kniga, istorija. Moskovskaja pečat’ XVII veka*. Moskva: Fantom-Press.
- . 2016b. “Moskovskij pečatnyj dvor XVII v.: meždu srednevekov’em i Novym vremenem.” *Acta Baltico-Slavica* (Warsaw) 40: 126–66.
- Pozdeeva, Irina V., Viktor P. Puškov, and Anton V. Dadykin. 2001. *Moskovskij pečatnyj dvor – fakt i faktor ruskoj kul’tury, 1618–1652 gg.: Ot vosstanovlenija posle gibeli v smutnoe vremja do patriarxa Nikona: Issledovanija i publikacii*. Moskva: Mosgorarxiv.
- . 2007. *Moskovskij pečatnyj dvor – fakt i faktor ruskoj kul’tury. 1652–1700 gody. Issledovanija i publikacii v trex knigax*. Volume 1. Moskva: Nauka.
- . 2011. *Moskovskij pečatnyj dvor – fakt i faktor ruskoj kul’tury. 1652–1700 gody. Issledovanija i publikacii v trex knigax*. Volume 2. Moskva: Nauka.
- Ramazanova, Džamilja N. 2016. *450 let Apostolu Ivana Fedorova. Istorija rannego knigopečatanija v Rossii (pamjatniki, istočniki, tradicii izučenija)*. Moskva: Paškov dom.
- Ramazanova, Džamilja N., Julija È. Šustova. 2018. *Kirilličeskie bukvari XVI–XVIII vv.* Moskva: Paškov dom.
- Rogatchevskaia, Ekaterina. 2020. “The Slavic Book.” In *A Companion to the History of the Book*, edited by Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose. Second edition. 335–47. Wiley/Blackwell (First edition: 2007).

- Sazonova, N.I. 2008. *U istokov raskola Russoj cerkvi v XVII veke: ispravlenije bogoslužebnyx knig pri patriarxe Nikone (1654–1666 gg.)*. Na materiale Trebnika i Časoslova. Tomsk.
- Schramm, Gottfried. 2007. *Slawisch im Gottesdienst: Kirchenwortschatz und neue Schriftsprachen auf dem Weg zu einem christlichen Südosteuropa*. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag.
- Semenova, Lidija E. 2006. *Knjažestva Valaxija i Moldavija. Konec XIV–načalo XIX v. (Očerki vnešnepolitičeskoj istorii)*. Moskva: Indrik.
- Skab, Marija. 2014. *Cerkovnoslov'jans'ka mova ukrajins'koji redakcii: istorija vynykennja ta funkcionuvannja, hrafika, orfohrafija, fonetyka, leksyka*. Černivci: Vydavnyčij dim "Rodovid."
- Stabile, Giuseppe. 2019. "Rumanian Slavia as the Frontier of Orthodoxy. The Case of the Slavo-Rumanian Tetraevangelion of Sibiu." *Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe* (Łódź) 9: 59–87.
- Stankov, Rostislav, and Albena Stamenova. 2018. *Istorija na slavjanskite ezici (očerci s tekstove)*. Volume II: *Iztočni slavjani*. Sofija: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski."
- Subotin-Golubović, Tatjana. 1999. *Srpsko rukopisno nasleđe od 1557. godine do sredine XVII veka*. Beograd: Sprska akademija nauka i umetnosti.
- Suša, Ales', ed. 2017. *Francysk Skaryna. Sa slaūnaha horada Polacka*. Minsk: Mastackaja litaratura.
- Thomas, George. 1989. "The Role of Diglossia in the development of the Slavonic literary languages." *Slavistična revija* (Ljubljana) 37 (1–3): 273–82.
- Tomelleri, Vittorio Springfield, and Sebastian Kempgen, eds. 2015. *Slavic Alphabets in Contact*. Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press. (Bamberger Beiträge zur Linguistik 7).
- Trancă, Dumitru, and Ion Marinescu. 1968. *A General Survey of the Romanian Book*. Meridiane Publishing House.
- Trueb, Isabel. 2008. *Studien zum frühen russischen Buchdruck*. Zürich: Pano Verlag (Basler Studien zur Kulturgeschichte Osteuropas, Band 16).
- Tutschke, Günther. 1983. *Die glagolitische Druckerei von Rijeka und ihr historiographisches Werk*. München: Otto Sagner, 1983 ("Slavistische Beiträge" 169).
- Videnov, Mihail. 2005. *Diglosijata s ogleđ na bālgarskata ezikova situacija*. Sofija: Marin Drinov.
- Vladimirov, Petr V. 1894. *Načalo slavjanskogo i russkogo knigopečatanija v XV–XVI vv.* Kyiv: Tipografija im. Piljuščenko.
- . 1989. *Doktor Francisk Skorina. Ego perevody, pečatnye izdanija i jazyk*. München: Otto Sagner (First edition: Sankt Peterburg 1888) ("Specimina Philologiae Slavicae" 85).
- Vladimirova, I., ed. 2017. *Čelovek èpoxi Vozroždenija. K 500-letiju izdanija Biblii Franciska Skoriny*. Moskva: Paškov dom.
- Vlasto, Alexis P. 1988. *A linguistic history of Russia to the end of the eighteenth century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Voznesenskij, Andrej V. 2010. *K istorii slavjanskoj pečatnoj Psaltiri. Moskovskaja tradicija XVI–XVII vekov. Prostaja Psaltyr'*. Moskva, Sankt-Peterburg: Al'jans-Arxeo.
- Worth, Dean S. 1978. "On 'Diglossia' in Medieval Russia." *Die Welt der Slaven* (Munich) XXIII 2: 371–93.
- Zapol'skaja, Natal'ja et al., ed. 2017. *Sed'mye Rimskie Kirillo-Mefodievskie čtenija. Tezisy*. Moskva: Indrik.
- . 2018. *Rimskie Kirillo-Mefodievskie čtenija. Selecta. Slavjanskoe Srednevekov'e. Bogosluženie. Knižnost'*. Jazyk. Moskva: Indrik
- . 2018. *Vos'mye Rimskie Kirillo-Mefodievskie čtenija. Materialy konferencii*. Moskva: Indrik.
- . 2019. *Devjatyje Rimskie Kirillo-Mefodievskie čtenija. Materialy konferencii*. Moskva: Indrik.
- . 2020. *Desjatyje Rimskie Kirillo-Mefodievskie čtenija. Materialy konferencii*. Moskva: Indrik.
- Zaxar'in, Dmitrij B. 1995. *Evropejskie naučnye metody v tradicii starinnyx russkix grammatik (XV–ser. XVIII v.)*. München: Otto Sagner. ("Specimina Philologiae Slavicae" 40).
- Željazkov, Dijan. 2016. *Naj-starite rečnici, sādāržašti bālgarski dumi*. Sofija: Dajrekt Sārvisiz.
- Žeňuch, Peter, and Peter Zubko (eds.). 2017. *Liturgické jazyky v duchovnej kultúre Slovanov*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Živov, Viktor M. 2017. *Istorija jazyka russkoj pis'mennosti*. Volumes I–II. Moskva: Universitet Dmitirija Požarskogo.
- Zoltán, András. 2014. *Inter-slavica. Issledovanija po mežslavjanskim jazykovym i kul'turnym kontaktam*. Moskva: Indrik.
- Zubkova, Ljudmila G. 2015. *Ėvoljucija predstavlenij o jazyke*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.

Index

- Abagar* (Filip Stanislavov), 62, 64
Abecedary, 116, 118, 119
Aggregated Catalogue of Early Cyrillic Prints (Nemirovskij), 49
Aggregated Catalogue of Old Print Editions in Glagolitic Type 1483–1812 (Kruming), 70
Alba Iulia, 51, 61, 106, 109, 110
anachronistic approach, to Bulgarian paleotypes, 63, 85
anagraphs (anagraph texts), in paleotypes, viii, 3, 57–59, 61, 65, 67n16; Cibranska-Kostova on, 60; Lis-Wielgosz on, 57; Maciejewska on, 60; metatexts, 58; *pripiski* and *beleški*, text additions, 58;
Andrejčin, Ljubomir, 26–27, 39
annotations, of Bulgarian source texts, 57–59; Rajkov on, 58–59
Anthim, the Iberian, 61
Apostle, December 15, 1566 (N: 122; G: 40), 108
Apostle, March 18, 1547 (N: 76), 104
Aspects of the Slavic Language Question (Goldblatt, Mathiesen, and Dell’Agata), 19
Atanasov, Petăr, 30, 65n3, 86, 90, 123n37
Babov, Kiril, 30
Barać, Dragan, 94
Baromić, Blaž, 72
The Beginnings of Cyrillic Printing (Nemirovskij), 121n7
The Beginnings of Printing Among the South Slavs (Nemirovskij), 76
beleški text additions, in Bulgarian texts, 58
Belgrade and Mrkšina crkva (1552, 1562–1566) Serbian printing shops, 100–103
Belgrade Gospel, 101–2
Bianu, Ioan C., 79, 106, 123n37
Bible: Elizabeth, of 1751, 9, 81, 116–17; *Gennadij*, 81; Gutenberg, 44, 69; *Moscow*, of 1663, 81, 116; *Ostroh*, 37, 52, 56, 81, 116; *Rusian*, 114
bilingualism: in Bulgaria, Nikolova on, 32–33; in Cyrillic incunabula prints, 50
Birnbaum, Henrik, 20
Bobrowski, Michał, 71
Bogdanov, Ivan, 53, 65n2, 122n17; on Bulgarian paleotypes, 63–64, 67n18; on first and old prints, 45–47
Bončev, Atanasij, 13
Book of Hours (*Časoslov*), 1491 (N: 2), 74

- Book of Hours (Časoslovec)*, August 30, 1566 (N: 120; G: 37), 89
- Book Printing in 16th-Century Italy* (Napoli), 92
- Bosilkov, Konstantin, 28, 31–32
- Braşov, 51, 61, 106–9, 112, 124n42
- Breviarium Romanum glagoliticum*, of Baromić, 71, 72
- Bucharest, 51, 61, 110–11, 122n16, *Bucharest Gospel*, 110–11
- Bujukliev, Ivan, 21
- Bulanin, Dmitrij, 131
- Bulgarian-Catholic writings and editions, 2, 61, 62, 64, 124n43, 126
- Bulgarian language: Andrejčin on, 26; Atanasov on, 30; Bosilkov stages of, 28, 31–32; Cibranska-Kostova on formation of, 33–34; Demina on, 31; Feuillet on, 24; Haralampiev stages of, 29; Ilieva on history of, 33; Ivanova-Mirčeva on, 25; Mirčev on, 24; periodization of, 3, 12, 22–23; Totomanova on, 12; Vačkova on typology of, 33
- Bulgarian paleotypes: anachronistic and nationalistic approaches to, 63; Bogdanov on, 63–64, 67n18; Bulgarian-Catholic seventeenth and eighteenth century editions, 61, 62, 64; chronological presentation of, 63–64; classification and periodization of, 61–65; Romanian-Bulgarian sixteenth and seventeenth century editions, 61, 62; Slavo-Bulgarian eighteenth century editions, 61; Teodosiev on, 53–54; Venetian sixteenth century editions, 61, 62
- Câmpulung, 61, 81
- Catalogue of Bulgarian Printed Books 1508–1878* (Teodosiev), 53
- Catholic paleotype division, 48–49. *See also* Bulgarian-Catholic writings and editions
- Center of Research on the Church Slavonic Language (Moscow), 10, 40n4; *Great Dictionary of Church Slavonic of the Modern Age* of, 14; NCS textbook of, 14–15
- Cetinje Cyrillic incunabula (1494–1495), 52, 75–78, 97, 100, 102
- Chernorizets, Peter, 84
- Church Slavonic (CS) language, 3, 25, 40n16, 130; Bulgarian studies and, 22–39; definitions and terminology, 7–13; East Orthodox liturgy use of, 12; Gerd on, 7, 21–22; key lexicographical and grammatical works, 13–15; Mathiesen periodization of, 19; Mladenov on, 23, 42n18; Orthodox Slavs mid seventeenth century use, 8–9, 10; research perspectives, 21–22; Russian-centric definition of, 9; of Orthodox Churches, 11, 39n2; theoretical and methodological models, 15–22; Trunte periodization of, 20–21; Vereščagin definition of, 9–10
- Cibranska-Kostova, Marijana, 41n24, 47, 74, 88, 89, 122n24; on anagraphs, 59–60; on Bulgarian language formation, 33–34; on Cyrillic incunabula, 54; on Cyrillic travel books, 84; on NCS language, 34–35, 37–39; on Nikon's reforms, 36
- Codex Slovenicus Rerum Grammaticarum* (Jagić), 128
- Conev, Benjo, 23, 41n18
- Coresi (Deacon) (*fl.* 1557–1583), 51, 61, 65n3, 82, 88, 105, 106–9, 123n41
- Cracow Cyrillic incunabula (1491–1493), 9, 48, 51, 55, 73–75
- Crnojević, Đurađ, 52, 75–77, 92
- CS. *See* Church Slavonic
- Cyrillic incunabula. *See* Cracow Cyrillic incunabula; Cetinje Cyrillic incunabula

- Cyrillic paleotypy in Venice (1519–1638): Fin on, 82; Ginammi, Bartolomeo, Marco, and Bartol (1638), 91–92; Jakov of Kamena Reka (*fl.* 1566–1572), 88–90; Krajkov (*fl.* 1566–1572), 88–90; Marinović (*fl.* 1561–1563), 87–88; Naumow on, 82; Nemirovskij on, 82, 84; Paštrović (1597), 90–91; Rampazetto (1597), 90–91; Sava (1597), 90–91; travel books, 84; Vuković, B., (*fl.* 1519–1521, 1536–1540), 82, 83–86; Vuković, V., (*fl.* 1546–1547, 1554–1561), 86–87; Zagurović (*fl.* 1566–1572), 87, 88–90, 91–92
- Cyrillic Printing from the Publishing Houses of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 16th–18th Centuries* (Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew), 56
- Cyrillo-Methodian period, 8, 9, 19, 28
- Daniil (Igumen), 98, 100
- Deacon Coresi* (Urs), 106
- Deacon Coresi and the Triumph of Writing in Romanian* (Gheție and Mareș), 106
- Dealu, 61, 81
- Dell'Agata, Giuseppe, 19
- Demina, Evgenija, 31
- dictionaries, 13–14, 31, 119
- Didactic (Homiliary) Gospel*, of 1569, 30, 116, 118, 119
- D'jačenko, Grigorij, 13, 40n6
- Dmitrović, Radiša (Prince), 101
- Dubrovnik, 85, 92, 101
- East Orthodox liturgy, CS use in, 12
- East Slavic Cyrillic paleotypy, 3, 50, 66n10, 67n17, 112–20; general characteristics of, 112, 120; Fëdorov (Fedorov) and, 115–17, 118; hymnography and euchography, 114; Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew on, 118; Lviv Stauropegion Brotherhood, 117–18; Moscow printing shop, 115, 117; Mstislavec and, 118; Nemirovskij on, 115; Skaryna and, 113–14, 122n22; Vievis printing house and, 119; Vilnius printing house and, 118–19
- Elizabeth Bible*, of 1751, 9, 81, 116–17
- Encyclopedia of Slavic Philology* (Jagić), 14
- epigraphy, 67n14
- Euthymian period, 19–20
- Euthymius (Patriarch), 19, 54, 84
- external history, of language, 1
- Fëdorov (Fedorov), Ivan, 37, 66n9, 56, 85, 91, 124n44, 129; East Slavic Cyrillic paleotypy and, 113, 115–18; Ostroh editions of, 53
- Festal Menaion (Mineja)*, December 6, 1568 (N: 125; G: 41), 108
- Festal Menaion (Mineja)*, January 19, 1538 (N: 67), 85
- Festal Menaion (Mineja)*, November 11, 1580 (N: 160; G: 75), 88, 109
- Feuillet, Jack, 24
- Fin, Monika, 82
- Fiol, Schweipolt, 52, 55, 73, 74, 75, 121n10
- first prints, 3; Bogdanov on, 46; Cibranska-Kostova and, 47; Teodosiev on, 53; term meaning of, 47
- Five Centuries of Serbian Printing 1494–1994* (Pešikan), 76
- Flowery Triodion*, *1493 (N: 4), 74
- Flowery Triodion*, December 24, 1563 (N: 109; G: 27), 87, 109
- Flowery Triodion*, July 30, 1558 (N: 89; G: 8), 107
- Flowery Triodion*, September 1, 1566 (N: 121; G: 38), 102
- The Formation of the Slavonic Literary Languages*, 20
- Frick, David A., 21

- Gălăbov, Ivan, 28
 Gamanovič, Alipij, 14, 79
 Genadije (Monk), 83, 98
Gennadij Bible, 81
 Georgievski, Mihajlo, 55, 63, 88
 Gerd, Aleksandr, 7, 21–22
 Gheție, Ion, 106
 Ginammi, Bartol, 62, 82, 91–92
 Ginammi, Bartolomeo, 62, 91–92
 Ginammi, Marco, 62, 82, 91–92
 Gladkova, Hana, 27
 Glagolitic incunabula (1483–1496),
 3, 43, 69–75, 120n4, 120n6;
Breviarium Romanum glagoliticum
 and, 71, 72; Cyrillic incunabula
 link to, 69–70; Kruming catalog of,
 70, 71, 72, 73; *Missale Romanum*
Glagolitice and, 70–72, 120n3; in
 National Library of Russia, 70;
 Nazor on, 70; Pantelić research on,
 70; *Senj missal* and, 72; *Spoivid*
općena/Confessionale generale
 and, 72
 Goldblatt, Harvey, 19, 22
The Goražde Printing House 1519–1523
 (Barać and Pantić), 94
 Goražde, 51, 93–95, 97, 98, 99, 100,
 101, 104
 Goražde printing shop, of Ljubavić
 family (1519–1523), 93–95, 99
Gospel, 1579 (N: 158; G: 74), 108
Gospel, October 13, 1562 (N: 106; G:
 17), 107
 Govora, 61, 81
 Gračanica (1539) Serbian printing shop,
 51, 89, 95, 97
 Gradinarova, Alla, 30–31
Grammar of the Slavonic Language
 (1586), 118
 grammatical system, of NCS: Center
 of Research on the Church Slavonic
 Language textbook, 14–15;
 Gamanovič grammar, 14; Izotov
 textbook, 15
 Grand Duchy of Lithuania, 50, 51, 56,
 114–15, 118
The Graphic Aspect of Serbian Printed
Books of the 15th–17th Centuries
 (Medaković), 54
Great Dictionary of Church Slavonic of
the Modern Age, 14
 Grković-Major, Jasmina, 55
 Guseva, Aleksandra, 50, 51, 52, 91,
 105, 121n8, 122n24, 123n26,
 123nn38–39, 123nn41–42
 Gutenberg *Bible*, 69
 Gyllin, Roger, 27
 Haralampiev, Ivan, 25, 27, 29
Historical Grammar of Bulgarian
 (Feuillet), 24
The History of Russian Lexicography, 13
History of Slavic Cyrillic Printing
of the 15th–Early 17th Centuries
 (Nemirovskij), 52, 73
History of the Bulgarian Language
 (Conev), 23
History of the New Bulgarian Literary
Language, 26
 Hodoș, Nerva, 79
 Ilčev, Petăr, 8
 Ilieva, Lilija, 33, 84, 91
 Illyrian movement, South Slavs and
 paleotype of, 62–63
 incunabula: cradle prints and, 44;
 fifteenth-century prints of, 47; *Slavia*
Orthodoxa literary language of, 3, 9,
 52; term definition of, 44. *See also*
specific incunabula
The Italian Biographical Dictionary
 (Spera), 92
 Ivanova, Cenka, 130
 Ivanova, Diana, 26, 31, 110, 111; on
Ostroh Bible, 81; on Romanian-
 Bulgarian paleotypy: Stage I, 81
 Ivanova-Mirčeva, Dora, 25, 28, 29, 39
 Izotov, Andrej, 15

- Jagić, Vatroslav, 14, 71, 120n6, 128–29
Jakov Krajkov, Writer, Publisher, Graphic Designer of the 16th Century (Atanasov), 90
 Jakov of Kamena Reka, 62, 82, 84, 88–90
 Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew, Zoja, 56, 118
- Kalin (Dyak), 109
 Karadžić, Vuk Stefanović, 90, 129
 Kawecka-Gryczowa, Alodia, 55
 Keipert, Helmut, 22, 40n16
 Krajkov, Jakov, 54, 59, 62, 65n3, 82, 84, 88–90
 Kraveckij, Aleksandr, 14
 Kretschmer, Anna, 22
 Kruming, Andrej, 70, 71, 72, 73, 120nn4–6
 Kryzia, Władysław, 2
- language: external history of, 1; internal history of, 1. *See also specific language*
- Lavrentie (Hieromonk), 110–11
 Lazić, Miroslav, 55, 104
Lenten Triodion, *1493 (N: 3), 74
Lenten Triodion, January 6, 1561 (N: 95; G: 15), 87
Lenten Triodion, March 26, 1578 (N: 153; G: 68), 108
- lexicographical works, 13–14
Lexicon of Serbian Church Slavonic Printing (Pešikan), 76
Library of European Spirituality (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa and Naumow), 113–14
Life and Sufferings (Sophronius of Vratsa), 26
Life of St. Petka (Euthymius), 84
 Lis-Wielgosz, Izabela, 57
 Ljubavić, Božidar, 93–95, 97, 98
 Ljubavić, Dimitrije, 95; Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypy: Stage II, 82, 103–4
- Ljubavić, Đurdo (Đuro), 93–95
 Ljubavić, Teodor, 93–95, 99
 Lorinč (Dyak, Precentor) (*fl.* 1567–1579), 61, 109–10
 Ludogovskij, Fëdor, 10
 Luther, Martin, 107
 Lviv, 51, 53, 113, 116, 117, 119, 124n44, 129
 Lviv Stauropegion Brotherhood, 117–18
- Macedonian Printing* (Georgievski), 55
 Maciejewska, Anna, 60
 Makarije (Monk), 52, 61, 65n1, 65n3, 76, 77, 80, 102, 104
 Mamonicz printing house, 51, 85, 113, 118, 119
 Mano-Zisi, Katarina, 55
 Mardarije (Monk), 98, 99, 100, 101–3
 Mareş, Alexandru, 106
 Mareš, František Václav, 39n3
 Marinović, Stefan, 62, 82, 87–88, 109
 Mathiesen, Robert: on CS language periodization, 19; on Cyrillic incunabula, 52, 66n8
 Mečkovskaja, Nina, 127
 Medaković, Dejan, 54–55, 82
 Meletian period, 19–20
 Middle Bulgarian recension, 50
 Mileševa (1544–1546, 1557) Serbian printing shop, 51, 95, 97–100, 101
 Mirčev, Kiril, 24
Missale Romanum Glagolitice, 120n3; Bobrowski on publication place of, 71; second publication of, 72; Stipčević on publication place of, 70–71
 Mladenov, Stefan, 23, 41n18
 Mladenović, Aleksandar, 55
 Moisijsje (Monk), 83, 95, 104
 Moldova (Moldavian), 38, 39n2, 61, 104, 106, 112
 Moldovan, Aleksandr, 39nn1–2
 Moldoveanu (Moldoveanul), Filip Pictor, 82, 96, 104–5
 Momirović, Petar, 60

Montenegrin Bibliography

- (Nemirovskij), 91, 121n10
Moscow Bible, of 1663, 81, 116
 Moscow printing shop (anonymous), in
 East Slavic Cyrillic paleotypy, 113,
 115, 117
 Moscow Print Yard, 113, 117
 Mošin, Vladimir, 16–17
 Mrazović, Abraham, 23, 129
 Mrkšina crkva. *See* Belgrade and
 Mrkšina crkva
 Mstislavec, Pëtr Timofeevič, 115–16,
 118, 124n45
- Napoli, Maria C., 92
 nationalistic approach, to Bulgarian
 paleotypy, 63
 Naumow, Aleksander, viii, 10, 16,
 113–14; on Cracow incunabula, 73;
 on Makarije, 80; on Marinović, 88;
 on paleotypy in Venice, 69, 71, 82,
 120n3; on Vuković, V., 86
 Nazor, Anica, 70
 NCS. *See* New Church Slavonic
 language
 Nemirovskij, Evgenij, 66n6, 69–70,
 91, 120n3, 120nn6–7, 129; on
 Cetinje Cyrillic incunabula, 76, 78;
 on Cracow Cyrillic incunabula, 73;
 on Cyrillic incunabula, 49, 50–51,
 66n9, 121n7; on Cyrillic incunabula
 locations, 51; on Cyrillic paleotypy
 in Venice, 82, 84; on Cyrillic
 printing shop in Wallachia, 79; on
 East Slavic Cyrillic paleotypy, 115;
 on Krajkov, 89; on Rujno printing
 shop, 96; on Serbian printing shops,
 95
 Neskovič, Atanas, 63, 65n1
 New Bulgarian texts, 1, 25–27
 New Church Slavonic (NCS) language,
 3, 7, 9, 10–12, 19, 20, 40n3, 41nn22–
 23, 61, 62, 64, 65, 81, 112, 125,
 126, 129; Center of Research on the
 Church Slavonic Language textbook,

- 14–15; Cibranska-Kostova on, 34–38,
 74; dictionaries of, 13; grammatical
 system of, 14; influence on
 Bulgarian, 22–33; liturgical language
 use, 39n2; Nikon on formation of, 35;
 Orthodox priests description of, 13,
 14, 79; Russian influence on, 26–27;
 subperiods of, 127
 Nikanor, Metropolitan, 97
 Nikolova, Nadka, 32–33
 Nikon (Patriarch), 9, 12, 14, 35–37, 38,
 62
- OCS. *See* Old Church Slavonic
 language
Octoechos (Oktoix), 1491 (N: 1), 74
Octoechos (Oktoix), 1578 (N: 155; G:
 70), 109
Octoechos (Oktoix), August 26, 1510
 (N: 10), 78
Octoechos (Oktoix), January 14, 1557
 (N: 87; G: 6), 107
Octoechos (Oktoix) (tones I–IV),
 October 20, 1574 (N: 142; G: 56),
 108
Octoechos (Oktoix) (tones I–IV),
 January 4, 1494 (N: 5), 76
Octoechos (Oktoix) (tones V–VIII),
 *1494 (N: 6), 76
Octoechos (Oktoix) (tones V–VIII),
 1539 (N: 68), 97
Octoechos (Oktoix) (tones V–VIII),
 *1560–1561 (N: 102; G:14), 86
Octoechos (Oktoix) (tones V–VIII),
 August 23, 1575 (N: 145; G: 61),
 108
Octoechos (Oktoix) (tones V–VIII), July
 27, 1537 (N: 65), 85
Octoechos (Oktoix) (tones V–VIII),
 June 20, 1567 (N: 123; G: 39), 109
 Oczko, Anna, 2, 62
 Oczkowa, Barbara, 1, 2
 Old Church Slavonic (OCS) language,
 1, 3, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21,
 39nn1–2, 40n16, 75

- old prints, 2, 3, 17, 30, 35, 49, 55, 57, 60, 61; Bogdanov on, 45–46; in Bulgaria, 38, 45; Bulgaria chronological stages of, 45; Cibranska-Kostova on, 54; Guseva on, 50; Mathiesen on, 66n8; Nemirovskij on, 51; paleotype as synonym of, 47; Teodosiev on, 53; term discrepancies for, 45. *See also specific paleotypy*
- Old Romanian Bibliography* (Bianu and Hodoş), 79
- On the Bulgarian Race and Language*, 27
- Orăștie, 51, 61, 111
- Orfelin, Zaharije, 63
- Ostroh Bible*, 37, 52, 56, 83, 116; Ivanova on, 81
- Pahomije (Monk), 63, 83
- Paisius of Hilendar, 19, 25
- Palea (Historical)*, 111
- Paleotype: anagraphic texts in, 57–61; old print as synonym of, 46–48; Orthodox, Catholic, or Protestant, 48–49. *See also specific paleotypy*
- Panaiteescu, Petre P., 79
- Panin, Leonid, 22
- Pantelić, Marija, 70
- Pantić, Miroslav, 94
- Paštrović, Stefan, 90–91
- Pavlova, Rumjana, 29
- periodization: of Bulgarian language history, 3, 12, 22–29; of Bulgarian paleotypes, 61–65; of CS language history, 19–21
- Pešikan, Mitar: 55, 76, 96, 102
- Petković, Sava, 13, 40n6
- Picchio, Riccardo, 17–19, 20
- Pletneva, Aleksandra, 14
- Poland, 3, 39n2, 74; Cyrillic incunabula and, 55–56, 67n11, 67n13, 121n9
- Prague, 51, 52, 113, 114, 120n6, 123n30
- Prayer Book* (miscellany), April 26, 1536 (N: 64), 85
- Prayer Book* (so-called little miscellany), May 19, 1597 (N: 244; G: 151), 90
- Prayer Book (Trebnik)*, *1495 (N: 8), 77
- Prayer Book (Trebnik)*, *1538–1540 (N: 69), 85
- Prayer Book (Trebnik)*, 1570 (N: 133; G: 50), 89
- Prayer Book (Trebnik)*, January 10, 1545 (N: 72), 104
- Prayer Book (Trebnik)*, September 20, 1546 (N: 74), 99
- Prayer Book / Miscellany (Sbornik)*, *1521 (N: 40), 83
- Prayer Book / Miscellany (Sbornik)*, June 1, 1547 (N: 77), 86
- Prayer Book / Miscellany (Sbornik)*, June 1, 1560 (N: 93; G: 11), 86
- Prayer Book / Miscellany (Sbornik)*, March 6, 1520 (N: 37), 83
- Prayer Book / Miscellany for Various Occasions*, 1572 (N: 138; G: 54), 89
- Prayer to the Mother of God* (Chernorizets), 84
- Pre-National (Pre-Revival) era, 1, 24–25, 27, 28, 31
- Primer/Abecedary (Bukvar'/Azбуka)*, May 25, 1597 (N: 245; G: 152), 90
- Printers of Old Poland from the 15th to the 18th Centuries* (Kawecka-Gryczowa), 55, 74
- pripiski* text additions, in Bulgarian texts, 58
- prostaja mova*, 50, 114
- Protestant paleotypy division, 48–49, 124n43, 126
- Psalter*, *1550 (N: 78), 100
- Psalter*, 1568/1570 (N: 134; G: 44), 108
- Psalter*, 1576 (N: 148; G: 63), 108
- Psalter*, 1577 (N: 150; G: 65), 108
- Psalter*, 1578 (N: 156; G: 71), 108
- Psalter*, 1580 (N: 165; G: 78), 108
- Psalter*, April 7, 1519 (N: 24), 83
- Psalter with Supplement*, 1546 (N: 75), 86

- Psalter with Supplement*, 1561 (N: 100; G: 21), 86
- Psalter with Supplement*, 1569–1570 (N: 130; G: 46), 89
- Psalter with Supplement*, 1572/1573 (N: 140; G: 55), 108
- Psalter with Supplement*, 1577 (N: 151; G: 66), 108
- Psalter with Supplement*, October 12, 1520 (N: 38), 83
- Psalter with Supplement*, September 22, 1495 (N: 7), 77
- Psalter with Supplement* (the so-called first), October 30, 1544 (N: 70), 98
- Psalter with Supplement* (the so-called second), November 4, 1557 (N: 88), 100
- Radulj (Dyak), 103
- Rajkov, Božidar, 58–59, 64, 67n14
- Râmnicu Vâlcea, 61, 120
- Rampazetto, Giovanni Antonio, 62, 82, 90–91
- Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypy: Stage I (1508–1512), 78–82; Cyrillic printing shops in Wallachia and, 3, 38, 61, 79, 80, 95, 103; Makarije as printer in, 52, 80, 65n1; printing house location debate in, 80–81; *Târgoviște Gospel* of 1512 and, 81, 96, 102; Târgoviște printing house, 79, 80–81, 104, 106
- Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypy: Stage II (1545–1554): Ljubavić, Dimitrije (*fl.* 1545–1547), 82, 103–5; Moldoveanu (*fl.* 1544–1554), 104–5
- Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypy: Stage III (1557–1588), 105–6; Coresi (*fl.* 1557–1583), 106–9; Lavrentie (1582), 110–11; Lorinț (*fl.* 1567–1579), 109–10; Șerban (*fl.* 1582–1588), 111–12
- Rujno Gospel* of 1537, 96
- Rujno (1537) Serbian printing shop, 51, 95–96
- Rus' and the South Slavs* (Zagrebin), 16, 17
- Rusian Bible*, Skaryna and, 114
- Rusian-Bulgarian language contacts and influences, 17, 23, 24, 26–27, 29, 30, 41n24
- Rusinov, Rusin, 26
- Russian-centric CS definition, 9
- Sava (Hieromonk), 90–91, 123n26
- Schenker, Alexander M., vii
- Sebeș, 51, 61, 88, 106, 108–9
- Senj missal*, 72
- Șerban (Deacon) (*fl.* 1582–1588), 111–12
- Serbia: Cyrillic incunabula and old prints research in, 54–55
- Serbian monastic printing shops (1537–1566): Belgrade and Mrkšina crkva (1552, 1562–1566), 100–103; Gračanica (1539), 97; Mileševa (1544–1546, 1557), 97–100; Nemirovskij on, 95; Rujno (1537), 95–97
- Serbian paleotypy (1519–1566): Ljubavić printing shops (1519–1523), 93–95, 98, 99; Serbian monastic printing shops (1537–1566), 95–103
- Service Book (Služebnik)*, 1554 (N: 84; G: 4), 86
- Service Book (Služebnik)*, 1568 (N: 128), 108
- Service Book (Služebnik)*, *1570/1580 (N: 167; G: 52), 87
- Service Book (Služebnik)*, *1570 (N: 135; G: 51), 87
- Service Book (Služebnik)*, *1588 (N: 197; G: 106), 112
- Service Book (Služebnik)*, July 7, 1519 (N: 26), 83
- Service Book (Služebnik)*, November 10, 1508 (N: 9), 78
- Service Book (Služebnik)*, September 25, 1587/1588 (N: 191; G: 103), 112

- Service Book* of 1519 (Ljubavić, B.), 98
 Shkodër, 51, 85, 87–88
A Short History of Literary Bulgarian
 (Bosilkov), 28
 Sibiu, 51, 61, 82, 104
 Sindik, R. Nadežda, 55
 Skaryna, Francysk, 53, 56, 104, 122n22;
 as *Rusian Bible* translator and
 publisher, 113–14
Slavia Latina, 15, 20, 21
Slavia Orthodoxa 2, 3, 7, 10, 13, 15,
 16, 17, 20, 22, 29, 32, 40n14, 52, 64,
 66n8, 81, 116, 119, 125, 126
Slavic Editions in Cyrillic (Church
Slavonic) Type 1491–2000
 (Nemirovskij), 50–51
Slavic Lexicography, 13
Slavo-Bulgarian History (Paisius of
 Hilendar), 19, 25
 Sławski, Franciszek, 5n1
Small (Little) Travel Book (Skaryna),
 hymnography and euchography in,
 114, 122n22
 Smotryc'kyj, Meletij, 9, 12, 19, 21, 23,
 30, 61, 119, 129
 Snagov, 61, 81, 119
 Sokolović, Makarije, 100
 Solak, Elżbieta, 2, 27
 Sophronius of Vratsa, 26, 30, 45, 46
 South Slavic Cyrillic paleotypy:
 Cetinje Cyrillic incunabula, 75–78;
 Cracow Cyrillic incunabula, 55,
 73–75, 121n10; Cyrillic paleotypy in
 Venice, 82–92; Romanian-Bulgarian
 paleotypy: Stage I, 3, 78–82, 95, 96,
 103, 104, 106; Romanian-Bulgarian
 paleotypy: Stage II, 82, 103–5;
 Romanian-Bulgarian paleotypy:
 Stage III, 105–12; Serbian paleotypy,
 93–103. *See also* East Slavic Cyrillic
 paleotypy
 Stančev, Krasimir, 16, 40n11, 40n14
 Stanislavov, Filip, 62, 64, 65n3
 Stankiewicz, Edward, 129
 Stępnia-Minczewska, Wanda, 75
 Stipčević, Aleksandar, 70–71
 Stojanović, Ljubomir, 60
 Suceava, 61
 Suprun, Adam, 8, 39nn1–2
 Taras'ev, Nikita, 117
Târgoviște Gospel of 1512, 78, 80, 81,
 96, 102, 104, 108, 111
 Târgoviște, 51, 61, 65n1, 78, 79, 80, 81,
 82, 95, 96, 97, 98, 102, 104, 106,
 107
 Teodor (Monk), 94, 99
 Teodosiev, Nikolaj, 53–54, 122n17
 Teodosije (Monk), 83, 96, 98
 Teszner, Jan, 73
Tetraevangelium, 1537 (N: 66), 95
Tetraevangelium, 1551–1554 (N: 81; G:
 1), 105
Tetraevangelium, 1582 (N: 173; G: 86),
 110
Tetraevangelium, 1583 (N: 180; G: 90),
 108
Tetraevangelium, after 1582 (N: 175; G:
 88), 110
Tetraevangelium, July 26, 1512 (N: 11),
 78
Tetraevangelium, June 22, 1546 (N: 73),
 105
Tetraevangelium, June 24, 1562 (N:
 104; G: 24), 102
Tetraevangelium, May 16, 1579 (N:
 157; G: 73), 109
 Timofeev, Neveža, 117
 Tolstoj, Nikita, 9
 Totomanova, Anna-Marija, 12
 Transylvania (Transylvanian), 61, 104,
 106, 108, 109, 111, 112
 travel books, Cyrillic, 83–84, 114,
 122n22
 Trubar, Primož, 91, 126
 Trunte, Nicolina, 20–21, 40n13
 Turilov, Anatolij, 16, 17
 Turzon, Jan, 73

- Unbegaun, Boris O., 22
 Urs, Adela Otilia, 106
- Vačkova, Kina, 33
 Vālčev, Bojan, 33, 129
 Vasilev, Vasko, 30
 Velčeva, Borjana, 31
 Venediktov, Grigorij, 27
 Venice, 3, 51, 54, 62, 63, 69, 70–72, 76, 93–95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 103, 108, 120n3, 121n6, 122n10, 126. *See also* Cyrillic paleotypy in Venice; Glagolitic incunabula
 Vereščagin, Evgenij, 9–10, 16
 Vievis, 30, 119
 Vilnius, 30, 35, 51, 52, 85, 104, 113, 114, 116, 118–19, 122n22
 Vostokov, Aleksandr, 13, 39n1
 Vuković, Božidar (*fl.* 1519–1521, 1536–1540), 53, 55, 62, 82–86, 89, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104
- Vuković, Gaspar, 85
 Vuković, Vičenco (*fl.* 1546–1547, 1554–1561), 53, 62, 84, 86–87, 90, 91, 93, 100, 101
- Walczak-Mikołajczakowa, Mariola, 2, 113–14
 Wallachia (Wallachian), 3, 38, 39n2, 52, 61, 63, 65n1, 78, 79, 80, 81, 94, 95, 96, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 111, 112
 Worth, Dean S., 20
 Wronkowska-Dimitrowa, Mirosława, 75
- Zabłudów, 30, 51, 53, 113, 116, 118, 119
 Zagrebin, Vjačeslav, 16, 17
 Zagurović, Jerolim, 62, 82, 87, 88–92
 Žefarović, Hristofor, 55, 63, 65n3
 Živko (Priest), 103
 Živov, Viktor, 14, 22
 Zyzanij-Tustanovs'kij, Lavrentij, 91, 119

About the Author

Ivan N. Petrov of the University of Lodz (Poland) is a linguist and Paleo-Slavist with expertise in Old Church Slavonic, the history of the South Slavic languages (especially those of the *Slavia Orthodoxa* area), historical syntax and morphology of the Slavic languages, theory and practice of translation from (Old) Church Slavonic into modern languages, and issues in Old Polish grammar. He is the author or co-author of three books and several dozen peer-reviewed articles, as well as the editor or co-editor of over a dozen collective volumes and scholarly journal issues. He has also published tens of translations of scholarly texts from and into Bulgarian, Polish, and Russian. Ivan N. Petrov has been the recipient of scholarships and awards from institutions such as the Government of the Republic of Poland, University of Warsaw, University of Lodz, Polish Academy of Sciences, Ministry of Science and Higher Education of Poland, New Bulgarian University, Sofia University, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, European Commission, and The Ohio State University. Currently, he is the head of the Department of Slavic Philology (Faculty of Philology, University of Lodz) and the director of the Waldemar Ceran Research Center for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe (*Ceraneum*).

