



Славянский Апостол: история текста и язык,
compiled by MARINA BOBRIK

(Studies on Language and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe, 21),
Verlag Otto Sagner, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 273 pp.
ISBN 978-3-86688-393-2.

Yana A. Pen'kova

Vinogradov Russian Language Institute
of the Russian Academy of Sciences
(Moscow)

Яна Андреевна Пенькова

Институт русского языка им.
В. В. Виноградова РАН (Москва)

The collection of articles published as *The Slavonic Apostolus: Text History and Language* (SA) is made up of materials presented at the roundtable discussion “Slawischer Apostolos: Bestandsaufnahme und Perspektiven” (*The Slavonic Apostolus: Results and Perspectives*), which took place on December 8–9, 2011 at the Institute for Slavic Studies, Humboldt University of Berlin. Slavists from different European countries including the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Great Britain, Italy, Russia, and Germany share their work in SA. The majority of the articles are published in Russian, which will allow Russian Slavists, or at least those who can read Russian, to evaluate the scholarly advances presented in the volume. SA has four parts: “Рукописная традиция Апостола” (*The Manuscript Tradition of the Apostolus*), “Печатный Апостол” (*The Printed Apostolus*), “Материалы для дискуссии” (*Discussions*), and “Справочные материалы” (*References*).

The first section, which is devoted to the manuscripts of the Apostolus, constitutes the main part of SA and is characterized by the widest variety in subject matter. The authors focus on the mutual relationships among the various versions (redactions) of the Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles; the history and structure of the Synaxarion included in Apostolus texts and its sources in the Byzantine tradition; the adaptation mechanisms for citation and informal references introduced in medieval texts and the role of such references in the study of the Slavonic translations over the course of their history and existence; linguistic characteristics of the manuscript sources and perspectives on applying computer technologies to textual studies of the Slavonic Apostolus.

The section starts with an article written by the recently deceased ZOE HAUPTOVÁ, Prague, the well-known Czech Slavist who devoted her life to the study of the Old Church Slavonic Apostolus. The article under consideration is entitled **“К вопросу о соотношении служебного и дополнительного текстов старославянского Апостола”** (*On the Interrelationships among the Lectionary and Non-lectionary Portions of the Old Church Slavonic Apostolus*, pp. 11–30); it was translated from Czech into Russian by IVETA KREJČÍŘOVÁ and enlarged and revised by EMILIE BLÁHOVÁ.

The subject of Hauptová’s article is the correlation and distribution of lexical archaisms and innovations in the lectionary and non-lectionary portions. The main sources of the study are the *Apostolus Christinopolitanus* (12th century) and the *Apostolus* from the collection of Alexander Hilferding (14th century), the latter filling in the lacunae of the former manuscript. The evidence from these texts is compared with evidence from about forty Old Church Slavonic manuscripts (using the card index data of the Old Church Slavonic Language Dictionary). The study reveals an extremely contradictory picture: on the one hand, the texts of the lectionary portions preserve a number of lexical archaisms which are not typical of the non-lectionary portions; on the other hand, the lectionary portions contain almost the same number of innovations corresponding to the earlier equivalents in the non-lectionary portions. Based on the essential distinctions between these texts, the author comes to the conclusion that these two parts were translated by different people.

This article has some intersections with the paper **“Соображения о критическом издании славянского Апостола”** (*Considerations for a Critical Edition of the Slavonic Apostolus*, pp. 197–206), written by ANATOLY A. ALEKSEEV, St. Petersburg, and placed in the third section of the volume, “Материалы для дискуссии” (*Discussions*). Alekseev notes the rather contradictory evidence that is revealed when the Archaic and Athonian redactions of the *Apostolus* are compared: the Cyrillo-Methodian lexis of the latter tends to replace a great number of preslavisms of the former. Both articles, based on different materials, show the lexical heterogeneity of the *Apostolus*, which reflects a complicated history of text building and corroborates the impossibility of reconstructing an archetype. The author argues that such lexical variability, in which no extant manuscript can serve as a basis, can be overcome in a future critical edition. One of the possible paths is to employ the editorial practices developed for the Greek New Testament (p. 205).

Some interesting points of intersection in the supporting data can also be found in the articles discussed above. The same correlation in lexis observed in the Archaic and Athonian redactions (preslavisms in the former and Cyrillo-Methodian in the latter) appears in some cases between the language of the Epistles and that of the Acts. Examples are the following: послухъ—свьѣдѣтель (ALEKSEEV, p. 199) and послушание / послушество / послухование—свьѣдѣтельство (HAUPTOVÁ, p. 19). In other cases the text of the Acts chooses a third path, for example: отдание грѣховъ—оставление грѣхомъ (ALEKSEEV, p. 199) and отъдание/оставление—отъпущение (HAUPTOVÁ, p. 18); повѣдати—възвѣстити (ALEKSEEV, p. 199) and възвѣстити/повѣдати—сказати (HAUPTOVÁ, p. 24).

One of the Slavonic translation decisions for the Greek εἶδωλον—тѣло неприязнино— receives different interpretations in the articles under discussion. Although she places this example in the chapter about innovations, Hauptová proceeds with the following commentary: “. . . можно было бы скорее говорить об инновации, корни

которой, однако, уходят в первоначальный текст Апостола” (‘One could rather speak about innovation, the roots of which, however, go back to the original text of the Slavonic Apostolus,’ p. 27). Alekseev, to the contrary, perceives here the result of subsequent textual redaction, typical of the Serbian manuscripts (p. 202).

Taking into consideration the absence of any cross-references between the articles mentioned above, one cannot avoid noting some unfortunate composition decisions for SA. As noted above, whereas Hauptová’s paper opens the first chapter, Alekseev’s publication is placed after the paper devoted to the printed Apostolus. Such a sequence is not quite logical and, indeed, hampers one’s understanding. There are eight papers in SA, and they are divided into three chapters, yet the first section contains six articles, whereas the second and third sections include only one article each. Such a distribution, based on formal grounds (handwritten or printed book, or something that falls into neither group) creates an impression of a certain artificiality and lack of proportion. The headings could have been left out or they might have been based on less rigid principles in order to avoid such a disproportionate distribution. It would probably have been more convenient for the reader to have Hauptová’s and Alekseev’s papers placed in the same chapter or at least in close proximity to one another, because both researchers to a certain extent deal with the problems of archetype reconstruction and both demonstrate that as many variant readings as possible should be taken into consideration in any critical edition of the Apostolus.

The self-evident connection with these questions is apparent in the paper **“Количественный метод в текстологии (на материале Соборных посланий)”** (*Quantitative Method in Textology (Based on the Material of the General Epistles)*, pp. 31–61), written by RALPH CLEMINSON, Winchester, UK. This article discusses the opportunities offered by quantitative textology (“количественная текстология”) and the results of its application, by means of which the process of comparing manuscripts belonging to one and the same version (redaction) becomes easier. This method, already applied in textual studies of the Greek New Testament, allows one to understand the mutual relations among large numbers of manuscript sources and seems to offer new perspectives in the studies of handwritten (and, perhaps, printed) traditions of the Apostolus, where it is typical not to have a direct correspondence to a text prototype. The method described by the author takes into account the rate of coincidence between minor variant readings, something that is beyond the abilities of a human linguist but which can serve as conclusive evidence for kinship existing between certain groups of manuscripts. This methodology is based on the calculation of the common rate of coincidences occurring in the variant readings, a rate which measures the degree of proximity between two particular manuscripts; this is also known as the “Levenshtein distance” (‘расстояние Левенштейна,’ p. 32). The result of the calculation can be represented by a dendrogram in which the “height” indicates the distance between clusters (groups of manuscripts): the higher the separation between the clusters, the greater the distance between them (“... «высота» указывает на расстояние между кластерами: чем выше разветвление между кластерами, тем больше расстояние между ними,” p. 36).

The method in question, however, is applicable only within large identical texts; that is the reason why short Epistles, such as 2 John, according to Cleminson, should be excluded from the calculation (this, however, did not prevent the author from including the data of 2 John in the dendrograms analyzed on pp. 49–50). Cleminson draws special attention to the fact that the method under description brings to light not the generic

relationships between manuscripts but only the distance between them. At the same time, the evaluation of the results still depends entirely on the researcher.

The advantages of quantitative textology are convincingly shown by the author on the basis of three redactions of the General Epistles: the First, the Second, and the Fourth (it remains unclear whether the author bears in mind that, as is well known, G. A. Voskresenskiy's classification has been revised; the reader is given no additional references on this matter). Twenty-three manuscripts attributed to the First redaction, twenty manuscripts from the Second redaction, and twenty-one manuscripts belonging to the Fourth redaction are examined (in some cases redactions may vary within one and the same manuscript). The First redaction is represented with dendrograms for the following texts: James (in both variants: extract or full text), 1 Peter (in both variants), 2 Peter (in both variants), 1 John (in both variants), 2 John, 3 John, Judas, and menaion texts for James 10–20, 2 Peter 10–19, and 1 John 1–7 and 12–19. The Second redaction has dendrograms for James, 1 Peter, 2 Peter (in both variants), 1 John (in both variants), 2 John, 3 John, Judas, and the menaion texts for James 12–20, 2 Peter 10–19, and 1 John 1–7 and 12–19. Finally, the Fourth redaction has dendrograms for James (in both variants), 1 Peter (in both variants), 2 Peter, 1 John (in both variants), 2 John, 3 John, and Judas.

The author's focus is an analysis of the method's abilities and limits in textology. However, when Cleminson turns from the language of dendrograms to the language of textology, his results are presented in a rather abbreviated fashion, which prevents the reader from comprehending all of the advantages of this method of analysis.

The article “**Синаксарные жития и агиографические данные в составе Апостолов**” (*Synaxarian Lives of the Saints and Hagiographic Events Included in the Apostolus*, pp. 63–113), written by the Bulgarian Slavist ISKRA HRISTOVA-SHOMOVA, Sofia, is devoted to one of the insufficiently studied peculiarities of the Slavonic Apostolus: the structure of the Synaxarion and Menologion and their sources in the Byzantine tradition. The author found accounts on short hagiographic events and even full synaxarian lives in the calendars of the most ancient codices of the Apostolus. In most cases, considerable or partial correspondence with the Greek original from the *Typikon of the Great Church* can be found. The most significant in this relation are rare commemorations which are not typical of the *Studite Typikon*, e.g., St. Nestor's commemoration on October 25 instead of on October 27 (in the *Draganova Menaion*), or St. Varus' commemoration on October 25 instead of October 19 (see pp. 68–69).

According to Hristova-Shomova, traces of the Synaxarion are most widely reflected in the *Praxapostolus Eninensis* of the 11th century, but can also be found in the *Praxapostolus Achridanus* and the *Dragotin Apostolus* of the 12th century and in some other Middle Bulgarian manuscripts of the 13–14th centuries, including some Menaia and Gospel Books (mainly in the *Draganova Menaion* from the 13th century, the Menaion RNB (National Library of Russia) F.п.I.72 from the end of the 12th or the early 13th centuries, the *Evangeliarium Ostromiri*, and the *Evangeliarium Assemani*).

In an appendix to the paper there is a detailed table of extracts from hagiographic events and lives found by the author in the calendars of Epistle and Gospel Books as well as Menaia, in most cases provided with the corresponding original Greek texts (pp. 79–108). A great deal of evidence from the ancient calendars included in the Epistle Books and going back to the *Typikon of the Great Church* indicates that the translation of these Synaxaria was made by Cyril and Methodius during their mission to

Great Moravia (p. 73): “Думаю, что [. . .] первая славянская богослужебная книга, составленная святыми братьями, содержала Апостол с Евангелием вместе с обоими синаксарями Устава Великой Церкви” (‘I believe that [. . .] the first Slavonic liturgy book, compiled by the brother saints, contained the Epistle Book, the Gospel Book, and both Synaxaria from the *Typikon of the Great Church*,’ p. 74).

Unfortunately, the paper discusses only in cursory fashion “the significant number of commemorations of ‘western’ saints and the celebrations of certain saints according to the ‘western’ calendar” (p. 73). A few names are mentioned only in the footnote on p. 74. However, this feature obviously deserves comprehensive commentary, especially because it corroborates the author’s hypothesis that the translation was made during the mission to Moravia.

A special field in the research on the Slavonic Apostolus is the study of the quotations and informal references from the Apostolus in literature from the Middle Ages and the possibility of using them as reliable sources both for the development of the Apostolus as well as for the development of the sources in which they appear. The article **“Послания Павла между традицией текста и экзегетической переработкой в литературе Slavia Orthodoxa”** (*Pauline Epistles between the Text Tradition and Exegetic Interpretation in the Literature of the Slavia Orthodoxa*, pp. 115–124), written by MARCELLO GARZANITI, Florence, and the paper in Bulgarian **“Апостолските цитати в старохърватския глаголически ръкопис на Бенедиктински устав от остров Пашман”** (*Quotations from the Apostolus in the Old Croatian Glagolitic Manuscript of the Rule of St. Benedict from Pašman Island*, pp. 125–164), written by GERGANA NIKOLOVA, Sofia, both touch upon these questions.

Garzaniti’s paper deals with certain quotations from the Pauline Epistles, the elaborate manner of their adaptation, and their structure-forming role in the texts in which they appear. In my opinion, one of the most revealing examples is the history of the citations from Rom 1:7 and 1:15, represented in Slavonic copies of the Apostolus with the variant reading Римъ/миръ. The interpretation of these quotations against the background of the particular extract from Andrew of Caesarea’s commentary on the Revelation of John (“Такожде якоже селище блудодѣищъ бысть той Стары Римъ Вавилонъ в Петрови епистоли. И всякъ кождо градъ. Иже о убійствѣ кровіи веселится [. . .] или перскій Вавилонъ в немже многи быша муки или Старый Римъ или Новый. Или весь миръ,” p. 121), according to Garzaniti, provides hegumen Philotheus with certain biblical grounds for his idea of “Moscow as the Third Rome.” However, the connection between the extract from Andrew’s commentary, cited above, which refers to Peter’s Epistle (cf., в Петрови епистоли), and the Pauline Epistles remains somewhat unclear.

The paper reveals the complex development of biblical quotations that were presented in texts and, simultaneously, were preserved in the medieval scribe’s mind; these passages recall to the reader not only specific verses from the Bible but also the wider context of the Byzantine exegetic tradition that was accepted by the Slavonic tradition.

Nikolova’s article is also devoted to the study of quotations from the Apostolus, but in this paper the author focuses on the adaptation of quotations from the Apostolus in Slavonic translations of the Rule of Saint Benedict. The identified quotations have been classified according to the extent of their coincidence with readings from the Apostolus; certain features which reflect, on the one hand, the influence of the vernacular Old Croatian language and, on the other hand, the influence of the original Latin text are

brought to light and comprehensively described in the paper. An extra purpose of the research was to find signs of Cyrillo-Methodian translation, that is, whether or not a Slavonic text might have been used in translating citations from the *Apostolus* in the Rule of St. Benedict. The manuscript is compared with four breviaries and five missals—all nine of these sources are generally considered to reflect features of the first Slavonic translation [ALEKSEEV 1999: 142]. In the appendix to the paper there is a table of quotations from the *Apostolus* in the *Pašman Codex* with parallel passages in Latin (from the Rule of St. Benedict and the Vulgate) and Greek (NTG) and corresponding readings from Slavonic *Apostolus* manuscripts and the Croatian missals and breviaries (pp. 152–164).

A correspondence between the *Pašman Codex*, the Slavonic *Apostolus*, and a Croatian missal was found only in one case (pp. 130–131), which unfortunately was not included in the table in the appendix. However this example can hardly be interpreted as a reflection of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition, since the example mentioned (B(og) a bojte se) is rather trivial, very short, and corresponds precisely to what we find in the Vulgate, although varying from the corresponding text in the Rule of St. Benedict. In light of the lack of any other reliable examples, the author's assumption about any kind of dependence on the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition seems unwarranted.

On the whole, one can highly appreciate the scope of the work undertaken and accept the author's general conclusions, that is, that the *Pašman Codex* is a free translation of the Rule of St. Benedict that reflects both the peculiarities of the contemporary vernacular Old Croatian language and numerous features of the original Latin text. However, it also differs from the Vulgate and stands far apart from the Croatian liturgical tradition. In this regard the codex in question is not unique in Croatian literature, in which free translations of biblical texts are typical [ALEKSEEV 1999: 145].

The first chapter of *SA* ends with the paper **“Орфографические, фонетические и морфологические особенности Скопльского Апостола, церковнославянского памятника 1313 года”** (*Orthographic, Phonetic, and Morphologic Features of the Apostolus Skopliensis, a Church Slavonic Literary Monument from 1313*, pp. 165–181), written by ŠTEFAN PILÁT, Prague. According to Pilát, the *Apostolus Skopliensis*, separated from the time of the first translation by more than four centuries, in many respects preserves features of that first translation. The text of the codex in question combines archaisms with innovations and may serve as an important source for the study of Macedonian historical grammar and dialectology. Moreover, the codex reflects the influence of the Serbian Church Slavonic redaction on the orthography of North Macedonian manuscripts from the 14th century (p. 180), e.g., the employment of yotated vowel letters, following the rules of the Raška type of orthography (p. 173). Another important feature of the *Apostolus Skopliensis* is that it has not undergone the Preslav redaction (p. 166). This feature, which is mentioned only in passing in the article—the author did not intend to include a description of the lexical characteristics in this work—will probably be developed more fully in the edition of the *Apostolus Skopliensis*, on which Pilát is currently working.

The article **“Апостол Франциска Скорины и его судьбы”** (*The Apostolus of Francysk Skaryna and Its Fate*, pp. 185–194), written by ALEKSANDER E. NAUMOW, Venice, is the only paper in *SA* that deals with the study of a printed *Apostolus*. In the paper the author gives some brief commentary on the personality of Francysk Skaryna, the purposes of his edition, and its composition and structure, as well as a brief description of four manuscripts copied from the printed edition. The article introduces readers to the central

issues of this field, drawing our attention to this unique literary monument of Renaissance culture: the *Apostolus* of Skaryna, which contains translations and commentaries made or edited by Skaryna as well as—for the first time in Cyrillic printing—parallel verses given in the margins (p. 189). According to Naumow, there is still a great deal left to be explored, for neither the underlying source used in the edition nor the correlation between the printed text and handwritten copies have been established.

This paper is obviously of great interest, yet the author did not manage to avoid some stylistic and terminological inaccuracies, for example, what is meant by “specific lexis” (‘специфическая лексика’) on p. 190 is left unclear and some phrases seem to be rather colloquial in style (“источником [. . .] послужили *какие-то* списки четвертой (афонской) редакции перевода,” p. 185, or “. . . Послание к Колоссянам у чехов отправлено из Эфеса, у Скорины — из Рима,” p. 186). The paper also lacks several bibliographical references that are mentioned in the bibliography list appended to the article.

One of the undoubted achievements of *SA* is the extensive “**Annotated Bibliography of Works Devoted to the Slavonic Apostolus**” (pp. 209–273), compiled by MARINA A. ВОБРИК, Berlin, with the collaboration of Ralph Cleminson, A. E. Naumow, M. O. Novak, Hieromonk Panteleimon (Korol’ev), T. V. Pentkovskaya, Sergejus Temčinas, Iskra Hristova-Shomova, and Archpriest A. Troitskiy. The bibliography numbers more than 300 items, representing an intermediate summary of the study of the Slavonic *Apostolus*, highlighting the most pressing issues in the field, and it can serve as a solid basis for further research.

In conclusion I should say only that the breadth and currency of the topics under discussion in *SA*, its high scholarly level, and its rich reference apparatus should earn this volume the interest and respect of specialists and provide a firm basis for additional research in the field.

Bibliography

ALEKSEEV 1999

АЛЕКСЕЕВ А. А., Текстология славянской Библии, С.-Петербург, 1999.

——— 2013

Алексеев А. А., “Соображения о критическом издании славянского Апостола”, в: М. ВОВРИК, ed., *Славянский Апостол: история текста и язык*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 197–206.

ВОБРИК 2013

Воврик М. А., “Аннотированная библиография работ по славянскому Апостолу”, в: М. ВОВРИК, ed., *Славянский Апостол: история текста и язык*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 209–273.

CLEMINSON 2013

Клеминсон Р., “Количественный метод в текстологии (на материале Соборных посланий)”, в: М. ВОВРИК, ed., *Славянский Апостол: история текста и язык*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 31–61.

GARZANITI 2013

Гардзанини М., “Послания Павла между традицией текста и экзегетической переработкой в литературе Slavia Orthodoxa”, в: М. ВОВРИК, ed., *Славянский Апостол: история текста и язык*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 115–124.

HAURTOVÁ 2013

Гауптова З., “К вопросу о соотношении служебного и дополнительного текстов старославянского Апостола”, Благова Э., ред., Крейчиржова И., пер., в: М. ВОВРИК, ed.,

Славянский Апостол: история текста и язык, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 11–30.

HRISTOVA-SHOMOVA 2013

ХРИСТОВА-ШОМОВА И., “Синаксарные жития и агиографические данные в составе Апостолов”, в: М. БОБРИК, ed., *Славянский Апостол: история текста и язык*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 63–113.

NAUMOV 2013

НАУМОВ А. Е., “Апостол Франциска Скорины и его судьбы”, в: М. БОБРИК, ed., *Славянский Апостол: история текста и язык*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 185–194.

NIKOLOVA 2013

НИКОЛОВА Г., “Апостолските цитати в старохърватския глаголически ръкопис на Бенедиктински устав от остров Пашман”, в: М. БОБРИК, ed., *Славянский Апостол: история текста и язык*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 125–164.

PILÁT 2013

ПИЛАТ Ш., “Орфографические, фонетические и морфологические особенности Скопльского Апостола, церковнославянского памятника 1313 года”, в: М. БОБРИК, ed., *Славянский Апостол: история текста и язык*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 165–181.

References

Alekseev A. A., *Tekstologiiia slavianskoi Biblii*, St. Petersburg, 1999.

Alekseev A. A., “Soobrazheniia o kriticheskom izdanii slavianskogo Apostola,” in: M. Bobrik, ed., *Slavianskii Apostol: istoriia teksta i iazyk*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 197–206.

Bobrik M. A., “Annotirovannaia bibliografiia rabot po slavianskomu Apostolu,” in: M. Bobrik, ed., *Slavianskii Apostol: istoriia teksta i iazyk*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 209–273.

Cleminson R., “Kolichestvennyi metod v tekstologii (na materiale Sobornykh poslanii),” in: M. Bobrik, ed., *Slavianskii Apostol: istoriia teksta i iazyk*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 31–61.

Garzaniti M., “Poslaniiia Pavla mezhdru traditsiei teksta i ekzegeticheskoj prerabotkoj v literature Slavia Orthodoxa,” in: M. Bobrik, ed., *Slavianskii Apostol: istoriia teksta i iazyk*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 115–124.

Hauptová Z., Bláhová E., “K voprosu o sootnoshenii sluzhebnoho i dopolnitel'nogo tekstov staroslavianskogo Apostola,” in: M. Bobrik, ed.,

Slavianskii Apostol: istoriia teksta i iazyk, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 11–30.

Hristova-Shomova I., “Sinaksarnye zhitii i agiograficheskie dannye v sostave Apostolov,” in: M. Bobrik, ed., *Slavianskii Apostol: istoriia teksta i iazyk*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 63–113.

Naumov A. E., “Apostol Frantsiska Skoriny i ego sud'by,” in: M. Bobrik, ed., *Slavianskii Apostol: istoriia teksta i iazyk*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 185–194.

Nikolova G., “Apostolskite tsitati v starokhърvat-skiiia glagolicheski rukopis na Benediktinski ustav ot ostrov Pashman,” in: M. Bobrik, ed., *Slavianskii Apostol: istoriia teksta i iazyk*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 125–164.

Pilát Š., “Orfograficheskie, foneticheskie i morfologicheskie osobennosti Skopl'skogo Apostola, tserkovnoslavianskogo pamiatnika 1313 goda,” in: M. Bobrik, ed., *Slavianskii Apostol: istoriia teksta i iazyk*, München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 165–181.

Яна Андреевна Пенькова, канд. филол. наук
научный сотрудник Отдела исторической лексикографии,
Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН
119019 Москва, Волхонка 18/2
Россия/Russia
amoena@inbox.ru