

Hanne Martine Eckhoff

First attestations. An Old Church Slavonic sampler

Abstract: Corpus linguistics and computational approaches to language constitute an important trend in today's linguistics, and Slavic historical linguistics is no exception. This chapter serves as an empirical touchstone for the entire volume. Using parallel Greek and Old Church Slavonic data from the PROIEL/TOROT treebanks, the first attested state of the phenomena covered in the volume is explored, including their relationship to the Greek sources. The chapter covers accusatives with infinitives (Gavrančić this volume, Tomelleri this volume), absolute constructions (Mihaljević 2017), deverbal nouns (Tomelleri this volume), prepositional phrase connectors (Kisiel & Sobotka this volume), numeral syntax (Sloboda this volume), the ordering of pronominal clitics (Kosek, Čech & Navrátilová this volume), tense use in performative declaratives (Dekker this volume) and relative clauses (Sonnenhauser & Eberle this volume; Podtergera 2020). The chapter presents corpus statistics on each of the phenomena, and a brief discussion of the possibility of influence from Greek. The chapters that provide their own studies of Old Church Slavonic data (Fuchsbauer this volume on “mock” articles, Pichkhadze this volume on syntactic blocking and Šimić this volume on negative concord), are not replicated, but brought into the discussion when relevant.

Keywords: rule borrowing, infinitives, participles, clitics, numerals, performatives, tense, relative clauses, discourse connectors, Old Church Slavonic

This volume covers a wide range of Slavonic contact phenomena in syntax, the majority of them taking place in relatively well-documented historical times. Yet the very first attestation of Slavonic, Old Church Slavonic (OCS), is almost entirely found in translations from Koiné and Byzantine Greek, and its syntax seems almost inextricable from the syntax of its Greek source texts. Old Church Slavonic, which we can obviously know only as a written language, was devised as a literary language precisely for the purpose of translating overwhelmingly Greek Biblical, liturgical and other religious sources such as lives of saints. Its subsequent influence on later varieties of Slavonic, especially those linked to the Orthodox church, can hardly be overestimated.

Hanne Martine Eckhoff, University of Oxford, e-mail: hanne.eckhoff@mod-langs.ox.ac.uk

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110651331-012>

Greek and OCS are both typical old Indo-European languages, with a lot of structural similarities. The task of teasing Greek and Slavonic native syntax apart is a challenging one, and a good number of the contact phenomena covered in this volume are also ones that may be or certainly are influenced by Greek in the earliest sources (see e.g. the account of the problem in MacRobert 1986, which touches on several of the constructions discussed in this volume). We are, however, in the fortunate situation that more and more digital corpus resources are available for OCS and other early stages of Slavonic. Instead of providing a summary of this volume I will therefore look at the phenomena covered in the various articles in this book and use Greek and OCS treebank data from the PROIEL/TOROT treebanks,¹ using the Codex Marianus and its Greek parallel.² My aim will be to assess the state of the relevant phenomenon in the Marianus dataset. Does it exist at all, and if so, how Slavonic does it seem to be? I will look carefully at the sources of a potential Greek loan, and make a survey of how the OCS translation deals with each of these structures. This immediately raises the difficult and much discussed issue of how to distinguish between contact-induced and internally motivated change. Can a linguistic rule or syntactic pattern be borrowed at all, and how can we determine that it has? Thomason (2006: 674) suggests that an indisputable example of rule borrowing must involve no lexical transfer, and should result in an identical rule in the source language and in the receiving language, which is also completely new to the receiving language. We are quite rarely in this position with OCS, since it is hard to conclusively prove that any rule was completely absent in Slavonic before the hugely influential translations from Greek in the OCS text canon.

Three of the articles in this volume include their own studies of OCS data: Fuchsbauer's article "The article-like usage of the relative pronoun *iže* as an indicator of early Slavonic grammatical thinking, Pichkhadze's "Blocking of syntactic constructions without Greek counterparts in Church Slavonic", and Šimić's "Non-strict negative concord proper and languages in contact: translating Latin and Old Greek into Church Slavonic". For obvious reasons I have not tried to replicate their studies, but I will refer to them when their work proves relevant to the other topics. Tomelleri's article raises a wide range of syntactic issues. I will look

¹ All datasets and scripts to process them are available at <https://doi.org/10.18710/J572YW>

² The Greek New Testament text used in the PROIEL treebank is Tischendorf 1869–1872. This is, naturally, not the source text of the Codex Marianus, and that fact will necessarily create some noise in the data. I will therefore refer to manuscript variants in the Gospels in cases where I deem it necessary, especially in cases of very low-frequency deviations between the Greek and OCS texts.

at only one of them in depth (the use of productive deverbal nouns), but will refer to his article elsewhere when relevant.

As the title suggests, this chapter is intended as a sampler, not as a set of fully worked-out studies of the phenomena in question. The statistical analyses are sometimes quite simple, often due to a scarcity of data, and I do not pretend to supply a full literature survey for each topic; I cite researchers whose ideas I would like to acknowledge, often just a few representatives from a much larger body of literature.

1 Accusative with infinitive

The accusative with infinitive (AcI) is a rarity in OCS, but relatively frequent in Greek. Gavrančić's study of the Croatian AcI in this volume naturally takes Latin as the point of comparison, since Croatia belonged to the West church and translated its religious texts primarily from Latin, albeit with traces of the Cyrillo-Methodian translations in the Old Croatian sources. In Tomelleri's article we can see that this type of influence can be found in 16th century Russian Church Slavonic translations from Latin as well. As Gavrančić points out, the AcI was used less in the Vulgate than in Classical Latin, but it is still fairly well attested, and not much less used than in the Greek New Testament, which must be the point of departure for any study of the OCS AcI.³

A quick look at the Codex Marianus data immediately shows us that the majority of OCS examples corresponding to a Greek accusative with infinitive do *not* have an accusative with infinitive, or indeed any infinitive construction at all. We are therefore faced with the task of determining which contexts could be rendered with an AcI, which contexts with a dative with infinitive (DcI), and which contexts had to be rendered with various other means. It is easy to dismiss the OCS AcI as an outright loan, and essentially ungrammatical (see e.g. Večerka 1971: 140), but such as it was, it was clearly not used uncritically, but under very restricted conditions, largely when the Greek AcI is a 'true' complement of a typical complement-taking verb (communicative and cognitive). The usage of the

³ In the PROIEL corpus (query performed June 2019) we find 577 constructions with accusative subjects in the Greek New Testament, 408 in the Vulgate. The number of complement infinitives is much more similar: 581 in the GNT and 620 in the Vulgate. Neither of these measures get us the exact number of AcIs, since not all accusative subjects belong in AcIs, not all AcIs have an overt subject, and not all AcI infinitives are direct complements – as we shall see, they are often nominalised with an article in the Greek.

AcI in OCS was thus considerably narrower than that observed by Gavrančić in 16th–19th century Croatian texts and by Tomelleri in 16th century Russian Church Slavonic.

For this study I extracted all Old Church Slavonic items which were aligned with a Greek nominal in the accusative case with the relation label SUB which depended on an infinitive (1).⁴

- (1) a. πῶς λέγουσιν τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι Δαυεὶδ υἱόν
 pōs legousin ton Christon einai Daueid huion
 how say.PRS.3PL the Christ.ACC be.INF.PRS David.INDECL son.ACC
- b. κακο ҃҃҃҃҃҃ є҃҃҃҃҃҃ ҃҃ ҃҃҃҃҃
 kako gljotъ⁵ edini xа byti
 how say.PRS.3PL some.NOM.PL Christ.GEN/ACC be.INF
- ҃҃҃҃ ҃҃҃҃
 sna dva
 son.GEN/ACC David-ov.M.SG.GEN/ACC
- ‘How can they say that the Christ is David’s son?’ (Lk. 20.41, 48564, 41281)⁶

We find 170 examples of Greek infinitives with an accusative deemed to be the subject, which also have an aligned OCS translation in the Codex Marianus.⁷ Looking at the Greek examples, we see that there are three main syntactic types. The AcI may be tagged COMP (112 examples),⁸ which means that it is either considered a straight complement clause (as in (1) above) or a clausal argument which may correspond to either a subject or an object (2).

⁴ Note that this yields quite a different set of examples from that found in Kurešević (2018), where constructions with transitive verbs of movement (*poslati* ‘send’) followed by an accusative object and an infinitive of purpose are taken to be AcIs. In the PROIEL/TOROT treebanks such infinitives are seen as adverbial modifiers rather than a part of an AcI in both OCS and Greek. Kurešević also takes accusatives and infinitives depending on verbs like *tvoriti* ‘make’ to be AcIs, see further discussion of this point below.

⁵ Underlined characters in the Latin transliteration indicate characters under a tilde in the manuscript.

⁶ All examples are given with sentence IDs from PROIEL/TOROT for easy access.

⁷ The criterion was that the Greek accusative subject must be aligned with something in the OCS translation. This means that in cases of coordinated accusative objects, each will be considered a data point. Only two example sentences are affected by this.

⁸ One of these examples (Lk. 17.1, 21276) has an article in the genitive, but is clearly perceived as the subject argument of the structure.

- (2) a. εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρήματος
 eukopōteron gar estin kamēlon dia trēmatos
 easier for be.PRS.3SG camel.ACC through hole.GEN
 βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν
 belonēs eiselthein ē plousion eis tēn
 needle.GEN enter.INF.AOR than rich.M.ACC.SG in the
 βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.
 basileian tou theou eiselthein
 kingdom.ACC the God.GEN enter.INF.AOR
- b. оудобѣе бо естъ вѣлъбѣдоу сквозѣ игълинѣ
 udobēe bo estъ velbōdu skvozē igblinē
 easier for be.PRS.3SG camel.DAT through needle-in.F.ACC.DU
 оуши проити. неже богату въ
 uši proiti neže bogatu vъ
 ear.ACC.DU go_through.INF than rich.M.DAT.SG in
 ѣсрствіе. вѣнити.
 c̑srstvie v̑niti
 kingdom.ACC enter.INF
 ‘For it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a
 rich person to enter the kingdom of God’ (Lk. 18.25, 21376, 41113)

The AcI may be tagged PRED, which means that it is the predicate of a subordinate clause headed by a subjunction – either *hōste* (17 examples, 3) or *prin* (7 examples, 4).

- (3) a. καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν ὄχλος, ὥστε μὴ
 kai sunerchetai palin ochlos hōste mē
 and gather.PRS.3SG again crowd.NOM so_that not
 δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μήτε ἄρτον φαγεῖν.
 dunasthai autous mēte artōn fagein
 be_able.INF.PRS they.ACC even bread.ACC eat.INF.AOR
- b. ꙗꙗ сѣбѣраша сѧ пакы народи. ꙗко не
 i sēb̑braše sę paky narodi jako ne
 and gather.AOR.3PL REFL again people.NOM.PL that not
 моѣи имѣ ни хлѣба сѣнѣсти.
 mošti im̑ ni xlēba sēnēsti
 be_able.INF they.DAT even bread.GEN eat.INF
 ‘and the crowd gathered again, so that they could not even eat’
 (Mk. 3.20, 6632, 36487)

- (4) a. πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι δις τρίς με ἀπαρνήση.
 prin alektora fōnēsai dis tris me aparnēsēi
 before rooster.ACC crow.INF.AOR twice thrice I.ACC deny.FUT.3SG
- b. прѣжде даже кокотъ не вѣзгласитъ двѣа
 prěžde daže kokotъ ne vѣzglasitъ dъva
 before than rooster.NOM not crow.PRS.3PL two.ACC
 краты. отъврѣжеши са мене три краты.
 kraty otъvnrěžeši sa mene tri kraty
 time.ACC.PL deny.PRS.2SG REFL I.GEN three.ACC time.ACC.PL
 ‘Before the rooster crows twice, you will deny me three times’
 (Mk. 14.72, 56965, 37276)

Finally, the infinitive may be nominalised and have a definite article. In 28 out of 33 examples, such nominalised infinitives are headed by a preposition, most frequently *en* ‘in’ (5).

- (5) a. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτοῦς
 kai egeneto en tōi hupagein autous
 and happen.AOR.3SG in the.DAT go_away.INF.PRS they.ACC
 ἐκαθαρίσθησαν.
 ekatharisthēsan
 cleanse.AOR.3PL.PASS
- b. и бѣистъ идѣштемъ имъ. иштиштиша
 i bystъ idōštemъ imъ ištistiše
 and be.AOR.3SG go.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.PL they.DAT cleanse.AOR.3PL
 са.
 sę
 REFL
 ‘And it came to pass that, as they went, they were cleansed’
 (Lk. 17.14, 21298, 41043)

Examples 1–5 also show us a number of the available OCS translation strategies. While example (1) does indeed have an Acl in the OCS translation, examples (2) and (3) have the much more common Dcl. Example (4) has a subordinate clause with a finite head verb, while (5) has a dative absolute. An overview of the translation strategies is seen in Table 1.

Table 1: OCS translation of three main types of Greek Acl.

	Acl is predicate	Acl has article	Acl is complement clause or clausal argument
Finite clause	15	16	6 ⁹
Acl	0	0	9
Dcl	8	0	10
Complement/predicate infinitive with no subject	1	0	1
Dative absolute	0	10	2
Purpose infinitive	0	2	1
Argument infinitive	0	0	67
Accusative with participle	0		4
Imperative	0	0	4
Other	0	5	8

To take the last group first, an infinitive can hardly be nominalised in OCS except with the help of the “article” usage of *īze* (see Fuchsbauer this volume). Nominalised Acls are not normally translated as infinitive constructions, and not at all as Acls or Dcls.¹⁰ Instead we find ten examples of dative absolutes (5), all rendering nominalised infinitives in the dative case, headed by the preposition *en* ‘in’.¹¹ The other main strategy (16 examples) is to translate the infinitive into a finite verb, typically in an adverbial clause, such as an *egda* clause (6).

- (6) a. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν
 Egeneto de en tōi hupostrephein ton
 happen.AOR.3SG PTCL in the.DAT return.INF.PRS the
 Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος·
 Iēsoun apedexato auton ho ochlos
 Jesus.ACC praise.AOR.3SG he.ACC the crowd.NOM
- b. БЫСТЪ же егда възврати сѧ ѿсѧ
 bystъ že egda vъzvratī sę iŕŕ
 be.AOR.3SG PTCL when return.AOR.3SG REFL Jesus.NOM

⁹ Including one *l*-participle which is treated as finite here, 36723.

¹⁰ The only two examples where the Greek nominalised infinitive is rendered with an infinitive have had the infinitives reinterpreted as purpose infinitives in the OCS translation (Lk. 2.27, 40031; Lk 5.17, 40183).

¹¹ For further discussion, see the next section.

приѣтъ и народъ.
 prijety i narodъ
 receive.AOR.3SG he.ACC people.NOM

‘And it came to pass that, when Jesus returned, the people received him’
 (Lk. 8.40, 48405, 40443)

In the second group, the Greek AcI serves as a predicate in a *hōste* or *prin* clause. Again we find no AcI renditions in the OCS translation. All of the seven *prin* clauses are rendered with a *prěžde* clause in the OCS dataset, and all of these examples have a finite predicate, as in (4). The *hōste* clauses are all rendered by *jako* clauses in OCS, eight with a finite predicate (7) and nine with an infinitive predicate (3). Eight out of nine infinitive predicates have dative subjects (3), and the final example has no subject, but a voice mismatch with the Greek, so that the Greek subject is aligned with the OCS object (8). For a discussion of the tendency in OCS to translate Greek passive infinitives as active ones under certain circumstances, see Tomelleri (this volume).

- (7) a. καὶ [. . .] ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων, ὥστε
 kai [. . .] exēlthen emprosthen pantōn hōste
 and go_out.AOR.3SG before all.GEN.PL so_that
 ἐξίστασθαι πάντας
 existasthai pantas
 be_amazed.INF.AOR all.ACC.PL
- b. ι изиде прѣдъ вьсѣми. ꙗко дивѣахъ
 i izide prědъ vьsěmi jako divljaaxo
 and go_out.AOR.3SG before all.INS.PL so_that wonder.IMPERF.3PL
 ца вьси
 sę vьsi
 REFL all.NOM.PL
- ‘and he went out before them all, so that they were all amazed’
 (Mk. 2.12, 6578, 50245)

- (8) a. καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ
 kai dōsousin sēmeia megala kai
 and give.FUT.3PL sign.N.ACC.PL great.N.ACC.PL and
 τέρατα, ὥστε πλανηθῆναι, εἰ
 terata hōste planēthēnai ei
 miracle.N.ACC.PL so_that deceive.INF.AOR.PASS if

- δυνατόν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.
 dunaton kai tous eklektous
 possible.N.NOM.SG even the chosen.M.ACC.PL
 b. и дадеѣтъ знамениѣ велиѣ и
 i dadęť znamenija velija i
 and give.PRS.3PL sign.N.ACC.PL great.N.ACC.PL and
 чудеса. ꙗко прѣлѣстити. аште естъ
 čjudeša jako přěľstiti ašte estť
 miracle.N.ACC.PL so_that deceive.INF if be.PRS.3SG
 възможѣно избѣранѣа.
 vŕzmožęno izbŕranyję
 possible.N.NOM.SG chosen.M.ACC.PL
 ‘and they will perform signs and miracles in order for even the chosen
 ones to be mislead, if possible’ (Mt. 24.24, 15901, 39480)

The first syntactic type is where we find the only examples of OCS ACIs, namely in translations of Greek ACIs tagged COMP. As demonstrated in example (2), not all of these are plain complements of the typical selection of complement-taking verbs – instead they may be clausal subject-like arguments of copular, existential or modal verbs. There are 58 such examples in the Marianus dataset, where the OCS verb translates a Greek ACI headed by the verbs *gignomai* ‘become’, *eimi* ‘be’, *exesti* ‘be possible’, *endekhomai* ‘be possible’ or *dei* ‘be necessary’. Only 8 of the OCS translations have been analysed as containing a COMP infinitive construction, for example (9), none of them with an accusative subject.

- (9) a. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ
 Egeneto de en heterōi sabbatōi
 happen.AOR.3SG PTCL in other.SG.DAT Sabbath.DAT
 εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ διδάσκειν.
 eiselthein auton eis tēn sunagōgēn kai didaskein
 enter.INF.AOR he.ACC in the synagogue.ACC and teach.INF.PRS
 b. Бѣсть же и въ другѣхъ соботѣхъ.
 Bystť že i vŕ drugŕjŕ sobotŕ
 be.AOR.3SG PTCL also in other.ACC.SG Sabbath.ACC
 вѣнити ему въ сѣньмиште и оучити.
 vŕniti emu vŕ sŕňmĩšte i učiti
 enter.INF he.DAT in synagogue.ACC and teach.INF
 ‘And it came to pass also on another sabbath that he entered into the
 synagogue and taught’ (Lk. 6.6, 20453, 40228)

This does not mean that the remaining 50 examples do not contain infinitives and potential dative subjects – most of them do. But in most cases it is possible to analyse the dative argument as an argument or adverbial dependent of the head verb rather than the subject of the infinitive. This is the case in 37 of the examples, such as (2), where the camel is taken to be an adverbial dependent on *estō* ‘is’, and (10), where the dative is taken to be the oblique argument of *podobati* ‘be suitable’.¹²

- (10) a. δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν.
 dei humas gennēthēnai anōthen
 be_necessary.PRS.3SG you.ACC.PL give_birth.INF.AOR.PASS from_above
 b. ποδοβαατῷ вамъ роди́ти сѧ съ вѣше.
 podobaatō vamъ roditi sę sъ vyše
 be_suitable.PRS.3SG you.DAT.PL give_birth.INF REFL from higher
 ‘you must be born from above’ (Jn. 3.7, 22011, 41716)

The same case could clearly be made for *dei* ‘be necessary’, but different annotation choices were made for OCS and Greek. In Greek it was deemed useful to find all the potential ACIs. OCS, on the other hand, has a large number of verbs that take a dative argument and an infinitive, and verbs like *podobati* were grouped with them. In this group, only examples such as (9) can be considered clear-cut examples of DCI, and there are no OCS ACI translations. There are, however, two dative absolutes.

This ambiguity is even clearer when we look at Greek COMP ACIs headed by the causative or jussive (and related) verbs *katakrinō* ‘judge, deem’, *keleuō* ‘order’, *kōluō* ‘hinder’, *poieō* ‘make’, *axioō* ‘deem worthy’, *aphiemi* ‘allow’, *eaō* ‘allow’, *erōtaō* ‘ask’ and *ōpheleō* ‘profit’ (26 examples). Here, the ACI cannot be considered a clausal subject of the head verb, but it is clearly possible to see the accusative as an argument of the main verb rather than the subject of the infinitive. Again, the latter analysis was chosen in OCS, where all the corresponding accusative or dative nominals are considered arguments of their head verb, as in (11) and (12), and are listed under argument infinitives in Table 1.

- (11) a. καὶ τοὺς κωφοὺς ποιεῖ ἀκούειν καὶ
 kai tous kōphous poiei akouein kai
 even the deaf.M.ACC.PL make.PRS.3SG hear.INF.PRS and

¹² In all of these examples, the infinitive is headed by *podobati* ‘be suitable’, *dostojati* ‘be worthy’ or *byti* ‘be’. They are included in Table 1 as argument infinitives.

- ἀλάλους λαλεῖν.
 alalous lalein
 dumb.M.ACC.PL speak.INF.PRS
- b. γλοῦχῃα творитъ слышати. и нѣмѣа
 gluxyĭe tvoritъ slyšati i nĕmyĭe
 deaf.M.ACC.PL make.PRS.3SG hear.INF and dumb.M.ACC.PL
 ᾱλατι
 glati
 speak.INF
 ‘He even makes the deaf hear and the mute speak’ (Mk. 7.37, 6896, 50377)
- (12) a. κέλευσόν με ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σὲ ἐπὶ
 keleuson me elthein pros se epi
 order.IMP.2SG.AOR I.ACC come.INF.AOR to self.ACC on
 τὰ ὕδατα·
 ta hudata
 the water.ACC.PL
- b. повели ми прити къ тебѣ по водамъ.
 poveli mi priti къ tebě po vodamъ
 order.IMP.2SG I.DAT come.INF to you.DAT along water.DAT.PL
 ‘command me to come to you on the water’ (Mt. 14.28, 15318, 50862)

Thus, there are no clear-cut examples of AclIs or DclIs in this group.

The place to look for “real” OCS AclIs and DclIs therefore turns out to be the group of Greek AclIs tagged as COMPs that do not belong to any of the two above-mentioned groups. There are 28 such examples (Table 2). They are headed by speech, perception and thought verbs, primarily *legō* ‘say’ (14 examples), and in none of the 28 examples is there an alternative syntactic analysis available for the Greek accusative subject.

Table 2: OCS renditions of Greek Acl complements of speech and thought verbs.

Finite clause	6
Acl	9
Dcl	3
Complement infinitive without subject	1
Argument infinitive	1
Accusative with participle	4
Other	4

In this group, the most common rendition is actually the AcI (Table 2). However, eight of the nine examples are extremely similar to example (1), as we can see in (13). Seven of these examples are headed by *legō* ‘say’ (one has *nerbševati* ‘think, consider’), and the infinitive is *einai/byti* in all of them.

- (13) a. τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι;
 tina me legousin hoi anthrōpoi einai
 who.ACC I.ACC say.PRS.3PL the man.NOM.PL be.INF.PRS
- b. кого ма гл҃ѣтъ ѡвци бѣти.
 kogo me gljotъ člvcī byti
 who.GEN/ACC I.ACC say.PRS.3PL man.NOM.PL be.INF
 ‘Who do people say I am?’ (Mk. 8.27, 6946, 36789)

The exception is (14).

- (14) a. καὶ Πειλᾶτος ἐπέκρινεν γενέσθαι τὸ
 kai Peilatos epekrinen genesthai to
 and Pilate.NOM judge.AOR.3SG become.INF.AOR the
 αἷτημα αὐτῶν.
 aitēma autōn
 demand.ACC.SG they.GEN.PL
- b. Пилатъ же посѣди бѣти прошение ихъ.
 Pilatъ že posōdi byti prošenje ixъ
 Pilate.NOM PTCL judge.AOR.3PL be.INF demand.ACC they.GEN.PL
 “and Pilate pronounced sentence that their demand be granted”
 (Lk. 23.24, 21760, 41483)

We only find three clear examples of the DcI in this group, all variations of (15):

- (15) a. Καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν,
 Kai erchontai Saddoukaioi pros auton
 and come.PRS.3PL Sadducee.NOM.PL to he.ACC
 οἵτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι
 hoitines legousin anastasin mē einai
 who.NOM say.PRS.3PL resurrection.ACC not be.INF.PRS
- b. ꙗ придиѣ сѣдоукѣи къ немѹ иже
 i pridō sadukei kъ nemu iže
 and come.AOR.3PL Sadducee.NOM.PL to he.DAT who.NOM.PL

ГЛАЖЪТЪ НЕ БЪТИ ВЪСКРЪШЕНИЮ
 gljotъ ne byti vьskrěšeniju
 say.PRS.3PL not be.INF resurrection.DAT
 ‘And Sadducees came to him, who say that there is no resurrection’
 (Mk. 12.18, 7228, 37058)

We also find four examples of accusative + participle constructions, which (Kurešević 2018) considers important support for the AcI pattern in OCS (see also Večerka 2002: 447–449 and Tomelleri this volume). This is regularly found with perception verbs in OCS and Greek. In (16), the head verb is actually a perception verb in both languages, but Greek uses an AcI, while OCS has the regular accusative + participle.

- (16) a. ὅτι ἤκουσαν τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποικέναι
 hoti ēkousan touto auton pepoiēkenai
 because hear.AOR.3PL this.N.ACC.SG he.ACC.SG do.INF.PERF
 τὸ σημεῖον.
 to sēmeion
 the sign.ACC
- b. ꙗко слышаша и сътворишь се
 jako slyšaše i sъtvorьšь se
 because hear.AOR.3PL he.ACC do.PTCP.PST.M.ACC.SG this.N.ACC.SG
 знамение
 znamenie
 sign.ACC
 ‘because they had heard that he had performed this sign’
 (Jn. 12.18, 22825, 42492)

Two of the examples are headed by thought verbs, which not infrequently pattern with perception verbs in this respect in OCS (17).

- (17) a. ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι.
 hoti ēideisan ton Christon auton einai
 because know.PLUPRF.3PL the Christ.ACC he.ACC be.INF.PRS
- b. ꙗко вѣдѣахѡ х҃а сам҃о҃го
 jako vĕděaxo xa samogo
 because know.IMPERF.3PL Christ.GEN/ACC self.M.GEN/ACC.SG
 с҃ѡшта.
 sqšta
 be.PTCP.PRS.M.GEN/ACC.SG
 ‘because they knew that he was the Christ’ (Lk. 4.41, 20373, 40151)

But there is also a single example where *glagolati* ‘say’ takes an accusative + participle construction.

- (18) a. ὅτι λέγετε ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλειν
 hoti legete en Beelzeboul ekballein
 for say.PRS.2PL in Beelzebul.INDECL throw_out.INF.PRS
 με τὰ δαιμόνια.
 me ta daimonia
 I.ACC the demon.ACC.PL
- b. ꙗко ꙗте о вельзѣвулѣ изгонѣшъ
 jako glte o velʹdzěvulě izgoněštʹ
 for say.PRS.2PL by Beelzebul.LOC drive_out.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG
 ꙗа ѿсѣи.
 me běsy
 I.ACC demon.ACC.PL
 ‘For you say that I cast out demons by Beelzebul’ (Lk. 11.18, 20917, 40671)

The rest of the examples either have finite complement clauses (19, 20) or various types of rephrasing.

- (19) a. καὶ εἶπεν φωνηθῆναι αὐτῷ τοὺς
 kai eipen phōnēthēnai autōi tous
 and say.AOR.3SG call.INF.AOR.PASS he.DAT the.M.ACC.PL
 δούλους τούτους
 doulous toutous
 servant.ACC.PL that.M.ACC.PL
- b. ꙗ рече да пригласаѣхъ емоу рабы
 i reče da priglasēxʹ emu raby
 and say.AOR.3SG that summon.PRS.3PL he.DAT servant.ACC.PL
 ꙗи.
 ty
 that.M.ACC.PL
 ‘he ordered these servants to be called to him’ (Lk. 19.15, 21427, 41161)
- (20) a. πεπεισμένος γάρ ἐστιν Ἰωάννην
 pepeismenos gar estin Iōannēn
 convince.PTCP.PRF.PASS.M.NOM.SG for be.PRS.3SG John.ACC
 προφήτην εἶναι.
 prophētēn einai
 prophet.ACC be.INF.PRS

b.	извѣстѣно	бо	бѣ	людемъ.	ѣко
	izvěstĕno	bo	bě	ljudemъ	jako
	known.N.NOM.SG	for	be.IMPERF.3SG	people.DAT.PL	that
	иоанъ	прѣкъ	бѣ.		
	ioanъ	prĕkъ	bě		
	John.NOM	prophet.NOM	be.IMPERF.3SG		
	'for they are convinced that John was a prophet' (Lk. 20.6, 21491, 51655)				

To conclude, we see that the translation of Greek AcIs is remarkably free in the Marianus dataset, with a wide range of constructions used for various purposes. OCS only responds with an AcI translation in a very small and restricted group of examples, namely in cases where the Greek AcI is a 'true' complement of a typical complement-taking verb. This may potentially be due to the support from accusative with participle constructions.

The use of unambiguous DcIs is also very limited – we see very few examples rendering 'true' complement AcIs. There are a few examples rendering Greek AcIs in the *egeneto* 'it came to pass' construction, and also some examples where the DcI serves as the predicate in a *jako* clause. There is, however, a large number of examples where the structure is ambiguous: the dative could be an argument of the head verb or the subject of a DcI. This is also the case for the accusative in many of the Greek AcI examples.

In quite a few cases, however, the OCS translation avoids an infinitive construction altogether. It will often render the AcIs as finite adverbial or complement clauses, and quite systematically opts for the dative absolute in cases where the Greek has a nominalised AcI dependent on the preposition *en*.

What we see, then, is that the usage of the AcI in OCS was considerably narrower than that observed by Gavrančić in 16th–19th century Croatian texts and by Tomelleri in 16th century Russian Church Slavonic, even in a situation with similar influence from a language rich in AcIs.

2 Dative absolute

Mihaljević's (2017) study of the dative absolute in the 15th century Croatian Glagolitic Second Beram Breviary shows us the construction at a stage where it was obsolete in the vernacular and susceptible to contact influence from Latin,

yielding instrumental absolutes. As Mihaljević points out, the situation was very different in OCS.¹³

When we look at the status of the dative absolute in the Marianus dataset, we find that it is very different from that of the accusative with infinitive. The overall frequency of the Greek genitive absolute is similar to the frequency of (potential) Greek AclS. We find 153 aligned examples where either OCS, Greek or both have an absolute construction. However, in as many as 124 of these cases there is a match, as in (21), where Greek has a genitive absolute which is translated by a dative absolute in the Marianus.

- (21) a. ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῶν θυρῶν
 erchetai ho Iēsous tōn thurōn
 come.PRS.3SG the Jesus.NOM the door.GEN.PL
 κεκλεισμένων, καὶ ἕστη εἰς τὸ μέσον
 kekleismenōn kai estē eis to meson
 shut.PTCP.PRF.PASS.F.GEN.PL and stand.AOR.3SG in the middle.ACC
- b. Приде Ἰс двѣремь затворѣнамъ.
 Pride is dvvremь zatvorenāmъ
 come.AOR.3PL Jesus.NOM door.DAT.PL shut.PTCP.PST.PASS.F.DAT.PL
 ι στα πο срѣдѣ
 i sta po srědě
 and stand.AOR.3SG at middle.DAT
 ‘Though the doors were locked, Jesus came and stood among them’
 (Jn. 20.26, 23359, 52175)

These matching examples are quite uniform. The subject part of speech is the same in all examples. The order of participle and subject is generally the same (ten exceptions, see (22)).

- (22) a. Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος πολλοὶ
 Tauta autou lalountos polloi
 this.ACC.PL he.GEN say.PTCP.PRS.M.GEN.SG many.M.NOM.PL
 ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν.
 episteusan eis auton
 believe.AOR.3PL in he.ACC

¹³ See also Tomelleri’s discussion of “contaminated” dative absolutes with overt subordinators (this volume).

b.	си	҃ѡѡѡѡѡѡ	емоу	мѣноси
	si	gljoštju	emu	mъnodzi
	this.ACC.PL	say.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG	he.DAT	many.M.NOM.PL
	вѣроваша	въ него		
	věrovaše	vъ nego		
	believe.AOR.3PL	in he.GEN/ACC		
	'As he was saying these things, many believed in him' (Jn. 8.30, 22495, 42174)			

The tense/aspect of the participle also largely follows the Greek (as is generally the case, see Eckhoff & Haug 2015). OCS has no perfect participle that can be used for this type of construction, but renders all six Greek examples with past participles (21). Apart from that, aorist participles are rendered with past participles (36 examples) and present participles with present participles (78 examples).¹⁴

Given the homogeneous nature of these examples, it is interesting to see that there are also mismatches in both directions: There are OCS dative absolutes that are not translations of Greek genitive absolutes (22 examples), and Greek genitive absolutes that are not translated into OCS dative absolutes.

In the first group we see two main types. The OCS dative absolute may, as we have already seen, translate an Acl, typically a nominalised one in an *en*+DAT PP (5). There are 13 such examples, two of which do not occur in *en*+DAT PPs but as subject-like arguments in *egeneto* constructions (23).¹⁵

(23) a.	καὶ	γίνεται	κατακεῖσθαι	αὐτὸν ἐν
	kai	ginetai	katakeisthai	auton en
	and	happen.PRS.3SG	lie_at_table.INF.AOR	he.ACC in
	τῇ οἰκίᾳ	αὐτοῦ		
	tēi oikiai	autou		
	the house.DAT	he.GEN		

¹⁴ There is one apparent example of an aorist participle rendered by a present participle, but that is due to a textual mismatch (Lk. 11.53). There are also three examples of Greek present participles rendered by past participles, two of which are renditions of the Greek present participle *ginomenou* 'becoming', where OCS has no exact counterpart. The third example is in Lk. 2.42 and has the present participle *anabainontōn* 'going down' rendered by the past participle *въшедъшею* 'having entered'.

¹⁵ The Byzantine majority text has an *en*+DAT PP here, but not in the second example of the same type, Mk 2.23.

- b. ι вѣистъ вѣзлѣжашю еμου вѣ
 i bystъ vѣzležestju emu vѣ
 and happen.AOR.3SG lie_at_table.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG he.DAT in
 дому его.
 domu ego
 house.LOC he.GEN
 ‘And it happened that He was reclining at the table in his house’
 (Mk. 2.15, 6584, 50249)

The second main type is OCS dative absolutes rendering Greek adverbial participle constructions in the dative (five examples) or accusative (two examples). As we can see in example (24), these examples do have participles that pick up the case of an argument of the main verb, with which they are coreferential, but they are very like absolute constructions in that they seem to have their own subject. Such constructions are analysed as absolute constructions in the PROIEL annotation of the Greek text – the first *autōi* is analysed as the subject of *katabanti*, while the second *autōi* is the oblique argument of *ēkolouthēsan*. In the OCS translation there is no case match between *emu* and *ego*.

- (24) a. Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους
 Katabanti de autōi apo tou orous
 go_down.PTCP.AOR.M.DAT.SG PTCL he.DAT from the mountain.GEN
 ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί.
 ēkolouthēsan autōi ochloi polloi
 follow.AOR3PL he.DAT crowd.NOM.PL many.M.NOM.PL
- b. Сѣшедъшу же еμου сѣ горѣ.
 Sѣsedъšu že emu sѣ gory
 go_down.PTCP.PST.M.DAT.SG PTCL he.DAT from mountain.GEN
 въ слѣдѣ его идѣ народи мѣноси.
 vѣ slēdѣ ego idѣ narodi mѣnodzi
 in track.ACC he.GEN go.AOR.3PL crowd.NOM.PL many.M.NOM.PL
 ‘When he came down from the mountain, great crowds followed him’
 (Mt. 8.1, 14908, 38496)

Example (25) is very similar, but with an accusative participle construction.

- (25) a. ἐξελθόντα δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα,
 exelthonta de auton eis ton pulōna
 go_out.PTCP.AOR.M.ACC.SG PTCL he.ACC in the gate.ACC

εἶδεν	αὐτὸν	ἄλλη			
eiden	auton	allē			
see.AOR.3SG	he.ACC	other.F.NOM.SG			
b.					
ишѣдѣшу		же	ему	въ	врата.
išǫdǫšu		že	emu	vъ	vrata
go_out.PTCP.PST.M.DAT.SG		PTCL	he.DAT	in	gate.ACC.PL
узырѣ	и	другаѣ			
uzyrĕ	i	drugaja			
see.AOR.3SG	he.ACC	other.F.NOM.SG			
'And when he went out to the entrance, another (servant girl) saw him'					
(Mt. 26.71, 16129, 51169)					

In addition, there are two examples (Jh 2.3 and Mk 4.6) where Greek finite adverbial clauses are seemingly translated into dative absolutes. However, in both cases multiple text variants, including the Byzantine majority text, deviate from Tischendorf and have genitive absolutes.

There are seven apparent examples of Greek genitive absolutes that are not rendered as OCS dative absolutes. On closer inspection, though, there are only two examples that seem reasonably reliable, (26) and the similar Lk. 14.29. Both of them translate a genitive absolute into an *egda* adverbial clause with a finite predicate.

- (26) a. καὶ ἐλθὼντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν
 kai elthontos autou eis to hieron
 and come.PTCP.AOR.M.GEN.SG he.GEN in the temple.ACC
 προσῆλθον αὐτῷ διδάσκοντι
 prosēlthon autōi didaskonti
 approach.AOR.3PL he.DAT teach.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG
 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς
 hoi archiereis
 the chief_priest.NOM.PL
- b. ι εгда приде въ ѿрквъ. пристѣпиша
 i egda pride vъ crkvъ pristopiše
 and when come.AOR.3SG in temple.ACC approach.AOR.3PL
 къ нему учащу. архiereи
 kъ nemu učaštju archierei
 to he.DAT teach.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG chief_priest.NOM.PL
- ‘And when he entered the temple, the chief priests came up to him as he was teaching’ (Mt. 21.23, 15697, 39280)

The rest of the examples either lack genitive absolutes in multiple text variants including the Byzantine majority text (Mt. 17.26, Lk. 23.24), really do have dative absolutes which are difficult to capture in queries (Jh. 6.23, Jh. 21.11) or translate a Greek construction that would be difficult to render directly (27).

- (27) a. Ἦδη δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς μεσοῦσης
 Hēdē de tēs heortēs mesousēs
 now PTCL the feast.GEN be_in_middle.F.GEN.SG
 ἀνέβη Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν καὶ
 anebē Iēsous eis to hieron kai
 go_up.AOR.3SG Jesus.NOM in the temple.ACC and
 ἐδίδασκεν
 edidasken
 teach.IMPERF.3SG
- b. Абие же въ прѣполовленіе прасѣдника.
 Abie že vъ prěpolovlenie prasdñnika
 now PTCL in middle.ACC feast.GEN
 възиде ѿс въ цркъ и
 vъzide is vъ crkь i
 go_up.AOR.3SG Jesus.NOM in temple.ACC and
 оучаше.
 učaaše
 teach.IMPERF.3SG
 ‘About the middle of the feast Jesus went up into the temple and began teaching’ (Jn. 7.14, 22344, 42043)

It seems likely that the translator had difficulty finding an OCS verb matching the Greek *mesoō* ‘be in the middle’, and chose a solution with a prepositional phrase instead.

To conclude, we see that OCS largely follows the Greek and translates genitive absolutes (and other absolute constructions) as dative absolutes. There is also evidence of systematic use of dative absolutes to render Greek AcIs, certainly when the AcI is nominalised and occurs in an adverbial PP. The status of the dative absolute is thus clearly very different from that of the AcI, which is only marginally used in a very narrow set of contexts. The dative absolute, on the other hand, is almost always acceptable when the Greek has a genitive absolute. This evidence supports the position that the dative absolute was a native Slavonic construction, but that the AcI was not. It is also clear that a substantial change must have taken place from the time of the translation of the Codex Marianus to Mihaljević’s 15th century Croatian source.

3 Deverbal nouns

As we have already seen, Tomelleri's study brings up a number of syntactic topics, but the one I will concentrate on here is an interesting usage of deverbal nouns in a 16th-century Russian Church Slavonic translation from Latin (Bruno's commented Psalter). In this text, as in a number of other earlier and later translations from Latin into several of the Church Slavonic recensions, productive verbal nouns in *-(en)ije* regularly translate Latin gerundive purpose constructions; in Tomelleri's example (2a; this volume), *кѣ пролитію крови* translates *ad effundendum sanguinem* '(in order) to shed blood'.

Deverbal nouns are very common in the Marianus dataset as well, and may easily be found since the PROIEL treebank has dedicated tagging for relational nouns. Looking at this tagging alone, there are 1070 occurrences of deverbal nouns with a Greek alignment in the dataset, 460 of which belong to a lemma ending in *-ije*. This formation is predictable and type frequent enough for Lunt (2001) to include it in all his OCS verbal paradigms (listed as "verbal substantive"), but as he points out, they often take on new, often resultative meanings, and may deserve their own entries in dictionaries (Lunt 2001:172). The great majority of these productive deverbal nouns (421 occurrences) are translations of Greek common nouns, most of them transparently deverbal, but derived with a variety of different suffixes, such as *anastasis* 'resurrection' (*-is*), *baptisma* 'baptism' (*-ma*), *epithumia* 'desire' (*-ia*) and many others. They occur in a wide range of constructions and environments, most frequently as subjects and objects of verbs or complements of prepositions, and overwhelmingly follow the Greek syntax. The nouns in these examples often have meanings other than pure process meanings (28), though the latter are also found (29).

- (28) a. καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσεν τὸν ἀσπασμὸν
 kai egeneto hōs ēkousen ton aspasmon
 and happen.AOR.3SG when hear.AOR.3SG the greeting.ACC
 τῆς Μαρίας ἡ Ἐλισάβετ, ἐσκίρτησεν
 tēs Marias hē Elisabet eskirtēsen
 the Mary.GEN the Elizabeth.NOM leap.AOR.3SG
 τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς.
 to brephos en tēi koiliai autēs
 the infant.NOM in the womb.DAT she.GEN
- b. ѿ бѣистѣ ꙗко услыша елисаветѣ
 i bystŭ jako uslyša elisavetŭ
 and be.AOR.3SG when hear.AOR.3SG Elizabeth.NOM

цѣлованіе	мариино	възигра	са
cělovanie	mariino	vъzигра	sę
greeting.ACC	Mary_in.N.NOM.SG	play.AOR.3SG	REFL
младѣнецъ	въ	чрѣвѣ	єѧ
mladъnecъ	vъ	čřevě	eje
infant.NOM	in	womb.LOC	she.GEN
'When Elizabeth heard Mary's greeting, the baby leaped in her womb'			
(Lk. 1.41 20195, 39966)			

- (29) a. καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐξηγοῦντο τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ
 kai autoi exēgounto ta en tēi hodōi
 and they tell.IMPERF.3PL the.ACC in the way.DAT
 καὶ ὡς ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει
 kai hōs egnōsthē autois en tēi klasei
 and how recognise.AOR.3SG.PASS they.DAT in the breaking.DAT
 τοῦ ἄρτου
 tou artou
 the bread.GEN
- b. ѿ та повѣдаашете ꙗже
 i ta povēdaašete jaže
 and they.NOM.DU tell.IMPERF.3DU which.N.ACC.PL
 бѣша на пѣти ѿ ꙗко са позна
 byše na pōti i jako sę pozna
 be.AOR.3PL on way.LOC and that REFL recognise.AOR.3SG
 има въ прѣломленіи хлѣба
 ima vъ prělomlenii xlěba
 they.INS.DU in breaking.LOC bread.GEN
 'Then the two told what had happened on the way, and how Jesus was
 recognized by them when he broke the bread' (Lk. 24.35, 21848, 41570)

There are also 11 occurrences where the OCS deverbal noun translates an adjective. These are all cases of nominalised adjectives in Greek, and thus resemble the noun-to-noun translations very much.

The really interesting group are the 28 occurrences of deverbal nouns translating a Greek verb, and primarily the 16 occurrences that translate Greek infinitives, since they are more likely to tell us something about the independent functions of the OCS deverbal noun. 14 out of 16 such occurrences render Greek prepositional phrases with a nominalised infinitive complement as a prepositional phrase with the deverbal noun as the complement. The semantics depends on the choice of preposition; there are seven occurrences with temporal semantics (30), six occurrences with

purpose semantics (three of which can be seen in 31), and a single example with causal semantics (32).

- (30) a. μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με προάξω
 meta de to egerthēnai me prosaxō
 after PTCL the.ACC rise.INF.AOR.PASS I.ACC go_before.PRS.1SG
 ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν
 humas eis tēn Galilaian
 you.ACC.PL in the Galilee.ACC

- b. по вѣск[р]ѣсноуєни же моему вѣрѣю
 po vѣsk[r]ѣsnoveni že moemu varějo
 after resurrection.LOC PTCL my.N.LOC.SG go_before.PRS.1SG
 въ въ галилеи
 vy vъ galilei
 you.ACC in Galilee.LOC
 ‘But after I have risen, I will go ahead of you into Galilee’
 (Mt. 26.32, 16050, 39627)

- (31) a. καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ
 kai paradōsousin auton tois ethnesin eis to
 and deliver.FUT.3SG he.ACC the Gentiles.DAT in the.ACC
 ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι
 empaixai kai mastigōsai kai staurōsai
 mock.INF.AOR and flog.INF.AOR and crucify.INF.AOR

- b. ѿ прѣдѣдѣтъ ѿ на порѣганіє
 i prědadetъ i na poroganie
 and deliver.PRS.3SG he.ACC on mocking.ACC
 ѿ ꙗꙗꙗꙗ ꙗꙗ биеніє ѿ пропѣтъ
 jęzkmъ i bienie i propetъ
 tribes.DAT and beating.ACC and crucifixion.ACC
 ‘and they will deliver him over to the Gentiles to be mocked and flogged and crucified’ (Mt. 20.19, 15632, 39215)

- (32) a. καὶ διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν
 kai dia to plēthunthēnai tēn anomian
 and through the.ACC increase.INF.AOR.PASS the lawlessness.ACC
 ψυγῆσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν
 psugēsetai hē agapē tōn pollōn
 chill.FUT.3SG.PASS the love.NOM the many.GEN

- b.

ι	за	оумѣноженіе	бєзаконіѣ	исакнетѣ
i	za	uměnoženie	bezakonija	isęknetě
and	for	increase.ACC	lawlessness.GEN	dry_out.PRS.3SG
- | | |
|----------|----------|
| любы | мѣногыѣ |
| ljuby | měnogyxě |
| love.NOM | many.GEN |
- ‘And because lawlessness will be increased, the love of many will grow cold.’ (Mt. 24.12, 15890, 39469)

It is worth noting that both example (30) and (32) involve Greek accusatives with infinitives, both with passive infinitives, both of which are rarely directly translated from Greek even when they are not nominalised, as Tomelleri points out in his article in this volume.

There are also twelve occurrences of deverbal nouns translating Greek participles, but eleven of those can be disregarded, as they represent the noun *iměnije* translating the Greek participle *huparkhōn* in the sense ‘possession’. The last one, however, is much more interesting, as it translates a genitive absolute: as already seen, in Jh. 7.14 (example 27 above) *tēs heortēs mesousēs* is rendered by *въ прѣполовленіе прасѣбника*. As we saw previously, one of the independent functions of the dative absolute in OCS is to render precisely prepositional phrases with nominalised infinitive complements, and the existence of examples such as (27) serve as a nice bridging context between dative absolutes and constructions with productive deverbal nouns.

All in all there are strong indications that the use of deverbal nouns of the productive *-ije* type was not much influenced by Greek in the Marianus dataset. We find that they were used for a wide range of Greek deverbal noun formations, and have not specialised with a specific derivation type. We also see that they are quite frequently used to render Greek nominalised infinitives, usually in prepositional phrases, which suggests that they could have a very verbal character. It would therefore seem that the choice to render Latin gerundive constructions with such nouns in later texts is quite consistent with their distribution and semantics in canonical OCS.

4 PP connectors

Kisiel and Sobotka’s study discusses the grammaticalization of prepositional phrases as linking particles. They note that this process is particularly common in West Slavonic, a fact that the authors partially ascribe to the influence of Latin.

The authors make the point that the Latin complex particle *ita-que* could more easily motivate a Slavonic PP rendition, while Greek had *oun* for the same function, which would lend itself better to be translated by a single discourse particle. When we look at the Marianus dataset, we see that this is true: all occurrences of Greek *oun* are translated into OCS discourse particles, predominantly *že* (167 out of 258 occurrences) and *ubo* (86 occurrences), but also scattered occurrences of *i* (3 occurrences), *bo* (one occurrence) and *da* (one occurrence). (33) and (34) are typical examples.

- (33) a. λέγει οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος
 legei oun ho mathētēs ekeinos
 say.PRS.3SG PTCL the disciple.NOM that.M.NOM.SG
 ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ
 hon ēgapa ho Iēsous tōi
 who.M.NOM.SG love.IMPERF.3SG the Jesus.NOM the
 Πέτρῳ·
 Petrōi
 Peter.DAT
- b. гла же ученикъ егоже
 gla že učenikъ egože
 say.AOR.3SG PTCL disciple.NOM who.M.GEN/ACC.SG
 любаѣше ѿсѣ петрови.
 ljubjaše isъ petrovi
 love.IMPERF.3SG Jesus.NOM Peter.DAT
 ‘Then the disciple whom Jesus loved said to Peter’ (Jh. 21.7, 23387, 43002)
- (34) a. γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν
 grēgoreite oun hoti ouk oidate tēn
 wake.IMP.2PL PTCL because not know.PRF.2PL the
 ἡμέραν οὐδὲ τὴν ὥραν.
 hēmeran oude tēn hōran
 day.ACC nor the hour.ACC
- b. будите убо ꙗко не вѣсте дньи
 būdite ubo jako ne vĕste dñni
 wake.IMP.2PL PTCL because not know.PRS.2PL day.GEN
 ни часа
 ni časa
 nor hour.GEN
 ‘Watch therefore, for you know neither the day nor the hour’
 (Mt. 25.13, 15949, 39529)

Seemingly, the translator picks *že* when the inferential semantics is less clear: ‘then’, *ubo* when it is more clear: ‘therefore’.

The authors also claim that combinations of prepositions and demonstratives with this type of content are rare in OCS. This is largely true, certainly there are no examples in the Marianus material of the three constructions in focus in their article: Russian *potomu* ‘therefore’, Czech *nadto* ‘moreover’ and Polish *zatem/zatem* ‘thus’. There are, however, two recurring PPs with similar semantics, which often render single Greek discourse particles: *kъ tomu* ‘still’ and *po tomъ* ‘then’.

The former PP consistently occurs with a negated verb to render Greek *ouketi* ‘no longer’ (14 examples) and *mēketi* ‘no longer’ (six examples), as shown in (35) and (36).

- (35) a. οὐκέτι γὰρ ἐτόλμων ἐπερωτᾶν αὐτὸν
ouketi gar etolmōn eperōtan auton
no_longer PTCL dare.IMPERF.3PL ask.INF.PRS he.ACC
οὐδέν.
ouden
nothing.ACC
- b. къ томоу же не съмѣахо его
kъ tomu že ne sŭmĕaĥo ego
to that.N.DAT.SG PTCL not dare.IMPERF.3PL he.GEN
вѣпрашати ницьсоже.
vĕprašati ničŕsože
ask.INF nothing.GEN
And they no longer dared to ask him anything (Lk. 20.40, 21550, 41279)
- (36) a. πορεύου καὶ μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε.
poreuou kai mēketi hamartane
go.IMP.2SG and no_longer sin.IMP.2SG
- b. иди и отъ селѣ не съгрѣшай к томоу
idi i otъ selĕ ne sŭgrĕšai k tomu
go.IMP.2SG and from now not sin.IMP.2SG to that.N.DAT.SG
Go and sin no more (Jn. 8.11, 22453, 42135)

The two Greek adverbs are both combinations of a negation (*ou*, *mē*) and *eti* ‘still’. In the OCS expression the demonstrative pronoun *tъ* must at some point have referred back to a time specified in the previous context, but as it appears in the Marianus it seems quite grammaticalised, and can hardly be a calque of the Greek

adverbs. Interestingly, the non-negated *eti* ‘still’ is consistently rendered as *ešte* ‘still’, not *kъ tomu*.¹⁶

The PP *po tomъ* ‘then’ is semantically closer to the grammaticalised particles studied by the authors and is also interesting in that it translates a wider range of Greek structures. Its most common correspondence is Greek *eita* ‘then’ (eight out of 17 examples), as seen in (37), and the related *epeita* ‘then’ (one example).

- (37) a. εἴτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς
 eita palin epethēken tas cheiras epi tous
 then again put.AOR.3SG the hand.ACC.PL on the
 ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ
 ophthalmous autou
 eye.ACC.PL he.GEN
- b. по томъ же пакы възложи рѣцѣ
 po tomъ že paky vъzloži rѣcě
 after that.N.LOC.SG PTCL again put.AOR.3SG hand.ACC.DU
 на очи его
 na očī ego
 on eye.ACC.DU he.GEN
 ‘Then he laid his hands on his eyes again’ (Mk. 8.25, 6941, 36784)

But it also translates the corresponding Greek PP *meta tauta* ‘after this’ (38) and various other combinations with *meta*, including one with a nominalised ACI (39). There are also combination examples (40).

- (38) a. μετὰ ταῦτα εὕρισκει αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ
 meta tauta heuriskei auton ho Iēsous en tōi
 after this.ACC find.PRS.3SG he.ACC the Jesus.NOM in the
 ἱερῷ
 hierōi
 temple.DAT
- b. по томъ же оѣрѣте и ѿс.
 po tomъ že obrěte i iŝ
 after this.LOC PTCL find.AOR.3SG he.ACC Jesus.NOM

¹⁶ There is a single exception in Lk. 16.2, but in that example the Greek has a negation elsewhere in the sentence, so the meaning is the same.

вѣ ѿркве.

vъ crkve

in church.LOC

'Afterward Jesus found him in the temple' (Jn. 5.14, 22169, 41871)

- (39) a. ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω
 alla meta to egerthēnai me proaxo
 but after the wake_up.INF.AOR.PASS I.ACC lead.FUT.1SG
 ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
 humas eis tēn Galilaian
 you.ACC in the Galilee.ACC

- b. Нѣ по томѣ егда вѣскръснѣ вариѣ
 Nъ po tomъ egda vъskrѣsnѣ varjѣ
 but after this.N.LOC.SG when rise.PRS.3SG go_ahead.PRS.3SG
 вѣ вѣ галилеи.
 vy vъ galilei
 you.ACC.PL in Galilee.LOC
 'But after I am raised up, I will go before you to Galilee'
 (Mk. 14.28, 7372, 37200)

- (40) a. ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς·
 epeita meta touto legei tois mathētais
 then after this.N.ACC.SG say.PRS.3SG the disciples.DAT.PL
 b. по томѣ же гла ученикомѣ
 po tomъ že gla učenikomъ
 after this.N.LOC.SG PTCL say.AOR.3SG disciple.DAT.PL
 'Then after this he said to the disciples' (Jn. 11.7, 22719, 42390)

We thus see that OCS seems to have a tendency to use PPs with demonstrative pronoun complements as linking devices in a relatively productive way. The two constructions we have looked at seem to be quite independent of the Greek ones, since they are primarily used when Greek has a simple adverb with no discernible structure. This type of device would thus seem to stem from Common Slavonic.

5 Numeral syntax

Sloboda's article suggests that language contact may have contributed to the restructuring of numeral syntax in Polish in particular and in Slavonic in general.

She puts forward three factors that may have conspired to achieve this. The fact that Latin has no dual might have weakened the dual in Old Polish. The fact that Latin numerals from 4 and up have adjectival syntax might have influenced the perception of the quantified element as the head of the quantified phrase. Finally, the Roman numeral notation in Old Polish is morphologically uninformative, and might have increased the temptation to case-mark the quantified noun at the expense of the numeral.

These potential sources of syntactic influence are all present in Greek as well. All numerals are indeclinable, and the quantified noun is the syntactic head of the phrase. There is no dual. We also see that there is a morphologically uninformative letter notation of numerals present in the Codex Marianus. However, in OCS there is no evident effect of these factors. The numeral system can be reduced to a combination of numeral syntactic type (adjective or noun) and the three-way number category (singular, dual, plural), and it seems entirely regular and is independent of the Greek.

Extracting all OCS correspondences of the Greek numeral *duo* ‘two’ in the Marianus dataset is instructive. There are 94 such examples. The OCS correspondences are the cardinal numeral *dъva* ‘two’ (76 occurrences), the collective numeral *dъvoi* ‘two’ (three occurrences) and *oba* ‘both’, which should perhaps be classified as a determiner (15 occurrences). 62 of the examples have the numeral in attributive position, as in (41), in the rest of the examples it stands alone with no quantified noun, sometimes with a quantifying PP as in (42).

- (41) a. ἄνθρωπος εἶχεν τέκνα δύο
 anthrōpos eichen tekna duo
 man.NOM have.IMPERF.3SG child.ACC.PL two.INDECL
- b. ѿкъ етеръ имѣ дѣвѣ
 čkъ eterъ imě dъvě
 man.NOM certain.M.NOM.SG have.AOR.3SG two.N.ACC.DU
 ѡдѣ
 čedě
 child.ACC.DU
 ‘A man had two sons’ (Mt. 21.28, 15716, 39299)

- (42) a. καὶ ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ
 kai apostellei duo tōn mathētōn autou
 and send.PRS.3SG two the disciple.GEN.PL he.GEN
- b. ѿ посъла дѣва отъ оученикъ
 i posъla dъva otъ učenikъ
 and send.AOR.3SG two.M.ACC.DU of disciple.GEN.PL

своиѡхъ

svoïxъ

REFL.POSS.PRON.M.GEN.PL

'And he sent two of his disciples' (Mk. 14.13, 7346, 37173)

As expected, we see no sign that the OCS syntax may be affected by the Greek in these two examples. The Greek numeral is always undeclined, and the case is always marked on the quantified noun. In (41) the form of the OCS quantified noun is unambiguously accusative dual, and we see that the numeral agrees with it in gender, case and number. In (42) the Greek has a partitive genitive dependent on the (still undeclined) *duo*, while OCS renders this with *отъ+GEN*, avoiding the case-governing pattern found with the OCS substantival numerals.

When the OCS numeral is in attributive position, the quantified noun is always in the dual. There are two apparent examples of plural quantified nouns, but on closer inspection they turn out to occur in sentences with coordinated numerals, such as (43).

- (43) a. ἵνα ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων
 hina epi stomatos duo marturōn
 that on mouth.GEN two.INDECL witness.GEN.PL
 ἢ τριῶν σταθῇ πᾶν
 ē triōn stathēi pan
 or three.GEN.PL stand.AOR.PASS.SBJV every.N.NOM.SG
 ῥῆμα
 rhēma
 word.NOM
- b. да въ устѣхъ двѡю ли трии
 da vъ ustěxъ dъvoju li trii
 that in lip.LOC.PL two.GEN.DU or three.GEN.PL
 съвѣдѣтелъ станетъ всѣхъ гдѣ
 sŭvĕdĕtelъ stanetъ vŭsjaxъ glъ
 witness.GEN.PL stand.PRS.3SG every.M.NOM.SG. word.NOM
 'that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be
 established' (Mt. 18.16, 15520, 39103, KJV)

We see that the plural of the quantified noun *sŭvĕdĕtelъ* 'witnesses' is there because genitive dual *dъvoju* 'two' is coordinated with genitive plural *trii* 'three', which is closer to the quantified noun, and which agrees with it in case and number.

When the reflexes of *duo* occur in subject position, with or without a quantified noun head, we likewise see that the predicate agreement is consistently in the dual, as exemplified in (44), which also has a conjunct participle in the dual.

- (44) a. ὕστερον δὲ προσελθόντες δύο εἶπον·
 husteron de proselthontes duo eipon
 finally PTCL approach.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL two.INDECL say.AOR.3PL
- b. Послѣдъ же пристѣпша двѣ
 Poslědъ že pristopřša dъva
 afterwards PTCL approach.PTCP.PST.M.NOM.DU two.M.NOM.DU.
 лъжа сѣвѣдѣтелѣ рѣсте
 lъža sъvĕdĕtelja rĕste
 false.M.NOM.DU witness.NOM.DU say.AOR.3DU
 Finally two (false witnesses) came forward and said (Mt. 26.60, 16103, 39680)

There is only one apparent example of the plural, which again turns out to be due to coordination, in this case of multiple singular and dual subjects (45).

- (45) a. ἦσαν ὁμοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ
 ēsan homou Simōn Petros kai
 be.IMPERF.3PL together Simon.NOM Peter.NOM and
 Θωμᾶς [. . .] καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου
 Thōmas [. . .] kai hoi tou Zebedaïou
 Thomas.NOM and the.M.NOM.PL the.M.GEN.SG Zebedee.GEN
 καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο.
 kai alloi ek tōn mathētōn autou duo
 and other.M.NOM.PL from the disciple.GEN.PL he.GEN two.INDECL
- b. бѣахѡ вѣ купѣ симонѣ петрѣ ꙗ
 bĕaxo vъ kupĕ simonъ petrъ i
 be.IMPERF.3PL together Simon.NOM Peter.NOM and
 тома [. . .] ꙗ сѣна зеведеова.
 toma [. . .] i sna zebede-ova
 Thomas.NOM and son.NOM.DU Zebedee-ov.M.NOM.DU
 ꙗ ина дѣва отъ оученикѣ его.
 i ina dъva otъ učenikъ ego
 and other.M.NOM.DU two.M.NOM.DU of disciple.GEN.PL he.GEN
 ‘Simon Peter, Thomas [. . .], the sons of Zebedee, and two others of his disciples were together’ (Jn. 21.2, 23372, 42988)

It should be noted that there are around 150 further indicative verbs in the dual in the Marianus material, with no explicit numeral in the subject. We must therefore conclude that the Slavonic dual is in excellent shape at this time of attestation.

For the numerals 3 and 4, Greek and OCS have exactly the same syntax: The numeral behaves like an adjective agreeing in case, gender and number with the quantified noun, which is the head of the phrase, as demonstrated in (46).

- (46) a. δύναμαι καταλῦσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ
 dunamai katalusai ton naon tou theou
 be_able.PRS.1SG destroy.INF.AOR the temple.ACC the God.GEN
 καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν αὐτὸν οἰκοδομῆσαι.
 kai dia triōn hēmerōn auton oikodomēsai
 and through three.GEN.PL day.GEN.PL it.ACC build.INF.AOR
- b. можъ разорити ѿрковь бж҃иѣ.
 mogō razoriti ōrkvь bž-ijō
 be_able.PRS.1SG destroy.INF temple.ACC God-ij.F.ACC.SG
 ꙗ трѣми дньми созѣдати ѿ
 i trьmi dньmi sozъdati jō
 and three.INS.PL day.INS.PL build.INF it.ACC
 ‘I am able to destroy the temple of God and rebuild it in three days’
 (Mt. 26.61, 16105, 51163)

The most interesting differences can be observed in the numerals 5 and above. We will limit the discussion to the Greek numerals 5–9 and their OCS correspondences. While the Greek numerals *pente*, *hex*, *hepta*, *oktō* and *ennea* are all indeclinable and behave exactly like *duo*, we see that the OCS corresponding numerals behave like feminine i-stem nouns, in that they are inflected the same way and trigger feminine singular agreement in attributive adjectives. If there is an explicit quantified noun, it occurs in the genitive plural (47).

- (47) a. ἶδε ἅλλα πέντε τάλαντα ἐκέρδησα.
 ide alla pente talanta ekerdēsa
 lo other.N.ACC.PL five.INDECL talent.ACC.PL gain.AOR.1SG
- b. се drugojъ 5 таланѣтъ приобрѣтъ ими
 se drugōjō d talanѣтъ priobrěť imi
 lo other.F.ACC.SG 5 talent.GEN.PL gain.AOR.1SG it.INS.PL
 ‘here, I have made five talents more’ (Mt. 25.20, 47972, 51098)

In the OCS correspondences the numeral is always the head of the phrase, so the quantified noun will occur in the genitive plural regardless of the case of the numeral, as seen in (48).

- (48) a. Καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ἕξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ
 Kai meta hēmeras hex paralambanei ho
 and after day.ACC.PL six.INDECL take_with.PRS.3SG the
 Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον
 Iēsous ton Petron [. . .]
 Jesus.NOM the Peter.ACC
- b. ι πο шести дѣнь поѣтъ ѱъ.
 i po šesti denъ pojetъ isъ
 and after six.LOC.SG day.GEN.PL take.AOR.3SG Jesus.NOM
 петра
 petra [. . .]
 Peter.GEN/ACC
 ‘And after six days Jesus took Peter with him’ (Mk. 9.2, 6967, 36809)

There is thus no sign that the Greek syntax affects OCS noun phrases with the numerals 5 and above either at this stage.

Finally, Sloboda suggests that numerals in opaque letter notation which does not provide any morphological information may be an environment that especially invites syntactic loans in order to disambiguate the syntactic role of the numeral phrase. We have already seen in (47) that the Marianus occasionally has letter notation of numerals. In a data set consisting of all the Marianus translations of the Greek numerals 2–9 (196 examples), we find 14 examples with letter notation. We find that there are no deviations from the expected OCS syntax in these examples. In (47) we see that the numeral *pet̃* ‘five’ has its expected syntax even though it is written in its conventional letter notation *d*. The quantified noun *talant̃* is in the genitive plural, and we see that the numeral triggers feminine accusative singular agreement in its adjectival modifier *drugoj̃*. In example (49) we see *dṽa* ‘two’ written as *b* in letter notation. We see that the quantified noun still occurs in the dual even though the morphological signal from the numeral is invisible and the Greek has a plural.

- (49) a. κύριε, δύο τάλαντά μοι παρέδωκας
 kurie duo talanta moi paredōkas
 lord.VOC two.INDECL talent.ACC.PL I.DAT hand_over.AOR.2SG

b.	҃и	ѣ	таланѣта	ми	еси
	gi	h	talanѣta	mi	esi
	lord.VOC	2	talent.ACC.DU	I.DAT	AUX.PRS.2SG
	прѣдалѣ				
	prědalѣ				
	hand_over.LPTCP.M.NOM.SG				
	'Master, you delivered to me two talents' (Mt. 25.22, 15961, 39541)				

We can therefore conclude that even though the same conditions are in place in New Testament Greek as in the Latin source texts in Słoboda's study, the numeral syntax of the Marianus shows no sign of being influenced by the Greek system.

6 Pronominal clitics

Kosek, Čech and Navrátilová discuss pronominal clitic placement in early Czech bibles, and discuss the extent to which it may be influenced by the Latin original. Their survey covers the short pronominal forms *mi*, *sě*, *tě* 'I.DAT, REFL.ACC, you.ACC' dependent on a finite verb. For my mini-survey I have extracted the corresponding OCS items *mi*, *sę*, *tę* 'I.DAT, REFL.ACC, you.ACC' from the Codex Marianus, as well as the Greek source items, if any. As in the Czech Bible, there is rarely any correspondent for reflexive *sę*, since Greek middle and passive forms are largely synthetic, with inflectional affixes marking the voice of the verb. As we can see in Table 3, the opposite situation is found with *mi* and *tę*, which nearly always have a Greek correspondence. There are only four exceptions, three of which are down to voice differences between OCS and Greek.

Table 3: OCS short pronominals, existence of Greek corresponding expression.

	Greek source expression	no Greek source expression
<i>mi</i>	23	2
<i>sę</i>	18	831
<i>tę</i>	55	2

In their study, Kosek et al. observe that an Old Czech pronominal clitic may occur in four main positions: 1) Post-initial (Wackernagel) position, 2) preverbal contact position, 3) postverbal contact position and 4) isolated medial position, i.e. neither in contact with the head verb nor in post-initial position. To minimise manual annotation, I will look at distance from the head verb first.

Table 4: OCS short pronominals, position relative to verb (positive number: precedes verb, negative number: follows verb).

	3		2		1		-1		-2		-3	
<i>mi</i>	0	0%	4	16%	5	20%	16	64%	0	0%	0	0%
<i>tę</i>	0	0%	1	1.8%	15	26.3%	41	71.9%	0	0%	0	0%
<i>sę</i>	2	0.2%	6	0.7%	21	2.5%	775	91.2%	43	5.1%	2	0.2%

Table 4 shows us that contact position is hugely preferred for all our three short pronominal forms – 84%, 98.2% and 93.7% respectively are found in immediate contact position in the Marianus dataset. Out of these, the postverbal contact position is strongly preferred, especially for *sę* (91.2%). This is illustrated in examples (50) and (51).

- (50) a. θυγάτηρ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε
 thugater hē pistis sou sesōken se
 daughter.VOC the faith.NOM you.GEN save.PRF.3SG you.ACC
 b. дъшти вѣра твоѧ спасе тѧ
 dǫšti věra tvoja spase te
 daughter.VOC faith.NOM your.F.NOM.SG save.AOR.3SG you.ACC
 ‘Daughter, your faith has healed you’ (Lk. 8.48, 20689, 51384)

- (51) a. ὅπου τὸ σῶμα, ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ ἀετοὶ
 horou to sōma ekei kai hoi aetoi
 where the body.NOM there also the vulture.NOM.PL
 ἐπισυναχθήσονται
 episunachthēsontai
 gather.FUT.3PL.PASS
 b. идеже тѣло тѡу орѣли сѣнемлѣтъ сѧ.
 ideže tělo tu orbli sĕnemlĭotъ sę
 where body.NOM there eagle.NOM.PL gather.PRS.3PL REFL
 ‘Where the corpse is, there the vultures will gather’ (Lk. 17.36, 21334, 51588)

However, an item in contact position may simultaneously be in post-initial position: 32 out of the 39 short pronouns in absolute second position are either immediately postverbal (29 examples, 52) or immediately preverbal (three examples, 53).

- (52) a. οἶδαμέν σε τίς εἶ
 oidamen se tis ei
 know.PRS.1PL you.ACC who.NOM be.PRS.2SG
- b. вѣмъ тѣ кто еси
 věmъ tē kto esi
 know.PRS.1PL you.ACC who.NOM be.PRS.2SG
 ‘I know you, who you are’ (Mk. 1.24, 47274, 50226)
- (53) a. τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ
 ti dokei humin hoti ou mē
 what.NOM seem.PRS.3SG you.DAT.PL that not not
 ἔλθῃ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν;
 elthēi eis tēn heortēn
 come.SBJV.AOR.3SG in the feast.ACC
- b. что сѣ мнѣнитъ вамъ, ꙗко не
 čto sē mñnitъ vamъ jako ne
 what.NOM REFL seem.PRS.3SG you.DAT.PL that not
 иматъ ли прити въ праздѣникъ.
 imatъ li priti vъ prazdēnikъ
 have.PRS.3SG PTCL come.INF in feast.ACC
 ‘What do you think? That he will not come to the feast at all?’
 (Jn. 11.56, 22804, 42472)

A good number of short pronouns in absolute third position must also be considered post-initial since the first word in the sentence is either a vocative (and thus intonationally separate from the rest of the sentence) or a proclitic (*ne* ‘not’, *ni* ‘not even’, *a* ‘and, but’, *i* ‘and’, *da* ‘and, so that’, *to* ‘then’, *nъ* ‘but’ and all mono- and disyllabic prepositions, cf. Večerka 1989: 33–40). We find that this is the case for 76 out of 147 short pronominal forms in absolute third position, and that all of them are in contact position (five preverbal (54), 71 postverbal (55)).

- (54) a. γύναι, τί κλαίεις;
 gunai ti klaieis
 woman.VOC what.ACC cry.PRS.2SG
- b. жено что сѣ плачѣши
 ženo čto sē plačeši
 woman.VOC what.ACC REFL cry.PRS.2SG
 ‘Woman, why are you crying?’ (Jn. 20.15, 23328, 52167)

- (55) a. ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.
 edakrusen ho Iēsous
 weep.AOR.3SG the Jesus.NOM
- b. и прослъзи сѧ ѿсѧ
 i proslъzi sę iŝъ
 and weep.AOR.3SG REFL Jesus.NOM
 ‘Jesus wept’ (Jn. 11.35, 22768, 42438)

There may be more pronouns beyond absolute second position that are actually in post-initial position (for instance, they may follow another clitic or the sentence could be introduced by multiple or complex vocatives). Nonetheless, this quick investigation clearly demonstrates that short pronouns are rarely found in post-initial position if they are not simultaneously in contact position.

We noted above that there were seven examples of short pronouns in absolute second position, but not in contact position. Interestingly, these examples are remarkably homogeneous: the pronouns are all in position 2 from the verb, with only one intervening element, and the intervening element is in all seven examples a pronoun dependent on the verb and in contact position with the verb (56, 57).

- (56) a. τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ;
 Ti humin dokei
 what.NOM you.DAT.PL seem.PRS.3SG
- b. чѣто сѧ вамъ мѣнитъ
 čъto sę vamъ mъnitъ
 what.NOM REFL you.DAT.PL seem.PRS.3SG
 ‘What do you think?’ (Mt. 18.12, 15514, 50912)¹⁷
- (57) a. εἰ μὲν δεῖ συναποθανεῖν
 ean me deēi sunapothanein
 if I.ACC be_necessary.PRS.3SG.SBJV with_die.INF.AOR
 σοι, οὐ μή σε ἀπαρνήσωμαι
 soi ou mē se aparnēsōmai
 not you.DAT not you.ACC deny.PRS.1SG
- b. аште ми сѧ клѹчитъ сѧ тобоѹ
 ašte mi sę ključitъ sъ tobojъ
 if I.DAT REFL happen.PRS.3SG with you.INS

¹⁷ Mt. 22.42 and Mt. 26.66 have exactly the same construction.

оумьрѣти. не отъврѣгъ ꙗ ꙗ тебѣ
 umyřeti ne otъvręgo sę tebe
 die.INF not reject.PRS.1SG REFL you.GEN
 ‘Even if I have to die with you, I will not deny you!’
 (Mk. 14.31, 7378, 37206)¹⁸

As we can see in Table 4, the largest group of clear exceptions from the contact positions are examples of *se* in second and even third postverbal position. However, when we look at these examples, we find that the short pronoun is always separated from the verb by one or more Wackernagel clitics (*bo*, *že*) and/or other short pronouns, typically in post-initial position (58, 59).

- (58) a. ἀφεῶνται σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι
 apheōntai sou hai hamartiai
 forgive.PRF.3PL.PASS you.GEN.SG the sin.NOM.PL
 b. отъпоуштаѣтъ ти ꙗ грѣси.
 otъpuštajotъ ti sę gręsi
 forgive.PRS.3PL you.DAT REFL sin.NOM.PL
 ‘Your sins are forgiven’ (Lk. 7.48, 20607, 51351)
- (59) a. οὐκέτι ἀνταποδοθήσεται δέ σοι ἐν τῇ
 ouketi antapodothēsetai de soi en tēi
 no_longer repay.FUT.3SG.PASS PTCL you.DAT in the
 ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων
 anastasei tōn dikaiōn
 resurrection.DAT the.GEN.PL just.GEN.PL
 b. въздастъ бо ти ꙗ во възкрѣшєннє
 vъzdaстъ bo ti sę vo vъskręšenie
 return.PRS.3SG PTCL you.DAT REFL in resurrection.ACC
 праведъныхъ
 pravedъnyxъ
 just.GEN.PL
 ‘For you will be repaid at the resurrection of the just’ (Lk. 14.14, 21135, 40883)

¹⁸ Mt. 26.35 has exactly the same construction. The two final examples, Jn. 8.22 and Jn. 8.53, have *se* in absolute second position and *samъ* ‘(one)self’ in third position.

The only real exception to this is (60), where *sę* appears to be a real direct object and not a reflexive marker, and has a proclitic *i* ‘even’ attached to it.¹⁹ This strongly suggests that this particular occurrence was actually stressed.

- (60) a. σωσάτω ἐαυτόν, εἰ οὗτός ἐστίν
 sōsatō heauton ei houtos estin
 save.IMP.AOR.3SG self.M.ACC.SG if this.M.NOM.SG be.PRS.3SG
 ὁ Χριστός τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός
 ho Christos tou theou ho eklektos
 the Christ.NOM the god.GEN the chosen.M.NOM.SG
- b. да сѣстѣ и сѣ аште сѣ
 da spstѣ i sę ašte sѣ
 let save.PRS.3SG even REFL.ACC if this.M.NOM.SG
 естѣ хѣ ѿ жиѣ избранѣ
 estѣ хѣ snѣ bž-ii izbъrany
 be.PRS.3SG Christ.NOM son.NOM god-ij.M.NOM.SG chosen.M.NOM.SG
 ‘let him save himself, if he is the Christ of God, his Chosen One!’
 (Lk. 23.35, 48594, 51738)

From these investigations we can conclude that contact position is very strongly preferred for our three short pronouns. We see that they are often *also* in post-initial position, and that clitic behaviour in post-initial position is often responsible for the few examples of non-contact position that can be found in our dataset. However, there is little to suggest that these three short pronouns can be placed in post-initial position if the contact between head verb and short pronoun is broken by items that are not particles or pronouns.

We can now turn to the question of potential Greek influence. As we already observed in Table 4, *sę* mostly lacks a Greek correspondence (as seen in examples 51 and 53–59), while *mi* and *tę* almost always corresponds to a Greek pronoun (45, 47). There are 96 examples where the short pronoun has a correspondence, and as we can see in Table 5, the position relative to the verb is the same in Greek and OCS in 74 (77%) of the examples. All of these 74 examples have the pronoun in contact position (58 postverbal, 16 preverbal), as illustrated in (50) and (52).

¹⁹ There are three further apparent examples that are due to a technicality in the annotation.

Table 5: Position of short pronoun relative to verb compared to Greek equivalent's position.

	same position	per cent	different position	per cent
<i>mi</i>	14	60.9	9	39.1
<i>tē</i>	49	89.1	6	10.9
<i>sē</i>	11	61.1	7	38.9

Three of the mismatch occurrences are due to alignment technicalities, but the remaining 19 all show up real mismatches. In (57), the OCS pronoun is split off from the verb by a reflexive *sē*. Four examples, including (60), have a direct object usage of *sē*, which we may suspect of having individual stress, while the Greek has *heauton* 'himself'. Two examples have the OCS short pronoun in contact position with the auxiliary rather than the main verb, while the Greek has no auxiliary (49). In the remaining 11 examples there is no obvious reason for the mismatch, as in (61).

- (61) a. καὶ ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει μίλιον ἕν,
 kai hostis se aggareusei milion hen
 and who.NOM you.ACC press.FUT.3SG mile.ACC one.N.ACC.SG
 ὑπάγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο.
 hupage met' autou duo
 go.IMP.2SG with he.GEN two.INDECL
- b. и аще кѣто поиметъ та по силѣ.
 i ašte kѣto poimetъ tē po silě.
 and if someone.NOM take.PRS.3SG you.ACC by force.LOC
 попрыще єдино. иди съ нимъ
 popryšte edino. idi sѣ nimъ
 stadium.ACC one.N.ACC.SG go.IMP.2SG with he.INST
 двѣ
 dvo
 two.N.ACC.DU
 'And if anyone forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles'
 (Mt. 5.41, 14813, 38399)

Given the large number of examples with no Greek correspondence, the relatively uniform behaviour of all the short pronouns, and the relatively common ordering mismatches between corresponding examples, it is hard to conclude from the evidence of the Marianus dataset alone that the Greek word order affects the placement of our three short pronoun forms.

Further comparison with non-translated text, as demonstrated in Pichkhadze (this volume), makes it possible to argue that Greek influence could suppress a native tendency to place reflexive *se* in post-initial (Wackernagel) position (following Zaliznjak 2008). This is even more pertinent since many of the modern South Slavonic languages still have clitics and clitic clusters in Wackernagel position. The argument would then be that the translators identified *se* with Greek middle and passive inflectional suffixes, and therefore placed them in postverbal contact position. Unlike in Kosek et al.'s Latin material, the Greek middle/passive forms are overwhelmingly synthetic, so there is little scope to mimic the position of an auxiliary verb. It is also worth noting that a fairly large share of the reflexive-marked verbs in the Marianus dataset correspond to Greek active verbs (283 examples, 270 without a corresponding Greek pronoun).

Table 6: OCS *se* by Greek voice, no corresponding Greek pronoun, position relative to verb (positive number: precedes verb, negative number: follows verb).

	3		2		1		-1		-2		-3	
active	0	0%	3	1.1%	11	4.1%	241	89.3%	14	5.2%	1	0.4%
middle or passive	1	0.2%	2	0.4%	8	1.5%	505	92.8%	27	5.0%	1	0.2%
no voice	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	16	94.1%	1	5.9%	0	0%

As seen in Table 6, the pattern found with these examples seems no different than the pattern found with translations of Greek middles and passives – they are overwhelmingly in postverbal contact position (of which quite a few are also in post-initial position). We can also note that none of the East Slavonic texts analysed by Zaliznjak display consistent post-initial placement, and it is easier to account for the data if we assume that both post-initial and contact position were allowed in the vernacular.

To conclude, if we compare the Marianus data to Kosek et al.'s Old Czech data, we see that even though the placement of pronominal clitics in both datasets is clearly strongly influenced by their Greek and Latin sources, the postinitial position is much rarer in the Marianus dataset. The preferred position is postverbal contact position. In the Old Czech data, Kosek et al. report a large number of examples of postinitial *se* in cases where its only correspondence is a synthetic middle/passive verb form. In the Marianus dataset, we see that even these examples are predominantly in postverbal contact position. Data from non-translated Church Slavonic sources convincingly show a very different picture (Pichkhadze this volume), so it seems likely that the postinitial position was more prominent in the early South Slavonic vernacular than the Marianus data let on. However, it

is difficult to account for the data if we assume that the postverbal contact position is an entirely non-Slavonic phenomenon.

7 Aorists and resultatives in performative formulae

Dekker’s contribution looks at tense usage in performative formulae in Novgorodian birchbark letters, and observes a tendency for the aorist to replace the resultative in such constructions at a stage when the aorist was almost certainly no longer in use in the vernacular. He argues that this use of the aorist has models both in Ancient Greek and (Old) Church Slavonic. As he points out, OCS resultatives (*I*-forms) and Greek perfects are clearly not semantically equivalent. While the tense usage in the Marianus dataset largely follows the tense usage in Greek, the relationship between perfect and resultatives are a clear deviation. This can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7: OCS tense and Greek tense, all indicative verb forms in the Codex Marianus.

	Greek aorist	Greek future	Greek imperfect	Greek pluperfect	Greek present	Greek perfect
OCS aorist	2955	6	79	13	393	171
OCS future	0	121	0	0	15	0
OCS imperfect	43	0	901	32	19	1
OCS present	17	727	3	1	2272	123
OCS resultative	89	1	27	13	7	18

OCS resultatives are usually translations of Greek aorists, while Greek perfects are normally translated as OCS aorists (62).²⁰ This constitutes the strongest piece of evidence that Greek tense was not slavishly transferred to OCS, and makes it seem unlikely that that OCS borrowed the use of the resultative or aorist in assertive declaratives from Greek.

²⁰ The number of present-tense translations also seems large, but 102 out of 123 occurrences are examples of Greek *oida* ‘know’, which irregularly uses the perfect tense in present meaning.

- (62) a. οὐπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα
 oupō gar anabebēka pros ton patera
 not_yet for ascend.PRF.1SG to the father.ACC
- b. не оу бо възидъ къ ѿцу моему
 ne u bo vъzidъ kъ otъcu moemu
 not yet for ascend.AOR.1SG to father.DAT my.M.DAT.SG
 ‘I have not yet ascended to the Father’ (Jn. 20.17, 23338, 42955)

How, then, are assertive declaratives expressed in the Marianus dataset? While a full scrutiny of all potential candidates is beyond the scope of this brief survey, one way of looking for at least some of them is to extract sentences with first-person finite verb forms and the interjection *se* ‘lo, behold’, which is often found in Dekker’s birchbark examples as well. There are 29 such examples in the Marianus dataset, twelve of which appear to be reasonably clear examples of assertive declaratives, such as (63).

- (63) a. ἰδοὺ τὰ ἡμίσειά μου τῶν ὑπαρχόντων,
 idou ta hēmiseia mou tōn huparchontōn
 behold the half.ACC.PL me.GEN the possession.GEN.PL
 κύριε, τοῖς πτωχοῖς δίδωμι
 kurie tois ptochois didōmi
 lord.VOC the poor.DAT.PL give.PRS.3SG
- b. се полъ имѣнїѣ моего г҃и
 se polъ imēnija moego gi
 behold half.ACC property.GEN my.N.GEN.SG lord.VOC
 дамъ ништиимъ
 damъ ništiimъ
 give.PRS.3SG poor.DAT.PL
 ‘Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor’
 (Lk. 19.8, 21417, 41151)

Eleven of the examples, such as (63), have an OCS present-tense form, and ten of the examples have a present tense form in Greek too. Six of the OCS present-tense verbs are perfective-looking, such as (63), the rest of them look imperfective (*posylaję* vs. *sъlję*, *damъ* vs. *daję*, for instance), cf. the interesting discussion on the ideal form for performatives in Dekker 2016. One example has a present-tense form (of an imperfective-looking verb) rendering a Greek perfect (64), and another has an aorist rendering a Greek aorist (65).

- (64) a. ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ
 idou dedōka humin tēn exousian tou
 behold give.PRF.1SG you.DAT the power.ACC the.GEN
 πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων
 patein epanō opheōn
 trample.INF.PRS on snake.GEN.PL
- b. Се даѣъ вамъ власть на стѣпати
 Se dajō vamъ vlastь nastōpati
 behold give.PRS.1SG you.DAT power.ACC step_on.INF
 на змиѣ
 na zmię
 on snake.ACC.PL
 ‘Behold, I give you the authority to tread upon serpents’
 (Lk. 10.19, 20838, 40596)
- (65) a. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν
 kai idou egō enōpion humōn
 and behold I.NOM before you.GEN.PL
 ἀνακρίνας οὐθέν εὑρον ἐν τῷ
 anakrinas outhen heuron en tōi
 examine.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG nothing.ACC find.AOR.1SG in the
 ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον,
 anthrōpōi toutōi aition
 man.DAT this.M.DAT.SG guilt.ACC
- a. ѿ се азъ истазавъ
 i se azъ istęzavъ
 and behold I.NOM examine.PTCP.PST.M.NOM.SG
 обрѣтъ прѣдъ вами. не ни единого
 obrěť prěď vami ne ni edinoęę
 find.AOR.3SG before you.INS.PL not not one.F.GEN.SG
 же о ѣвцѣ семъ винѣ
 že o člvcě semъ viny
 PTCL about man.LOC this.M.LOC.SG guilt.GEN
 ‘and behold, having examined Him before you, I have found no guilt
 in this man’ (Lk. 23.14, 21745, 58769)

This is not much material, but it suggests that the present tense was a common choice in assertive declarations both in OCS and Greek, but also that the perfect and the aorist were possible choices in Greek.

8 Relative clauses

In their contribution to this volume, Sonnenhauser and Eberle explore the origins of the relativising function of the originally interrogative pronoun of the type ‘which of two’ in North Slavonic, such as Russian *kotoryj*, Polish *który* and Czech *který*, whereas Podtergera (2017) discusses the possibility that the introduction of Russian *kotoryj* in relative clauses was a contact-induced change. In the Marianus dataset, the situation is very simple: There are eight occurrences of *kotoryi*, and all of them have a clear interrogative function. They all have modifiers denoting ‘of a certain group’, but there is only one example where the group consists of only two individuals (66). None of the examples seem to be potential bridging constructions for future relative clauses, as hypothesised by Večerka (2002: 179).

- (66) a.

τίς	οὗν	αὐτῶν	πλεῖον	ἀγαπήσει	αὐτόν;
tis	oun	autōn	pleion	agapēsei	auton
who.M.NOM.SG	PTCL	he.GEN.PL	more	love.FUT.3SG	he.ACC
кѡтѡрѣ	оубо	ѣю	павѣ	вѣзлюбѣтъ	и.
kotory	ubo	eju	pače	vězljubity	i
which.M.NOM.SG	PTCL	he.GEN.DU	more	love.PRS.3SG	he.ACC

‘Now which of them will love him more?’ (Lk. 7.42, 20591, 40362)

As in (66), they all correspond to Greek *tis* ‘what, who’, which is the general Greek interrogative pronoun ‘who’, and which does not come with any explicit contrastive semantics. There are 379 examples of Greek interrogative *tis* with an OCS correspondence in the material. The most common translations are, unsurprisingly, *čto* ‘what’ (214 occurrences) and *kto* ‘who’ (95 occurrences). The choice of *kotoryi* thus seems entirely independent of the Greek.

Podtergera also discusses the use of *čto* as a relative pronoun in colloquial Russian. The situation in the Marianus dataset is similar to that of *kotoryi*: of all the 242 occurrences of *čto*, none are analysed as relative pronouns in the Marianus dataset. Instead, they can all comfortably be analysed as interrogative pronouns in direct or indirect questions (67) or as indefinite pronouns (68).

- (67) a.

μή	γνώτω	ή	ἀριστερά	σου
mē	gnōtō	hē	aristera	sou
not	know.IMP.AOR.3SG	the	left.F.NOM.SG	you.GEN
ті	ποιεї	ή	δεξιά	σου
ti	poiei	hē	dexia	sou
what.N.ACC.SG	do.PRS.3SG	the	right.F.NOM.SG	you.GEN

- b. да не ꙗꙋетъ шюица твоѣ.
 da ne čjuetъ šjuica tvoja
 may not notice.PRS.3SG left_hand.NOM your.F.NOM.SG
 ѡѣто творитъ десъница твоѣ.
 čto tvoritъ des'nica tvoja
 what.ACC do.PRS.3SG right_hand.NOM your.F.NOM.SG
 'do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing'
 (Mt. 6.3, 14826, 38412)

- (68) a. ἐπερώτα αὐτόν, εἴ τι βλέπει;
 epērōta auton ei ti blepei
 ask.IMPERF.3SG he.ACC if something.ACC see.PRS.3SG
 б. въпрашааше и аште ѡѣто видитъ.
 vŭprašaаше i ašte čto viditъ
 ask.IMPERF.3SG he.ACC if something.ACC see.PRS.3SG
 'he asked him if he could see anything' (Mk. 8.23, 6938, 36781)

The standard relative pronoun in OCS is, as Podtergera points out, *iže* 'who, which'. There are 541 occurrences of relative *iže* in the Marianus dataset, 465 of which are aligned with the standard Greek relative pronoun *hos*. The translation is thus not mechanical. A further 50 examples are translations of the Greek indefinite relative pronoun *hostis* 'whoever, whatever, someone who, something which'. Interestingly, only five of these examples have the particle *ašte* to indicate indefiniteness. The remaining examples are translations of various other relative expressions, as well as a range of non-relative pronouns. Note that *iže* translations of Greek nominalised prepositional phrases (see Fuchsbauer this volume) are taken to be elliptic relative clauses in the PROIEL/TOROT analysis, so they are included in this count. In the Greek source text there are 480 occurrences of *hos* that are aligned with some OCS item. As we already know, 465 of them are translated into *iže*. The 15 remaining occurrences are rendered by a diverse range of relative expressions (*eliko*, *elikože*, *ideže*) and regular pronouns (*i*, *тъ*, *онъ*, *онѣ*). The usage of *iže* thus seems to be wider than that of *hos*, which does not suggest strong Greek influence on this particular syntactic pattern.

9 Conclusion

In this article I have made an attempt at linking the studies in this volume up with the situation in canonical Church Slavonic, as attested in the Codex Marianus,

and its source text, the Greek Gospels. The results fall into two rough types. On the one hand we have syntactic phenomena that appear to have been influenced by the Greek source text, as well as by the the source language in the later study, but not necessarily to the same extent. This is clearly the case for the accusative with infinitive (Gavrančić and Tomelleri) and the placement of pronoun clitics (Kosek et al.): the Greek source text exerted the same type of influence on the language of the Marianus as Latin source texts exerted on 16th–19th century Croatian, Russian Church Slavonic and on Old Czech. The same can potentially be said for the dative absolute (Mihaljević 2017), but whatever one may think about the status of the dative absolute in canonical Church Slavonic, it must be considered much less artificial than the instrumental absolute found in 15th century Croatian. The problem we encounter is that raised in the introduction – it is difficult to know for certain exactly which patterns existed in Common Slavonic before the first contact with Greek.

The rest of the studies, except those directly dealing with Old Church Slavonic data, all deal with potentially contact-induced changes that happened after the time of canonical Old Church Slavonic. In some of the cases it seems clear that the Greek source text *could* have influenced the language of the Marianus in a similar way, but that it did not. This is especially clear in the case of numeral syntax. Even though we find exactly the same patterns in the Greek Gospels as in the Latin texts in Sloboda's study, the numeral syntax of the Marianus shows no sign of being influenced by the Greek system. Kisiel and Sobotka's PP-based linking devices are not in evidence in the Marianus dataset, but we do find other PP-based linking devices that seemingly are completely independent from the Greek. Similarly, Sonnenhauser and Eberle (this volume) and Podtergera (2017) look at relative clause patterns that were not yet around in the Marianus dataset. To the extent that we were able to examine tense usage in assertive declaratives (Dekker this volume), we found that it was not obvious that it was influenced by the Greek source text.

This survey is, naturally, relatively superficial and based on a limited empirical material, but it is my hope that it can spark further discussions and interpretations of the data at hand.

References

- Dekker, Simeon. 2016. *Old Russian birchbark letters: A pragmatic approach*. PhD dissertation, University of Leiden. <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/43413>
- Eckhoff, Hanne & Dag Haug. 2015. Aspect and prefixation in Old Church Slavonic. *Diachronica* 32(2). 186–230.
- Kurešević, Marina. 2018. The status and origin of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction in Old Church Slavonic. In Jasmina Grković-Major, Björn Hansen and Barbara Sonnenhauser (eds.), *Diachronic Slavonic syntax: The interplay between internal development, language contact and metalinguistic factors*, 261–283. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Lunt, Horace. 2001. *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*. 7th revised edition. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- MacRobert, Catherine Mary. 1986. Foreign, naturalized and native syntax in Old Church Slavonic. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 84(1). 142–166.
- Mihaljević, Milan. 2017. Absolute Constructions in the Second Beram (Ljubljana) Breviary. Paper presented at the workshop Diachronic Slavonic Syntax 3: Traces of Latin, Greek and Old Church Slavonic in Slavonic syntax, University of Salzburg, 3–4 November.
- Podtergera, Irina. 2020. Otnositel'nye predloženiya v rusko-cerkovnoslavjanskom perevode „latinskix“ knig Gennadijevskoj biblii (na primere 1-oj knigi Paralipomenon [Relative clauses in the Russian Church Slavonic translation of the „Latin“ books of the Gennadius Bible (The case of 1 Chronicle)]). *Trudy Instituta russkogo jazyka im. V. V. Vinogradova. Vypusk 23. Grammatičeskie processy i sistemy v diachronii. Pamjati Andreja Anatel'eviča Zaliznjaka*. 240–278.
- Thomason, Sarah. 2006. Rule borrowing. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 10, 671–677. 2nd edn. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Tischendorf, Constantin von. 1869–1872. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 8th edn. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Večerka, Radoslav. 1971. Vliv řečtiny na staroslověňštinu. *Listy filologické* 94(2). 129–151.
- Večerka, Radoslav. 1998. *Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax. I. Die Satztypen: Der zusammengesetzte Satz*. Freiburg: U.W.Weier.
- Večerka, Radoslav. 2002. *Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax. IV. Die lineare Satzorganisation*. Freiburg: U.W.Weier.
- Zaliznjak, Andrej A. 2008. *Drevnerusskie enklitiki* [Old Russian enclitics]. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskich kul'tur.