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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

**Statement of Purpose**

Most of the modern Slavic languages have no articles of the type we know in English **the** and **a**. But it is fairly well established that Late Common Slavic did have something that may have functioned like a definite article. This is the morpheme -\( j^a \), derived from the Indo-European demonstrative *ei*- or the relative *io*-.. This -\( j^a \) seems to have had one salient peculiarity: it could appear only as an enclitic on adjectives. As one would expect from the form, adjective plus -\( j^a \) would have been equivalent to adjective plus definite article. English-speaking scholars generally call this combination a long adjective. The adjective without -\( j^a \) is a short adjective.

The earliest Slavic manuscripts date from the tenth or early eleventh century. Already by this time, we find quite a number of situations where definite NP's have short adjectives and indefinites have long ones. Given than the -\( j^a \) morpheme could at best mark definiteness only in NP's with adjectives, and even then was perhaps not consistent, there arises a basic question: does early Slavic really express the category definite/indefinite,
and if so how? This is the problem I have addressed in my dissertation.

**Old Church Slavic and Early Original Slavic**

In 862 A.D., Prince Rastislav of Moravia appealed to the Byzantine emperor Michael for a teacher who could teach the Moravians about Christianity in their own language. (They were already Christian.) At Michael's request the scholar Constantine, called the Philosopher, and his brother Methodius, a learned man and a priest, spent nearly four years in Moravia. They devised an alphabet (probably glagolitic); translated the Gospels, important liturgical books, and writings of the Church Fathers; and trained disciples. Constantine died in 869, having become a monk and taken the name Cyril. Methodius carried on the mission. He finished translating the entire Old and New Testaments, wrote sermons, took the Slavic liturgy and books to Pannonia, and instructed more disciples.

The spread of the Slavic liturgy was viewed as a threat by the Franks, who wanted control of the Moravians and Pannonians for themselves. They made Methodius's work difficult in various ways, even imprisoning him for two and a half years. Finally, when he died in 884, the Frankish bishop Wiching succeeded in convincing the Pope to make him the religious administrator of the Slavic lands. The Slavic liturgy was promptly banned, and
Methodius's disciples fled. The most prominent of these took refuge in Bulgaria, where Slavic culture flourished until 1018, when the Bulgarian empire was annexed by Byzantium. From there the center of Slavic culture moved to Kiev.¹

Old Church Slavic (OCS) is the name given to the language of the oldest surviving manuscripts of the work of Constantine and Methodius and their disciples. It is based on the brothers' South Slavic dialect of Salonika, but also includes calques and borrowings from Greek. In addition, there was a certain amount of imitation of Greek grammatical constructions. OCS, therefore, is a literary and not a spoken language. Since the brothers lived and worked in the ninth century and the surviving manuscripts are from the tenth and eleventh, we have an additional source of remoteness from the spoken language: the OCS texts are copies, not originals, and they contain mistakes, both sporadic and systematic.

In spite of these problems, the OCS manuscripts are extremely important for linguists because they are the oldest written record of Slavic. Furthermore, their phonology and morphology are very close to what has been reconstructed for Common Slavic. Lists of the manuscripts

¹Life of Constantine, chaps. 14-18; Life of Methodius, chaps. 5-17; Francis Dvornik, The Slavs: Their Early History and Civilization, Survey of Slavic Civilizations, 2 (Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1956), pp. 100-145.
considered OCS can be found in many textbooks. Almost all of them are translations from Greek.

While OCS texts are the best possible sources for many studies of early Slavic phonology and morphology, they are more problematical for investigations involving word order and syntax. For example, several investigators have noticed that OCS word order follows very closely that of the original Greek; Michael Flier found that Greek article usage can affect the appearance of long and short adjectives in the Gospel manuscripts.

Since one of the hypotheses that I wished to test was whether word order in earliest Slavic functioned as an auxiliary means to express definite/indefinite, texts whose word order is an amalgam of Greek and Slavic did not seem very helpful. It was for this reason that I chose to use a different group of texts, all of which are believed to have been originally written in Slavic between 863 and 1018. The texts are the Life of Constantine, the Life of Methodius, the Poxvala (encomium) to Cyril and Methodius, the Life of Wenceslas, Tale of the Iron Cross, the anonymous sermon in the manuscript Clozianus, "O

1 For a recent one see William R. Schmalstiege, An Introduction to Old Church Slavic, 2d ed., revised and expanded (Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1982), pp. 25-29.

pismeněxъ," six of the sermons by Clement of Oxrid, and Presbyter Kozma's Treatise Against the Bogomils. I have called the language of these works and some others which I did not use Early Original Slavic (EOS).

The EOS texts have rarely, if ever, been used for linguistic study of early Slavic. The reason for this is that the manuscripts (except for that of the sermon in Clozianus) are much later copies, from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, and have obviously been contaminated by the later language of their scribes. A shown in chapters 2 and 5, a study of the history of each manuscript and the history of the relevant forms in the languages of the later copyists makes spotting the contamination relatively easy. Once these instances are eliminated, the EOS texts can be seen to contain a great deal of useful material for analyses such as the one presented here.

Methodology

The methodology used here proceeds from meaning to form. Given the number and type of exceptions found in OCS by previous researchers and the heterogeneous nature of the EOS corpus, I feel that this is the only way that sense can be made out of what appears initially to be chaos.

Furthermore, and as other recent investigators have also found, it is interesting to explore the category definite/indefinite as a universal, given that so many
languages express it. Had I not used this approach, it
would have been difficult to relate my material to the
work of these linguists and philosophers.

Finally, it would have been difficult with a form-
to-meaning approach to answer the question of whether
sentence word order expresses definite/indefinite. One
could determine what is expressed by sentence word order
and decide whether it is the same as what is indicated by
long and short adjectives. But whether the two meanings
ever coincide and under what circumstances would be hard
to study without looking for one form's meaning (e.g.,
definite/generic) in the other form (e.g., pre-verbal
position).

Organization

The second chapter discusses the history of each
text and its extant manuscripts. This is important both
for authenticating the texts as EOS and for determining
what form contamination from later languages is likely to
take.

In the third chapter the general notions definite,
indefinite, and generic are discussed. This exploration
helped me to determine precisely what I was looking for
and should aid the reader in understanding my use of these
terms in the subsequent sections.

Chapters 4 and 5 concern the main purported vehicle
for expressing definite/indefinite in early Slavic, long
and short adjectives. Chapter 4 reviews significant recent studies on long and short adjectives in OCS, and chapter 5 presents my own results from the EOS texts.

The relationship among word order, topic/comment, and definite/indefinite in the EOS texts is explored briefly in chapter 6. And finally, chapter 7 summarizes my findings and discusses their implications for the history of Slavic and general linguistics.
CHAPTER II

TEXTS

This study is based on all the longer Early Original Slavic (EOS) texts that I am aware of, and some of the shorter ones that have been published. All were written in Bohemia, Moravia, Pannonia, or Bulgaria. My criteria for selecting the texts were that their originals demonstrably date from before 1018 (the fall of the Bulgarian Empire) and that the oldest extant manuscript be fifteenth century or earlier. We have none of the original manuscripts for any of them, only copies, with regional orthographic and lexical features in varying degrees. Most of the copies were preserved in Russia, but we also find a few from the South Slavic area.

The EOS texts by no means present a unified corpus. As far as the content is concerned, we find saints' lives, sermons, prayers, panegyrics, legends, prologues to translated works, polemics, inscriptions, and parts of a law code. Their styles range from very literary, often with much imitation of Greek, to rather informal. While most are written in prose, there is some metered, unrhymed poetry as well.

For a study such as this, it would naturally be preferable to confine oneself to informal, lively prose narrative. Such texts introduce new referents as well as
talking about ones already known to the hearer/reader. In addition, their authors are not pushed by constraints of meter or syllable-counting into dropping or contracting word endings. Unfortunately, the quantity of EOS lively prose narrative is rather small: one saint's life, parts of two others, and one legend. Hence it is necessary to examine other types of texts also. All verse texts have been eliminated, since the definiteness marker is word-final. Of the others, the longest, Presbyter Kozma's "Treatise against the Bogomils," has been included, along with a selection of the remainder. This group of texts, I believe, uneven and small as it is (about 160 pages), comes as close as it is possible to come in retrieving the common language of the early Slavs (Common Slavic).

In table 1 is a list of all the texts used for this study. The abbreviations following the names of the texts are those that will be employed in citing examples. Full information concerning the editions used will be found in the Text Sources section of the bibliography.
TABLE 1
TEXTS USED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Moravo-Pannonian</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Life of Methodius (LM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Life of Constantine (LC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Poxvala to Cyril and Methodius (PCM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anonymous sermon in the manuscript Clozianus (SCI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Bohemian</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Life of Wenceslas (LW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Bulgarian</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 6 sermons by Clement of Oxrid (CS1-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. &quot;O pismenēx&quot; (&quot;On letters&quot;) by the monk Xrabr (OP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presbyter Kozma's &quot;Treatise against the Bogomils&quot; (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3 miracles from &quot;Tale of the Iron Cross&quot; (IC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inscription from the tomb of Mostič (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moravo-Pannonian Texts

The texts analyzed for this study can be divided by their probable place of origin into Moravo-Pannonian, Bohemian, and Bulgarian. The Moravo-Pannonian texts are, of course, the earliest. They include the Life of Constantine (LC), the Life of Methodius (LM), the *Poxvala* (encomium or panegyric) to Cyril and Methodius (PCM), and the anonymous sermon in the manuscript Clozianus (SCI).

All four of the texts, while undated and bearing no explicit statement of where they were written or by whom, are almost universally agreed to have been written in either Moravia or Pannonia during the last three decades of the ninth century. This conclusion is based on the content of the texts themselves. There is no reference in any of them to the chaos and subsequent flight to Bulgaria that ended the Moravian mission. On the contrary, the audience in SCI is
assumed to be newly baptized: they are exhorted not to engage in pagan practices and given advice on how to deal with their unbaptized relatives. Christianity and the Slavic liturgy are described as prospering in LM (chapter 10)—and this Life is universally agreed to have been written after LC—and also in PCM (chapter 13). It is quite likely, however, that the authors of these texts, whoever they were, came from the Bulgaro-Macedonian linguistic area or eventually ended up there.

Various scholars have suggested that the two Lives and SCI were written originally in Greek or perhaps, in the case of the two Lives, Latin. For the two Lives, the hypothesis rests first of all on the many more or less obvious Hellenisms to be found there, and secondly, on the existence of the so-called Italian Legend, a Latin text similar in many respects to LC. It is now, however, quite generally accepted that these are original Slavic works. Hellenisms are confined almost exclusively to individual words (e.g., jevangelije, names of months), and their quantity and frequency do not exceed that found in works whose original Slavic nature is beyond dispute. In addition, there are no awkward syntactic constructions which would indicate word-for-word translation. And finally, the numerous Biblical quotations accord almost completely with the Slavic translations. The authors of the Lives undeniably used Byzantine hagiographical models and Greek and Latin sources, but there
is no convincing reason to believe that either was originally written in Greek or, especially, Latin. ¹

The original language of SCI has also been problematic, although I believe there is evidence that it could have been written in Slavic. The glagolitic manuscript Clozianus is a very badly-copied and mutilated collection of sermons. For all the sermons except one, the Greek originals have been found, and they are older than this manuscript could possibly be. That fact, plus the presence of a number of obvious Hellenisms, has led scholars such as Vaillant to conclude that it, too, is translated, but that the Greek original has been lost. I believe, however, that the argument "Hellenisms means translation" is rather inconclusive. As Emilie Bláhová has shown, SCI does, indeed, have quite a number of Hellenisms, both lexical and syntactic (e.g., frequent use of the dative at the expense of other cases, often in violation of the OCS norm). In fact it and the sermon of Epifanij have more Hellenisms than the other three homilies in the collection. But those three

and Epifaniј's sermon are all translated. This means, she says, that there were different styles of translating. Bláhová avoids taking a position on whether SCI is translated or not, but it seems to me quite possible that it could have been written in Slavic in conscious imitation of one translation style, perhaps to lend more authority to the content.1

The content itself of SCI is also rather problematic for the Greek-original hypothesis. A fairly significant part of the text is devoted to the rather specific case of godparents marrying their godchildren, to the point of threatening excommunication to the princes who allow the practice. Since an incident of this exact problem is recorded in LM (chapter 10), Vaillant thinks that this must have been a scandal of the time. He further suggests that the author of SCI is Methodius and the prince being addressed is Světopláк. This hypothesis has been fairly widely accepted.

If the purpose of the sermon, or one of its purposes, was to convince Moravians to stop a specific practice, why would it have been written in Greek? As Grivec points out, if Methodius is the author, it is unlikely that he would

1André Vaillant, "Une homélie de Méthode," Revue des études slavescs 23 (1947): 40, 45; Emilie Bláhová, Nejstarší staroslovenšté homelie (syntax a lexikon) (Prague: Academia, 1973); see also Antonín Dostál, Clozianus: staroslovenštý hlaholský sborník Tridentský a Innsbrucký (Prague: Nakl. Československé akademie věd, 1959), pp. 11.
have written such a speech in Greek, since he certainly knew Slavic.¹

One final bit of evidence that SCI was originally written in Slavic is its connection with the earliest Slavic legal document, "Zakon sudnyi i ljudmy" (ZSL). This relationship has been explored in some detail by Josef Vašica. According to him, SCI and ZSL have similar legal terminology and SCI at times quotes ZSL directly. SCI, he says, is actually a rhetorical commentary on ZSL, applying the latter to a contemporary problem.²

Since I believe that there is sufficient evidence that all three of the above texts were originally written in Slavic (no one that I am aware of doubts the originality of PCM), I will proceed to a short discussion of the manuscripts and stylistic and linguistic peculiarities of each of the four.

**Life of Methodius**

The Life of Methodius (LM) has come down to us in fifteen manuscripts, by far the oldest of which is in the "Uspenskij sbornik," a Russian collection dating from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century. The next


²Josef Vašica, Literární památky epochy velkomoravské, 863-885 (Praha: Lidová demokracie, 1966), p. 71; a summary and list of his articles on the general problem can be found on pages 70-73 of this work.
younger is from the fifteenth century. The "Uspenskij sbornik" text, then, is the one used for this study, with variants generally not considered. A hagiographical text on the Byzantine model, LM is basically a narrative, interspersed with Scriptural quotations. It is fairly short by some standards, although it is one of the longer texts used here, at eleven printed pages. It is also written rather simply, generally preferring paratactic constructions to more complex sentences. With its informal, often lively style and use of direct discourse, it is an ideal text for a study such as this one, since, presumably, it reflects actual usage at least somewhat.

Linguistically, the "Uspenskij sbornik" text shows characteristic Russian phonetic features: confusion of ɐ, ǝ and ja; u everywhere substituted for ọ; ʐ<*dj], etc. In addition, and of particular relevance here, this text is one that preserves the short form in the group masc./neut. instr. sg.; all genders of the dat./instr. du.; and all genders of the gen., dat., loc., and instr. pl.; which I will call the oblique group. (It is, of course, possible


2There is some dispute as to whether the fem. instr. sg. distinguished between long and short forms even in OCS proper. (See, for example, Paul Diels, Altkirchenslavische Grammatik: mit einer Auswahl von Texten und einem Wörterbuch, 2d ed., 2 vols. in 1, Sammlung slavischer Lehr-und Handbücher, Reihe I, No. 6 [Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1963], 1:195-196.) In any case, the only form that occurs in any of the texts used here is -oju<*ojq.
to have a long/short opposition in these cases only if both forms can occur.)

Life of Constantine

The Life of Constantine (LC), like LM, is a hagiographic text, written on the Byzantine model. As such, it, too, is primarily a narrative, with numerous quotations from Scripture. But LC differs from LM in being generally more sophisticated. Its sentences are more complex and it presents several knowledgeable philosophical disputes. Its style still tends to be quite lively, with much direct discourse. At 36 printed pages, LC is the second longest of the texts used for this study.

As of 1973, there were between forty-eight and fifty-three known copies of LC. Of these, the oldest is No. 19 from the library of the former Moskovskaja duxovnaja akademija, of not later than the mid-fifteenth century, as indicated by the paper mark.¹ That this manuscript is a Russian copy of a South Slavic, specifically Bulgarian, original, is indicated by such unmistakably South Slavic features as ṕ, ḏ for etymological *ṭr, *śr, *śl, *śl and such Bulgarian features as ɐt (ψ), ｚd where one would expect _atual, ă in Russian (e.g., LC 21:26 xošteši<*xotješi), and the historical fact that it was to Bulgaria that most of the disciples of Constantine and Methodius fled when they were

---

driven from Moravia. Manuscript 19 is used here as published in Lavrov's Materialy, which contains variants from eighteen other Russian manuscripts.

Eight of the remaining copies of this Life have been considerably influenced by the ornate style of the school of Efimij of Tărnovo (ca. 1325/30-ca. 1401/12). This group includes the second oldest manuscript, that of Vladislav Grammatik, which is also the oldest one containing precise dates. Since a large number of the changes in these documents, as compared to the Russian manuscripts, are grammatical, I am disregarding this group as overly contaminated.

The No. 19 Manuscript does preserve a few short forms of the oblique group discussed in the last section. Of the four instances, however, one is used incorrectly and one is the wrong gender (!), no doubt under the influence of the preceding noun:

1. (LC 19:10) I Mixěja reče: i ty, Vifleome, And Micah said: and you, Bethlehem, zemle Ijudova, nikakože menѣši eši v* land of Judah, not-at-all less you-are in vladykax Ijudovax* rulers of Judah

(Micah 5:2 as paraphrased in Mt. 2:6) 'And you, O Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, are by no means least among the rulers of Judah'
The correct masculine form would be Ijudovexa. All the plural dative absolutes and the remainder of the possessive adjectives in these cases are long.

**Poxvala** to Cyril and Methodius

Like the two Lives, the Poxvala (Panegyric) to Cyril and Methodius (PCM) uses a Greek form. In addition to the Scriptural quotations and rhetorical praising one would expect, however, there is also some narrative material, much of it taken directly from the Life of Methodius and, to a lesser extent, the Life of Constantine. It also includes some facts that are not in either. Nevertheless, the work is clearly derivative. Its other notable sources are the Poxvala to Cyril, the verse preface to the Gospels (both EOS) and the Treatise on the Orthodox Faith (translated from Greek). The last two are quoted literally.¹

As to the quality of the text, Grivec considers PCM definitely inferior to its sources. For example, its longest Biblical quotation, from Ecclesiasticus 39:1-14 in chapter 5 (111b25ff), is carelessly and confusingly translated. PCM in general is characterized by quotations strung together without transition and often not integrated into their new contexts.² The effect is choppy, repetitive and sometimes confusing.


²Ibid., pp. 32, 42.
According to B. St. Angelov, there are now twenty-six manuscripts of PCM. Of these, twenty-three belong to the same Russian family and three are South Slavic. The earliest of all is in the Russian "Uspenskij sbornik," directly following LM. PCM is, in fact, usually found together with LM and LC. The earliest of the South Slavic manuscripts is that of Vladislav Grammatik (1469). All of this latter group, however, have undergone numerous editings and changes, and therefore have been disregarded here. I have used, then, the text found in the 1971 edition of "Uspenskij sbornik" and consulted the variants in Lavrov's Materialy when necessary.

Linguistically, one is hardly surprised to find basically the same phonetic and morphological features in PCM as in LM, since both come from the same manuscript and were often copied together. We see such Russian features as u<£, -zm, for the masc. instr. sg. of nouns and short adjectives, jers used correctly and occasional mixing of e and ja. Short forms of the oblique group are well-represented. The text is particularly notable for its frequent and consistent use of the dual. Two of the three adjective

---

1B. St. Angelov, editorial comments in Clement of Oxrid, Sǎbrani sǎčinenija, 1:446,475; Grivec, "Poxvala sv. Cirilu in Metodiju," p. 27.

mistakes, however, occur in dual forms; both are dat./
instr., i.e., oblique group. There is only one indefi-
nite specific NP, a situation that is not surprising in
a text that introduces only two characters, and those
both at once. That NP contains an adjective and it is
short. Because of its lack of sustained narrative and
small cast of characters, this text was useful mainly
for comparison with others and for its many dual forms.

Sermon in Clozianus

The final Moravo-Pannonian text used for this
study, the anonymous so-called sermon in the Glagolitic
manuscript Clozianus (SCl), may not really be a sermon
at all. According to Vaillant, it is not even a literary
work, but rather an indictment and an appeal to the prince
to make the law apply.¹

The text, like the rest of the manuscript, is
fragmentary, badly-preserved, poorly-copied, full of mis-
takes, and at times even incomprehensible. Nevertheless
the use of long and short adjectives is quite consistent.
There are only two "incorrect" forms, and both can be ex-
plained by contraction.

This text has no narrative and no dialogue, and hence,
ot surprisingly, it has no indefinite specifics, either. It
is also very short, two and a half pages in the manuscript.
In the spelling and the vocabulary, we find South

¹Vaillant, "Une homélie de Méthode," pp. 41, 44.
and West Slavic features, e.g., confusion of jers (S. Sl.)
and such words as \emph{mědlost} 'negligence' (W. Sl.).

The use of \textit{eter} in this work deserves some comment.
Unlike any of the other texts considered here, SCI uses
\textit{eter} with non-specific indefinites. In all three of its
occurrences, its meaning is equivalent to English 'any.'

2. (SCI 2a9-16) \textsuperscript{2} \textit{důžen} est\textsuperscript{3} \textit{všek} \textit{knez} ... 
\textit{obliged is every prince}

\textit{zapr\v{e}stati ne obid\v{e}ti kogo nemo\v{s}\v{t} něišix}. ni
\textit{to-forbid not to-harm anyone of-the-weakest nor}
\textit{pogan\v{s}k} \textit{eter} \textit{oby\v{c}ai sád\v{e}ati}. ni \textit{pogan\v{s}ky\v{y} pagan}
\textit{any custom to-make nor pagan}
\textit{pris\v{e}gy. ili ino \v{c}to blôd\v{e}ste}
oaths or other anything sinning

'\textit{Every prince is obliged to forbid harming any of}
\textit{the weakest or practicing any pagan custom or}
\textit{pagan oaths or anything else sinful.}'

It is, in fact, used in this meaning, and only this meaning,
throughout the entire Clozianus manuscript. This deviation
from the usual EOS usage is best explained, I think, as a
Hellenism, since \textit{tis} means both 'any' and 'a certain.'

With all the problems present in SCI, I have used it
here primarily to compare with the findings from other texts.

\textbf{Bohemian Text}

Our single Bohemian text, the Life of St. Wenceslas
(LW), is believed to have been written shortly after its
subject's murder in 929 and the transfer of his remains in
932. Although the legend does not say so directly, there is
a fair amount of evidence for placing the work there and then.
First, the author is familiar with both the people and the places he writes about (e.g., LW 43:17-19, where Wenceslas's remains are brought to the Church of St. Vitus in Prague and laid on the right side of the Altar of the Twelve Apostles). Second, the first two sentences of his account use the word nyně 'now' twice, as if the events are still fresh in his memory. Third, the description of Wenceslas's murder is quite vivid and takes up nearly a third of the entire composition. Perhaps the author was even an eyewitness. And fourth, Wenceslas is never referred to as a saint, only as a "good, just man," and only one miracle is described, with the hope that there will be more. The cult of St. Wenceslas, evidently, was not yet established. Linguistically, we find such archaisms as the asigmatic aorist (the younger forms are also used), and lexical items like *měša for 'mass' instead of the later liturgija attesting to the age of the text. Such West Slavicisms as kostel for 'church' and biskup for 'bishop,' alternating with the OCS crčky/crčkově and episkopt, give additional evidence of its Western origin.¹

There is, as far as I know, no evidence that LW was not originally written in Slavic. Weingart discusses four Latin legends, Christian's "Vita et passio s. Venceslai et s. Ludmilae, aviae eius," those of Gumpold and Vavřinec, and

"Crescente fide." The content of the first three is different enough to rule them out as possible sources for translation. In addition, Weingart believes they were written after our LW. "Crescente fide" is fairly similar, but Weingart believes that it is more likely derived from the Slavic version than vice versa. It contains more miracles, fewer details about Wenceslas's asceticism and a less vivid description of his murder. In addition, the language of "Crescente fide" is often dependent word-for-word on the Slavic, even to the point of following the word order.\(^1\)

There are three different redactions of LW, the Croatian glagolitic (five manuscripts, fifteenth to seventeenth century), the cyrillic Rumjancev or Vostokov manuscript (sixteenth century) and the cyrillic minaea (seven Russian manuscripts, sixteenth to seventeenth century). All but the glagolitic manuscripts are too late to be used here.

Not only are the glagolitic manuscripts earlier, but evidence indicates that the legend was originally written in glagolitic. The date when Wenceslas's remains were transferred to Prague is 4 March in the glagolitic manuscripts and 3 March in the cyrillic. 4 March is correct. The letter which represents 4 in the glagolitic alphabet is transliterated as the letter whose value is 3 in the

\(^{1}\)Ibid., 1:1002-1020.
The language of the glagolitic manuscripts is also older and it preserves a number of Bohemianisms that the cyrillic texts do not. For instance, kri (*kry) in the glagolitic vs. krov in the cyrillic.¹ For both reasons, then, the age of the extant manuscripts and this version's relative closeness to the original, the texts considered here are all glagolitic redaction.

The five glagolitic manuscripts are as follows: three complete texts: (1) Ljubljana breviary, end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century, in the Lyceum Library in Ljubljana, C161 a/2, leaves 134-136; (2) Novljanski breviary, fifteenth century, from Novi, a city on the Croatian coast; now in the capitol archive; (3) Rome breviary, 1379, in the Vatican Library, Illir. 6; and two fragments: (4) Moscow breviary, 1443, in the former Rumjancev Museum, now the Lenin Library: beginning of legend only; and (5) Another Novljanski breviary, 1493-1495: first five sentences. All five of these manuscripts appear to be from one original, since there are no major differences among them.²

The manuscript used here is the first Novljanski. Although it is not the oldest, it is the best manuscript,


according to Weingart. It has for the most part preserved the original constructions and word order, while the others have undergone a greater degree of croatization.\(^1\) The published version also has a critical apparatus that makes it more useful than the published versions of the other two.

Linguistically, the style of LW is similar to that of LM, although there is less dialogue. Sentences are mostly simple, with little subordination. Scribal interference is, not surprisingly, generally from Serbo-Croatian. Among others, we find mixing e and e and substituting a for both (e.g., maša from *maša), e<e, u<o, i<y and some confusion of e, e and o. But we also see e usually substituted for ja and sometimes even for e: (crēki<crēky<crēky). The former is most likely due to there being no letter ja in the glagolitic alphabet; ja is not used in the text at all. I have no explanation for the latter.\(^2\)

As far as Serbo-Croatian influence on the adjective is concerned, we would expect it in the form of the ending in several cases, but not in the basic meaning of the long/short distinction. This is, indeed, the case. I will discuss this matter further in chapter 3.

There are six indefinite specific NP's. All have ećere, 'a certain,' and one has a short adjective in addi-

\(^{1}\) Weingart, "První česko-církevněslovanská legenda o svatém Václavu," p. 919.

\(^{2}\) Zbigniew Golah (personal communication) notes that the form crikva is attested in Old Serbo-Croatian. Since e> i in some dialects, this phenomenon is evidently not confined to this manuscript.
tion. A frequent construction for introducing new characters is the individual's name with an indefinite appositive either preceding or following and accompanied by eter: 

3. (LW 42:13) prizva že erēē etera imenem. Pūλ, 'he called a certain priest by the name of Pavel' 

4. (LW 42:2) Krastei že erēi eter v'zam' i 'Krastei, a certain priest, taking him . . .' 

That eter is not required, however, is indicated by variant readings of two passages without it, including that in example 4. Although such a NP contains a proper name (definite by definition), the name is used to characterize the individual further, not to refer to him as someone identifiable by the hearer: he is, after all, only just being introduced. This construction accounts for five of the six NP's counted as indefinite specifics.

**Bulgarian texts**

The Bulgarian texts used for this study, also undated, are generally believed to have been written there between the time the disciples of Constantine and Methodius arrived (885) and the fall of the Bulgarian Empire in 1018. In contrast to the Moravo-Pannonian texts, there is little or no dispute concerning the language most of them were originally written in, and in some the author's name is even given. Such authors' names, however, are not necessarily very helpful, since the name, in many cases, is all the information we have about the writer.
Sermons by Clement of Oxrid (CS1-6)

One of the three most influential of Constantine and Methodius's immediate disciples was Clement, who later became bishop of Velica, near Oxrid. (The other two were Constantine, bishop of Bulgaria, and Naum.) Clement lived from about 830-916 and was probably a Slav from Macedonia. A fair number of works appear with his name given as the author, and an even greater number have been attributed to him by one or more scholars. According to his biographer, Theophilakt of Oxrid (who wrote in Greek), Clement is the author of sermons for all the holidays, panegyrics to Mary the Mother of God and stories about miracles connected with her; lives of prophets, apostles, and church fathers; and liturgical songs and prayers. But many of the works bearing his name are also extant in manuscripts where they appear anonymously or under the name of the Greek Church father John Chrysostom (ca. 345-407, in Slavic Ioan Zlatoust). It was, of course, common all through the Middle Ages to attribute works to well-known personages. Thus it is impossible to tell exactly which works Clement or the others of the time actually wrote.

Of the texts that are generally agreed to be Clement's, I have chosen six, primarily on the basis of there

---

1Clement of Oxrid, Săbrani săčinenija, 1:5-6.

2The editors of his complete works (Clement of Oxrid, Săbrani săčinenija), using the most liberal possible criteria for the determination of authorship, have published three volumes, including LC, LM and PCM.
being at least one early manuscript (twelfth to thirteenth century). All are sermons.

1. Zapovédanija o praznicěx

"Zapovédanija o praznicěx" [Messages for Holidays] is one of the genre of all-purpose "form-sermons." As Professor Kuev points out in the introductory note to this work, a large proportion of the clergy at this early date were far from educated. They could read the prayers and lessons, but were not sufficiently familiar with Byzantine homiletics to write their own sermons. Thus works such as this one, where the priest need only fill in the name of the saint being honored, became very popular.

This sermon has come down to us in twenty-seven copies, the oldest of which is from the twelfth century. It is of Russian redaction and has "Kliment episkop slověnskii" as its author. This copy, now in the Lenin State Library in Moscow (folio 304, no. 12), was formerly the property of the Holy Trinity Sergiev Monastery north of that city. The remaining copies are all from the fifteenth century or later and many have the name of John Chrysostom on them. John Chrysostom, however, did not write sermons of this type.2

The version used for this study is that of the Trinity copy above. Variant readings are provided in this

2Ibid., 1:55.
edition from the two other manuscripts which are part of the same family, but none of them is directly relevant here.

The work is rhetorical, as one would expect, and it abounds in complex sentences. There is no narrative, and hence, no indefinite specifics. It is very short, at not quite three pages of manuscript.

2. Poučenije na pameti apostola ili moćenika

"Poučenije na pameti apostola ili moćenika" [Sermon in Memory of an Apostle or a Martyr] (CS2) exists in twenty-six copies, the oldest and least changed of which is of Russian redaction, from the twelfth century and anonymous. This manuscript, part of a collection, formerly belonged to the Holy Trinity Sergiev Monastery, and it also is now in the Lenin State Library in Moscow (folio 304, no. 12). This is the version used here. The other copies range from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century and comprise a fairly different second version, which I did not use.

This text is also an all-purpose sermon. The priest need only fill in the name of the apostle or martyr being honored. Not surprisingly, a very similar work has been found which has a name filled in, the sermon listed under 3 here.\(^1\) These versions were compared. The language of this work is similar to that of the previous text, and there

\(^1\)Ibid., 1:88-108.
are no indefinite specifics here, either. It also is quite short, three and a half pages in the manuscript.

3. Poučenije svetago apostola Marka

"Poučenije svetago apostola Marka" [Sermon (in honor) of the Holy Apostle Mark] (CS3) is a slight variant of "Sermon in Honor of an Apostle or a Martyr" above. It seems to have been extremely popular, for there are ninety manuscript copies, ranging from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, and five early printed copies (seventeenth and eighteenth century). Of the manuscripts, all of those dating from before the sixteenth century are of Russian redaction.

The copy reproduced in Clement's Săbrani săčinenija, the one used here, dates from the thirteenth century, and belonged formerly to the printing establishment of the Holy Synod in Moscow. It is now in the Central State Archive of Ancient Documents (Central'nyj gosudarstvennyj arxiv drevnix aktov) in Moscow, folio 381, no. 172. Variants are given from four thirteenth century Russian manuscripts, three sixteenth century Russian ones, one sixteenth century Serbian copy with Bulgarianisms, and the oldest copy of the general sermon above.¹

In general, the language of this text is almost identical to that of the immediately preceding general sermon.

¹Ibid., 1:119-139.
But it differs from it in having an unusually large number of unexplainable adjective forms (long where one would expect short and vice versa) for a document of this length (three manuscript pages). Of the seven "wrong" forms, four are "right" in the general sermon and one does not occur there at all. The general sermon, by contrast, has two "wrong" forms, one of which is in the "right" form in this text.

4. *Poučenije episkopa Klimenta na svetoje vškrššenije*

"Poučenije episkopa Klimenta na svetoje vškrššenije" [Bishop Clement's Sermon for Holy Sunday] (CS4) is another general sermon, but not of the fill-in-the-blank type. Since its subject is Sunday in general, it could be used without changes on any of them.

Only one manuscript of this work has been found. This is part of the same twelfth-century Russian collection which also contains the "Sermon in Memory of an Apostle or a Martyr" and "Messages for Holidays" (CS2 and CS1, respectively).¹

The language and style of this sermon are similar to those of the others, including a lack of indefinite specifics. Its length is slightly over three manuscript pages.

¹Ibid., 1:151-157.
5. Poučenije na predprazdnostvo svetyja Bogorodica

"Poučenije na predprazdnostvo svetyja Bogorodica"

[Sermon for the Holiday (of the Birth) of the Holy Mother of God] (CS5) is one of the many reworkings of the general sermon "Messages for Holidays" (CS1 above). But it is less than half the length of its prototype at only one and a quarter pages of manuscript.

Thirty-seven copies of this sermon are known. The oldest of these is of Russian redaction, from the twelfth or thirteenth century, and was discovered in the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Novgorod. It is now in the Saltykov-Ščedrin Public Library in Leningrad (Sof. 1324). The remainder range from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century and are all of purely Russian redaction, except two from the sixteenth century. The version used here is the oldest copy, as published in Clement's Šabrani sčinenija, with variants from twelve of the Russian manuscripts. Its language is similar to that of the other sermons, and there are no indefinite specifics.

6. Poučenije presvetyja vladycica naseja Bogorodica

"Poučenije presvetyja vladycica naseja Bogorodica"

[Sermon (to Honor the Birth) of our Most Holy Sovereign, Mother of God ] (CS6) is another reworking of "Messages for

1Ibid., 1:186-197.
Holidays," but it is almost twice as long as CS5 above (slightly over two manuscript pages), and thus about the same length as its prototype.

This sermon is extant in 42 copies, the oldest of which is in the same twelfth- or thirteenth-century Russian collection as the previous work. The rest range from the thirteenth century to the sixteenth and are probably mostly or entirely of Russian redaction. The editors of Clement's Săbrani sâcinenija have reproduced the oldest copy, with variants from twelve others;¹ this is the text I have used.

In general, the language of this sermon is like that of the others, although there are several extremely complex sentences. There is one masc. instr. sg. short form (malomə in line 20), which two later manuscripts (fourteenth and fifteenth to sixteenth century) changed to the long malymə, despite the indefinite meaning. No doubt others not noted in the variants have the long reading as well.

O pismeněx₂

"O pismeněx₂ čranorizca Xrabra" [On Letters, by the Monk Xrabr] (OP) is a short (seven pages of manuscript) polemic defending the Slavic alphabet and holy books, and attacking their opponents the Greeks, who were trying to preserve the preeminence of their own language. Since precisely the situation brought out in the text existed in Bulgaria at the beginning of the reign of Tsar Simeon (893-927), the text

¹Ibid., 1:198-208.
was very likely written there and then. Another indication of its very early date is the sentence found in three of the manuscripts: sotë bo ešte živi iže sotë viděli ixe, 'for there are those still alive who have seen them,' i.e., Constantine and Methodius. This sentence appears in the same place in all three manuscripts, and in its context strengthens the argument of which it is a part:

(Moscow MS 383a:2-8) Ašte bo vprosiši knig-čie grečeskago gle, kto vy estь pismena sтворilъ, ili knigy přeložilъ. ili vž koe vremě. to redcii o(t) ni(x) věďę to. ašte li vprosiši slovenskuę bukare, gle, kto vy pis-мена sтворилъ estь; ili kto knigy přeložилъ. vžsi věďę, i o(t)věšťavъ rečetъ, štyi konstantinъ filosofъ naricaemyi kirilъ. tv pismenà s tvori, i knigy preloži. i mefodii brat ego. sot bo ešte živi, iže sotv viděli i(x)

'If you ask a Greek scribe, saying Who created letters for you, or translated the (holy) books, or when, few of them know. But if you ask Slavic scribes, saying Who created letters for you, or Who translated the (holy) books, everyone knows, and answering, will say Saint Constantine the Philosopher, called Cyril, he created the letters and translated the books, and Methodius his brother. For there are those still alive who have seen them.'

This sentence was deleted from most later copies, Kuev believes, because it caused the text to sound outdated.¹

Other evidence for dating this text very early includes linguistic archaisms, e.g., masc./neut. dat. sg. česomu (in the Lavrentiev and Moscow copies), which is also found in the Gospel manuscripts Marianus, Zographensis and

Assemanianus. The newer form is čemu; aor. 3 pl. reše (Moldavian or I Hilendarski MS and others), the Middle Bulgarian form being reše; words like život& and takmo, etc.¹

At the end of the nineteenth century, most scholars believed "O pismeněx" to have been written in Moravia. Such linguistic forms as Rastiva (for Rastislav) and četyr meždu desetima, 'twenty-four,' were seen as exclusively Moravianisms. But as Kuev points out, it seems only natural that the author would refer to this Moravian ruler by the Moravian form of his name regardless of where he was writing. In addition, B. Ljapunov has argued that Rastiva is not exclusively West Slavic, but had its origin in proto-South-Slavic.² Similarly, while it is true that only Czech preserves such numerical forms, they do also occur in some manuscripts that are not of Bohemian or Moravian origin. For example, the Russian Lavrentjev Chronicle (l. 103) has tretii mežju dvěma desetima, 'twenty-third;' a Bugarian Aleksandrija by Pseudo-Kalisthenes shows dvěma meži desetuma, 'twenty-two,' and others.³ Thus neither


²B. Ljapunov, "Ist die Form Rastiva etwa beweisen für ihre westslavische Provenienz?" Archiv für Slavische Philologie 12 (1904): 564-568, cited by Kuev, Černorizec Xrabár, p. 35.

³Kuev, Černorizec Xrabár, pp. 35-36.
of these arguments implies necessarily that the work was written in Moravia.

The evidence for its Bulgarian origin, however, is fairly convincing. Today, in fact, most scholars trace its origin to the Preslav school in East Bulgaria. The arguments are historical and linguistic. First, Preslav was the capital. It was here where the Greek archbishop was, and the highest political leaders as well. Here also the disciples of Constantine and Methodius founded their literary school. Additional evidence comes from the Eastern Bulgariansims in the earliest manuscripts. St. M. Kuljbakin points out the following:

1. Æ is preserved in strong position: tázkmo, sátnoe, sábrašq, etc. There is only one exception, Črkove, probably a technical term.
2. ë, η is preserved: čkoljubecv, načenž, menšimv, prišedž, sátnoe, dëskä. There are two cases where ë is preserved: čustž, čustniša.
3. Old dz is regularly preserved: dzëlo, drudzii, dzvëzdöčštenie, mnodžëxi, mnodzi, knëdzä.
4. The conjunction no is regularly written nø.

The fact that the above characteristics occur even in manuscripts belonging to different redactions (Lavrentiev, Moldavian, Moscow) leads Kuljbakin to believe that the original also contained these features.¹

It has also been suggested that this work was originally written in Greek, but I believe that this hypothesis is now generally, if not universally, rejected.

Xrabr's work is so far known in seventy-three manuscripts, of which sixty-seven are complete and six comprise fragments. These exhibit seven different redactions. The oldest copies are Middle Bulgarian (Lavrentiev/Sinodal'nyj, 1348), Bulgarian-Russian (Moscow/Moskovskaja duxovnaja akademija, fifteenth century), and Bulgarian-Serbian (Savinski, fifteenth century). Most numerous are the Russian: sixty-three, all from the sixteenth century or later. Lavrov's edition,¹ used here, is of the Lavrentiev copy with variant readings from the Moscow manuscript. Readings from Savinski have been considered where appropriate.

In contrast to the texts discussed previously, "O pismenëx" is decidedly secular in character. God plays an important part, of course, and Constantine is referred to as "holy," but there is only one sentence which could be considered a Scriptural quotation (OP 163:13 bë dëska napisana židovský i rimsky i ellinsky, 'There was an inscription written in Hebrew and Latin and Greek,' Jn 19:20, Lk 23:38), and it is historical rather than theological, and in the mouth of an opponent besides. His sources are chiefly Greek chroniclers, Church fathers and a grammarian.

¹Lavrov, Materialy po istorii vozniknovenija drevnejšej slavjanskoj pis'mennosti, pp. 162-164.
The form is that of an apology, a genre used in Greek since antiquity. The style is succinct and straightforward, not rhetorical. There are occasional sentences of narrative incorporated into an argument, as in the quotation above, but no sustained narration. Nevertheless, there are four indefinite specific NP's. All three manuscripts examined employ the short members of the oblique group.

Treatise Against the Bogomils

Considered the most important work in EOS, Presbyter Kozma's Treatise Against the Bogomils, "Slovo světago Kozmy prezvitera na eretiky" (literally, 'Treatise by the Holy Presbyter Kozma Against the Heretics'), is also by far the longest, with 159 pages of manuscript. But as Vaillant points out, the text in its present form is too long for a sermon and must have been intended to be read. Others, e.g., Popruženko, have argued that it began as more than one work.¹ No one, however, questions that it was originally written in Slavic.

The Treatise Against the Bogomils most likely dates to shortly after 972, when the Byzantine Emperor John Tzimisces deposed both the Bulgarian tsar and patriarch.

The most important evidence for this date is the mention

of John, Exarch of Bulgaria as a contemporary:

5. (B 79:11-13) Podražaite ivana prozvitera novago, egož i ot vas saměx mnozi znajut, byvšago pastuxa i eksarxa. iž v zemli bolgarštii

'Imitate John the new (or, recent) presbyter, whom many of you yourselves know, the former shepherd and Exarch of the Bulgarian land.'

Ju. Trifonov has suggested that the individual referred to here is not Exarch John, the contemporary of Simeon the Great (893-927), but Presbyter John, a contemporary of Ioan Debrski, Archbishop of Oxrid, active in the first third of the eleventh century. Both Vaillant and Popruženko reject this theory. In any case, Kozma's referring to Bulgaria as zemli bĂłlgarštii in example 5 would seem to indicate that the work was written before the fall of the Bulgarian Empire in 1018. Otherwise, according to Popruženko, he would have called it carstvo bĂłlgarskoje, 'Bulgarian Empire,' presumably to distinguish that political entity from the state when he was writing.

The Treatise Against the Bogomils, like "O pismeněx," was probably written in Preslav. Since this city was the capital and cultural center, we would expect much of his audience to have been there. In addition, the text's vocabulary is typically Eastern Bulgarian: pastuxa is generally used instead of pastyră for 'shepherd,' the former

---

1See Popruženko, Kozma Presviter, bolgarskij pisatel X veka, pp. lxi-lxii.

2Ibid., pp. lxii-lxvii; Peuch and Vaillant, Le traité contre les Bogomiles de Cosmas le Prêtre, pp. 21-22.
also being found in the Gospel manuscripts Suprasliensis and Savina kniga. The Macedonian translators used pastyrə. We also see strany instead of jezyci for ta ethnē, a translation also found in the psalter from Čudov Monastery.\(^1\)

As of 1945, there were nine known copies of the complete text, all of Russian redaction, and dating from 1494 to the 17th century. There are also a number of fragments to be found in collections from the twelfth to the fourteenth century, again mostly Russian, but there are also two of Serbian redaction, one of which also has Bulgarian traits. The manuscripts of the whole text fall into three families, all from the same archetype, which could be Old Russian. Despite the lateness of the manuscripts, Vaillant finds no indication that the original has been seriously altered, as indicated by comparisons with the fragments. There has, however, been some paraphrasing.\(^2\)

Popruženko's edition\(^3\) is of the oldest manuscript, that from the Volokalamsk Monastery, dated 1494. The whole text is written in one hand, and the orthography and mistakes are typical of Novgorod: the confusion of ĉ and ĉ, ĉ and i, q and u. But it has not lost all its Bulgarian character, for there are many instances of a instead of u and ra, la, ra, lu, even where they are etymologically wrong (63:12 dražati, 25:4 dražašte, 16:1 vilči, etc.).

\(^1\)Peuch and Vaillant, Le traité contre les Bogomiles de Cosmas le Prêtre, p. 37.
\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 10-13.
\(^3\)In Popruženko, Kozma Presviter, bolgarskij pisatel' X veka.
sometimes even finds the Russian and the Bulgarian forms on the same line, e.g., \textit{40:1 mlčanii, molčaniju}. Popruženko provides variants from six other complete manuscripts and eleven fragments.\textsuperscript{1}

The language of the treatise is rather popular in nature. Since its intended audience was clergy with little education, Kozma avoids learned or complicated constructions. There are Greek words, but this is hardly surprising, since the only higher culture of the time was Greek. And his derivatives are of popular character: \textit{zapržžke}, 'rotten egg'; \textit{možatica}, 'married woman'; \textit{mržvčina}, 'carcass'; \textit{Mamoničištë}, 'child of Mamon'; abstracts are in -\textit{čestvie} and verbs in -\textit{čestvovati}; artificial derivatives are rare.\textsuperscript{2}

A peculiarity of this text relevant for this study is the frequent use of \textit{drugyi} to mean 'certain' rather than 'other.' This usage is also found in Suprasliensis and in the Eastern Bulgarian Epistle manuscripts as a translation of Greek \textit{tis}.\textsuperscript{3}

Short forms of at least the dative and locative plural of the oblique-group adjectives are generally used

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. viii-xxiv, 81.

\textsuperscript{2}Peuch and Vaillant, \textit{Le traité contre les Bogomiles de Cosmas le Prêtre}, pp. 38.

\textsuperscript{3}Vaillant tells its history. The Macedonian translators used \textit{eterë} for \textit{tis}, and this became contaminated with Greek \textit{heteros} 'other.' They then were using \textit{eterë} for both 'certain' and 'other.’ When Eastern Bulgarian substituted \textit{drugyi} for \textit{eterë}, the result was that \textit{drugyi} was now used for both meanings. (Peuch and Vaillant, \textit{Le traité contre les Bogomiles de Cosmas le Prêtre}, pp. 39-40).
where they belong. The fact that there are more mistakes here than in, for example, LM is undoubtedly due to the lateness of our manuscript.

Tale of the Iron Cross

Although less significant than the previous text from a general perspective, "Skazanie za železnija krāst" [Tale of the Iron Cross] (IC) is one of the more important works for this study. It consists of a series of short, lively narratives in which quite a number of characters are introduced. The result is nine indefinite specific NP's in seven and a half printed pages of text. Of these, six have adjectives that could express the long/short opposition and all of them are short.

The narratives used here are three miracles of St. George. Most of the stories in the Slavic collections of such miracles are also found in Greek, and they are generally set in Byzantine surroundings. In these three, however, the background is Bulgarian. We hear of the original conversion of the Bulgarians to Christianity under Prince Boris Michael, and battles of Bulgarians against Hungarians, known from other sources to have occurred under Tsar Simeon. These tales are also not found in any of the Greek collections. For most scholars, this evidence indicates a Bulgarian origin for the tales. Still, some, including Angelov himself, believe that the stories were originally written in
Greek and that the Bulgarian details were added by a later compiler. But since the language is very old, the translation and adaptation must have been done quite early.¹

Two of the miracles, known collectively as "Čudoto s bālgarina" [Miracle with Bulgarian], were extant in nine manuscripts as of 1978. These range from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century, with six Russian redactions, one South Slavic, one Ukrainian and one Belorussian. Not all are complete. The oldest is found in a Russian prologue, No. 5 of the Holy Trinity Sergiev Monastery collection, also called the Uvarov manuscript. The "Miracle with Bulgarian" comprises miracles 4 ("O krestē i o bālgarina") and 5 ("O ženē"). Thematically connected with these two is miracle 9 in the same manuscript ("O Klimentē, egože izbavivē Styi Georgi vē rati"), which also tells of a Bulgarian being rescued by St. George from the Hungarians.

The language of this text is the most popular of any of the works used for this study. The work consists entirely of narrative. There are no philosophical discussions, religious disputes or even long prayers, and therefore no learned or complicated constructions. (Interestingly, though, there are three dative absolutes.) It is therefore probably as close an approximation to the spoken language of the time as we are likely to find. The

spelling in the Uvarov manuscript has obviously been contaminated by Old Russian (e.g., 84:13 prežе, 84:14 o krestě where one would expect prežde, o krestě, and 85:4 Volodimera where one could expect Vladimir in Old Bulgarian).

The Uvarov manuscript is the one printed by Angelov and the one used here. Angelov's edition has no variant readings from other manuscripts and there are a few corrections, but these are clearly marked.

Inscriptions

Inscriptions are of particular importance because they are, presumably, the original documents rather than copies several times removed. But they are usually short and often fragmentary besides, making them difficult to use in a study such as this one. Nevertheless, one of the better-known inscriptions, that on the tomb of Mostić (M), contains a masc. nom. sg. past active ptc. of the type discussed in chapter 5. This inscription, discovered in 1952 in excavations at Preslav, was dated at 950-970 by Stančo Stančev and his colleagues.1 Its style is simple, without learned constructions and its thirty words probably comprise two or three sentences. It contains six definite NP's without variable adjectives: one which could be a NP, one with the previously-discussed participle (see

1Stančo Stančev et al., Nadpisat na čårgubilja Mostić, Bålgarska akademija na naukite, Arxeologičeski institut, Epigrafska poredica, No. 1 (Sofia: Bålgarska akademija na naukite, 1955), cited by Vaillant, Textes vieux-slaves, 2:84.
example 119), three predicate NP's of undetermined status, and no indefinites.

**Other Texts**

In table 2 is a list of the EOS texts that I did not use here. Although the list appears long, none of the individual works is longer than about two pages. Furthermore, none of them contains much, if any, narrative, a feature which makes these texts considerably less interesting for present purposes than many of those in table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEXTS NOT USED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Works of John, Exarch of Bulgaria
1. Prologue to "Treatise on the Orthodox Faith"
2. Prologue to "Zlatostruj"
3. Prologue to "Hexameron"
4. Prologue to "Theology" of Saint John of Damascus
5. Sermon on the Ascension
6. Sermon on the Meeting (Srětěnie)--fragment
7. Sermon on Christmas
8. Poxvala to the Apostle John

### B. Works of Presbyter Constantine
1. Prologue to "Commentaries on the Gospels"
2. Colophon to "Discourse against the Arians"
3. Colophon to Catechism of Cyril of Jerusalem
4. Service in honor of Methodius

### C. Verse texts
1. Verse prologue to Gospels ("Proglas sv. Evangelija")
2. Dedication of Panegyric to Simeon in Izbornik 1073 and elsewhere

### D. Poxvala to Cyril

### E. Prologue to Hilferdingsblatt (Makedonskij listok)

### F. Other sermons by Clement

### G. "Address on the Orthodox Faith" ("Napisanije o pravěi věře") attributed to Constantine/Cyril

### H. Kiev fragments

### I. Portions of "Zakonč sudnyi ljudom" and Slavic Ekloga which do not correspond with Greek Ekloga

### J. Other inscriptions
CHAPTER III

DEFINITE, INDEFINITE, AND GENERIC

In order to determine whether the data we are observing express the category definite/indefinite or not, we need to know what it is we are looking for. Some general exploration of the relevant notions is therefore in order. First and most importantly, the meaning definite/indefinite should not be viewed as the equivalent of definite and indefinite article usage in a language like English.

Articles

Let us look briefly at some of the tasks that can be performed by articles. Their primary function, by definition,\(^1\) is to mark the distinction between definite and indefinite in NP's. This, of course, can be adequately accomplished by formally marking only one or the other, as modern Bulgarian does, rather than both, as does English.\(^2\)

---


2With two articles, however, definite/indefinite can be regularly differentiated from a third meaning. See Flora Klein, "'Same vs. Different' Crosslinguistically: the 'Articles' in English and in Spanish," in Papers from the Twelfth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society, April 23-25, 1976, ed. Salikoko S. Mufwene, Carol A. Walker, Sanford B. Steever (Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1976), pp. 413-424; Joseph Pentheroudakis, "Reference and Indefinite Descriptions in Modern Greek" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1977); and example 3 here.
Another function observed in various languages is marking NP's which have been created out of other parts of speech, e.g. English the living; German ein Toter, 'a dead person (masc.)'; Greek (Lk 16:10)

ο ἐν ἐλαχιστὸν ἁδικὸν καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς ἁδικὸν ἑστίν,
the in least dishonest and in much dishonest he-is,

'He who is dishonest in the least is dishonest also in much.' We can also observe them sometimes providing the only indication of the gender, number and/or case of the NP: (spoken) French l'âme/les âmes (sg./pl.), 'soul;' German der Tisch 'the table' (masc. nom. sg.)/den Tisch, 'the table' (masc. acc. sg.)/dem Tisch (masc. dat. sg.).

They also can be used for certain secondary meanings. For example, in 1a, an seems to indicate that John's wife is not inherently or permanently or already known to be angry. In fact, 1a appears equivalent to 1b, with his and a non-restrictive relative clause.

1. a. Sneaking into the house at 3:00 A.M., John was confronted by an angry wife.

   b. Sneaking into the house at 3:00 A.M., John was confronted by his wife, who was angry.

   c. Sneaking into the house at 3:00 A.M., John was confronted by his angry wife.

Substituting his for an, producing 1c, gives implications that (1) John has more than one wife and it was the angry one who confronted him; (2) his wife is always angry; or (3) there is some preceding narrative, so that we already know she is angry. In other words, the meaning of 1c seems
to involve a restrictive relative clause. For the most part, these non-central functions are not incompatible with definite/indefinite. For example, we would not expect to find a definite article marking gender, number, and case if the context indicated the NP to be indefinite. The type exemplified by 1 appears to be exploiting the incompatibility between a NP that all the speech act participants know is definite and the indefinite article.

In addition, there is a type of NP where the semantic opposition between definite and indefinite articles is neutralized. This is the generic or class name, which has no referent.\(^1\) Note that there is still a formal opposition the/a in sentences like 2.

2. A/The motorcycle rider is required by law to wear a helmet.

3. *Un/Le tigre est un animal feroce.
   A/The tiger is an animal ferocious

   In the plural in English, however, the possibility of Ø-article can be used to distinguish generic/class from both definite and indefinite.

4. a. Motorcycle riders are required by law to wear a helmet/helmets. (generic/class)

   b. Some motorcycle riders are required by law to wear a helmet/helmets. (indefinite or part of class)

   c. The motorcycle riders are required by law to wear a helmet/helmets. (definite)

   And what is the meaning of the definite article in the following quotation, which concerns Begin and Sadat?

1This matter will be discussed further in the section on generics below.
Although their lives have followed different paths, they share a sense of pride and purpose that impels them to play for the highest stakes. "Both are very confident men," says a high U.S. official who knows both of them well. "Only confident men would take the big risk, the big gamble." (Newsweek, 28 November 1977, p. 49)

The NP does not appear to refer to anything concrete. If it did (to their historic accord), the official would probably have used this or that. The sentence itself is generic, and the subject is certainly generic. The direct object may be also: the archetypal big risk. It seems synonymous with such a big risk, such a big gamble, rather than with a big risk, a big gamble.

Because of phenomena like those discussed above, a distinction must be made between formally or morphologically definite or indefinite and semantically definite or indefinite, a difference that seems to have escaped some of the researchers discussed in the next chapter. As Jerry Morgan warns,

The morphological manifestation of the so-called definite article (in languages that have one at all) is not a very reliable indicator of the semantic property of definiteness, whatever it is. There seems to be, across languages, a common core of usage of the definite determiner, of the usual sort, but there are many language-particular complexities that cloud the picture, including both extended usages of the definite article and cases were it fails to show up even though semantically motivated.

For this reason I have adopted the approach meaning-to-form.

---

Definite/Indefinite

The category definite/indefinite will be treated here as primarily pragmatic, and not as syntactic or semantic. As I see it, this is the only way to attack the problem as a whole. Syntax, of the type we students of the generative-transformational school are used to, concerns sentences, and most instances of definitization involve units larger than a single sentence. To take a simple example, a room may be identified at the beginning of a paragraph (or a whole narrative) as having a large, comfortable armchair. This object can then be talked about throughout the rest of the paragraph, and perhaps the whole narrative, as the armchair, the easy chair, Grandpa's chair or other definite NP suitable for distinguishing the chair in question from similar ones. If this anaphoric usage were the only one, it might be theoretically possible to expand the domain of syntax to include the linguistic text. This becomes a practical problem, however, when one considers the not unlikely circumstance that this armchair may be mentioned several times in widely-separated portions of a novel, without being reintroduced with an indefinite. A more serious problem is that the armchair may not be introduced linguistically at all. In a speech act, the participants may be in a room where the chair is, it may have been a subject of many previous quarrels, etc. And how does one account for the definiteness of the sun, the mayor or the cat? Clearly, one cannot incorporate physical
settings, shared experiences, knowledge of the world, and the like into the syntax. I therefore conclude that many aspects of definite/indefinite cannot be treated in the syntax.

If definiteness were semantic, it would presumably be representable by some sort of logical formula. Such analyses have, indeed, been suggested; probably the most famous is in Russell's "On Denoting:" "One and only one term has the property F,"¹ also expressible in the formula \( \exists x (F(x)) \land \forall y (F(y) \rightarrow (y = x)) \). Very few definite NP's, however, actually satisfy this uniqueness requirement. For example, there is more than one entity describable as mayor, cat, and even sun if we stretch our imaginations, and yet the mayor, the cat and the sun can be used and understood to refer to particular entities. We could add the situation of the speech act into Russell's formulation, producing something like "one and only one term has the property F in the situation S." Even this is inadequate: as I utter the mayor in Chicago, I am well aware that there are other mayors than Harold Washington; as I say the cat, I know that there are other cats than the one belonging to the friend that I just mentioned, and my hearer shares this knowledge even as the utterance is made and understood. But still we both know who

or what is being talked about. Perhaps there is only one relevant term which has the property F in the situation S. Relevance, however, is hardly a semantic notion, separable from speaker and hearer: it is they, after all, who must decide whether a particular entity which might be the intended referent: (since it has the property F) could, in fact, be the intended referent, given shared experiences, knowledge of the world and each other, the present state of the conversation, etc.¹

I do not wish by the preceding to say that no manifestations of the opposition definite/indefinite can be treated syntactically or semantically. It is quite possible that definitization due to a relative clause could be called syntactic and that truly unique NP's could be called semantically definite, but I believe I have shown that neither of these frameworks would be able to cover much of the range of cases where the distinction definite/indefinite is made.

Definite

As a working definition of definite, let us use Chafe's formulation of what the speaker intends to communicate to the hearer by the use of a definite NP: "I assume

you can pick out, from all the referents that might be categorized in this way, the one I have in mind.\textsuperscript{1}

Two parts of this definition deserve particular discussion. First, it presupposes a class of objects that can be characterized in a certain way, and second, the speaker (Sp) chooses one of them. The definition appears to exclude uniques and proper names, and, intuitively, they should be included. I trust it is not stretching the definition too far to consider these either as one of a class of one (true uniques, i.e., there is only one that could possibly be referred to), or as the uniquely-salient representative of its type (the sun, God, Olga—the last being the uniquely-salient individual characterized as being named Olga).

More seriously, however, the definition excludes class names (man), plurals, mass nouns (water, jewelry), and abstracts (truth, redness). When a speaker uses a noun as a class name, he refers to the category of entities that can be considered X's. Since identification of a particular individual within the category has nothing to do with the way the noun is being used in this communication, the category definite/indefinite is irrelevant. This is why the English sentences in 5 are essentially synonymous.

5. a. **Lions** are ferocious.
   
b. **The lion** is ferocious.
   
c. **A lion** is ferocious.

As far as I can ascertain, the function class name is identical to generic. Such a usage should be excluded from any definition of definite or indefinite and considered a category apart from either.

Plurals, mass nouns and abstractions, however, cannot be so easily dismissed. Plurals exhibit all three categories, definite, indefinite, and generic.

6. a. Last time we were at the zoo, we missed **the lions**. (definite: the lions at the zoo)
   
b. **Some lions** had escaped or been stolen. (indefinite with specific referent)
   
c. **Some lions** will escape tomorrow. (indefinite with or without specific referent)
   
d. **There are(some) lions** in there. (indefinite with specific referents)
   
e. **Lions** are ferocious. (generic or class name)

Mass Nouns can be definite and generic,

7. a. **Water** is essential for life. (generic: the substance water)
   
b. Billy doesn't like **sand** in his shoes. (generic: the substance sand)
   
c. **Some music** I like, **some** I don't. (quantified generic, contrastive)
   
d. Someone used up **the hot water**. (definite: the uniquely saliènt hot water, the hot water in our house)
   
e. Suddenly, **the music** stopped. (definite: the music present in the context/situation.
   
f. **The heat** was unbearable. (definite: the heat present in the context/situation)
and also indefinite.¹

8. a. (Some) sand got into Billy's shoes. ([quantified] indefinite with referent)
   b. Please give Susie some milk. (quantified indefinite without referent)
   c. Mabel has (some) jewelry for the rummage sale. ([quantified] indefinite with referent)
   d. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them. (Lk 22:19) (indefinite with referent)

The addition of a singular indefinite article turns some mass nouns into count nouns:

9. a. Can you suggest a good wine?
   b. Please give me a beer.

Abstracts are more complicated. They can, of course, be generic.

10. a. Water is essential for life.
    b. Truth is beauty.
    c. The candidate spoke vaguely in favor or fiscal restraint.

¹As Howard Aronson pointed out to me, the underlined NP's in 7 would be translated into French using partitive de+definite article. But these NP's are not definite. A speaker uttering sentence i, for example, may not

   i. Donne à Susie du lait. (du=de+le)
   ii. Donne à Susie un verre de lait.

even know if the addressee has any milk. Note also that if Sp requests a glass of milk for Susie, as in ii, there is no article. Such NP's are, I think, best analyzed as quantified generics in French. They could be viewed that way in English as well. When there are no individuals being discussed, the boundaries between indefinites, on the one hand, and generics meaning part of a whole, on the other, are rather fuzzy. (A traditional explanation of the use of partitive de in French can be found in J. E. Mansion, French Reference Grammar for Schools and Colleges, Heath's Modern Language Series (Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., n.d.), pp. 113-115; thanks to Jim McCawley for bringing the possibility of fuzzy boundaries between grammatical categories to my attention.)
The addition of an article can cause various changes. The usually makes the noun mass or count, and often concrete as well.

11. a. The life you save may be your own. (count)
   b. She brought home the cleaning. (concrete, mass: the clothes that had been taken to the dry cleaner)
   c. Have you done the cleaning? (mass: the situationally-salient cleaning task)
   d. The beauty slowly climbed the stairs. (concrete, count)

although it can make it simply definite,

12. a. The redness of his face indicated the extent of his embarrassment. ("syntactically definite")
   b. She groped around in the darkness. (the darkness in the situation)
   c. Are you afraid of the truth? (the real state of affairs in the situation; contrast with Are you afraid of truth?, truth in general: generic)

or do nothing at all.

13. Billy is afraid of the dark. (generic)

Some usually creates indefinite abstracts,

14. a. There is some truth to that statement. (some of the quality truth: indefinite specific)
   b. Adam did some cleaning. (some of the activity cleaning: indefinite specific)
   c. Some life/liveliness would help this party considerably. (some of the quality: indefinite non-specific)
   d. Please send some love this way. (some of the feeling: indefinite specific)

although the resulting NP's can be mass and concrete,

15. Adam took some cleaning and disappeared. (concrete mass indefinite specific)

or, with a stress shift, contrastive quantified generics.
16. Some beauty is fleeting.

Abstracts accompanied by a are indefinite and count,

17. a. That article reveals an important truth about the use of aspect. (indefinite specific)
   b. A life hung by a thread. (indefinite specific)
   c. The director is looking for a blonde beauty. (indefinite specific or non-specific)
   d. She said she gave the child a spanking he wouldn't forget. (indefinite specific)

but, as with other types of NP's, there are some environments where the use of a does not involve indefiniteness in the sense of talking about a referent the hearer cannot identify.¹

Chief among them is the predicate NP.

18. a. That fish is a beauty.
   b. Be a love and bring me the paper.

Since plurals, mass nouns, and abstracts all exhibit definite, indefinite and generic (albeit to different degrees, they should be included in any definition involving these categories. Chafe's definition of definite, then, can be amended to read "a communication by Sp to H that 'I assume you can pick out, from all the referents that might be categorized in this way, the one(s) I have in mind; or from all the material, quality, activity, etc., the quantity or manifestation I have in mind.'"

Now both Chafe's definition and my expanded version seem to run into difficulty when one considers some of Donnellan's observations on the uses of definite NP's. Both

¹See section on indefinites below.
fit his referential usage very well: "A speaker who uses a definite description referentially in an assertion . . . uses the description to enable his audience to pick out whom or what he is talking about and states something about that person or thing." But they do not appear to describe the attributive usage at all: "A speaker who uses a definite description attributively in an assertion states something about whoever or whatever is the so-and-so."¹ To illustrate the distinction, let us consider 19, a variant of one of Donnellan's examples.

19. Isabel's boyfriend is crazy.

This sentence can be used to say that Louis is crazy (referential) or that whoever is Isabel's boyfriend is crazy, because she is impossible to get along with, or whatever (attributive). In the latter usage, in fact, not only is the identity of the boyfriend irrelevant, but the speaker himself may not even know who he is.

What referential and attributive definite NP's have in common is a communication by the speaker (Sp) to the hearer (H) that there exists a person or object (persons or objects; material, quality, etc.) that fits the description and that this individual is uniquely salient. This communication is in the form of a presupposition. Observe that

regardless of which way the underlined NP in 19 is interpreted, the sentence is meaningless if Isabel has or could have no boyfriend, or if she is known to have more than one.

The description of a definite referential NP permits H to pick out the referent in the context/situation. The description of an attributive definite may permit this also or it may not. The achievement of an attributive interpretation when H is able to pick out the referent in the real world or some alternate can, I think, be explained fairly straightforwardly using Grice's principles.¹ Consider 19 again.

19. Isabel's boyfriend is crazy.
Both Sp and H know (and know that the other knows) that Isabel's boyfriend's name is Louis Smith. Normally, his name would be the most direct way to refer to him. Yet Sp has chosen instead to use Isabel's boyfriend, thereby violating the Maxim of Manner ("Be perspicuous"). Assuming, H thinks, that Sp is being cooperative, he must have a reason for describing Louis Smith in this particular way. Therefore the description must be relevant to the communication (Maxim of Quantity). Stated generally, then, if H can pick out the referent that Sp has in mind and he knows that Sp knows that he can, yet Sp provides some description NP that is not the clearest, most direct one available (thereby

violating the Maxim of Manner), Sp can be said to be implicating that the description itself is relevant (Maxim of Relevance) and/or that it provides some necessary information (Maxim of Quantity).

Likewise when H cannot pick out the referent. If H assumes Sp is being cooperative and is not misinformed about what H knows, then H can use the Maxim of Relevance to conclude that the description is what is relevant to the conversation. In addition, since Sp communicates presuppositions of existence and unique salience by using a definite NP, H can assume this information is relevant also. Therefore, since H was unable to pick out a referent in the context or situation, he creates one here and now with the characteristics specified by the description. Or, to use Kripke's terminology, he uses the NP to "fix a referent," or as an "initial baptism" for a referent. He then can act as if he had picked out the referent according to the instructions implied in Chafe's definition.

In summary, the fact that attributive definite NP's do not fit Chafe's definition is not necessarily a reason to discard it. If the analysis in the previous paragraphs is correct, the hearer is using just such a definition in conjunction with Grice's Cooperative Principle in order to interpret attributive NP's.

---

Indefinite

To begin with approximately the opposite of Chafe's definition of definite, indefinite indicates that the speaker does not expect the hearer to pick out, from all the entities that might be categorized by the description, the referent he has in mind. But a Sp can use an indefinite NP to communicate the above information for a variety of reasons, e.g., he feels H is not able, on the basis of the information he has, to identify the proper referent; he feels H can identify the proper referent, but he doesn't want him to; he has no referent in mind; he is not talking about a referent at all, but about a characteristic; etc.

It seems, though, that among the various possibilities there is a very basic distinction between indefinite NP's used to talk about a referent and those where the speaker's concern in using the NP is with something else. This distinction is most clearly observed, I think, in the interpretations given the underlined NP's in sentences like 20 and 21.

20. Horace is a teacher.

21. A teacher got up and started shouting.

In 20, the concern is not to identify Horace with a (particular) teacher, but rather to tell something about him, what he is. Sentence 21, on the other hand, is using a teacher to indicate an individual. Such a distinction is also present in sentences like 22, 23, and 24. Let us examine some of the proposals which may relate to this problem.
Specific/non-specific

As generally used, this opposition has to do with whether the NP in question is to be understood as talking about some particular entity or entities or not. It is often used to distinguish the two readings observed in sentences with verbs which create an opaque environment:

22. Susan is looking for a car.
   a. I see it over there. (+SPEC)
   b. She hasn't decided yet what kind she wants. (-SPEC)

As such, the distinction is open to being confused with existence or scope (see below), and often is. Fillmore's proposal involves defining the specific/non-specific distinction by whether or not the NP undergoes some-any suppletion when negation is introduced.

This view is no longer accepted. Robin Lakoff has shown that the situation with some and any is more complicated than Fillmore's proposal implies. In 23, for example, the underlined NP in both sentences is non-specific.

23. a. Why hasn't John done something to end the war?
   b. Why hasn't John done anything to end the war?


The difference between the two sentences, she says, lies in the speaker's beliefs: in 23a, Sp believes John should have done something, while in 23b there is no such belief. Notice also the difference between 24a and 24b.

24. a. Who wants some beans?
   b. Who wants any beans?

Again the NP's are non-specific. Sentence 24a is probably an invitation to have some beans, with Sp assuming H will want some. On the other hand, 24b might be used as an expression of scorn, with the assumption that no one would want any.\(^1\) Furthermore, a NP can denote a particular entity even though the speaker is not referring to it. (See section on speaker reference below.) Are both 25a and 25b specific, or is only 25a?

25. Some of my friends speak French.
   a. (Predicates of certain specific friends that they speak French)
   b. ("I have friends who speak French.")

Existence

This notion can be loosely defined as a presupposition, implication, or entailment to the effect that there exists some entity which fits the description of the NP. In a sentence such as 22, for example, we see an ambiguity as to

\(^1\) Robin Lakoff, "Some Reasons Why There Can't Be Any Some-Any Rule," Language 45 (1969): 610, 612-613. This article is not a criticism of Fillmore. In fact, she does not even cite him. Nevertheless several of her examples and her analysis of them call his proposal into question, as well as that of those she criticizes directly.
whether or not there exists a car such that Susan is looking for it. In 25, both readings involve the existence of some X's such that X is a friend and X speaks French. Existence appears to be a semantic notion, in that it can be said to be based on the truth value of ∃x(Fx) given the circumstances in which the sentence is used. Since it fails to capture the ambiguity of a sentence like 25, existence is also not what we are looking for in attempting to capture the referent/something-else distinction.

Scope

The notion of existence can be closely equated with the concept of an existential quantifier and its scope. Under this analysis, the two readings of a sentence like 22 would be represented as something similar to 26 and 27.

26. ∃x(car,x) ∧ (Susan is looking for x)
There exists some x such that x is a car and Susan is looking for x. (+EXIST) or wide scope

27. Susan is looking for ∃x(car,x)
Susan is looking for there to exist some x such that x is a car. (-EXIST) or narrow scope

This, too, is a semantic notion. The scope concept encounters the same problem as the existence analysis above in sentences like 23 and 25: it cannot represent their ambiguity because there is only one clause and hence nowhere to vary the scope.
Referential/attributive

Partee proposes that the same ambiguity observed by Donnellan among definite NP's is present with indefinites as well. For example, 28 (her 8) is ambiguous as to whether the underlined NP is to be understood referentially or attributively.

28. John married a girl his parents didn't approve of. \(^1\)

Example 28 followed by 29 would most likely be given an attributive reading,

29. That's why they refused to come to the wedding.

while 28 followed by 30 would probably be interpreted as referential.

30. You know her, I think. She's a friend of Susan's.

In the sequence 28 + 29, we see the description giving the reason that John's parents refused to come to the wedding, while in 28 + 30, the description merely provides some information about the individual being introduced into the conversation. Notice that both readings involve the existence of the individual indicated by the underlined NP in 28, and that she is a specific individual, only with what type of person she is, this usage can be equated with (-SPEC).

Partee in the same paper suggests that the referential/attributive distinction among indefinites may be a broader

version of the phenomenon which causes the ambiguity with opaque-context-creating verbs. I think this is not the case. First of all, the ambiguity of a sentence like 22 is based on existence or scope, and as Partee herself shows, and has been illustrated in 28, 29 and 30, a referential/attributive distinction can be present even where both readings involve an existing entity or nowhere to vary the scope. In addition, a sentence like 31 appears to have not two but at least three possible readings,

31. John wants to marry a girl his parents don't approve of.

those that 28 has:

31. + 32. That's why they're refusing to come to the wedding. (attributive, wide scope)

31. + 30. You know her, I think. She's a friend of Susan's. (referential, wide scope)

and one in which being a girl that his parents disapprove of is a criterion that John is using in wife-hunting (attributive, narrow scope). Notice also 33.

33. Astrid is hoping to marry an American. But I suspect what she really wants is immigration visa.

Clearly, the description in 33 is significant, thereby fitting the definition of attributive, but that communication as it stands remains indeterminate as to whether an American is to be interpreted as representing an existing individual or not.

\[1\] Ibid., p. 417.
Donnellan's paper, and the application of his distinction to indefinites by Partee and others, have generated a certain amount of controversy among philosophers. The most relevant objection for present purposes comes from Philip Peterson. He says that Donnellan's terminology should not be identified with the specific/non-specific opposition among indefinites. It is true that some specific indefinites do function rather like referential definites, i.e., they "pick out a referent the speaker has 'in mind' and/or that he knows who/which it is." But attributive definite descriptions also refer ("weakly," according to Donnellan) to particular, single individuals. Non-specific indefinites do not: their point, that there may be no referent, or more than one. The referential/attributive distinction, then, can apply, at most, only to specific indefinites. Furthermore, he says, the specific/non-specific distinction is also applicable to definite NP's. Non-specific definites are also called generics. They involve either existential or universal generalization, but not uniqueness.¹


his referential/attributive distinction. As he puts it, "People refer and expressions refer." If Sp intends that H use the description of a definite NP to pick out the entity that Sp has in mind, then speaker reference is present. As an illustration, Donnellan notes that H may argue that the description does not fit this referent. But in so doing, H is arguing about a feature of the referent that Sp was referring to, not about the denotation of the description. He uses the example given in 34.

34. a. Mr. Smith: The fat old humbug we met yesterday has just been made a full professor. He must have bamboozled the committee.

b. Mrs. Smith: Is he the one with the funny goatee?

c. Mr. Smith: He's the one I mean.

d. Mrs. Smith: I don't think we met him yesterday. Wasn't it Friday?

e. Mr. Smith: I think you're right. He was coming from a faculty meeting, so it must have been a weekday.

Semantic reference is simply the denotation of the description. Thus a definite description used referentially, or "in a referential context," has a speaker reference associated with it; a definite description occurring in an "attributive context" has none.¹

Donnellan himself applies the notion of speaker reference to indefinites. When speaker reference is present, Sp has a particular referent in mind, and that is

¹Ibid., pp. 47, 53-54.
what he is talking about. But he feels that his description, together with H's background knowledge, would be insufficient to allow H to pick out the proper individual. When speaker reference is present, then, the only difference between a definite NP and an indefinite one consists in whether Sp believes H will be able to recognize his referent.¹

Property Reading

This is the term used by Joseph Pentheroudakis in his dissertation to describe the obligatory reading given to a NP with no article in modern Greek. There are in the language two different surface forms for indefinites, one with the indefinite article ena or mia and one without any article. The indefinite with no article, according to Pentheroudakis, contrasts with its articulated counterpart "in suggesting very strongly that the (property) of being what the noun phrase describes is essential to the suggested meaning of the sentence,"² while the articulated NP does not necessarily involve such an interpretation. In addition, Pentheroudakis proposes, on the basis of numerous syntactic arguments, that articulated indefinites in Greek should be analyzed as possessing some sort of referring device which would be absent in non-articulated NP's. The non-articulated NP, then, receives a reading in which (1) the property of being a certain type

¹Ibid., p. 65.

²Pentheroudakis, "Reference and Indefinite Description in Modern Greek," p. 3.
of X (indicated by the description) is significant for the meaning of the sentence, and (2) the NP is not used to refer to anything (although there may, in fact, exist some entity which fits the description). Let us examine a few of Pentheroudakis's examples illustrating the distinction.

35. a. πέρα ενα τάξι τη δευτέρα, και πέρα ενα τάξι
I-took one cab the Monday and I-took one cab
και την τρίτη
and the Tuesday
'I took a cab on Monday and I took a cab on Tuesday as well.'

b. πέρα τάξι τη δευτέρα, και πέρα τάξι και την τρίτη
'I took a cab on Monday, and I took a cab on Tuesday as well.'

The difference between 35a and 35b is the presence versus absence of the indefinite article on both instances of the noun τάξι. In 35a the two cabs must be interpreted as non-coreferential: the articulated NP's refer in some sense, and if the referents of the two NP's were the same, the second would obligatorily receive the definite article το. Sentence 35b, however, with the property reading, provides no information beyond the fact that a taxi was used in both cases; since the sentence is not concerned with referents, the speaker could, in fact, have taken the same cab or two different ones.

Ibid., p. 20, examples 122 and 123.
36. pou menai é theia sou? se (ena/*Ø)
where she-lives the aunt your in one
retire sto kolônaki
penthouse in-the Kolonaki

'Where does your aunt live? In a/*Øa penthouse
in Kolonaki.'

An answer to the question above using a Ø-article NP would
be appropriate only if the question were interpreted to mean
"What type of location does your aunt live in?" While this
is a possible interpretation of the question, in the more
usual reading, "What location?," the speaker is seeking the
identity of a referent, namely the place where the hearer's
aunt lives; thus the inappropriateness in the answer of the
Ø-article form, which has nothing to do with a referent.

37. eimai (*enas/Ø) giatros, giauto parkaro edo.
I-am *a/Ø doctor for-this I-park here
'I am (*a/Ø doctor, that's why I can park here.'

Here the property of doctorness is the reason the speaker
can park in this spot, rather than the description being used
to identify the speaker with a referent. The proper meaning,
then, is captured by the non-referring non-articulated form.

Example 38 illustrates that the property reading is
independent of considerations of existence or scope. In
Greek, if a NP containing a relative clause does not signify
an existing entity (e.g. if it is within the scope of a verb
of propositional attitude), the verb in the relative clause
occurs in the subjunctive, which is marked by the particle na
before the verb.

---

1Ibid., pp. 24-25, examples I30 and I31.
2Ibid., pp. 27-28, examples I22, I23.
As seen in 38, he says, both articulated and non-articulated (property reading) NP's can co-occur with either scope.  

The property reading, according to Pentheroudakis, is not the same as the attributive reading for indefinites for two reasons. First, articulated NP's can be interpreted attributively. In 39, either the speaker or John may have a particular nurse in mind, or he may not.

39. o giannes thelei na pantreutei mia nosokoma.
If there is no particular referent, the NP is used to indicate the set to which the expected referent will belong, with the description being significant for that reason.  

While I cannot make judgments about Greek sentences, I suspect 39 is of a similar type to 40.

40. An Australian is expected to win in swimming.  
Example 40, of course, is ambiguous, but what we are concerned with here is the narrow-scope reading. Chances are, a speaker would not be using 40 in the narrow-scope sense intending to

---

1Ibid., pp. 42-43; examples II16, II17.

2Ibid., pp. 37-42.
convey the meaning that being an Australian was somehow significant to winning swimming competitions (property reading). More likely, the Australian entrants as a group are considered enough better than everyone else that some one of their number is bound to win. The narrow-scope interpretation of 40, then, answers the question "Who is expected to win in swimming?," but incompletely: it does not identify a specific individual (there is none), only the set to which the future winner is expected to belong. In other words, the winner will be one member of the set Australian (contextually, Australian swimming team), but it is not known which one. The description therefore is significant in that it functions to narrow the set of possible referents.

But is this usage attributive? I think not. The description is being used to identify a set, even though not a particular individual in it. Sentence 40 in this reading is synonymous with 41.

41. One of the **Australian team** is expected to win in swimming.

Now the definite NP in 41 exhibits an ambiguity. It could be described as one of scope:

41. a. \((\exists x) \ (x \text{ is the Australian swim team} \land \text{expect (one of } x \text{ wins)})\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. expect (} & \exists x \ (x \text{ is the Australian swim team} \land \text{one of } x \text{ wins})
\end{align*}
\]

In other words, either the Aussie team has been chosen at the time of utterance (and thus constitutes a unique and identifiable set) or it has not and the set is "the Australian team,
whoever they turn out to be." Or the ambiguity in the definite NP could be called referential/attributive. But what is the status of the whole underlined NP in 41, and therefore, presumably, the one in 40? At this point, I cannot say anything more than that it is non-specific, on both readings.

Secondly, Pentheroudakis claims that NP's can be used referentially and attributively at the same time. He uses as an example 42.

42. The man standing by the window is insane.

This sentence, he says, can be used to pick out a referent, but if it is used referentially in a situation where standing by a window endangers one's life, then it is both.¹ A similar phenomenon can occur with indefinites, as in 43.

43. Astrid is hoping to marry an American. I don't think she really loves him, though. I suspect what she actually wants is an immigration visa.

In other words, a speaker can use a particular description to enable the hearer to pick out the proper referent (or to put an identifying label on a referent being introduced), and he can simultaneously intend that that description be significant to the meaning of the discourse. In Greek, a NP cannot have both a property reading and a referring reading on the same NP because the speaker must choose one form or the other.

Now let us return to the negation of Chafe's definition of definite, the communication by Sp to H that "I do not

¹Ibid., p. 37.
assume you can pick out, from all the referents that might be categorized in this way, the one I have in mind." There arises here a similar, though more serious, problem to that observed with definites, namely that the formulation applies only to NP's (1) with referents and (2) where the speaker actually has one in mind—unless one takes the rather unnatural interpretation that the one I have in mind could be in the scope of not. I do not think that the hearer uses a preferred specific reading and then something like Grice's principles to decide that there is no referent. A sentence like 22, repeated here for convenience, remains ambiguous until the context disambiguates the NP or H asks Sp whether it is a specific car Susan is looking for.

22. Susan is looking for a car.

This state of affairs is not necessarily bad. Common sense tells us that the question of whether H can or cannot identify the/a referent is most relevant when there is, or could be, a referent corresponding to the description. Furthermore, identifiability is most important to the communication precisely when there is speaker reference. It appears, then, that the central domain of the definite/indefinite distinction is rightly seen as definite NP's and indefinite specifics used with speaker reference.

More work still needs to be done concerning indefinite NP's used for purposes other than to introduce a referent into the discourse. The property reading is one subcategory here. Indefinite non-specifics which mean 'some unspecified instance
of a kind' are another. Do these sub-types have anything in common with each other besides being non-referring expressions? Does this whole class have anything in common with indefinite specifics used referentially, other than being non-definite NP's? And are they related in any way to generics?

**Generic**

Generic NP's are most obvious when they occur in generic sentences.

23. a. Bears hibernate in caves.
   b. A dog has four legs.
   c. The dodo is extinct.
   d. Cockroaches are widespread.
   e. Fido chases cars.
   f. Sea turtles lay approximately two hundred eggs at a time.¹

It is intuitively pleasing to suggest that the meaning of these NP's is 'the whole class of X's,' or the NP accompanied by the quantifier all. But in 23a some bears hibernate in zoos, and certainly not all caves are used by bears for hibernation. Likewise in 23b there are some three-legged dogs, but the generic sentence is still true. Perhaps these would be better paraphrased with most or all normal.² The all analysis does

¹Examples are from James D. McCawley, *Everything That Linguists Have Always Wanted to Know about Logic but Were Ashamed to Ask* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), pp. 442-443.

appear at first glance to work for 23c and d. But these, too, are not as expected. Sentence c does not mean that all individual dodos, e.g., Sylvester, are extinct. Nor does d mean that any individual cockroach is widespread. Neither all nor most works with e or f, however. The statement in e can be true even if Fido chases only every fifth moving car he sees, and f is, of course, true only of the females. The quantifier some would probably work with e, but it is unclear what quantifier would be appropriate in f. Conceivably, one could add modifiers to sea turtles until f was like a--but which modifiers to add would be based on knowledge of the world and the predicate involved, rather than any feature of the NP itself.

Because of such problems and others, Greg Carlson has argued persuasively that at least those generics expressed in English by what he calls the "bare plural" (as in 23a, d, e, and f) should not be analyzed as having a $\emptyset$ quantifier which means 'all,' 'most,' or 'some.' He further shows that these NP's should not be seen as having an ambiguous $\emptyset$ quantifier or, in fact, any quantifier at all. One argument for the latter is that the putative generic quantifier G does not function like any other English quantifier in matters of scope. Compare 24 and 25.

24. Matilda doesn't like all spiders.
25. Matilda doesn't like spiders.

Sentence 24 is ambiguous between 24a and 24b,
24. a. \(~((\forall x: \text{spider, } x) \land (\text{Matilda likes } x))\)  
b. \((\forall x: \text{spider, } x) \land (\neg (\text{Matilda likes } x))\)  
whereas 25 has only the interpretation 25a.\(^1\)

25. a. \((\exists x: \text{spider, } x) \land (\neg (\text{Matilda likes } x))\)  
b. \(*\neg((\exists x: \text{spider, } x) \land (\text{Matilda likes } x))\)\(^2\)  

English bare plural NP's can also occur in non-generic sentences.

26. a. **Mice** were chasing my cat all over the house.  
b. Kerry gave **quarters** to **bums**.  
c. I thought I saw **beans** spilled on the floor.\(^2\)  
d. **Dinosaur tracks** have been discovered in the United States.

These and similar sentences can often be paraphrased using **some**. Should such NP's be considered something different from the bare plurals in 23? There are, after all, specific mice that were chasing the cat, specific bums who received specific quarters, etc. No, these appear to be generic NP's also. Observe first the anomaly of the sequence 27-27a, where the antecedant is of the type found in 23 and the pronoun refers to certain specific individuals.

27. **Opossums** thrive in this area.  
a. ?? But **they** are dead.  
b. But **these** are dead.

---


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 36.
Continuation b is acceptable because its "antecedent" is not opossums in the previous sentence, but some concrete individuals in the extra-linguistic context. The sequences in 28, however, are perfectly coherent.

28. a. Fluffy hates mice. Last night they were chasing her all over the house.

   b. Kerry has always looked down her nose at bums, but yesterday she and a friend from her new church went downtown and gave quarters to them.

   c. They say that untreated beans must be carefully protected from insects. But when I looked into the back room of that health-food store, I thought I saw them spilled on the floor.

   d. Dinosaur tracks have been discovered in the United States. They are actually quite common in some areas.

In 28a-c the antecedent receives an 'all' or universal reading, while the pronoun is interpreted with 'some' or the existential reading. The sequence in d has an existential antecedent and a universal pronoun.

English bare plurals typically pattern like another type of NP: one modified by this kind of or a similar expression. Observe that substituting such a NP for the bare plural NP's in 23 produces the same variety of truth conditions as in the original sentences.¹

¹Ibid., pp. 87-88.
29. a. This kind of animal hibernates in caves.
   b. Bears hibernate in this kind of place.
   c. This kind of insect is widespread.
   d. Fido chases this kind of thing.
   e. This kind of animal lays approximately two hundred eggs at a time.

This kind of can also replace the underlined existential NP's in 26.

30. a. This kind of animal was chasing my cat all over the house.
   b. Kerry gave quarters to this kind of person.
   c. Kerry gave this form of money to bums.
   d. I thought I saw this kind of food spilled on the floor.
   e. This kind of material evidence has been discovered in the United States.

NP's of this type can also occur with a quantifier. Depending on the predicate, though, the result may be ambiguous between 'Q kinds of N' and 'Q individual N's.'

31. a. The zookeeper has found that every animal has its favorite food. (ambiguous)
   b. One opossum lives in the United States. (Knowledge of the world makes the 'individual' reading impossible.)
   c. One opossum lives in John's garage. (Knowledge of the nature of garages makes the 'individual' interpretation most likely.)
   d. One opossum lives in the United States. ?? It lives in John's garage.

---

1 Ibid., pp. 89-91.
From these and other arguments, Carlson concludes that English bare plurals refer to kinds and not to individuals or sets of individuals. He further argues that such NP's are names of kinds, parallel to names of individuals. For example, both can occur with the so-called construction.

32. a. Slim is so-called because of his slender build.
   b. Cardinals are so-called because of their color.
   c. \[ \text{All, Most, Few, etc.} \] cardinals are so-called because of their \text{color}.\textsuperscript{1}

The remainder of Carlson's elegant analysis of English bare plurals will not concern us here.

Carlson also notes that other forms of NP function much like bare plurals in many respects. The first of these is generics with the definite article. Observe 33a, for example, whose meaning is essentially the same as that of 32b. 33b is like 23d.

33. a. The cardinal is so-called because of its color.
   b. The owl is widespread.

Neither sentence in 33 can be paraphrased with a quantifier—exactly like their bare plural counterparts. The contexts where definite generics can occur, however, are much more restricted than those for bare plurals.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. 97-101.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., pp. 100, 432-442.
34.  a.  ? The bear hibernates in caves.  (generic reading)
    b.  * Bears hibernate in the cave.  (generic reading)

Unquantified mass nouns also behave similarly in many ways to bare plural count nouns. In fact, they are sometimes synonymous.

35.  a.  Hail  fell on the city.  ('Some'—existential)
      Hail stones
    b.  Snow  fell slowly.  (ambiguous)
      Snowflakes
    c.  Rain  is wet.  ('All'—universal)¹
      Raindrops are
    d.  Hail  was everywhere.  (neither)
      Hailstones were

Unquantified abstracts are more complicated, says Carlson, but treating them as expressing kinds of things makes sense in many contexts. For example, some can have both a universal and an existential reading depending on the predicate.

36.  a.  Democracy is a form of government.  (universal)
    b.  The Greeks practiced democracy.  (existential)

And they can occur in contexts that require kind-nouns.

37.  Courage is not very common/widespread.²

Carlson's analysis is quite English-specific, but the semantic distinction he makes between NP's which refer to kinds and those which refer to individuals is probably

¹Ibid., p. 463.
²Ibid., pp. 467-468.
universal. (A language could conceivably, however, not express this semantic opposition formally at all.) More research needs to be done in this area, particularly concerning the relationship between generic NP's and indefinites of the non-specific or property reading type.
CHAPTER IV

LONG AND SHORT ADJECTIVES IN EARLY SLAVIC:

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

ON OLD CHURCH SLAVIC

The most obvious of the possible manifestations of definite/indefinite in early Slavic is the opposition between long and short adjectives. The short adjective is declined like a noun, and the long adjective consists historically of the short adjective in the proper case, plus the same case form of *ju. The *ju morpheme is derived from either the Indo-European demonstrative *ei- or the relative *jo-. (This controversy is outside the scope of the present study.) In all the documents I am aware of, however, *ju appears only as the third person pronoun, personal and relative. As might be expected from the morphology, the long or pronominal form is the one potentially equivalent to adjective plus definite article. Sample paradigms can be found in table 3.

Summary and Critique of Major Studies

The first scholar to observe a correspondence between long and short adjectives and definite/indefinite in early Slavic was Ju. Križanić (1617-1683), a Croatian philologist. In his Gramatično izkazanje ob ruskom jeziku, published by O. Bodjanskij in 1859, he wrote that the short adjective
TABLE 3
MORPHOLOGY OF LONG AND SHORT ADJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Adjective: Declined Like Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (=N or G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg. D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du. NAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl. NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl. D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3--Continued

**Long Adjective: Historically, Case Form of Short Adjective Plus Case Form of -ju**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>(*slēpi-ji)</td>
<td>slēpa-ja</td>
<td>slēpo-je</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slēpyi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(=N or G)</td>
<td>slēpo-jo</td>
<td>slēpo-je</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>slēpa-jego</td>
<td>slēpy-je</td>
<td>slēpa-jego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(*slēpē-ji)</td>
<td>slēpēi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slēp -jemu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>slēpē-jemu</td>
<td>(*slēpē-ji)</td>
<td>slēpē-jemu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(*slēpy-ji)</td>
<td>slēpo-jo</td>
<td>(*slēpy-ji)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slēpyim</td>
<td></td>
<td>slēpyim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du.</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>slēpa-ja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>(*slēpē-ji)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(*slēpē-ji)</td>
<td>slēpēi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slepu-ju</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(*slēpt-jima)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slepyima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>(*slēpi-ji)</td>
<td></td>
<td>slēpa-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slēpii</td>
<td>slēpy-je</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>slēpy-je</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
<td>slēpa-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>(*slēpt-jix)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(*slēpyix)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(*slēp -jix)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>(*slēp -jix)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(*slēpy-jimi)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slēpyimi</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
<td>(=masc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aExample word is slēp*, 'blind;' phonological changes in the languages of the later copyists will cause forms in some examples to look slightly different.

bLong forms often undergo assimilation and/or contraction, e.g., masc. dat. sg. slēpu-jemu > slēpumu (> slepomu, by analogy to pronouns).
indicates "po prostu, kakovo jest čto," [simply what something is like], while the long indicates an entity to be distinguished from similar ones.\(^1\)

A. X. Vostokov, in *Grammatika cerkovnoslovenkogo jazyka, izložennaja po drevnim onogo pis'mennym pamjatnikam*, noticed that long adjectives frequently translate Greek adjective plus definite article, but not always.\(^2\)

Franz Miklosich theorized that the long adjective functions identically to both the Greek definite article and the definite articles of the Western European languages.\(^3\)

Since Miklosich there have been quite a number of articles and some longer works on the subject. Most writers feel that the long adjective really is generally equivalent to adjective plus definite article. Other disagree, saying the long adjective is used for other purposes. I will discuss five major recent works, which include representatives from both sides of the controversy.

Josef Kurz

Josef Kurz in his "K otázce členu v jazycích slovan-ských se zvlastným zřetelem k staroslověnštině" begins with

---

\(^1\) Cited in N. I. Tolstoj, "Značenie kratkix i polnyx form prilagatel'nyx v staroslavjanskom jazyke (na materiale evangel'skich kodeksov)," *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznaniya* 2 (1957): 43.


a definition of "determination" taken from Raoul de la Grasserie's "De l'article."¹ Determination consists of individualizing, i.e., distinguishing one entity from all others, or several entities from others, or one class of entities from other groups. Often the accompanying characteristic is so distinctive that the NP needs no overt expression of determination. This type includes proper names; words like sun, moon, earth; NP's where the context or situation is sufficient to distinguish the entity referred to; NP's containing possessives, ordinal numbers, or other distinctive modifiers; NP's which are sentence-initial; and accusative objects of negated verbs. At other times, the difference between determined and its opposite, non-determined, is overtly expressed by means of deictics, anaphoric pronouns, or articles. Determined/non-determined is a continuum, not a binary opposition.

The basic meaning of a definite article is to signify determination of an object (individualizing meaning) or a whole class (generic meaning). An article is obligatory, while an an anaphoric pronoun is not. The definite article can be contrasted with the indefinite article ("relatively definite") and/or with no article (unspecified, abstract, undetermined).

Can the -ju> morpheme of the Slavic long adjective be considered simply a definite article? No, says Kurz. First,

¹Raoul de la Grasserie, "De l'article (morphologie et syntaxe)," Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris 9 (1896): 384-390.
it would be most peculiar if determination in the NP were marked only in the presence of an adjective. The adjective, he says, makes the NP determined by itself. Secondly, Slavic long adjective usage does not always correspond to that of the Greek definite article. The reason for the lack of complete correspondence between Greek and Slavic is that the use of the article in Greek was already "mechanical," [i.e., obligatory—KR], while the Slavic long adjective, in conjunction with anaphoricity in the NP, at least partially preserved the original meaning of determined. This original meaning involved attention being focused on the adjective. The referent was thereby emphatically differentiated from others with different characteristics.

Because of its focus on the adjective, a NP containing a long form was in many cases synonymous with a nominalized adjective, or with a noun with a nominal appositive. As an example of the latter he says that staryi mož, 'old-(long) man,' is equivalent to mož starč, 'man old-one-(masc.).' In English, this meaning would probably be expressed by the blue house, as opposed to the same NP with non-contrastive stress on house.

In the second part of this study, Kurz discusses postposed slu, tu, and onu. Having collected all 1541 examples of

---

this construction in the OCS texts, he examines their meanings and concludes that these are used as demonstratives and not articles.¹

Kurz's study is valuable as a thorough, many-sided treatment of a complex problem. Particularly astute is his separation of the semantic notion of determination from the surface manifestation of articles: determination can be expressed by other means than articles, and articles can be used for purposes besides determination. He also distinguishes between articles and anaphoric demonstratives. The former are obligatory and the latter are not.

But Kurz's study also has some problems. First, like many investigators, he includes generics among definites. This is probably because many languages use a definite article with such NP's. But generics and definites do not denote the same type of entity (as we saw in chapter 3), so they are not the same thing.

One of Kurz's arguments against the Slavic morpheme being a definite article is that its appearance does not always correspond with the use of the definite article with an adjective in Greek. But as later investigators point out, there are morphological as well as semantic factors that influence the form of the Slavic adjective. In addition, even among languages like French and English, where no one would argue about the presence of a definite article, there are differences in usage.

¹Ibid., 8:172-188.
Third, he claims the original meaning of the long adjective was "emphatic differentiation," by means of the adjective, in the presence of anaphoricity. Contrastiveness, however, can occur with any type of NP, not just definites:

1. a. Ann hit the/a blue ball and threw the/a red ball.
   (definite/indefinite with referent)
   
   b. Ann has hit the/some blue balls and thrown the/some red balls.
   (plural definite/indefinite with referents)
   
   c. Ann prefers to play with a red ball.
   (indefinite, ambiguous whether to referent or not)
   
   d. Ann doesn't like green balls.
   (generic)

Why would the language choose to mark only the definite form morphologically? And why did this pragmatically-marked form then spread to other definites rather than to other contrastives? It is clear from the presence of short indefinite contrastives and hundreds of examples of long definite non-contrastives that what occurs with long adjectives is definites and not contrastives—unless, of course, these are definite. Observe, for example, the interplay of long and short adjectives in the underlined NP's in 2. All the NP's are contrastive, but only the definite ones are long.
2. (Lk 5:36-37 Mar) Glašše že i pritičo k ne nimz he-spoke CONJ and parable to them

čko niktože pristavleni rizy novy how no-one-at-all patch of-garment new(short)
ne pristavleat na rizu vetvxy ašte že not he-adds onto garment old(short) if CONJ
ni i novojo razderet i vetxei ne no and new(long) it-tears and to-old(long) not
priljučit se pristavleni eže ot novago it-matches REFL patch which from new(long)
i niktože ne vživaat vina nova vž and no-one-at-all not he-pours wine new(short) into
mexy vetvxy ašte li že ni prosadit vino skins old(short) if Q CONJ no it-tears wine
novoe mexy new(long) skins

'And he also told them a parable, "No one would add a patch from a new garment to an old garment. If otherwise, the new one gets torn and the patch from the new one does not match the old. And no one pours new wine into old skins. If otherwise, the new wine tears the skins."

Fourth, Kurz's meaning of emphatic determination appears to include not only contrastive, but something more subtle as well, a concentration of attention on the adjective. The vagueness of the latter, however, invites circular reasoning: if a Greek arthrous NP with adjective is not matched by a Slavic long adjective, it is because the Slavic long adjective still preserves some of its original meaning.²

He therefore does not consider such additional possibilities as scribal interference, morphological factors in the


²Kurz, "K otázce členu v jazycích slovanských se zvláštním zřetelem k staroslovenštině," 7:255.
adjective and different use of articles in different
languages. Elsewhere, he even suggests that some of the
degree of correspondence between Greek definite articles
and Slavic long adjectives is due to Greek contamination
of the Slavic text!¹

N. I. Tolstoj

The next major study is N. I. Tolstoj's "Značenie
kratkix i polnyx form prilagatel'nyx v staroslavljanskom
jazyke." Tolstoj believes that Miklosich was basically
correct when he said that the -ju morpheme functions like
a definite article. But his study is not exhaustive, says
Tolstoj, and does not consider the idiosyncracies of the
Slavic category.

Tolstoj emphasizes that the definiteness indicated
by the long adjective relates to the head noun and not to the
adjective itself. This explains why long adjectives occur
attributively, i.e., in connection with a noun, and not pred-
icatively. The -ju morpheme is also not a mark of nominal-
ization: substantivized adjectives occur both long and
short. Nor does -ju concern the degree of a quality. That
is expressed by degrees of comparison or by such suffixes as
-o vat- and -iv-. Permanence of the quality and other shades
of meaning are supplementary and linked to the meaning of the
particular context.

¹Ibid., 7:213.
In addition, one must consider that factors in the adjective itself can determine which form appears, regardless of the meaning of the NP. These include its morphology, derivation, syntactic function and lexical meaning. (The first three I will discuss along with my data below.) As far as lexical meaning is concerned, Tolstoj divides adjectives into three types in order of their decreasing ability to individualize head nouns: possessive, relational, and qualitative. Possessive adjectives are almost always short because their lexical meaning alone tends to make the NP definite: *Isusovъ*, 'Jesus'; *pastuxovъ*, 'shepherd's.' These often translate Greek genitive with definite article.

Tolstoj lists the following meanings of relational adjectives as generally occurring in the long form: (1) temporal; (2) locative; (3) part-whole; and (4) intended function. For example,

3. (1) *utrei,* 'morning;' *sobotnyi,* 'Saturday'
(2) *niжni,* 'lower;' *poslednii,* 'last;' *desnyi,* 'right-hand'
(3) *crквeнн, 'church, temple' (na krilе *crквeнн, 'on the temple roof')
(4) *kupлен, 'trade' (domъ *kupлен, 'house of trade');
*raspustныи,* 'divorce' (*kниги raspustныи, 'divorce papers')

Qualitative adjectives are the least able to individualize their head nouns by their lexical meaning. Thus it is

---

1 Russian *otnositel'noe*. A derived adjective which expresses a relationship between its underlying word and the head noun, e.g., *kromеstvenъ*, 'outside (adjective)' < *kromе, 'outside (adverb)'; *vavilonски*, 'Babylonian,' < *vavilone, 'Babylon.' Possessive adjectives are actually a sub-type of relationals, but Tolstoj is obviously referring to relational adjectives here which are not possessive.
with this type that the long/short opposition is most fully realized.

Tolstoj seems to feel that short is the unmarked form, because it is used when the referent is not "logically emphasized" or the referent does not occupy a central position in the narrative. It also predominates in "neutral position." (See below.)

Tolstoj looks for semantic and pragmatic explanations for the appearance of the two forms, which I believe is the right approach. It is this methodology which allows him to explain, in intuitively-pleasing terms, several types of systematic deviation of the Slavic translations from the Greek originals. One type, exemplified by 4, has a short adjective translating a Greek NP with article.

4. (Mk 6:39) na trévě zeleně  Gk: epi tō chlōrō chortō
   on grass green(short)  on the green grass

'And he commanded them to make all sit down by companies upon the green grass.'

Tolstoj says that the referent here is not "logically emphasized," so there is no need to distinguish it from similar individuals. Certainly not all definite NP's used attributively¹ (this appears to be the same as "not logically emphasized") have short adjectives in Slavic matched by Greek

¹But is this example really attributive? After the disciples issue the order to the audience, "it down by companies upon the green grass," each person must find the uniquely-salient quantity of grass, namely, the grass he or she is standing on, and sit on it. But someone would not be disobeying the command by walking ten feet and sitting on the grass there. Neither Jesus nor the disciples is referring to any particular grass. The referent seems to be whatever green grass is at hand, making the NP, indeed, attributive.
arthrous NP's. But the point is well-taken that marking them as definite is not important pragmatically. Similarly, the vocative case necessarily involves definiteness, since one is addressing the referent of the NP, so marking it as definite is redundant. In OCS, such a NP with adjective usually uses the long nominative form; in Greek, there is no article here. Redundancy, then, explains both the deviation from Greek and the Slavic exceptions to its own rule.

Tolstoj is also the only investigator of the five to use the concept of "neutral position." This, if I understand him correctly, is the fuzzy middle ground where one cannot determine for sure whether a NP is definite or indefinite, and it does not matter to the context, anyway. I think this notion is essential if one wishes to consider all the NP's in a text, and not just the clear-cut ones. Without it, one is forced to assign a questionable NP to one meaning or the other on the basis of Greek or English article usage—or the form of the adjective.

Tolstoj also points out that the break-up of the system of definite/indefinite did not lead to a distinction between attributive and predicative adjectives in all the Slavic languages, as it did in Russian. In Serbo-Croatian, the long adjective is taking over lexical group by lexical group in both attributive and predicative positions.\(^1\) Thus

\(^1\)Tolstoj, "Znaczenie kratkix i polnyx form prilagatel'nyx v staroslavjanskom jazyke," pp. 49-50.
a purported need to distinguish attributive from predicative adjectives could not have caused the demise of the category. Its fall, he says, was more likely the result of the many factors independent of the category definite/indefinite that also influenced the form of the adjective.

Maria Honowska

Maria Honowska feels that the long adjective originally appeared, and later spread, for morphological rather than semantic reasons. It arose as a means to distinguish adjectives formally from nouns. Its development formed part of a larger, general-Slavic trend toward the convergence of adjective, numeral, and pronoun declensions.

Although, she says, the spoken language of the ninth century probably used primarily the short adjective, the long form did appear in fixed expressions, adjectives with certain suffixes (e.g., -\\texttt{vn}-, -\\texttt{sk}-) and nominalizations. The meaning of the two forms was most likely the same. Because the Slavic translators had two formal means to express one meaning, they could use the opposition to translate the Greek arthrous/anarthrous distinction. In addition, the existence of two forms allowed the development of such meaning differences as the intensity of a quality and determined/non-determined.

\footnote{Maria Honowska, Geneza złożonej odmiany przymiotników w świetle faktów języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego, Polska Akademia Nauk, Oddział w Krakowie, Prace Komisji Słowianoznawstwa, 4 (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1963).}
The need to distinguish adjectives from nouns (modifier from modified) was strongest in attributive position. Therefore the predicate adjective never used the long form.

This work makes the well-taken point that morphology has a great deal to do with the form of adjective we find in the texts. This point is also made by Tolstoj, whom she cites repeatedly. But her position that meaning has nothing to do with it is extreme and, I think, inadequately justified.

First, given the structure of the long adjective she needs to explain why the morpheme that was added was precisely *jīb, the demonstrative/relative third person singular pronoun, and not something else. She does not even raise the question.

Second, she has no evidence for surmising that the spoken language of the ninth century used primarily the short form. On the contrary, the evidence of the texts used here in my study indicates that long and short adjectives occur in the same distribution in original texts as in translated, and the long forms far outnumber the short. The only defense I can imagine against this argument is that the entire written language was so contaminated by Greek that it is impossible to determine the nature of the spoken language. This line of reasoning reduces both of our endeavors to speculation.
Third, by not considering semantics, she has no way to account for the vacillation that appears among indefinite non-specifics.

Fourth, as Howard Aronson pointed out to me, if a perceived need to distinguish adjectives from nouns caused the spread of the long form, why did it appear so early and so regularly on adjectives in -un- and -ask-? The function of these suffixes is precisely to derive adjectives from other parts of speech. Hence the suffix alone should have been sufficient to mark the word as an adjective.

Finally, she seems on two occasions in her table of exceptions to have misinterpreted the Greek. For Mt 12:33 she quotes the reading in Marianus:

\[ \text{li sttvorite drëvo dobro} \]
\[ \text{or make-IMPER tree good (short)} \]

and says that the Greek text has an article. But Mt 12:33 reads:

\[ \text{ē poiēsate to dendron kalon kai ton karpon autou kalon,} \]
\[ \text{or make-IMPER the tree good and the fruit its good} \]

\[ \text{ē poiēsate to dendron sapron kai ton karpon autou sa-} \]
\[ \text{or make-IMPER the tree rotten and the fruit its rot-} \]

\[ \text{pron. Ek gar tou karpou to dendron ginosketai.} \]
\[ \text{ten by for the fruit the tree it-is-known} \]

\[ ^1 \text{Ibid., p. 62.} \]

The underlined words comprise a NP plus a predicate adjective, not a NP which includes the adjective. Thus the article goes with the noun and not with the adjective. Since the Greek adjective has no article, it agrees with the readings in Marianus, Zographensis and Assemanianus.\(^1\) The predicate adjective interpretation is supported by both the English King James translation and that into modern Russian. The same problem occurs with Mt 20:16.

The King James translation of Mt 12:33:

Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit.

The Russian translation of the same passage:

Ili priznajte derevo xorošim i or acknowledge-imper. tree-acc. good-instr. and plod ego xorošim; ili priznajte fruit-acc. its good-instr. or acknowledge-imper.

derevo xudym i plod ego tree-acc. bad-instr. and fruit-acc. its xudym; ibo derevo poznaetsja po plodu\(^2\) bad-instr. for tree is-known by fruit

V. V. Borodič

Another significant Soviet study is V. V. Borodič's "O kategorii opredelennosti/neopredelennosti v

\(^1\)For the long reading in the fourth Gospel manuscript, Savvina kniga, see Michael S. Flier, Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic, Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 172 (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), p. 156.

\(^2\)Novyj zavet gospoda našego Iisusa Krista i psaltir, v russkom perevode (London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1921).
starešlavjanskom jazyke." Her methodology and conclusions are influenced by Tolstoj, but she uses more texts than he does, including Clozianus, Suprasliensis and Euchologium Sinaiticum, among others. She begins with the category definite/indefinite and seeks to determine whether it exists in OCS, and if so, how it is expressed.

She finds adjectives and participles in the long form when the NP is definite under the following conditions:

A. When definiteness of the NP is indicated by the context
   1. Demonstrative in NP
   2. NP in vocative case
   3. Anaphoricity
   4. Referent generally known (proper names, concepts relating to religious law and scripture, events in Bible)
   5. Referent seen as unique (God, sun, life, death, cross, faith)
   6. Referent implied by context
   7. Part known from whole
   8. Species names (Species meaning is close to generalized meaning, so one often finds short adjectives as well as long here.)

B. When definiteness of the NP is indicated by a modifier in the NP individualizing the referent
   1. Possessive pronoun
   2. Personal pronoun or noun modifier
   3. Adjectival relative clause
   4. Adjective phrase indicating location

Short forms appear under the following conditions:

A. Meaning is that of general idea
   1. Predicate adjectives
   2. Adjective or participle in expression functioning as an adverb, especially verbal participles and dative absolutes; in other adverbial expressions, interfering factors may cause long form to appear

---

3. Importance of referent to speaker: if the referent is important, speaker may use a short form, even if the referent is known

B. Referent is indefinite concrete object
   1. Referent unknown (often accompanied by an expression of indefiniteness like edinu, 'one;' koto, 'who,' ete, 'a certain,' etc.)
   2. Indefinite plurals (meaning close to general idea)
   3. NP introducing new referent

The form is determined by the semantics of the adjective in these cases:

A. Denominal adjectives with suffixes -ov-, -in-, -ij-, -j- are almost always short; most of these indicate possession by a definite individual

B. Denominal adjectives with suffix -sk-: halfway between possessive and relational in meaning, these can be either long or short, with much variation

C. Relational adjectives derived from nouns which are unique, body parts, or exact time or place are generally long, although other factors can interfere

Based on this evidence, Borodić feels that OCS did have a category definite/indefinite. She finds weak the usual argument that OCS did not have this category because it was expressed only in NP's containing adjectives. First, she cites the Scandinavian languages, where she says the article first appeared on adjectives and then spread to nouns. She also found a few examples where *ju is apparently attached to a noun. One of them is in our text "Poxvala to Cyril and Methodius."
(PCM 113dl6) i do njego veselę se i slave boga remained until the (his?) day rejoicing and praising God
and thus he-rested in Lord in year 869.'

'And having named the day of his own death, he continued rejoicing and praising God until that day, and thus passed away in the year 869.'

With this thorough and perceptive study, I have only one significant quarrel. This concerns short forms, point A 3, where the meaning is that of a general idea. Here she states that if the referent is important to the speaker, he may use a short adjective even if the referent is known. Surely, she could not have placed this meaning under "general idea" if she really meant that the referent was important. Important known referents tend to be topics, exhibiting such typical topic behaviors as pronominalization, ellipsis, or lack of sentence stress. In all of her examples except one, however, the NP in question could not be anything but stressed. The clearest example is 5.

1Lavrov lists the following variants for this NP: do nego dane; do njego danii; do sego 'this' dane; prebyste danii 1, 'he remained 5 days.' (P. A. Lavrov, Materialy po istorii voznikovenija drevnejšej slavjanskoj pis'mennosti, Trudy Slavjanskoj komissii Akademii nauk SSSR, 1 (Leningrad: Akademija nauk SSSR, 1930), reprint ed., Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 67 [The Hague: Mouton, 1966], p. 85.) Furthermore, the preposition do governs the genitive case, but dane appears to be in the nominative in the "Uspenskij sbornik" reading given here. The meanings of the other passages Borodič cites are more or less similarly equivocal, as she herself admits.

5. (Lk 19:7 Mar, Zog) I videvše vsi rpptaaxq

and having-seen everyone murmured

čko kž grēšno možju vznide vitat Gk: para

how to sinful man went-into to-stay at-house-

amartolo andri of sinful man

'And when they saw it, they all murmured, saying, That he was gone to be guest with a man that is a sinner.'

The referent here is Zacchaeus the publican, the topic, along with Jesus, of the parable. The reason the crowd was murmuring is embodied in the description of him as sinful. In other words, what is important to the speaker is not the referent, but how he is characterized. Tolstoj would say the referent is not "logically emphasized;" Pentheroudakis would see a property reading here. Perhaps Borodič is saying that the description is being used as a general idea. But none of this has to do with importance of the referent to the speaker.

Michael Flier

Michael Flier in Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic takes a position similar to Tolstoj's and Borodič's. However, he seeks to improve upon previous studies by considering additional factors. First he defines Old Church Slavic as a literary, somewhat hybrid language, influenced by New Testament Greek in both the use of existing constructions and the creation of new ones within the framework of Slavic grammar. He also feels it is important to look at the history, style and dialectal elements of the
the texts being studied. They are not all equally close to the putative OCS norm. Variants in the Greek texts are likewise significant, because they indicate that a translator may have used a different version of the original text than one we would now consider authoritative. Flier also considers sporadic scribal errors and the systematic interference of the copyist's own language on the text he was copying. He confines his analysis to the four Gospel manuscripts, Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus and Savvina kniga.

Based on semantic considerations, Flier divides his adjectives into three broad categories. The first of these is denominal adjectives of affiliation and apposition, which he further subdivides into adjectives of location and nationality in the suffix -лк-; adjectives of location in -ов-; of location in -т-; those in -лк- and -ов- referring to sects; adjectives derived from proper names; and adjectives derived from common nouns. With the exception of adjectives in -лк-, almost all the adjectives of this affiliation-apposition group are short. The reason for this is that most are derived from proper nouns, in themselves sufficient to individualize the head noun, he says. Even those based on common nouns are almost always short. Among -лк- adjectives, those derived from common nouns are generally short, while those from proper nouns show a great deal of variation between long and short.
Flier's second category consists of adjectives derived from or modifying nouns with unique reference. These include religious, social, temporal, and spatial concepts, e.g., Son of Man, wedding (adj.), morning (adj.), left hand. They are usually long, except for adjectives in -ov-, -j-, -ij-, and -in-, which are almost entirely short. Those in -usk- are mostly long.

The last category, adjectives modifying common nouns or undergoing nominalization, includes everything else: indefinite, specific, definite and generalized nouns, and nominalizations. Indefinites, specific and non-specific, are generally short, while definites are usually long. Generalized nouns [singular generics--KR] occur regularly with long adjectives, but since their meaning is similar to indefinite, he says, short forms also occur with a general meaning.

Flier criticizes Tolstoj's treatment of nominalizations as incomplete. Factors determining the form of attributive adjectives do have an effect on nominalizations, and there are more unexpected long forms among nominalizations than among attributive adjectives. But Flier finds that singular and plural nominalizations behave differently. While the singul- lars and duals show long forms for definites and short for indefinites almost without exception, the plurals vacillate, with a tendency to favor the long form. This vacillation leads him to posit a grammatical rule which neutralizes the long/short distinction among plural nominalizations.
He then returns to the plural attributive adjectives and finds more vacillation among them, too, than among the singulars and duals. On this basis he concludes that the general Slavic trend toward long-form attributes and short-form predicates began in the plural under the influence of plural nominalizations.

Flier's study makes several important contributions to the study of long and short adjectives. First, it is exhaustive: he has considered all the non-predicate adjectives in the four Gospel manuscripts. Second, and related, he lists almost all of them, either in the text or in the appendix, and then indexes them. This makes his work valuable for quick reference. Third is his fundamental concept that the extant texts are but an imperfect manifestation of the language they are thought to represent. There are several possible sources of interference, and each text has its own history and therefore its own peculiarities. The corpus is not uniform and should not be analyzed as if it were. And fourth is his observation that plural adjectives behave differently from singular and dual ones.

My only criticism at this point concerns the putative "trend in Slavic toward long-form attributes and short-form predicates," which began, he hypothesizes, in the plural, under the influence of plural nominalizations.

¹So has Tolstoj, but as Flier notes, Tolstoj's citations are not always accurate.
The end result of this trend is seen in contemporary Serbo-Croatian which still preserves a distinction between long and short adjectives in attributive position. Unlike the singular, the plural paradigms are formally identical. Theoretically they are distinguished by differences in tone and length but speakers continually confuse them in practice.

Serbo-Croatian does not manifest a trend toward long-form attributes and short predicate adjectives, although it is slowly losing the meaning distinction between long and short forms. In the plural, the form found in the predicate is the same as that in attributive position: in most dialects, there is only one paradigm. In the singular, an adjective either has both forms or it does not. If it does, it will use the short ending in the predicate and either the long or the short when modifying a noun, according to criteria of definite/indefinite. If it does not, there will be no difference between the attributive and predicate forms.¹

If there were a trend toward long attributives and short predicatives, we would expect at least a few adjectives to have short forms that were used only in the predicate. I find no evidence in either of the grammars cited that this is the case. The situation in Slovenian is similar to the one in Serbo-Croatian, except that the opposition survives

¹ Flier, Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic, p. 172.

for the most part only in the masc. nom./acc. sg. ¹ The history of adjectives in Bulgarian shows a semantic confusion of the two forms leading toward the development of a new article from the demonstrative този. This could be postposed to either a noun or the long form of the adjective. There was no trend toward long attributes and short predicates. ² Thus since the trend toward long-form attributive and short-form predicative adjectives did not and does not exist in South Slavic, it cannot be considered the inevitable result of some situation in Common Slavic. It should not be used to explain anything in OCS, as Flier does on occasion. One also should not interpret over-use of the long form as evidence of such a trend in texts as early as the Gospel manuscripts. Movement toward long attributive and short predicative adjectives was a later development specific to East and West Slavic.


CHAPTER V

LONG AND SHORT ADJECTIVES IN EARLY SLAVIC:
EARLY ORIGINAL SLAVIC DATA

With the amount of controversy and complication evident in previous work on this problem in Old Church Slavic, it is not surprising to find that no single factor like definite/indefinite explains the appearance of all long and short adjectives in the Early Original Slavic texts, either. Not surprisingly also, I have discovered that most of the patterns observed by researchers on OCS apply to the EOS texts as well. My purpose here, however, is not to compare EOS and OCS texts on the basis of, for example, Flier's analysis. He seeks to account for the forms, whether they express definite/indefinite or some other meaning. Rather it is more like Borodić's, namely, to determine whether definite/indefinite really is systematically expressed in these texts, and if so how.

Most of what follows is based on the five narrative texts: Life of Methodius (LM), Life of Constantine (LC), Poxvala to Cyril and Methodius (PCM), Life of Wenceslas (LW), and Tale of the Iron Cross (IC). Narration involves more diverse use of NP's, viz., new characters and situations are introduced as well as old ones interacting and being discussed. The others listed
in table 1 were consulted for comparison and will appear occasionally in examples.

I will first discuss the expression of definite, indefinite, and generic and will then proceed to an analysis of the exceptions.

Definite/Indefinite/Generic

In this section I will apply the general notions of definite, indefinite, and generic discussed in chapter 3 to the EOS material. Comparisons will be drawn with Flier's conclusions from the Gospel text manuscripts where possible, in light of the fact that our approaches are somewhat different.

I had hoped to carry out a statistical analysis on the adjective forms used for definite, indefinite, and generic NP's, as well as on the correlation of these meanings with sentence position and topic/comment for chapter 6. However, once I had laboriously coded and input the first fourteen pages of the Life of Constantine and gotten my SAS program to run, I realized that there were a sufficient number of instances where I could not tell for sure whether a NP was definite or indefinite, indefinite or generic, etc., that the impressive-looking results really did not mean very much. This is a problem even when there is a translation by someone else into a language which uses articles. In several instances the translations are from different versions of the texts
than the ones I am using;\textsuperscript{1} also I sometimes disagree about the interpretation of a passage.

It was recently suggested to me that I could deal with the problem of indeterminate-status NP's in one of two ways. Either the program could be run without the questionable NP's; or it could be run twice, once with the doubtful NP's all one choice and once with them all the other, and the two results compared. These are promising avenues for future work.

Much as I would prefer it to be otherwise, then, most of the discussion which follows is impressionistic and not quantified. I have, however, in each section randomly chosen (using a pre-complied list and a random number table) one or two texts and counted instances of the relevant type of NP. These numbers are to be considered suggestive and not statistically significant.

Definite

The hearer or reader can pick out the proper entity (intended referent) from among those that could be similarly classified in a variety of ways. The NP can be semantically unique, e.g., proper names or superlatives.

Or it can be anywhere along a continuum of situational-contextual uniqueness from uniqueness determined only by knowledge of the world (the sun, the earth, life) through culturally-determined uniqueness (religious terms like the mass, eternal life) to uniqueness within a particular smaller speech-act situation or linguistic context (anaphora, speech-act participants, NP's containing demonstratives, etc.).

Proper names

Adjectives accompanying or forming part of proper names are long in these texts almost without exception. This finding accords with Flier's Gospel text data.

1. (IC 85:7-8) ḡi ñe xristianwskz, ñitvami 0-Lord God of-Christians by-prayers velikago mcnka Georgie izbavi m§ of-great(long) martyr George save-IMPER me 'O Lord, God of the Christians, by the prayers of the great martyr George, save me!'

2. (LC 18:4) otz more ċrzmnago do more filistimwska from sea red(long) to sea Philistine 'from the Red Sea to the Philistine Sea [i.e., the Mediterranean]' An interesting example is 3, where David is not being used to refer to the person David, but rather is a non-referential meaning 'person having the qualities of David.'

3. (LC 7:22-23) t* da ti podastb blagodatb he SUBJUNC to-you he-gives grace

1Kantor and White, The Vita of Constantine and the Vita of Methodius, p. 31.
i silu vš slovesěx, i jako drugago Davida
and strength in words and as second David

novago* javitě na Goliada
new(long) he-reveals against Goliath

*Variant in MSS 3 and 4: nova (short)

'May he give you grace and strength in words and
reveal you as a second, new David against Goliath.'

Is the underlined NP, with its variant reading, definite
or indefinite? It seems that the fact that it could
plausibly be interpreted either way accounts for the vari-
ant reading, despite the proper name.¹

Superlatives (comparatives)

In English, use of the superlative in its literal
meaning (i.e., not in the so-called absolute superlative,
as in a most undesirable proposal, 'a very undesirable pro-
posal') almost always makes the NP definite. This is
because in a series, there is always a first and a last.

Early Slavic, however, has no formal superlative,
but uses instead the comparative for both comparative and
superlative meanings. There is, in addition, a morpholog-
ical peculiarity that the masc. nom./acc. sg. comparative
has only one form. Both long and short end in -ěi or -ii.
The ending -ěi, *-ějě, is etymologically short; -ii,
*-jěje, is morphologically long, with the final *-jě most

¹That this is a standard in a comparison further
complicates the picture. These will be treated below
under indefinites not used for referring. The question
will be raised there whether they really belong in that
category.
likely added by analogy with the *-ju ending on the *-ěju type.¹

Except for this morphological peculiarity, we might expect a long comparative form to have superlative meaning. There is little evidence, however, that this is the case, and one often cannot determine whether a given adjective would be translated into English with a comparative or a superlative, regardless of whether it is long or short.

4. (B 26:7-9) ñsa ubo tворетв Christ therefore they-make
stareišago syna, mensaago
older/oldest(long) son younger/youngest(long)
že . . . diavola menетв CONJ devil they-change-into
'Therefore they make the older/oldest son Christ, but the younger/youngest they change into the Devil.'

The NP's in 4 are certainly definite, but whether the meaning of the adjectives corresponds to the English comparative or superlative is unknown. Likewise with 5, which shows interference from later Russian on the masc. acc. sg. adjective. (The expected form is bolii.) Here, however, we cannot even tell whether the NP is definite.

5. (LC 27:13-14) bogт, iże velitв vsěkomu God who he-commands to-each
daby vz razumž istinnyi prišelž SUBJUNC-AUX into knowledge true(long) come

¹Paul Diels, Altkirchenslavische Grammatik; mit einer Auswahl von Texten und einem Wörterbuch, Sammlung slavischer Lehr- und Handbücher, Reihe 1, no. 6 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1963), p. 199.
This situation does not mean that EOS could not distinguish comparative from superlative meaning when necessary.

6. (PCM 112d27-30) otc slnca svetli prijemljusti
   svetleis vsex javlejet
   bright of than all she-manifests
   svet svet light
taking
'Taking light from the sun, [the morning star] appears brighter than all/brighter of all.'

Most comparatives/superlatives are long if the context or situation indicates that the NP is definite, just like NP's with ordinary adjectives. But the exception rate seems somewhat higher.

7. (LM 104d29-30) nzb sud sluzi jako
   but having-gone he-served like
   rabz mnu bratu
   slave to younger/youngest brother

'But he went and served [his] younger/youngest brother [i.e., Constantine] like a slave.'

The underlined NP in 7 cannot be anything but definite. The referent is easily identifiable from previous text, and saying that Methodius served in the way slaves serve younger brothers (non-referential indefinite or generic meaning) makes no sense at all.

In the same way, short forms usually appear where we would expect them: on predicate adjectives and indefinites. But here again, the exception rate seems somewhat
higher than for ordinary adjectives. For example, in LC we find 146 non-comparative predicate adjectives and attributive adjectives on indefinite NP's. Of these, 14 or 9.5% are long. Comparative adjectives in the same environments occur long in 2 cases out of 14, or 14.2%.

8. (LC 5:14-16) ot care že veliju čestu i from emperor CONJ great honor and knężenie priimž, bolůša poćai, princedom having-received greater(short) expect-IMPER v»skorě bo stratigž budeši soon for stratigos thou-wilt-be *variant in MS 2: bolůšaa čai greater(long) expect-IMPER 'After you receive great honor and a princedom from the emperor, expect [something even] greater, for soon you will be a stratigos.'

9. (IC 92:13-15) I v toi ča<s> jako nikotoryi and at that time like some vlastelinž jaromž gl<s>m jako k ž lord with-fierce voice like to menšemu ili k ž rabu reče: younger/youngest(long) or to slave he-said poimi člka sego i nastavi i na puxt catch-IMPER man this and put-IMPER him on way 'And at that [very] moment, a fierce voice, like some lord [speaking] to a younger [person] or to a slave, said, "Take this man and send him on his way."'

The underlined NP in 9 has no discernible referent, so it is not definite. It could, however, be generic instead of indefinite non-referential,¹ except that it is hard to interpret nikotoryi vlastelinž as anything but indefinite. Bolůša in 8 has no referent that is identifiable when the

¹See the discussion on standards in comparisons in the section on indefinites below.
word is uttered, so it is not definite, either. This one, in fact, seems to be both specific and referential, so the variant reading is particularly noticeable.

In summary, we see that (1) there appears to be no morphologically-expressed, separate category of superlative in the language of these texts. In other words, superlative is not expressed by comparative plus \(-j\wedge\). (2) With the exception of the masc. nom. sg., the comparative-superlative form takes the \(-j\wedge\) morpheme under the same conditions as an ordinary adjective, although the exception rate seems somewhat higher. And (3) there is a certain amount of interference from later Russian on this type of adjective. Flier hypothesizes that in the language of the Gospel texts, the comparative adjective neutralized the opposition between long and short adjectives.¹ My material does not support such a strong position, although there seems to be a slight tendency in that direction.

**Definite by virtue only of knowledge of the world**

Examples totally unconditioned by cultural or contextual-situational factors are rare. One type which may fit into this category is a NP denoting a disease, in particular or general terms. Such NP's are quite uncommon in these texts, but what data there are support Flier's conclusion from the Gospel texts that these NP's require the \(-j\wedge\) mor-

¹Flier, Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic, pp. 146, 161-162.
pheme—although it seems that all of the examples here could be considered to be definite for other reasons, as in 10.

de-DAT infection sickness-ADJ(long) many days

'His many labors having overtaken him, he became ill, and enduring the illness for many days . . .'

**Contextually-situationally definite**

With demonstratives and possessive pronouns

A speaker using a demonstrative singles out his intended referent by pointing to it, literally (within the speech-act situation) or figuratively (within the linguistic context). With a possessive pronoun, the speaker indicates which entity by overtly connecting it with one of the speech-act participants or an individual or object in the context.

In agreement with Flier's material, NP's containing either demonstratives or possessive pronouns in these texts have long adjectives almost without exception. Not unexpectedly, most of the NP's in the present corpus which have one of these would be unambiguously definite even without the overt markers. They would fall into one of the categories I will discuss below. A few examples.

11. *(IC 95:8-10)* Zręše na divnoe to looking at wonderful(long) that

světloé lice, ne drzńuxové prikosnuti serene(long) face not we-two-dared to-touch
Looking at that wonderful, serene face, we did not dare to touch [him], but [only] to lay his holy body in the grave.'

An interesting exception to the above generalization is 12, containing along with a possessive pronoun the indefinite adjective in, 'another,' which regularly occurs with the short-form adjective.

12. (LC 11:11-12) Isperva edin bog tokmo znaem, from-first one god only we-know
iže est nad vsémi, i tomu se klanem who he-is above all and to-him REFL we-bow
na vrostok, a obyjea svoa iny studny* toward east and customs own other shameful(short)
držaše holding
*variant in MS 2: studnya, 'shameful(long)'
'From the beginning, we have known only one God, who is over all, and we bow to him toward the east, and we have our other shameful customs.'

In LW we find four instances of the same lexical item (zali, 'evil') in what appears to be the short form masc. nom. pl., accompanied by the demonstrative ti. The referents of all of these NP's are also the same: the murderers of Wenceslas. One instance is 13.

13. (LW 40:7-9) Prišadši že nošti, sabraš having-come CONJ night they-gathered
se ti zali vrazi na dvor* REFL those evil(short) enemies in courtyard
etera vraga Gněvisa of-a-certain enemy Hnévysa
'Night having come, those evil enemies gathered in in the courtyard of a certain enemy, Hnévysa.'
But the seeming exception in 13 could be a contracted long form, especially since there seem to be other contracted adjectives in this text. (See example 107.)

Anaphoric NP's

Same-item anaphoric NP's used referentially and containing adjectives are rather rare. In addition, most of them seem to have some factor that otherwise determines the form, e.g., a demonstrative, a -vsk- adjective, or the NP being a known religious concept (see below). The reason for their rareness is clear: such NP's are usually pronominalized or deleted. Even if a noun does appear in this function, it is generally without an adjective, since the noun alone is sufficient to identify the referent. When they do occur, the adjectives are long, as in 14, or the NP xristoljubivae bratie in 15.

14. Previous context: 'And when he heard that St. Clement was still lying in the sea, he prayed, saying, "I believe in God and place my hope in St. Clement, that I will find his relics and take them from the sea." ... They boarded a boat and set out for that spot.'

(LC 12:17-18) Toqda že byst' vonę velia,
then CONJ it-was smell great(short)
jako kadilž mnogž pometž javaićesę
like of-incense much after-this they-appeared
svętya mošti
holy(long) relics

'Then there was a great fragrance, as of much incense, [and] after this, the holy relics appeared [i.e., the relics of St. Clement].

Anaphora which bear a part-whole or other associative relationship to their antecedents occur more frequently.
15. (IC 84:9-10) ... i priteče učenik i r<če>e:
and he-came disciple and he-said

Vzovi bratiju. Jako priidoša
summon-IMPER brethren as they-arrived
xoljubivač bratije, i posadi
Christ-loving(long) brethren and he-seated
staršešix, i druzii staša
older/oldest(long) and others stood
'. . . and a disciple came and [Father Peter] said,
"Summon the brethren." When the Christ-loving
brethren arrived, he seated the older/oldest [ones]
and the others [remained] standing.'

16. Previous context, as translated by Kantor and White:
'And they said to him, "You are teaching in our
lands." Then he answered,' "

(LM 106d10-15) ašte li i vy rvñnija radi
if and you jealousy because-of
i lakomštva na staryja prèdëli postupajete
and greed for old(long) boundaries you-act
čeros kanony vžbranéjušte učenija žjija
against canon prohibiting teachings God's
'If you, because of jealousy and greed, act against
the canon for the old boundaries by prohibiting
God's teachings . . . '.

This type of anaphoric NP, too, is almost always long. The
"antecedent" can also be in the same NP. (The "antecedent"
in 17 is marked with dotted lines.) Adjectives here are also
long. Example 18 contains a modifying participial phrase.

17. (IC 86:15-16) I čjudivše se veličši
and having-marveled REFL at-great(long)

sile štye tr<če>ca i pomoštì
strength of-holy(long) trinity and at-help.
skorėi velikago mčnika Georgie . . .
quick(long) of-great(long) martyr George
idoxom na voinu tu.
we-went to war that

---

1This text has no short gen. pl. adjectives.
2Kantor and White, The Vita of Constantine and the Vita of Methodius, p. 81.
'And having marveled at the great strength of the Holy Trinity and the prompt help of the great martyr George, ... we went to the war.'

18. (LM 103c25-28) pročii proči k*ž*do v* svoje
next prophets each in own

vrčmė  o  divnyzx1 veštwz2
time about miraculous(long) things

xotęståtx4 byti prořčstvovaša
FUT-AUX-PRES.ACT.PTC.(long)to-be they-prophesied

'The subsequent prophets, each in his own time, prophesied about the miraculous things that would come to pass.'

Situationally definite

Finally, we have NP's which are definite because they refer to something in the situation of the speech act or the broader cultural or situational context, even though the antecedents are not explicit in the text.

19. (IC 92:4-5) I egda nača bolšti, rče
and when he-began to-be-ill he-spoke

mi tai: Pope Efrēme, povelē[i] da
to-me secretly 0-priest Efrem order-IMPER that

izlēzut vzn o<t> naju, sēdastii sdē ... they-go-out away from us-two sitting(long) here

I rekox suštima tu: Izlēzete
and I-said to-being(long)there go-out-IMPER

'And when he first became ill, he said to me secretly, "Father Efrem, tell the [people] sitting here to go out, away from us." And I said to [those who] were there, "Go out."'

First and second person referents

Adjectives occurring in NP's whose intended referent is a first or second person take the long form. The finding

1This text has no short loc. pl. adjectives.
for vocatives agrees with Flier's data. He does not discuss NP's with first person referents.

20. (LC 22:5) skaži namž, čestny tell-IMPER to-us honorable(long)-NOM
mujžmu
man-VOC
'Tell us, honorable man'

21. (LM 102c12-13) iže . . . v•si pravověrnii whom all orthodox(long)
slavimž
we-praise
'whom all we Orthodox praise'

22. (LM 106c15-17) vy že čada vžzljublenaja you CONJ children beloved(long)
poslušaite učenija božija listen-IMPER teachings God's
'You, beloved children, listen to God's teachings.'

With masculine nouns in the vocative singular, an alternative to the long-form nominative adjective, such as the one in 20, is a short vocative adjective.

23. (LC 4:10-11) bože otc̆ našixž, i God-VOC of-fathers our and
gospodi milostive Lord-VOC merciful-VOC(short)
'O God of our fathers and merciful Lord'

The feminine singular adjective has no distinct vocative ending (although the noun does), so we occasionally find a short nominative ending.

24. (IC 94:20) tr̆ce nerezdelima, trinity-VOC indivisible-NOM(short)

Flier, Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic, pp. 152-153.
pomilui me
have-mercy-on-IMPER me
'Indivisible Trinity, have mercy on me!'

That the short form can occur in such a NP is undoubtedly
due to the fact that the definiteness marker is redundant:
someone or something being addressed is already identifiable
by virtue of the speech act itself.

Teodorov-Balan claims the following is a long voca-
tive:¹

25. (LM 105a30-105b1) to dobrei vladyko
   so better/best(long) lord-VOC
   posli tak muž iže ny ispravit všęku
   send-IMPER such man who us he-corrects every
   pravdu
   truth
   'So, most excellent lord, send us a man who will
correct every truth for us.'²

But the form dobrei, Аобрън, is a masc. nom. sg. comparative.
A long vocative would be dobrei, Аобрън. Russian manu-
scripts in general are known for confusion of ė and e,
since the two sounds [ië] (or high ě) and [e] eventually
merged in many dialects. According to Knjazevskaja, sub-
stitution of e for ě is a fairly characteristic feature of the

¹Aleksandår Teodorov-Balan, Kiril i Metodi, Universi-
²The interpretation of the last part of this passage
is disputed, but this does not affect the present discussion.
See Skazanija o načale slavjanskoj pis'mennosti, ed. V. D.
Koroljuk, introduction, translation, and commentary by B. N.
Flori, Pamjatniki srednevekovoj istorii narodov Central'noj
i Vostočnoj Evropy (Moscow: Nauka, 1981), p. 147, n. 5 for
a summary and plausible resolution to the debate.
manuscript, but she makes no mention of ę being written with any frequency instead of e.\(^1\) In addition, the word index to the Uspenskij sbornik lists this occurrence as a masc. nom. sg. comparative.\(^2\) Zbigniew Gołab suggests that since the addressee is the Byzantine emperor Michael, the form in question is probably a superlative meaning 'most excellent.'\(^3\) Flier found no long vocative adjectives in the Gospel texts, and I found none in the EOS material, either.

**Definite by virtue of knowledge of the culture**

Given the nature of these texts, one is hardly surprised to find that the largest part of the culture and broader context represented is religious. Included as common knowledge are Bible stories, Christian doctrine, the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the liturgy, various rituals, etc. There are a large number of examples, of which I cite only a few.

26. (LC 30:25) krestę̆şte ja vo ime otca i syna i svę̆tago duxa
baptizing them in name of-father and of-son and of-holy(long) spirit

'baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit'

---


\(^2\) Uspenskij sbornik XII-XIII vv., p. 554.

\(^3\) Personal communication.
27. (LC 28:9-10) 
zli nastavnik isperva,
evil(long) teacher from-first
djavol dvil
'devil'
'the evil teacher from the beginning, the Devil'

28. (LM 109a17-19) sbaravšem že se im
having-gathered-DAT CONJ REFL they-DAT
v cvetnuju nedelju
on flower-ADJ(long) Sunday
'They, having gathered on Palm Sunday . . .'

29. (PCM 113c4-6) i vsu crkwnyi zakon
and all church-ADJ(long) law
preloša
having-translated
'And having translated the whole Church Law
[Nomokanon, probably]\ . . .' 2

Adjectives in this type of NP are also almost always long.

1My problem with this NP seems to illustrate a
type of NP are also almost always long.

1My problem with this NP seems to illustrate a
question Howard Aronson asked me about "definiteness by
virtue of knowledge of the culture," namely, whether it
should not be "knowledge of the culture by virtue of def-
inite." I do not think so. Outside of an opaque context,
the semantics of the past tense plus a verb like translate
would imply that the direct object has a referent. Thus if
H is not able to identify the referent independently of the
sentence, as I cannot here without more research, H can at
least use the implication to learn that there is such a
referent. For him to do this, it does not matter whether
the NP is definite or indefinite specific. What knowledge
I have of early Slavic religious culture suggests that Sp
is referring to a uniquely-salient collection of religious
laws that he assumes H will be able to pick out from his own
knowledge of the culture. If Sp is not making such an
assumption, the NP is not definite, despite the long form.
Whether I actually can identify the referent is irrelevant;
what is important is the speaker's assumption, as far as it
can be determined.

2The presence of vs, 'all, whole,' in a singular
NP does not necessarily make it definite. Note the English
sentence He wrote an entire chapter before going to bed,
for example.
We also find these factors combined. In 30, for instance, a bishop is introduced. Knowledge of the culture tells H that bishops are associated with churches and that churches often have steps. Also mentioned is an event about to take place, the tonsuring of young Wenceslas. From all this information, H can identify na krilě stepeně 'm predě oltaromě as a location inside the church where the tonsuring would occur.

Notions of time and space

Cutting across all the above criteria for the establishment of definiteness are notions of time and space, which are associated with all contexts and situations. In OCS, spatial and temporal derived adjectives have only long forms: vyšnii, 'highest, on high;' внěšnii, 'outer, outside;' kroměšnii, 'outer, outside;' bližnii, 'near;' внčerašnii, 'yesterday's;' нyněšnii, 'present, today's' (from нyně, 'now'); utrěšnii, 'morning;' etc.¹ With the context or

situation providing a reference point $P$, such an adjective will often be used to enable the hearer to pick out the intended referent $R_i$ by contrasting it with other $R$s related to $P$. For example, if the current action is taking place in a certain village $(P)$, the land outside the village $(R_i)$ can be identified by contrast with the land inside the village through calling it the outside land. Likewise, the morning service $(R_i)$ can be identified in contrast to the other services on the day the narrated events take place $(P)$. Related to the above adjectives derived from adverbs are denominal adjectives like utrënii, 'morning;' poludnii, 'noon;' and večernii, 'evening;' which also occur only in the long form.¹ I found only one exception in my texts. This, I suspect, is a mistake, made under the influence of malo, which is an adverb.

¹ Noštyni, 'night, nightly,' however, is also attested in the short form, according to Sadnik and Aitzetmüller's Handwörterbuch. This lexical item does not occur at all in the present texts. It will be noted that most of the spatial and temporal adjectives in the above lists involve the suffix -tnii, which, as observed by most investigators (e.g., Tolstoj, Značenie, pp. 62-65; Honowska, Geneza, p. 56), almost always occurs with the long form when the meaning is temporal or spatial. Flier (Aspects, p. 120, but cf. pp. 131-132) states this without reference to the meaning, which he can do since his texts contain no possessives with this suffix. (See section on morphology below, as well as Antoine Meillet, Études sur l'etymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave, 2d ed., 2 vols. [Paris: Librairie Champion, 1961], 2:381-383.) Adjectives denoting positions in a spatial or temporal sequence are likewise exclusively long-form: pervyi, 'first;' pročii, 'next' (may also occur with -il- suffix and therefore short); poslednii, 'last;' desnyi, 'right (as in right hand);' and all ordinal numbers.
31. (B 22:13) no obače malo povědavš o but nevertheless little having-told about
proč* pomolčju
next( short) I-pass-over-in-silence
*variant o pročěm (long) in all other manuscripts
'But having told a little, the rest I pass over in silence.'

In the preceding section, we have looked at various ways in which a NP can be determined to be definite, i.e., ways in which the hearer/reader of texts such as these can use his knowledge of the world in general and of the culture of the time, and the linguistic and situational context to pick out the intended referent $R_i$ from the class of potential referents $R$. Adjectives contained in proper names, anaphoric and culturally- and contextually/situationally-definite NP's are almost always long in these texts, with the occasional exception of voc. sg. adjectives.

In a randomly-chosen narrative text, LM, of 81 definite NP's modified by variable adjectives,¹ one, or 1.2%, is short. (The one exception is example 7.)

For the most part, this material agrees with Flier's Gospel text data, although he includes definiteness ("uniqueness") of the noun from which a denominal adjective is derived as a criterion for the appearance of the -ju> morpheme, in addition to the definiteness of the whole NP.

¹By variable adjective I mean an adjective which is capable of participating in the long/short opposition according to the criterion of definiteness. There are some morphological groups of adjectives which use one form or the other exclusively, or exhibit the two seemingly in free variation. These will be discussed in the final section of this chapter.
I have found, however, that NP's containing adjectives derived from definite nouns can usually be treated along with other types in terms of the whole NP. Flier also treats some generics as definites. My data show comparative adjectives following the expected pattern for definite-indefinite-generic, while Flier found this opposition neutralized. Furthermore, the superlative was seen to be a category not separate from the comparative, i.e., superlative is not equivalent to comparative plus -jw.

**Indefinite**

Indefinite NP's will be divided into those used to talk about a referent (referential) and those that are used for other purposes, whether or not a referent exists for the NP (non-referential). The reader will notice that I am using the terms "referential" and "non-referential" to talk of speaker reference in the sense of Donnellan's "Referential Reference, Descriptions and Anaphora." This usage is not to be confused with having a referent or with various other ways in which the term "referential" has been used in the literature. ¹ For purposes of discussion each type will be subdivided by whether or not there is a referent and if so, who in the speech act can identify it.

Referential

Referential indefinite NP's by definition all have referents. The referents can be identifiable by Sp and H or by Sp only. In the first type both Sp and H can actually identify the referent, but Sp, for one reason or another, is referring to the referent as if it were unknown. Some English examples will illustrate this usage.

32. Teacher to class: Some of you seem to feel that you can cheat and get away with it. I have news for you . . .
   (Teacher does not want to identify the culprits to the rest of the class.)

33. Mother: Who was that you were talking to?
   Teenager: Oh, just a boy.
   (It is likely here that the teenager knows her mother could identify the boy she was talking to and does not want her to do so.)

34. Parent to child: A certain kid I know is going to be sent outside if he doesn't stop screaming.
   (Here the parent may be playing reference games with the child, knowing the boy can solve the puzzle and draw the proper conclusion.)

I was not able to find an instance of this usage in any of the EOS texts. This is probably because it occurs in a rather restricted context, namely, where there is some real or feigned secrecy about the identity of the referent, and none of the texts happens to include such a context.

In the more common type of referential indefinite, only Sp can identify the referent. It is this class that might fit the negation of Chafe's definition, a communication by Sp to H that "I do not assume that you can pick out, from all the referents that might be categorized in this way, the one I have in mind." The primary function of this
usage seems to be to introduce the referent into the discourse. The referent can then be treated as identifiable and referred to using definite NP's. For example, 35.

35. (IC 85:26-28) I ležáštu mi v noště v klěti and lying I-DAT in night in cell svoeí s podružie<m>, priide ko mně vo sně own with wife he-came to me in dream mužь golousь světelь. I man without-moustache(short) radiant(short) and ne moža<x> na lice ego vzrěti not I-could at face his to-look

'[One] night as I was lying in my cell with my wife, a radiant man without a moustache came to me in a dream. I could not look at his face.'

Two randomly-chosen narrative texts, LW and IC, together produced 17 NP's of this type, of which 8 have variable adjectives. All of these are short. There are 5 with only a marker like ewartь, 'a certain,' and one has both a marker and a short adjective. Four, or 24%, have neither. It should be noted that long adjectives do occur, very occasionally, with NP's of this type.

36. (LC 5:11-14) Edinoju že reče kž nemu: tvoa once CONJ he-said to him thy krasota i mudrostь nuditь mę izliixa beauty and wisdom it-compels me exceedingly ljubiti tę. Imaju ćaštere duxovnuju, juže to-love thee I-have daughter spiritual(long) whom esmь krьstilь, krasnu i bogatu, I-AUX baptized beautiful(short) and wealthy(short) roda dobra i velika. Ašte xošteši, of-family good(short) and great(short) if thou-wishest podružiju siju ti damь. wife this to-thee I-give

'Once he said to him, "Your beauty and wisdom compel me to love you exceedingly. I have a goddaughter whom I baptized, a beautiful and wealthy [girl]
from a good a noble family. If you wish, I will give her to you as [your] wife."

This NP cannot be definite, yet there are no variant readings with the short duxovnu. The anomaly appears to lie in this particular lexical item. Duxovnu does not occur in the short form in any of the texts used here, although there are seven instances of the short form in other Uspenskij sbornik texts.¹ In OCS the word often translates the Greek arthrous genitive tou pneumatos.² And it usually occurs in definite and generic NP's. Both of these factors could lead to the word tending to become fixed in the long form.

In support of this argument, we also find that B has an anomalous long form of duxovn- in a NP with selikz, 'so great.'³

37. (B 64:11-13) Priim že ubo selikz,

having-received CONJ therefore so-great

darę duxvnyi rekše krsťt gņe
gift spiritual(long) that-is cross Lord's
dolžni esmy těmę ogražajušę se
obligated we-are with-it defending REFL

ţvxně požiti na zemli ďni naśa
spiritually to-live on earth days our

'Therefore, having received so great a spiritual gift, that is, the Lord's cross, defending ourselves with it spiritually, we must live our days on earth.'

¹Uspenskij sbornik XII-XIII vv., p. 557.
³Discussion of NP's with 'such' and 'so' will be found in the section on non-referential indefinites below.
If there is no short adjective or word like etern, how does one know that a NP is indefinite? There can be no communication to the hearer about the status of the NP. Of the three instances in our sample texts, two are objects of the verb uzrěti, 'to see,' and the other is the object of prizvati, 'to summon.' Both verbs can take definite or indefinite objects. All three NP's occur at the ends of their clauses, usually a stressed position. These are the only clues, and neither is unambiguous. Compare 38 with 39.

38. (IC 92:21) I poidox̂ puteṃ i ozn̄e se na and I-went on-way and I-looked REFL to šuju stranu. I uzrě<x> muža 4 na konex̂. I left side and I-saw men 4 on horses and jako uzrěša mę, pustiša na mę as they-saw me they-let-fly against me 'I went on my way. I looked to my left and saw four men on horses. And when they saw me, they let fly against me.'

That is, at least in modern Slavic languages. See, for example, I. I. Kovtunova, Sovremennyj russkij jazyk: porjadok slov i aktual'noe členenie predloženija (Moscow: Prosvesčenie, 1976), pp. 50-51, 97, for Russian; and Aleksander Szwedek, Word Order, Sentence Stress and Reference in English and Polish (Edmonton, Alberta: Linguistic Research, 1976), p. 83, for Polish. This is the so-called "neutral" sentence-stress pattern, which applies when the comment is in final position. In 38 and 39 the underlined NP's are both sentence-final comments. In addition, given the contexts, these NP's communicate the most new information of any phrase in their respective sentences. (See J. Firbas, "Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English," in Trav-eaux linguistiques de Prague 2 [1966]:243, for the notion "degree of communicative dynamism," or the degree to which a sentence component adds new information to the communication.)
Neither of the underlined NP's contains any definiteness or indefiniteness marker, both verbs can take definite or indefinite direct objects, and both NP's occur at the ends of their clauses. One is forced to conclude that H attempts to identify both referents. With 39 he succeeds on the basis of his knowledge of the culture, but he fails with 38.

Observe that it is not necessary that Sp be able to identify the referent in the real world. All that is required is that he be referring to it. Example 40 begins a parable. Constantine, the speaker, has probably made up the man, and distinguishing the particular quantity of sea water involved is simply irrelevant. Nevertheless Constantine refers to both of them throughout the story, as we can see from the pronouns and deleted subjects in just the sentence in 40.

40. (LC 10:11-13) človek nekyi, počerpez
man a-certain having-scooped
vodu v mori, v měščce nošase ju,
water in sea in waterskin he-carried-around it
i gręděšesę gлаголе k Stranger: visite
and he-put-on-airs saying to strangers you-see
li vodu, ejaže nikto že ne imatε, razvε mene Q water which no-one EMPH not he-has except me

'A certain man, having drawn water from the sea, carried it around in a water skin and put on airs, saying to strangers, "Do you see this water? No one has it except me!"

Referential indefinite NP's are quite uncommon in comparison with other types, even in narrative texts. LW and IC combined, for example, yield only 17. Compare this figure with 154 generics in PCM alone and 601 definites in LM alone.¹

In summary, we have seen that the only type of referential usage with indefinite NP's in our texts is with those where Sp can identify the referent and H cannot. These are usually used to introduce the referent into the discourse. Thirteen, or 76% of our sample of 17 such NP's, are morphologically marked with a short variable adjective, a word meaning 'a certain,' or both. Four, or 24%, have neither. Short adjectives, then, can be considered markers for indefiniteness in NP's used referentially. Neither they nor words meaning 'a certain' are obligatory, however. Long adjectives are almost never used on NP's of this type.

Non-Referential

For purposes of discussion I will divide non-referential NP's into two classes, depending on whether the NP has a referent—even though the speaker is not referring to it. Those with referents I will further subdivide by

¹These figures include all NP's of the type, whether they have variable adjectives or not.
who could identify the referent: Sp and H, Sp only, or neither.

The type most obviously distinguishable as non-referential has a referent identifiable by both Sp and H. There are two types: one which is accompanied by a short adjective or a relative clause, and the other which occurs with short adjectives and such modifiers as tolov, 'so;' selo, 'so;' sicu, 'such;' and their variants with these and similar meanings. A clear example of the first type is seen in 41.

41. (OP 164:10-11) těm že slověnskaa pismena with-that CONJ Slavic letters
štěiš[a] sg<1> i čvstněiša. stě holier are and more-praiseworthy holy(short)
bo možě stvoril% ja je<s>, a grčeskaa Ellini for man made them he-AUX but Greek-ADJ Greeks
pogani pagans
'And therefore the Slavic letters are holier and more praiseworthy. For a holy man made them, while the Greek ones [were made by] pagans.'

In 41 the referent of the underlined NP is identifiable as Cyril. If the NP were being used referentially, however, the entire first half of the second sentence would be redundant, since the reader knows from the previous text that St. Cyril created the Slavic alphabet. The point of the sentence is to contrast the description of him as a holy man with the description of the Greeks as pagans. Example 42 is less clear-cut since it could as well be interpreted as definite, but I think it could also fit into this same category.
42. (LM 109b13-17) ljudii že bestislwn narod CONJ numberless crowd
sibarav se provazaaxu sz svestami having-gathered REFL they-accompanied with candles
placjuste se dobra ucitele i pastyre weeping REFL good(short) teacher and shepherd

'An innumerable crowd of people having gathered, they accompanied him with candles, mourning a good teacher and shepherd.'

The description here is not being used in order that H might identify Methodius. If mere identification had been the speaker's aim, he could have used a pronoun. Methodius is, after all, the topic of the entire narrative. Rather the description is used to tell why the people are mourning or how they thought of him. It is also not a definite attributive NP, because the meaning is not 'whoever was the good teacher and shepherd.' LW and PCM together contain eight NP's of this type with variable adjectives, all of which are short, and one with a relative clause only.

The second type is illustrated by 43-46.

43. (B 14:23-15:1) syi vide mal

'You see a small straw in his eye, but you do not remove from your own eye so large a beam of heresy.' (paraphrase of Lk 6:41)

1The long xulnago may or may not constitute an exception to the usual pattern. What goes with tol is only the short velika. Xulnago is a relational adjective which can be analyzed as transformationally derived from a noun in the
44. (LM 102c5-8) ... togo poznati iže jestw that-one to-recognize who he-AUX
stvorili% sice dela divna i mnoga
done such deeds wondrous(short) and many
'. ... to recognize the one who has done such abundant and wondrous deeds'

45. (LC 5:6-7) Otse sego Že pače vzljubi i i
from this CONJ more he-loved him and
prisno vprašaše i o vsem% tolik%
constantly he-asked him about everything such
muž% velik% i česten%
man great(short) and venerable(short)
'After this he, such a great and venerable man,
grew to love him even more, and constantly questioned him about everything.'

46. (B 70:23-24) Tože sel% velika detel%
likewise so great(short) doer
ne priata est% bogom% ašte ne budet s
not accepted he-is by-God if not he-is with
tixostju i krotostiju i s ljubovju daema
quietness and meekness and with love given
'Likewise [even] so great a man of action is not accepted by God, if he is not gifted with quietness, meekness, and love.'

In English, NP's modified by such have two possible readings. Consider 47, from Carlson.

47. Such intelligent farmers should be treated with the utmost respect.

This sentence, he says, is ambiguous, with one reading which can be paraphrased 'farmers that are so intelligent.' The other reading is equivalent to 'intelligent farmers of that genitive case. This underlying noun is probably a generic abstract. Relational adjectives which modify generic abstract nouns are usually long, and this adjective may be long by analogy with those. It is also derived morphologically by means of the suffix -dn-, which almost always governs the long ending. (See the sections on generics and morphology below.)
kind,' and "means that intelligent farmers with such-and-such characteristic(s) should be so treated."¹ Carlson calls the two readings the "extent reading" and the "kind" or "identifier reading," respectively.²

All of 43-46 seem to involve the extent reading. In fact, I encountered no instances which had unambiguous identifier readings. (Example 44 is possibly ambiguous.) Carlson shows that the identifier reading is generic,³ but he spends very little time on the extent reading. In our examples we find that 46 is generic--because the context is generic--but 43-45 seem to be simply indefinite, where the description is significant and not the referent, like 41 and 42.

It should be noted that the adverbs and adjectives under consideration here do not always have the same meaning from one text to another. In LC, for instance, tolikα means 'such,' while in B it means 'so many.' This lexical item occurs with adjectives once in B. The underlined NP is generic ("so many of the kind "strong emperors, princes, and sly ones of yore"') and the adjectives are long.

²According to Carlson (Ibid.), the term identifier reading was first used by Dwight Bolinger in Degree Words (The Hague: Mouton, 1972).
48. (B 15:19-21) Tolici silnii drěvnîni
so-many strong(old) oldtime(long)
čre i knědzi i xytrčci pokušaše se
emperors and princes and sly-ones they-tried REFL
oboriti črkvę božiju
to-demolish church God's
'So many strong emperors, princes, and sly ones of
yore tried to demolish God's church.'

There are no instances of such-words in our two
randomly-chosen texts, LW and PCM. But occurrences in the
other texts with variable adjectives all exhibit the short
form except for xulnago in 43.

The second class of non-referential indefinites has
a referent identifiable by the speaker but not by the
hearer; again, naming the referent is not the reason for
using the NP. This is the type that Partee used in formu-
lating the notion of referential/attributive for indefinites.
But since an indefinite NP with a referent introduces that
referent into the discourse whether the NP is used referen-
tially or not, it is often difficult or impossible to tell
the readings apart in connected text or discourse. I heard
it from a doctor, so I'm inclined to take it seriously is
unambiguous enough as it stands, but what if Sp goes on to
talk about the doctor? Example 49 illustrates this problem.

49. Previous context: 'When Constantine came for the
feast at the Kagan's and they wished to seat him,
they questioned him, saying, "What is your station
so that we may seat you according to your rank?"
And he said,'

(LC 13:19) děďe iměxę velii i slavenę
grandfather I-had great and famous(short)
'I had a great and very famous grandfather who stood close to the emperor.'

Following context: 'But he voluntarily rejected the great honor granted him and was banished. He became impoverished after going to a foreign land, and there he begot me. Though I have sought my grandfather's former station, I have not succeeded in obtaining it, for I am Adam's scion.'

LW and PCM together contain two NP's of this type with variable adjectives. Both are short.

The third type has a referent, but it is conceivably not identifiable by either Sp or H. The meaning is 'some unspecified entity(s) that meet(s) the description.' Again, the referent itself is not relevant to the context. Some English examples will illustrate this type. The reader will, of course, notice that some of these have a definite article despite the fact that neither discourse participant can identify the referent.

50. A: How was Colonel Mustared murdered?
   B: The butler did it with a knife.

51. A: Al is in the hospital again.
   B: Which one?
   A: I don't know.

52. A: How did Susan get there?
   B: She took the/a plane. C the/a train.

53. They put wallpaper in the kitchen.

54. A: What's Randy doing?
   B: Reading a book, I think.

---

Translation adapted from Kantor, *Medieval Slavic Lives of Saints and Princes*, p. 45.
In some cases the verb-plus-noun combination can be replaced with a verb derived from the noun.

50. a. The butler knifed him.
51. a. Al is hospitalized again.
52. a. She
   \{ *bussed. \\
   \{ flew. \\
   *trained. \}
53. a. They wallpapered the kitchen.
54. a. Randy is reading.

In light of English article usage with NP's of this type, it is not surprising to find that EOS uses both long and short variable adjectives here. LW and PCM together produce 9 such NP's with variable adjectives. Of these, 5 are short and 4 are long. The form of the adjective does not necessarily match the English translation.

55. (PCM 112a20-23) v* pustyni že bezvodne
   in desert CONJ waterless(short)
   napoi ja proraž kamen
   he-caused-to-drink them having-cleaved stone
   i xleba angliška nasyti
   and of-bread angel-ADJ he-satiated
   'In the waterless desert he gave them drink, having split open a stone. And he satiated [them] with angel bread [i.e., manna].'

56. (PCM 113a 13-16) proidosta jako slince
   you-two-traversed like sun
   tumnaja mesta stopami svoimi prosvesťajušta
   dark(long) places with-steps own illuminating
   'Like the sun you traversed (the) dark places, illuminating with your steps.'

This type of NP is almost certainly included in what Tolstoj calls "neutral position."¹ In our texts they are almost

¹Tolstoj, "Značenie kratkix i polnyx form prilagatel'nyx v staroslavjanskom jazyke," pp. 75-76.
always inanimate, plural, or mass nouns. Groups, inanimates, and mass substances, it seems, are often rather peripheral in our human- and individual-centered discourse. And since the referent itself is not relevant to the communication, it does not matter much to the hearer's understanding which way the NP is marked.

The fourth type of indefinite non-referential has no referent because of an opaque context. These can trigger pronominalization or deletion if the opaque context continues in some sense, but they cannot introduce a referent into the general discourse. For example, 57.

57. John couldn't catch a fish if it jumped into his lap.¹

Although I expected at least a predominance of short forms in NP's of this type with variable adjectives in the EOS sample, PCM and LW yield 1 short and 2 long. Expanding the sample to include CS1-6 produces 12 more short adjectives and 4 more long, for a total of 13 short and 6 long. Some examples.

58. (CS6 207:15-16) da jegda vidimų, bra＜t＞je, li so if we-see 0-brethren or

stranuna, li ništ, li naga li foreign(short) or poor(short) or naked(short) or

alžna, i o＜t＞idem, ne stvorše imξ hungry(short) and we-go-away not having-done to-them

nikojegože dobra... not-any good

¹Partee's example from "Opacity, Coreference and Pronouns," p. 432. See pages 426-434 of the same article for discussion of the complexities of this phenomenon.
'So, brethren, if we see a foreigner or a poor [person] or a naked [person] or a hungry [person] and we go away, not having done them any good . . . '

59. (LW 42:21-24) I ošte nadeem' se o božě and still we-hope REFL in God
mitvami blagovernago i dobrago m<ž>a with-prayers of-pious(long) and good(long) man
Veštes' lava vešťšemu čudesi éviti se Wenceslas greater(long) miracle to-manifest REFL

'And we still hope in God that an [even] greater miracle will manifest itself through the prayers of the good and pious man Wenceslas.'

60. (PCM 110d22-26) i išľďž vž olumbž • and having-gone-away to Olympus
postriže se vž čqrný rizy • he-tonsured REFL in black(short) clerical-garments
caja prijati bělu i netlěňnu hoping to-receive white(short) and imperishable(short)
anglškuju 1 odežju angel-ADJ garment

'And having gone to Olympus, he was tonsured in black clerical garments, hoping to receive a white and imperishable angel's garment.'

Part of the explanation for the observed variability seems to lie in the closeness of some instances of this meaning to the generic, coupled with the fact that there is no referent. It is possible that 58 could be translated as 'So, brethren, if we see the foreigner or the poor [person] or the naked [person] or the hungry [person] and we go away, not having done him any good,' particularly if all the adjectives were long. The meaning difference is something like '(any) member of the class' versus 'the archetypal member of the

1 Adjectives using the suffix -šsk- will be dealt with in the morphology section of "Other factors" below.
class.' Also compare 58 with 61, which contains plural generics.

61. (CS1 65:18-21) Tacēm bo prazdnikom xošteto bę, such for holidays he-wants God
jegda stranōni prijati buduę nami, when foreign-PL(short) received they-are by-us
jegda alčnii nakrmętęsę, jegda when hungry-PL(long) they-feed-REFL when
nazii ođezjatuę sę, . . . jegda naked-PL(long) they-clothe REFL when
bolowyim i ništim pomostę nekaka
to-sick-PL(long) and to-poor-PL(long) help some
stvorite sę o<ıt> nasę
it-does REFL from us

'For God wants such holidays: when foreigners are received by us, when the hungry are fed, when the naked are clothed, . . . when to the sick and the poor some help is privided by us.'

In 59 there is no evidence that the underlined NP refers to any particular anticipated miracle. In other words, the NP is not definite. Kantor's translation agrees with mine in this--very likely, though, because the manuscript he is translating from has a short adjective, bolši [sic] čudo. His translation: "And we too place our hope in God to work an even greater miracle through the prayers and piety of the good Wenceslas."¹ One of the other glagolitic manuscripts has veštšē tu čudo, 'greater(short) there miracle,' which makes no sense, but perhaps indicates that its copyist had trouble with the long form here. Could this be a mistake?

The fifth type comprises indefinite standards in expressions of comparison like jako, 'like,' and podobiti,

¹Kantor, Medieval Slavic Lives of Saints and Princes, p. 151.
'to resemble.' These NP's have no referents and introduce no referents into the discourse. Since this meaning is also close to generic and there is no referent, it is not surprising to find pairs like 62 and 63.

62. (PCM 110b19-20) mudrostiju cvetuju prismo
   with-wisdom flowering-DU constantly
   jako cvetja blagousyan
   like flower sweet-smelling(long)

'Flowering with wisdom always, like the/a sweet-smelling flower'

63. (PCM 110c22-23) mudrostiju bo jako cvetja blgo-
   with-wisdom for like flower sweet-
   uxaunyn
   smelling(short) flowering-SG

'For, flowering with wisdom like the/a sweet-smelling flower'

There is no evidence that either of the underlined NP's in 62 and 63 is definite. For the same reason, it is not surprising to find the eight NP's of this type with variable adjectives in LW and PCM to be evenly divided between long and short forms. Observe also that nekotoryy can occur in this non-referential context.

64. (IC 92:12-15) I v' toi ca s jako nikotoryy [sic]
   and at that time like some
   vlasteliny jarom
   lord with-fierce voice like to
   men'semu ili k rabu reche...
   younger/youngest(long) or to slave he-said
   Gla slysha x, a ne vijju kto est
   voice I-heard but not I-see who it is

'And at that moment, a fierce voice like [that of] some lord to a younger [person] or to a slave, said... I heard the voice, but I can't see who it is.'

(The disembodied voice accompanies a miracle.)
And finally, there is the predicate indefinite NP, which also has no referent and triggers neither pronominalization nor deletion. These merely give a description which applies to the subject of the sentence.

65. (LW 40:22-23) brate dobar bě nmu
O-brother good(short) thou-wast to-us
s'lužab'nik v'čera servant yesterday

'[My] brother, you were a good host to us yesterday.'

LW and PCM together contain 17 predicate NP's with variable adjectives. Of these, 12 are short and 5 are long. I suspect that the amount of vacillation observed here is due to there being no referent and to it making little difference to the communication in some cases what the status of the NP is. For instance, in 65 how much difference does it make to the discourse whether the speaker characterizes his brother as "a good host" or metaphorically compares him to the archetypal good host? (Both of these meanings can be contrasted to saying the brother is the situationally- or contextually-definite good host. In this case, the hearer must identify the referent in order to interpret the utterance.) Consider also the pair 66 and 67.

66. (PCM 112d18-20) bysta provědnika i
you-two-were prophets and
novaja apsla
new(long) apostles

'You were prophets and new apostles.'

67. (PCM 114c12-14) jemu že javi se
to-it CONJ he-revealed REFL
propovednik i apsla nov
prophet and apostle new(short)
'To [the Slavic people] he revealed himself a prophet and new apostle.'

Both of the underlined NP's could be indefinite, as I have translated them. Surely, the reasoning goes, the author did not think that there had been or would be only two "new apostles." What about peoples who received alphabets and Bible translations in their own languages earlier or later than the Slavs? (LC 30:10-13 shows that at least some Slavs of the time knew about, for example, the Armenians.) But it is also possible that the NP in 66 is a definite meaning something like 'the new apostles of our time and place.' In either case, however, the NP is used as a description which applies to the subject of the sentence, not to refer to anyone. The predicate NP, it seems, is also sometimes "neutral position."

In summary, indefinites used non-referentially fall into three categories. In the first, there is a referent identifiable by one or more participants in the speech act. These are almost always (always in our sample) accompanied by short variable adjectives. If both Sp and H can identify the referent, almost without exception the NP's are marked with either a short adjective or a word meaning 'such;' otherwise they would be interpreted as definite. If only Sp can identify the referent, there may or may not be a marker (a short adjective or a word like eter). The latter pattern is also found with the referential use of indefinite NP's of this type.
In the second class, comprising only type 3, there is a referent or referents but none of the speech act participants can identify it/them. Instances of variable adjectives with these are about evenly divided between long and short forms. Since the referents tend to play peripheral roles and are not being referred to, anyway, a certain amount of what appears to be sloppiness does not interfere with the communication.

NP's of the third class have no referents. They include NP's in opaque contexts, standards in comparisons, and predicate indefinite NP's. All of these show a fair amount of vacillation between long and short variable adjectives because there is no referent to be identified. This vacillation amounts to free variation for standards in comparisons.

Indefinite non-referential NP's, although more common than referential indefinites, are considerably rarer than definites and also less common than generics. The two randomly-chosen narrative texts, LW and PCM, between them produced only 128. Compare this figure with 154 generics in PCM alone and 601 definites in LM alone. (These figures include NP's without adjectives.)

The data for all indefinites are summarized in table 4. Comparing this material to Flier's Gospel text data, we find a great deal of agreement, although his categorization of plural NP's causes the situation to look more
### TABLE 4

**INDEFINITE NOUN PHRASES AND THEIR MARKERS IN RANDOMLY-CHOSEN EOS TEXTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NP Used Referentially</th>
<th>NP Used Non-Referentially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sp &amp; H can identify referent</td>
<td>('a certain')</td>
<td>tolw, 'so,' etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>short adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>only Sp can identify referent</td>
<td>eteri, 'a certain,' etc.; short adj.; ø*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Sp nor H can identify referent</td>
<td>eteri, 'certain-PL,' etc.; short adj.; long adj.; ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>indef. NP's in opaque contexts</td>
<td>short adj.; long adj.; ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>indef. NP's as standards in comparisons</td>
<td>short adj.; long adj.; ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>predicate indefinite NP's</td>
<td>short adj. preferred; long adj.; ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ø signifies 'no overt morphological marker of indefiniteness, i.e., no short variable adjective, eteri or its semantic family, or tolw or its semantic family.'
chaotic than I believe it is. Taking the first seven of his examples without the details, we find the following (my interpretations are in square brackets):

A. MF: Indefinite [KR: Non-Referential Indefinite]

68. (Mt 15:19) pomyslenie zula / zulaέ
'For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries . . . '
[Generic]

69. (Lk 6:18) ot* dux* nećistrz / nećistyxyr
'And a great multitude of people . . . came to hear him . . . and they that were vexed with unclean spirits: and they were healed.'
[Indefinite non-referential class 3]

70. (Lk 11:13) uměate daanie blaga daeti / blagaa
'If ye then, being evil know how to give good gifts to your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?'
[Generic]

B. MF: (Indefinite) Specific

71. (Mt 4:24) vsє boljštєę razlyčwnymi nedょgy
'And they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils . . . and he healed them.'

cf. (Lk 4:40) vsį eliko imɛaxɔ boljštєę nedょgy različwny
'. . . all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them . . .' 
[Indefinite non-referential class 3]

I fail to see the distinction that Flier makes between the partially-underlined NP's in 69 and 71. (In none of the three is there an article in the Greek.)

72. (Lk 8:29) vєzaaxɔ i ɔži želɛzny / želɛznymi
'For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. For oftentimes it had caught him: and he was kept bound with chains and in fetters;
and he brake the bands, and was driven of the devil into the wilderness.'

[Indefinite non-referential class 3]

The speaker in 72 probably cannot identify the chains; there may, in fact, be several sets of them; and it does not matter to the story, anyway.

73. (Jn 10:32) mānoga děla dobra / dobraa
'Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me?'

[Indefinite referential class 2]

Example 73 and a few others like it are problems for my analysis also. I have categorized 73 as referential class 2 because Jesus is telling his audience that they can identify the referent, rather than assuming or presupposing that they can (class 1 or definite). To use Vendler's term, the clause with the underlined NP is being used as an "identifying sentence."¹ I have no idea why a long adjective appears on this NP in Zographensis.

74. (Mt 21:11) mānodi ližii proroci / liži²
'And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many.'

[Indefinite non-referential class 4]

In none of these examples except 73 is the speaker using the NP in question to name a group of referents that he has


²Flier, Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic, pp. 126, 171-172.
in mind. Examples 68, 70 and 74 do not even have referents. The NP's in 69 and 71 tell what sort of afflictions the people have; the one in 72 tells how the man was restrained; none of these three is being used to bring specific instances of diseases or specific iron chains into the narrative. Except for 73, all of these NP's fit into the patterns in table 4, as do almost all of the NP's in Flier's appendix AA.

Relating the categories in table 4 to the more traditional ones, we can say that class 1 referential and all of class 2 can be considered specific, that is, they carry existential quantifiers and are unique in the sense that the speaker has only one referent or set of referents in mind that might be categorized by the description. These are precisely the categories that the data show occur with long adjectives only extremely rarely.

The remainder are non-specific. Class 1 non-referential seems, intuitively, to have something in common with predicate indefinite NP's, despite the fact that there is a unique, identifiable referent. The referent is being described or characterized rather than being referred to. Class 3 has a referent, but it is not unique for either Sp or H. The rest have no referents. It is in these non-specifics where the vacillation between long and short adjectives occurs.
Generic

In this section I will be treating as generic any NP which is used to refer to a kind or class of entity, an abstract concept in general, or a mass substance in general. Following Carlson, I will not distinguish among those which could be paraphrased with the quantifiers all, most, some, or none of these. This meaning generally is clearly distinguishable by context from that of a NP used to refer to specific individuals. There are instances, however, when the meaning is so close to that of a definite NP or an indefinite non-specific as to be nearly impossible to differentiate.¹ As a result, the reader may dispute some of my interpretations.

¹The semantic closeness of some generics to definites and others to indefinite non-specifics is not confined to Slavic. Compare the Spanish and English equivalents in i and ii, given to me by Matias Aranda, a bilingual Mexican-American.

i. In the United States houses are expensive and cars are cheap.

ii. En los Estados Unidos las casas son caras y in the States United the houses are expensive and los carros son baratos. the cars are cheap

Both, according to Aranda, are the way the idea would normally be expressed in their respective languages. But the English sentence uses generic NP's while the Spanish uses definites. (If the Spanish used generics here, they would have no articles.) Aranda says the Spanish NP's mean 'the houses and cars in the United States.' Next consider iii and iv.

iii. Cats like to fight in our yard.

iv. Cats often fight in our yard.
Generics with variable adjectives almost always occur with the long form. The most common type in our texts is a plural nominalized adjective or participle. (Quantifiers with which the NP's could be paraphrased are in parentheses after the translations, along with other possible interpretations of the NP's.)

75. (PCM 109d13-15) pĕrvĕnēcь bystĕ iz mĕrtvyyixь first-one he-was from dead(long)

'He was the first one of the dead.' (all)

76. (PCM 113d24-30) i načaša mŏnoga icĕlenija [sic] and they-began many healings byvati . . . slĕpiii abije načaša to-be blind(long) immediately they-began prosvĕštati sĕ nedužĕnii cĕliti sĕ • bĕsi to-light REFL sick(long) to-heal REFL demons isxoditi to-go-out

These sentences are functionally equivalent. But, ignoring Carlson's analysis, one might say that iii involves a generic (cats as a class—although, of course, not every individual), while iv is indefinite non-specific:

iv.' (many, t)∧ (there are cats fighting in our yard at t)

Note that the same vagueness of individual membership observed by Carlson with generics applies to the sets denoted by the NP's in ii and iv. This seems, in fact, to be a property of plurals and collectives in general. Observe that the a sentences in v and vi are not falsified by the b sentences, even though the referent of the underlined NP is to be understood as a member of the set denoted by the underlined NP in the a sentences.

v. a. The dogs have fleas. (definite where every member of the set is known)
  b. Fido does not have fleas.

vi.a. A Brownie troop walked onto the stage. (indefinite specific)
  b. Jessica stayed home that night.
'And there began to be many healings. Immediately the blind received light, the sick were healed, demons went out.' (some/most/all of those who visited Cyril's grave)

77. (IC 91:25-27) Za dva dni pre<ž> sъbiraše for two days beforehand he-gathered xъu bratiju ništa. Pervyi dnu posaže slee Christ's brethren poor(short) on-first day he-seated slępye i xromye, solykьe. blind(long) and lame(long) humped(long)

'For two days beforehand, he used to gather Christ's poor brethren. [Then] on the first day, he would seat the blind, the lame, and the hunchbacks.' (some/all that were available; could be definite: those he had gathered)

Also possible are singular adjectives and participles,

78. (SCI 2a7-8) ljubež oča li materь pače loving(long) father or mother more-than mene nėstь mi na podobь he-is-not to-me worthy

'He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me.' (Mt 10:37) (all)

79. (LC 8:26-9:2) Egda bo nėstь vamь since therefore he-not-AUX to-you věstęgнулъ gněva i poxoti, no popustilъ, to restrained anger and lust but allowed then vę kakovъ vy imatь vъrnuti propastь, into which you he-will to-throw abyss sъmyslenъ da razumětь. Xristos sensible(long) SUBJUNC he-understands Christ že ne tako CONJ not that-way

'Therefore since he has not restrained your anger and lust, but allowed them, then into which abyss will he throw you? May the sensible [person] understand. Christ is not that way.' (all? could be definite attributive: whoever is sensible among those being addressed)

and adjective- or participle-plus-noun combinations.

80. (PCM 110a32-33) blęnь mužь bojai se bęa blessed man fearing(long) REFL God

'Blessed is the man fearing God.' (all)
Generalized abstracts behave like other generics: variable adjectives are normally long.

A combination particularly typical of early Slavic is an abstract noun modified by a relational adjective. In this construction the adjective can be analyzed as a transformation from a noun in some oblique case. It is usually derived by means of the suffix -nv- from a noun which refers to a class or is itself an abstract, as in 83.

83. a. slovesnaja siла
word-(b)n-ADJ(long) strength
'strength in words,' from siла vs slovesežt strength in words
b. poxotnaja slastь
desire-(b)n-ADJ(long) sweetness
'sweetness of desire,' from slastь poxoti sweetness of-desire

1See footnote 1, p. 95 above.
c. učitelnyi sanz
   teacher-\u2113-ADJ(long) rank
   'rank of teacher,' from sanz učitele
   rank of-teacher

But we also occasionally find other suffixes and underlying nouns which are not generic or abstract.

84. a. rodž člověče
   kind person-j-ADJ(short)
   'humankind,' from rodž člověk
   kind of-people

b. xlebš angelšskž
   bread angel-\u2113-sk-ADJ(short)
   'angel bread; manna,' from xlebš angelž
   bread of-angels

c. xristovnaja služba
   Christ-ov-\u2113-ADJ(long) service
   'service to Christ,' from služba xristu
   service to-Christ

Adjectives in -\u2113- are almost always long, as in 84c
(for an exception see 86); those in other suffixes, not surprisingly, follow the rules for their suffixes.¹ This construction is not limited to generics, although most of them in these texts seem to be.

Mass substances likewise pattern like generics when the meaning is general.

85. (PCM 115a10-12) žadnỳja napoista
   thirsty(long) you-two-caused-to-drink
   životnago piva
   life-ADJ(long) drink
   'You gave the thirsty living water² to drink.'

¹See section on morphology below.
²životnoje pivo is not the usual way 'living water' is expressed in either EOS or OCS, but it is difficult to see what else this NP could mean. The usual phrase is voda živa(ja?), as in example 87.
In one randomly-chosen narrative text, PCM, we find 63 generics with variable adjectives. Of these, 59 or 93.7% are long. Interesting exceptions include xristovu bratiju ništa in 77, sanu veliku in 81 and the underlined NP's in 86 and 87.

86. (PCM 113c14-20) vŽ zapadnixž ze stranaxž... in western(long) CONJ countries
jako slnci vžsijavša • mraka grškovšna
like two-suns having-shone darkness sin-ADJ(short)
ogznavša • prosvetista bukžvami
having-chased-away they-two-illumined with-letters
'In the western countries... they illuminated with letters, shining like suns and chasing away the darkness of sin.' (some; could be definite)

87. (PCM 110c3-8) jako ze reče samž gž bž
as CONJ he-spoke himself lord God
našž Ī xšž • verujai vž mé jako že
our Jesus Christ believing(long) in me as CONJ
knigy rekoša • ršky otž čržva jego potekutž
books they-said rivers from bowels his they-flow
vody živy
of-water living(short)

'As our Lord God Jesus Christ himself said, "He who believes in me, as the books said, 'from his bowels shall flow rivers of living water.'"' (rivers of the general substance)

Of all of these examples, the only one which could be indefinite (non-specific) is xžvu bratiju ništa in 77.

Since there is no individual referent to be picked out from a class of similar ones, why does EOS use the long...

---

1This NP is interesting for some other reasons, too. First, it has an acc. pl. adjective modifying a fem. acc. sg. collective noun. Second, here is an example of a NP with both a possessive adjective and a short adjective. And third, this is a non-definite NP which contains a possessive adjective.
form so consistently for generics? There seems to be a combination of factors at work here. First, it depends partly on what one calls generic. Carlson's analysis appears to include among kind-words many usages that others would call indefinite non-specific. If one uses the substitutability of this kind of [appropriate higher category noun]¹ as a test for reference to kinds, one finds that all or most of the types treated here as indefinite non-referential would be categorized as generic.

88. Class 1: Sp and H can identify referent
   a. The Slavic letters were made by a holy man, but the Greek ones were made by pagans.
   b. The Slavic letters were made by this kind of person, but the Greek ones were made by that kind of person.
   c. It was unusual that such a great man would take an interest in a young boy.
   d. It was unusual that this kind of person would take an interest in that kind of person.

89. Class 2: only Sp can identify the referent
   a. There is a rabbit in the garden.
   b. ?There is this kind of animal in the garden.
   c. This kind of animal is in the garden.

90. Class 3: no one can identify the referent
   a. The butler did it with a knife.
   b. The butler did it with this kind of instrument.

91. Class 4: indefinite NP in opaque context
   a. Astrid is hoping to marry an American.
   b. Astrid is hoping to marry this kind of person.

92. Class 5: standards in comparisons
   a. My love is like a red, red rose.
   b. My love is like this kind of thing.

93. Class 6: predicate NP's (Carlson explicitly excludes these.)
   a. John is a teacher.
   b. John is this sort of person.

¹ See Carlson, "Reference to Kinds in English," pp. 44-49.
If this test is a valid means to detect reference to kinds, the apparent consistency of adjective usage with generics in our texts is partly the result of my having placed the inconsistency and short adjectives elsewhere. In other words, if the category generic has a fuzzy boundary on one end with indefinite non-referentials and on the other end with definites, as in 94, Carlson has built a fence in one place and I have built one in another.

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{GC} & \text{KR} \\
\text{indefinite} & \text{generic} & \text{definite} \\
\text{non-referential} & \\
\end{array}\]

Still, the consistency of adjective usage in NP's to the right of my fence in 94 needs explanation. The second factor, then, is that these NP's have an important feature in common with definites. Although a generic NP does not have an identifiable individual or individuals as referent, it does have a referent, a class, which is distinct from all other classes and therefore unique. Sp can therefore expect that H will be able to identify the referent, and can signal that expectation with the same marker that he uses for definites, a long adjective.

Third, the early Slavic system offers only two choices. With the primary domain of the long adjective being definite NP's and of the short (in NP's) being indefinite specifics, the language can choose between the
oppositions definite versus indefinite specific and generic, and indefinite specific versus definite and generic. Our frequency statistics show that indefinite specifics are relatively uncommon even in narrative texts. In PCM, for example, we find 12 indefinite specifics (indefinite referentials plus classes 1 and 2 of the non-referentials), compared to 154 generics. LM contains 601 definites. Indefinite specifics where only Sp can identify the referent introduce that referent into the discourse—a function which involves high information load and causes such NP's almost always to appear in the comment rather than in the topic.¹ Generics and definites, on the other hand, occur in both topic and comment. Indefinite specifics, then, are highly marked, both in terms of frequency and in terms of information load. For this reason it is not surprising that the language chooses to place the less-marked generics with definites and not with indefinite specifics.

Comparing my data with Flier's from the Gospel texts is not a straightforward matter. The first reason for this is that he does not admit the existence of plural generics. Most of them he calls definite, but he also calls some specific or indefinite. Some examples of the last are 68 and 70. Example 95 contains a "specific."

¹See chapter 6 below.
95. (Lk 12:48) dostoina (Mar., Zog.)¹
worthy(long)

'But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy
of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes.'

Since he that knew not . . . in 95 does not refer to anyone
in particular, but rather means 'whoever knew not,' I find
it hard to interpret the underlined NP in this example as
anything but generic. The presence of a long adjective
here, despite a lack of article in the Greek, suggests that
the Slavic translator thought likewise.

The second difficulty comes from Greek interference
on the Slavic text in the Gospel manuscripts. All of Flier's
definite nominalizations² which have variant readings are
generic. Of these there are eleven, and five are matched
by anarthrous Greek constructions.

What is necessary for a proper comparison, then, is
to gather all the generics, singular and plural, remove
those which appear contaminated by the Greek, and count the
remainder.

Other Factors

As hinted in earlier sections of this chapter,
there are exceptions to the rules that definite and generic
NP's have long adjectives and indefinite specifics have
short. The exception rate is, in fact, quite high--just
as other investigators have discovered in OCS. But as

¹Flier, Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old
Church Slavic, Appendix AA, p. 217.
²Ibid., Appendix BB, pp. 217-225.
Tolstoj, and later Flier, showed for the Gospel manuscripts, almost all the exceptions in EOS are systematic, or at least fall into patterns. Much of what follows is based their work, especially Flier's.

Factors other than definite/indefinite/generic which affect adjective form can be divided into three categories: linguistic and graphic interference, syntax, and morphology.

Linguistic and Graphic Interference

Like any ancient text where we do not have the original, the EOS documents (except the inscription) cannot be expected to render perfectly the grammar of the language in which they were originally written. Even if the original contained no errors at all, as Flier points out, there have been opportunities for the copyists themselves, knowingly or unknowingly, to influence the reproduction of the text. The problem, of course, intensifies with the number of times a manuscript has been copied.

Two basic types of scribal errors can be anticipated, sporadic "slips of the pen" and systematic errors caused by interference from the scribe's own speech.¹ About the former I have little to say, except that there are instances in the manuscripts where letters are left out (as in ic̆elenija in 76), words as they stand make no sense at all, etc. These are not frequent. More important and more interesting are several types of systematic interference

¹Ibid., pp. 44-52.
that could affect the form of the adjective, and these I will discuss in the following sections.

Early sources

The first of these sources of systematic interference was present in the earliest period of the life of our texts. This is the problem of the so-called "tense" jers. The jers (ʲ, ʰ) were short, lax i and ū, respectively, characteristic of Late Common Slavic and the very early stages of the individual languages. When one of these occurs in a text before a phonetic yod, i.e., in "tense" position, we often find free variation between ʲ-i and ʰ-y. Observe what consequences this has on the distinction between long and short masc. nom. sg. adjectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>short</th>
<th>long</th>
<th>translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96. a. novʲ</td>
<td>novyi/novy</td>
<td>'new'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>štuždı</td>
<td>štuždıi/štuždı</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The long and short forms underlined in 96 are distinguished by ʲ/y and ʰ/i, but before a word like językʲ, 'tongue; language; people,' or inokʰ, 'hermit' (with preceding j as hiatus-filler), there is a formal neutralization of the opposition.¹

In the EOS texts this problem is not frequent, but it does occur occasionally, as seen in example 97.

¹Ibid., p. 46.
After these things, in order to surprise him, they showed him a garden that had once been planted, which which was springing up from the earth.

Notice that the long-form participle nasażdeny modifies vinogradъ, which is also modified by izniknuščь, a short-form participle. In addition, there is a variant reading with the short nasażdenь in another manuscript. The NP being unmistakably indefinite specific, one would expect a short adjective or participle here.

Another early source of weakening of the formal opposition is contraction. As seen in table 5, contraction causes the long forms of certain cases to become identical to the short forms. It is, of course, impossible to determine whether an unexpected short form in one of these cases is actually a contracted long form or not. But unexpected short forms are relatively rare in all these texts, particularly those of Russian redaction, that is, all but LW and OP. Of the seven anomalous short forms in LW, four are the same case of the same lexical item, zali < záli, masc. nom. pl., and all are preceded by the demonstrative ti. All seven could be contracted. OP has no unexpected short forms at all.

Before we leave the early sources of interference, note should be made of a fairly frequent confusion even in
TABLE 5

EFFECT OF CONTRACTION ON CERTAIN LONG-FORM ADJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Ending</th>
<th>Long Form (Written)</th>
<th>Contracted Form</th>
<th>Short Form (Written)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom./acc. du. masc.</td>
<td>aja</td>
<td>[aja&gt;aa&gt;a]</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen./loc. du. masc., fem., neut.</td>
<td>uju</td>
<td>[uju&gt;uu&gt;u]</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom. pl. masc.</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>[iji&gt;ii&gt;i]</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom./acc. pl. neut.</td>
<td>aja</td>
<td>[aja&gt;aa&gt;a]</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom. sg. fem.</td>
<td>aja</td>
<td>[aja&gt;aa&gt;a]</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. sg. fem.</td>
<td>ojö</td>
<td>[ojö&gt;qq&gt;q]</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Adapted from Flier, Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic, p. 47.

OCS in the instr. fem. sg. of -a/-ja stems. According to both Diels and Lunt, the proper short form is -ojo/-ejo and the proper long form -øjö. If the instr. fem. sg. of the pronominal declension (as in tojö, našejö) is substituted for either of the normal adjective declensions--this sometimes occurs in other cases as well--the resulting ending is -ojo/-ejo, identical to the short form.¹ In Old Russian

the only form for either type of adjective is -oji/-eju, from -oji/-eji. Not surprisingly, the only form found in any of the Russian-redaction texts is -oji/-eju, even where the NP is obviously definite.

98. (LC 35:18) Ustroi § silnoju tvoeju
guide-IMPER them with-strong your
desniceju
right-hand
'Guide them with your strong right hand.'

None of the other texts has -oji, either.

Later interference

Later systematic interference in our texts might be expected to come from developments in Russian, Bulgarian, and Serbo-Croatian.

Russian

In Russian we find a trend toward the gradual displacement of the short adjective by the long adjective in attributive position, regardless of definite/indefinite. In the process, the short form became more and more confined to the predicate. Some morphological groups of adjectives lost their short forms entirely. Adjectives with the suffix -isk- in early (pre-thirteenth-century) texts allow variation -oji undergoes if it follows a soft consonant. Diels's paradigm example of a soft-stem adjective shows nistojiq in the long fem. instr. sg. Determining what happens after consonants where palatalization is written with ь or an iotated vowel (e.g., adjectives in the suffix -enb) would require further investigation beyond the scope of the present work.
between long and short forms that is unrelated to definite/indefinite, and unrelated to whether the adjective is used attributively or predicatively. (NP's containing these adjectives are frequently definite, anyway.) But the long form predominates. As time continues, we find long forms almost exclusively with this suffix, until, in modern Russian, these adjectives have no short forms at all. But the earliest morphological group of adjectives to lose its short form completely in Russian was the gen., dat., loc., and instr. pl.; dat./instr. du.; and masc. instr. sg.

As far as the influence of these Russian developments on our manuscripts is concerned, we see that they exhibit long and short -wsk- adjectives, with long predominating. Contrary to what one might perhaps expect from looking at Russian, however, the ratio of short to long -wsk- adjectives is larger in the Life of Constantine (manuscript of fifteenth century) than in the Life of Methodius (manuscript of twelfth century): LC 37:51; LM 17:32.2 LM and PCM have both long and short forms in the masc. instr. sg. and gen., dat., loc., and instr. pl. The short forms are consistently used according to the rules for definite, indefinite and generic, but out of seven indefinite instrumental plurals, five are long. (The remainder of these

---

1 Except in place names like Minsk, which have become fixed in the short form. These are now nouns, and are opposed by adjectives in the long form which mean 'from/of [place].' Minsk-ij, 'from/of Minsk,' is semantically equivalent to leningrad-sk-ij, 'from/of Leningrad.'

2 Feminine instrumental singulars do not figure in these numbers at all.
cases either are used as expected or do not occur at all in these texts.) What we find in LC and IC in the masc. instr. sg. and gen., dat., loc., instr. pl. is long forms very consistently, regardless of definite/indefinite, attributive/predicative, or any other consideration—with eight exceptions, all in LC, one of which is the wrong form (no variant readings!).

99. (LC 19:9-11) I Mixēja reče: i ty, and Micah he-said and thou Vifleome, zemle Ijudova nikakože menši esi O-Bethlehem land Judah's not-at-all less thou-art vž vladykaxz Ijudovaxz among rulers Judah's 'And Micah said, "And thou, Bethlehem, land of Judah, art not the least among the rulers of Judah."' (Mic 5:2, Mt 2:6)

Vladyka in 99 is masculine; thus the adjective should be Ijudověx. Two instances could be interpreted as having pronominal,¹ rather than short adjective desinences. One of these is 100.

100. (LC 27:17) bogz... javl bukvi vž vaš language he-manifested letters in your jazykz... da i vy pričtetesę language so-that also you you-be-counted velicexz jazycēxz, iže slavęt boga svoimz in-great peoples who they-praise God with-own jazykomz language 'God... manifested letters in your language... so that you also might be counted among the great peoples who praise God with their own language.'

¹That is, like těxe, 'in those.'
In 100 the underlined adjective occurs in what appears to be a definite NP. Not surprisingly, five manuscripts have the long form velikyx. The fourth and fifth exceptions are found only in variant readings. One is 101.

101. (LC 12:14-16) Ubediv* ze arxiepiskopa
having-convinced CONJ archbishop
i s klirosom* vsèm* i govëinyx* muži,
and with clergy all and pious(long) men
vัสёдьте v* korablë, i idoša na mësto
having-sat into ships and they-went to place
*variant in six manuscripts: govëiny (short)
'After convincing the archbishop, he and all the clergy and pious men boarded ships and went to the place.'

The sixth is an instrumental plural correct in every respect, with no variant readings. Bill Darden suggests that this may be a frequently-quoted Biblical passage.1

102. (LC 31:3-4) Znamenija že vërovavësix*
signs CONJ having-believed(long)
poidut* si: imenem* moim* bësy iždenut*,
they-follow these with-name my demons they-cast-out
jazyky vazglagoljut* novy
with-tongues they-speak new(short)
'And these signs shall follow them that believe: in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues.' (Mk 16:17) Greek: glôssais
lalësousin kainais (dat. pl., no article)

The final two are possessive adjectives. (See section on morphology below.)

103. (LC 5:3-5) Čto estë filosofia? On* že
what it-is philosophy he CONJ
xytrym* umom* reçe toga:
with-clever(long) mind he-spoke then

1 Personal communication.
božiamt and člověčemt*
God's-DAT.PL.(short) and man's-DAT.PL.(short)
veščemt... razumt...
things-DAT.PL. knowledge
*variants: člověčškam (short) in 5 MSS; člověčškym (long) in 2 MSS. These forms use -šk- suffix instead of -j-.

"What is philosophy?" With his clever mind he then answered, "Knowledge of things of God and man..."

We might, in addition, expect to find long adjectives in general overused, especially in the late manuscripts, i.e., LC, B, and IC. In LM and PCM, the rare inexplicable usages are approximately evenly distributed between long and short forms. LC, on the other hand, has almost no unexplainable short forms, but several long forms where the NP appears to be indefinite. (None of these are referential.) For example, 104.

104. (LC 4:24-25) Bolě že učenija tixyi
more CONJ of-study serene(long)
obraža, na sebe javlja, s těmi besědovaše,
countenance on self showing with those he-conversed
s nimiže běže polezněe
with whom it-was more-useful

'With more study acquiring a serene countenance, he conversed with those with whom it was more useful.'

IC contains one long adjective without seeming motivation. In B, unexplained long forms predominate, although I did not count them. Particularly curious is 105, where a long adjective is accompanied by an indefinite pronoun.
This example is less surprising when one considers the fact that svet- almost always forms part of a definite NP, either as an attributive adjective or as a nominalization. Davidov's index reveals that this word occurs short only four times in the entire "Treatise Against the Bogomils." Three of these are predicative and the other is accompanied by toľma, 'so; such a.'

Bulgarian

The history of long and short adjectives in Bulgarian is somewhat different from that in Russian. According to Mirčev, by the middle Bulgarian period (twelfth to thirteenth centuries), long and short adjectives were often confused, but this was not accompanied by the elimination of the short form from attributive position. Rather we find the rise of a new article from the demonstrative тă, тă, тo, which occurs as an enclitic on nouns or long adjectives. When exactly this article arose is disputed, but it seems from looking at the masc. nom. sg. -ăt that the form orig-

---

1 Angel Davidov, Rečnik-indeks na Prezviter Kozma (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bâlgarskata akademija na naukite, 1976), pp. 268-270.

2 Mirčev, Istoričeska gramatika na bâlgarskiya ezik, pp. 176, 185.
inated before the fall of the jers (tenth to eleventh century), even though the non-demonstrative meaning probably did not. In most types of adjectives, at least according to Mirčev, the long form was then lost as an independent form and the short became once again generalized as the indefinite adjective. One exception is -<wsk>- adjectives, whose (contracted) long form was generalized. The contracted long form is also used in the vocative and frequently in epithets, e.g., sveti Dimităr, 'Saint Dimităr.' Another view is that at least some of the middle Bulgarian confusion of forms was the result of sporadic contraction in the long form: aja>-a, -oje>-o, -ije>-i, etc.

---

1 The process leading to the form -āt can be explained as follows. Most masculine nouns in Old Slavic ended in -<Cs>, as in gradv, 'city.' When the masculine demonstrative tě was added, the result ended in -<Cs+tě>. The loss of the jers consisted of dropping completely every other jer beginning with the end of the word or the first jer backwards from a full vowel. This is the so-called rhythmic rule. The remaining jers became full vowels, with ā in Bulgarian being vocalized as ą, transliterated as ā. Consider these examples.

gradv>grad 'city; a city'
gradv+tě>gradt āt 'the city'

If this combination had arisen after the fall of the jers, one would expect gradv+tě>*gradt āt, a development which probably would have resulted in homophony and/or unpronounceable consonant clusters. Also note that N+āt form one stress unit: gradt āt, mólivāt. (Howard Aronson, personal communication.)

2 Mirčev, Istoričeska gramatika na bālgarskija ezik, pp. 159-160.

3 Aronson, personal communication.
As a result of Bulgarian influence, then, we might expect to find in LC, IC, B, and OP apparent misuse of both long and short adjectives, not only the long ones, and some enclitic demonstratives used with an article-like meaning. As indicated above, however, LC and B overuse long forms; short adjectives are generally used correctly. In IC there is only one instance of incorrect usage, and it is long. OP contains three unexpected long forms and no odd short ones. We do occasionally find enclitic demonstratives which have no deictic meaning, as in 106, but most demonstratives are clearly used as demonstratives.

106. (LC 2:10) Po tom že dobraa ta roditeljef
after that CONJ good(long) the parents
s*veštav*ša, ne s*xdistase
having-agreed not they-came-together
'After that, the good parents agreed not to have relations.'

Serbo-Croatian

Serbo-Croatian still preserves the long/short distinction in adjectives. The forms are referred to as definite and indefinite (određeni, neodređeni), respectively. The morphological difference is clearest in the masc. nom., gen., dat., loc. sg. and neut. gen., dat., loc. sg. (same as masc.), where the long forms contain the expected i, g, and m. But even the earliest manuscripts use only the long form of the masc./neut. instr. sg. By the mid-thirteenth century, stokavian frequently used -omъ for the fem. instr. sg. as well as for masc. and neut. From the earliest times also,
only long forms were used for the gen., dat., and loc. pl. The dative and locative plurals merged between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. The short instrumental plural (all genders) survived until the end of the sixteenth century. The remaining cases underwent contraction very early in the long form, causing them to be indistinguishable from short adjectives in written documents.¹

The only text in this study exhibiting Serbo-Croatian features is LW. Since our manuscript is from the fifteenth century, we might expect the following interference: only long forms of instr. sg. and gen., dat., loc. pl.; both dat. and loc. plurals with endings in -m-; and desinences from soft paradigms appearing on adjectives ending in hard consonants, a štokavian development attested already in the twelfth century.² Except for the above oblique cases in the plural, we would anticipate no interference on the long/short adjective distinction. Indeed these are exactly what we find, insofar as the cases in question occur in the text. There are no mistakes in adjective usage here that are not explainable as due either

¹Aleksandar Belić, Istorija srpsko-xrvatskog jezika, 2d ed. (Belgrade: Naučna knjiga, 1965), vol. 2, pt. 1: Reći sa deklinacijom, pp. 41, 145, 148, 151. In the spoken language, contracted long adjectives were distinguished from short by tone, a feature which is still preserved in many dialects.

²Ibid., pp. 36-38, 42.
to contraction or to Serbo-Croatian influence on the form, or both. For example, only the long forms of the dat. masc./neut. pl. and masc. instr. sg. are used, even in possessive adjectives (LW 42:14 ňd telomVeštesselavl'mu) and dative absolutes (LW 36:15 v'spěvšimju že imu mašu). Particularly interesting are the forms in 107.

107. (LW 37:21) ljudi uboge i bogate milovše
'He loved [both] rich and poor [people].'

The NP, of course, is generic, not definite, but all the other generics in this text are long. The expected shapes here are ubogie and bogatie (ubogye, bogatyey), and the other three manuscripts do, indeed, have those. In this version, however, we have the contracted ending from the soft paradigm.

In summary, we have looked at several possible sources of contamination in the manuscripts that we have of our texts. Of these the only serious interference comes in the masc. instr. sg; dat./instr. du.; and gen., dat., loc., instr. pl. (what I have called the oblique group) in all but LM, PCM, and OP. In those texts where only the long form occurs, it was, of course, necessary to eliminate any adjective in these cases from further consideration. Except for this problem, none of the manuscripts appears to be hopelessly contaminated, despite the lateness of some of them.
Morphology and Syntax

An examination of the remaining two factors which influence adjective form—morphology and syntax—shows that these cause exceptions to the rules based on definite, indefinite, and generic in a way different from the interference discussed above. Except for early contraction, which may have been present sporadically in the original manuscripts, linguistic and graphic interference is the result of copyists' mistakes. These mistakes form patterns, as we have seen, but rarely systems which can predict individual instances, especially across different EOS texts.

The syntactic and morphological factors, on the other hand, function so consistently that they can be expressed as rules with predictive value which apply to all or almost all of the EOS texts. These rules can be seen as competing with those based on pragmatic factors. (And, as the historical development of the Slavic languages shows, they eventually win.)

Syntax

Adjectives and participles immediately dominated by S or VP, as opposed to NP, are almost always short. This situation is hardly surprising, since the category definite/indefinite is irrelevant here. Some examples.

Predicate adjectives:
108. (LM 105c23-25) i povelę jedinomu episkpu and he-commanded to-one bishop
iže bė toju že jazeju boltna who he-was with-the-same disease sick(short)
'And he commanded a bishop who was sick with the same disease'

Embedded predicate adjectives and participles in "second nominative" and "second oblique" constructions:

109. (LM 106a10-13) i otpadaju ti iže se and they-fall-away those who REFL
mnjet bā znajušte a děly s se they-think God knowing-NOM but with-deeds REFL
jego otmėta jut him they-deny
'And those who think [that they] know (literally, [are] knowing) God, but deny him with deeds, will fall away.'

110. (LM 102d25-26) uzwrév že dijavol člvka having-seen CONJ devil man-ACCUS
tako počhtena so honored-ACCUS
'Now the devil, having seen man so honored'

Adverbial participles:

111. (LC 5:18-19) slyšav že logofet otvět having-heard CONJ Logothete answer
ego, šedž k z carici i reže his having-gone to empress and he-said
'The Logothete, having heard his answer, went to the empress and said'

112. (LC 19:23-24) i otž prorok že i otž iněx and from prophets EMPH and from other
knigž skazaja, ne ostavi ixt, dondeže sami books explaining not he-left them until selves
rěša, jako tako estž, jakože glagoleši they-said that thus it-is just-as thou-sayest
'And explaining from the prophets and other books, he did not leave them until they themselves said, 
"It is just as you say."'
Dative absolutes:

113. (LC 2:13-14) Na sudzu že emu xoteštu to judgment CONJ he-DAT FUT.AUX-PTC-DAT

iti plakašese mati otr čete sego glagoljušti to-go she-was-crying mother of-child this saying

'Now when he [Constantine's father] was about to go to the Judgment, the mother of this child cried, saying'

Participles with other verbal functions:

114. (LC 34:9-10) Filosofž že sv svoimi učeniky philosopher CONJ with own disciples

ne perestaaše dostoinuju xvalu bogu vizzdaa not he-stopped worthy praise to-God giving

o semž about this

'The philosopher, with his disciples, never stopped giving praise to God for this.'

There are some exceptions to the generalization illustrated by 108-114. The largest class of these is masc. nom. sg. active participles. Most of them are present tense, but there are some past ones also. They occur in a variety of texts. Some examples of present participles appear in 115-118.

115. (B 10:23-11:2) praksv ap<5>lž že po acts of-Apostles CONJ after

množexž lětěx napisanž by<s> dělesa bo many years written it-was deeds because

paulova i slovesa sřvědyi luka eu<5>alistž Paul's and words knowing(long) Luke evangelist

stpisavž preda cřkvamž having-written he-transmitted to-churches

'The Acts of the Apostles were written many years later. Knowing Paul's words and deeds and having written them down, Luke transmitted them to the churches.'
Note the conjunction of the long present participle with the short past participle списавъ in 115.

116. (LC 2:4-5) živyi ss podružiem svoim, living(long) with wife own
rodi sedmero otročez he-begot seven children
"Living with his wife, he begot seven children."

117. (IC 92:8-9) I načax tužiti, ne vide, ni and I-began to-grieve not seeing not
vědyi kamo sęděti knowing(long) where to-sit
'And I began to grieve, not seeing, nor knowing where to sit.'

Observe that in 117 also, there is a conjunction of a long and a short participle.

118. (PCM 110c21-24) mudrostiju jako cvěťa blguxanb^ with-wisdom like flower sweet-smelling
cvětyi • vsěmi vladykami bys ljubim^ flowering by-all lords he-was beloved
'Blooming with wisdom like a fragrant flower, he was beloved by all the lords.'

All of these texts are of Russian redaction. Participles in -yi do not occur in either LW or OP. Both of these facts would support the idea that this is a Russianism: since Old Russian had replaced the -y participial ending by -а, copyists would not have recognized the -y except as a long adjective ending. But in the inscription on the tomb of Mostič in Preslav, Bulgaria, we find what could be a

---


2This hypothesis was suggested to me by Bill Darden.
syntactically-similar long past active participle with this ending.

119. •de ležitš Mostičč črgbubylja byvyi pri
dere he-lies Mostič (title) having-been by
Simeoně cēsari i pri Petrē cēsari, osmiyo že
Simeon emperor and by Peter emperor eighth CONJ
desetu ležt sy, ostavivž črgbubyljištvo
ten years being having-left office-of-cr gubylja
i vše imenije, bystž črenorizčio i vž tomb
and all property he-became monk and in that
svrži žizn svojž
he-finished life own

'Here lies Mostič, who was a črgbubylja under the
emperor Simeon and under the emperor Peter, being
eighty years old. Having left the office of
črgbubylja and all his property, he became a monk,
and thus finished his life.'

In this interpretation the syntax of the inscription is
of a type very typical of OCS and other early Slavic lan-
guages: a series of clauses with the same subject strung
together, with the most important actions or circumstances
expressed by finite verbs (here the present ležitš and the
aorist bystž and svrži) and the secondary by active par-
ticiles (here past participles byvyi and ostavivž and
present participle sv).

The only unusual feature is that
one of the participles is long. Translating such syntax
into English (or French) using participles is quite awkward,


which is why I followed Vaillant and used a relative pronoun and a finite verb for byvyi. More literal would be 'Here lies Mostič, having been a čṛgubylja, . . . being eighty years old.' Bill Darden suggests that the phrase beginning čṛgubylja byvyi is not adverbial, but rather is an appositive to the noun Mostič.¹ This interpretation seems possible also, in which case byvyi would perhaps mean 'former.' The long form is still odd, though: there was almost certainly more than one čṛgubylja under the emperors Simeon and Peter. According to Vaillant, this title was well-known in medieval Bulgaria and corresponds to the Turkish içirgu boila, 'boyar of the interior.'² Although the interpretation of this phrase is not clearly one or the other of these alternatives, I believe there is a stronger case for the former one because that construction is so common. Furthermore, Xaburgaev says that active participles are not usually used as nominal modifiers.³

Long past active participles occur elsewhere, too, although they are not nearly as common as the present active ones. One is 120. In addition, one occasionally finds active participles of this type in ~e and ~y~, as in 121 and 122. Resolution of this problem awaits the accumulation of

¹Personal communication.
²Vaillant, Textes vieux-slaves, 2:84.
³Xaburgaev, Staroslavjanskij jazyk, p. 412.
more data from other original texts with non-Russian manuscripts.

120. (LC 8:13-15) vidiši li, filosofe, divnoe you-see Q O-philosopher wondrous
čjudo, kako božji prorok Maxmetu, prinesyi* miracle how God's prophet Mohammed having-brought
nam' blagu věst ot' boga, i obrati mnogy to-us good news from God and he-converted many
ljudi, i vsi držimse po zakon' ego, people and all we-adhere to law his
ničtože prestupajušte nothing-at-all transgressing
*variant prines* (short past active participle) in 3 MSS

'Do you see, Philosopher, the wondrous miracle, how God's prophet Mohammed brought us good news from God and converted many people, and how we all adhere to his law, transgressing in nothing at all?'

121. (LC 27:8-9) vskore' že s' emu bog' javi, soon CONJ REFL to-him God he-revealed
poslušajai molitvy rab' svoix' hearing(long) prayers of-slaves own

'Hearing the prayers of his servants, God soon appeared to him.'

122. (LC 24:3-4) kršti že s' ot' six' čedi he-baptized CONJ CONJ from these people
dveste, ovtv'gšeš* mrazostii
200 having-thrown-off-PL(long) abominations
pogan'skyx' i ženitv' bezakon'nyx' pagan and marriages lawless
*8 MSS have short form here; 3 have aorist verb.

'About 200 of these people were baptized, having cast off heathen abominations and lawless marriages.'


2 Ibid., p. 61.
Morphology

There are certain typically denominal suffixes that govern the short form regardless of definiteness. These are -ov-/-ev-, -in-, -j-, and -ij-. The denominal -osk- suffix also does not take long or short endings according to definite/indefinite. And in addition, there are some miscellaneous morphological and morphological-semantic peculiarities.

Suffixes -ov-/-ev-, -in-, -j-, and -ij-

These suffixes are most often used to derive possessive adjectives from proper names. Hence NP's containing this type of adjective are often definite regardless of the lack of article morpheme.  

---

As Howard Aronson pointed out to me, it is quite possible to have an indefinite NP which contains a possessive adjective derived from a proper noun, e.g., God's law (definite), as opposed to a law of God('s) (indefinite). My "gut feeling" is that such indefinites are unusual— they certainly are in the texts used for this study—and therefore are very likely to contain some morphological marker of indefiniteness. In the Gospel manuscripts Marianus, Zographensis, and Assemanianus we find the following:

(Jn 4:46) eter& c[e]s[a]r mpzi?
Greek: tis vasilikos
'a-certain emperor's man

'[And there was] a certain nobleman.'

* and % are often confused in many manuscripts.

The suffix here is -j-.

The same "emperor's man" is referred to a few verses later simply as c[ê]s[a]rt mpzî (Jn 4:49; Greek o vasilikos, 'the nobleman').
123. a. xristovə zakonə  
   'Christ's law'
   Noevə zavětə  
   'Noah's covenant'
b. bogatstvo Amavriino  
   'Amavria's wealth'
c. znamenije Avraamel  
   'Abraham's covenant' (m+j→mlj)
d. po božiju smotreniju  
   'according to God's design'

These suffixes are occasionally used with place names as well.
e. dršti Sionova  
   domu Izrailevu  
   'daughter of Zion' 
   'to the house of Israel'

In addition, the above suffixes can derive adjectives from common nouns. Most such examples in our texts are from an animate nouns, and almost all are short. Note that the underlined NP in 124 is indefinite (non-specific).

124. (LC 7:1-3) a ikona otə lica obrazə javlētə i
   but icon from face image it-shows and
   podobie togo, egože radi
   likeness of-that of-which for-the-sake-of it-is
   pisana. Ne ləvova bo lica, ni ryszə zritə,
   painted not lion's for face nor lynx's he-sees
   iže viditə, no pruvago obrazə
   that he-sees but of-first image
   'But an icon shows an image and a likeness of the one for whose sake it is painted. It is not a lion's face or a lynx's that he who looks [at it] sees, but an image of the former.'

They can be definite, though, if the noun they are derived from has a definite referent, as in 125.

125. (LM 107a16-20) poszla kletvu na nei da
   he-sent interdict against them that
   ne pojugə məzə rekšə služby vəsi koroljevi
   not they-sing mass that-is service all king's
   epspi • donde i duržatə
   bishops as-long-as him they-hold
   'He sent an interdict against them, that all the King's bishops not sing the mass, that is, the service, as long as they held him [Methodius].'
They are occasionally derived from inanimate nouns as well:

126. \text{(LC 10:30-11:1)}  i na utrii dnie

and for the-morrow's day

ničtože ne ostavleja, no ništimž
nothing-at-all not leaving but to-poor

razdaaše vše
he-gave-away all

'And leaving nothing for the morrow, he gave away everything to the poor.'

The suffixes -j- and -ij- also occur on a handful of underived adjectives, and these, too, are always short. Included are velije, 'large, great;' divije, 'wild;' ŝujë, 'left;' bujë, 'impetuous;' and sujë, 'empty;' although not all of these are found in our particular texts.

There are a few cases of long possessive adjectives in -ij- and -ov- in the texts. As they are all in the oblique group discussed above and all in manuscripts which have only long forms in these cases, I think it is reasonable to credit their appearance to later Russian and Serbo-Croatian interference on the manuscripts.\footnote{This statement does not mean that long possessive adjectives do not occur in the canonical OCS manuscripts. (These were copied too early to have been affected by Russian and Serbo-Croatian.) In the Gospel manuscripts, however, all such forms cited by Flier (Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic, pp. 92-95) and which appear to represent all the occurrences, are matched by articles in the Greek original.}
Suffix -\textit{sk-}

That the appearance of a long or short ending with the -\textit{sk-} suffix is not governed by definite/indefinite can be seen in 127, with two long adjectives in NP's with indefinite specific referents, and 128 and 129, which show short adjectives in NP's with definite referents. Such instances are numerous.

127. (LC 12:19-20) Kazar\textit{skyi}* že voevoda sz
Khazar\textit{(long)} CONJ commander with
voi šedż, ostupi xristian\textit{skyi} warriors having-come he-surrounded Christian\textit{(long)}
ogradż, i opletesę o nemż city and he-laid-siege around it
*variant in MS 3 (17th century): Kozareskż (short)
'A Khazar commander came with his warriors, surrounded a Christian city and laid siege to it.'

128. (LM 108c11-15) preloži vž bźrzě všę knigy
he-translated quickly all books
všę ispłlnw* razvě makavěi otž ghrćeśka all complete(ly?) except Maccabees from Greek\textit{(short)}
jazyka v slovčnskō language into Slavic\textit{(short)}
'He quickly translated all the books in their entirety, except Maccabees, from the Greek language into the Slavic.'

129. (LC 17:29-18:2) vsi jazyci xotětż byti all peoples they-want to-be
blagosloveni otź nasź i obrźzanii vž gradě blessed from us and circumcized in city
Jerusalimstě
of-Jerusalem\textit{(short)}
'All peoples want to be blessed by us and circumcized in the city of Jerusalem.'
Miscellaneous

In addition to the suffixes listed above, there are
also some minor suffixes and individual lexical items which
involve peculiarities in the use of adjective forms. The
suffix -nj- is usually used to derive adjectives from
adverbs (e.g., prěždnîi, dolînîi, dalînîi from prěžde,
'formerly;' dolë, 'underneath;' dalë, 'far, farther'), is
occasionally employed with common nouns denoting human
beings. In this situation the ending can be long or short—
short under the influence of the more usual possessive
suffixes -ov-/ev-, -in-, etc., or long because the NP is
definite.

130. (LC 13:22-23) Az... česti
I CONJ grandfather's(long) honor

drevnëa išta, ne dostigoxë
old(long) seeking not I-achieved

'Seeking [my] grandfather's former honor, I did
not achieve [it].'

131. (LC 2:7-8) otročë že ne xotešë jatisë po
child CONJ not he-wanted to-take PREP

čijuž stsecə nikakože, razvë po
unfamiliar breast not-at-all except PREP

mother's(short)

*variant in MS 2 (15th century): materınə (-in-
suffix)

'But the child would not take any other breast at
all except [his] mother's.'

Occasionally, -jn- is also used as a possessive suffix,
and such adjectives seem to occur only in the short form.
132. (LC 1:7-9) No ne ostavljaet človeča roda but not he-leaves man's kind
otpasti oslablemiem i vz szaizn to-fall-away with-weakness and into temptation
neprijaznen priiti i pogynuti enemy's(short)to-enter and to-perish

'But He does not leave mankind to fall away due to weakness and to enter into the Devil's temptation and to perish.'

The suffix -en-, used to derive names of materials, belongs to this category in some texts. LM and PCM, for instance, have only short endings on adjectives with this suffix. For example, in 83 we see two generics with short adjectives.

133. (PCM 112c6-9) ne na skrižali kameny not on tablets stone-ADJ(short)
napisan n na srdci skrižali plžten not on of-hearts tablets fleshly(short)

'It is not written on tablets of stone but on tablets of fleshly hearts.'

In LC we find on generics not only the short stekele and dreveńe (28:22), but also the long kamenye (25:21), which belongs to the oblique group. In B derevenii and srebrenii occur on generics (12:12), and drevni and kameni as predicate adjectives (5:9-10). The explanation for the observed variation probably lies with Russian interference. (The suffix happens not to occur in any of the texts that are not of Russian redaction.) The original form was with short endings. But Sreznevskii lists as variants of the suffix -en/-jan also -enun-, -en-, -en-, -en-, and -en-, e.g.,

1In Russian eja; hence the suffix variant.
drěven̄nyi; měd̄nyi = měděnyi = mědeny [=] mědjanyi; kamen̄nyi = kamenyi = kamęnyi [= kamjanyi]; serebr̄nyi = serebrenyi = serebręnyi. The suffix -tn- can take long endings in OCS and EOS. In Old Russian, -en- and -bn- appear to have been sometimes combined and sometimes confused. Most of the examples of -en/-jan- as such cited by Sreznevskij have the correct short endings, but the change toward the modern Russian form, with two n's (usually) and long endings seems to be in progress.

Five adjectives are listed by Diels and/or Leskien as indeclinables in OCS, lacking a long form as well as case endings: svobod̄, 'free;' ispoon̄, 'full, complete;' različ̄, 'different, diverse;' sugub̄, 'twofold;' and prěprost̄, 'simple.' All but prěprost̄ occur in these texts also. And as in OCS, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether they are being used as adverbs or adjectives. (See, for example, 128.) Some of these also occur in declinable forms, where we find sugub̄ and the suffixed svobod̄n- and različ̄n-.


Having killed the abominable priests, he rose into heaven... having given his disciple double spirit. Elisha, having received the mantle, performed double miracles.'

Finally, investigators of OCS have noted that if a definite noun is modified by a series of adjectives, it is common to put the -j morpheme only on the first one and leave the others in the short form.\(^1\) This phenomenon is rare or non-existent in the EOS texts. The reason for the non-use in EOS of a construction considered common in OCS will require further investigation.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has shown that the category definite/indefinite is, indeed, reflected in the use of long and short adjectives in the EOS texts. Definiteness—where Sp is signaling H that he assumes H can pick out, from those entities that might be categorized by the description, the one he has in mind—is matched by long adjectives.

Indefiniteness is more complex. If the speaker is referring to a referent using an indefinite NP (i.e., using the NP referentially), he is communicating to the hearer

\(^1\)Flier, *Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic*, p. 126.
something like "I assume you cannot pick out, from all the referents that might be categorized in this way, the one I have in mind." These NP's are almost always accompanied by a short adjective, a word meaning 'a certain,' or both. When the speaker is not referring to a referent (whether or not the NP denotes one), there are two patterns. If both speaker and hearer can identify the referent, either a short adjective or a word meaning 'so' or 'such' is almost always used. Otherwise the NP would be misinterpreted as definite. (Those where only the speaker can identify the referent are so often indistinguishable from the referential usage that it seems questionable to separate them.) The remaining non-referential indefinites occur with variable adjectives in either the long or the short form. The meaning with these is 'some unspecified entity which fits the description,' or else there is no referent at all. With these non-specifics, identification of the referent is irrelevant or impossible, so it seems that which adjective form is used is not crucial to the communication. In addition, talking about a non-specific instance of a kind can sometimes be close pragmatically to speaking of the archetypal representative of the kind (e.g., My love is like a/the red, red rose). We see, then, that indefinite specific is expressed consistently by short adjectives, along with those NP's meaning 'such an [adj.] [noun]' or 'a [noun] of the [adj.] type,' but indefiniteness in general is not.
The meaning 'generic' is also expressed by long adjectives, although our sample suggests that the exception rate is slightly higher here than for definites. Although there are no individuals to be picked out from similar ones, a class of entities is distinct from other classes and therefore unique and identifiable.

Definite/indefinite/generic is not the only factor which affects the form of the adjective. Linguistic and graphic interference cause sporadic exceptions. These fall into patterns which vary in predictable ways with the histories of the manuscripts. Syntax also affects the form: adjectives and participles not dominated by NP are short, with few exceptions, but this does not mean they are indefinite. Finally, morphology competes in a major way with definite/indefinite/generic as a determinant of adjective form. Adjectives with certain suffixes take the short form, the long form, or free variation between the two forms without regard to definiteness.

The data suggest several possibilities about the nature of the category I have called definite/indefinite. First, it is not a simple, two-way opposition. Such an opposition occurs only between definites and indefinite specifics. Two factors point toward indefinite specific as the marked member of this opposition. First, indefinite specifics are quite rare in all the texts, compared to
definites. And second, when they do occur, they are usually marked morphologically.

The second general implication is that indefiniteness is not a homogeneous category. EOS treats most non-specifics very differently from the way it treats specifics.

Third, generics have some features in common with definites. They denote something unique, and their referents are therefore identifiable. And they are unmarked in relation to indefinite specifics in terms of frequency and typical information load.
It was one of my hypotheses when I began this dissertation that the "free" word order exhibited by the Slavic languages throughout their history was one of the factors which allowed most of them to lose the obligatory morphological marking for the category definite/indefinite. Since this marking was rather restricted even in Old Church Slavic, I naively hoped to find auxiliary means to express definite/indefinite by studying word order in the earliest original Slavic texts.

This hope arose as a result of reading a number of studies which purport to show that in various modern Slavic languages without articles, one of the primary means of indicating the definiteness versus indefiniteness of a NP is sentence word order. Consider, for example, 1a with continuations b or c in Polish.

1. a. W pokoju siedział chłopiec.
   in room was-sitting boy
   b. Chłopiec wyszedł.
      boy went-out

Sentence 1b in the context of 1a is 'The boy went out,' whereas 1c, under "normal stress" means 'A boy went out,'
which renders the situation uninterpretable, according to Aleksander Szwedek.¹ Such examples lead one to expect definite NP's to appear mainly preverbally in a text, and indefinites postverbally. A variant of this hypothesis has definites before the verb and either definites or indefinites after it. Example 2 is from Russian.

2. a. Direktor izučaet proekt.
    director is-studying project
    'The director is studying a/the project.'

    b. Proekt izučaet direktor.
    'The project is being studied by a/the director.'²

Kenneth Naylor gives the following pairs from Serbo-Croatian:

3. a. Devojka je slomila času.
    girl she-AUX broken cup
    'The girl broke a cup.'

    b. Času je slomila devojka.
    cup she-AUX broken girl
    'The cup was broken by a/the girl.'


² Examples are from Willy Birkenmaier, Artikelfunctionen in einer artikellosen Sprache: Studien zur nominalen Determination im Russischen, Forum Slavicum, Bd. 34 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1979), p. 48. Translations into English are mine, from Birkenmaier's German translations. Neither the Russian sentence in 2b nor his translation are passive. The passive is forced in English because the OVS order of the original is not a possible English surface order.
Leaving aside the matter of whether the hypothesis is borne out in modern Slavic texts, let us see what relevance it has to EOS. It seems reasonable to expect that word order rules in EOS would be very similar to those described for modern Slavic languages. There are two reasons for such an expectation. First, studies relating word order to definite/indefinite in Russian, Polish, Czech, and Serbo-Croatian (for example, the cited ones by Birkenmaier, Szwedek, and Naylor) come to such similar conclusions that it seems likely we are looking at an inherited phenomenon or, at the very least, an inherited tendency. And second, O. S. Mel'nyčuk, in his study on the development of Slavic sentence structure, states that there have been no substantive changes in the rules for the arrangement of syntagms in the sentence from the time of the earliest written records. There have been variations in the frequency of occurrence of various orders in different languages at different times, but

this fact, he says, reflects stylistic peculiarities and not historical tendencies.¹

In light of what these investigators say, it seemed potentially interesting to test on EOS the hypothesis that NP's before the verb are definite and those after it are indefinite—or its variant, perverbal NP's are definite and postverbal ones are either definite or indefinite. Since we are looking at original and not translated texts, whatever we find presumably reflects something close to the actual situation in ninth- and tenth-century Slavic. And this language in turn should be extremely close to Common Slavic.² Recall from chapter 5 above that EOS has a morpheme which functions like a definite article, but this can appear only under certain morphological conditions. Thus one might expect auxiliary means to exist for expressing the category definite/indefinite when the morphological criteria are not met, and that these means would have existed in Common Slavic.

This chapter is based on all the texts used for chapter 5 except the sermon in Clozianus and Presbyter Kozma's "Treatise Against the Bogomils." It should be noted that considerably more can be done with this material. The


²Evidence for this statement comes from the close-ness of the phonology and morphology of the OCS texts (manu-scripts of the tenth to eleventh centuries) to what has been reconstructed for Common Slavic.
The chapter therefore should be viewed as a report on work in progress, rather than as a definitive statement on the subject.

**Testing the Hypothesis on EOS**

As soon as we begin to examine the texts, it becomes obvious that the hypothesis does not work as expected, in either version. Let us look at some fairly straightforward sections. (Lettering is mine for future reference.)

5. a. (LC 3:24-4:5) Stranen če bě někyi tu, foreigner CONJ he-was a-certain there

uměa gramotikiju, i k nemu šedě, knowing grammar and to him having-gone

molëše i, i na nogu ego padaa, vzdaasë he-begged him and at foot his falling giving-self

emu: dobré déë, nauči me xudož-listvu

to-him well doing teach-IMPER me art

gramotičsku.

'There was a certain foreigner there who knew grammar. He went to him and begged him, falling at his feet, giving himself to him, "Please teach me the art of grammar."

b. Onz če talantz svoi pogrebe i reče kž nemu: he CONJ talent own. he-buried and he-said to him

otroce, ne tružaisë.

O-youth not trouble-self-IMPER

'But he buried his talent and said to him, "Young man, do not trouble yourself."

c. Otreklzše esmë otudu nikogo če ne naučiti I-have-renounced completely nobody EMPH not to-teach

semu vz moa dni.

this in my days

"I have completely renounced teaching this to anyone at all [for the rest of] my days."
d. Paky že otrok, sre slezami klanjaš se emu, then CONJ youth with tears bowing to-him

*glagolaše: vzmi vsju moju čast vs domu he-said take-IMPER all my part in house

otca moego, eže mene dostoit, a of-father my which to-me it-is-due but

nauči me
teach-IMPER me

'Then the youth, bowing to him with tears, said, "Take all my part in my father's house which is due me, but teach me."'

e. Ne xotevšu že poslušati ego, šed domovi, not having-wanted to-listen him having-gone home

v molitvax prebyvaše, daby obrěl in prayers he-remained that-SUBJUNC he-gain

želanie srđca svoego.

wish of-heart own

'Since the man did not want to listen to him, he went home, and prayed for a long time that he might gain the wish of his heart.'

In example 5 there are some sentence-initial definites: on in b, otrok in d, for example, but the only indefinite, stranen nekyi in a, is sentence-initial. In addition, there are several definite NP's which are sentence-final: in c, vs moa dni; in d, me; in e, želanie srđca svoego; among others.

6. a. (CS 156:7-12) Se pomyslivše sti this having-considered holy(long)

bžii ugodnici prědaša se na trudž, na bžděnije, God's servants they-gave REFL to work to vigil

na vsenko vzděržanije.
to every abstinence

'Having considered this, God's holy servants gave themselves up to work, to vigil, and to every abstinence.'
b. Sego radi, bratija, i my daljni jesmy of-this because brethren and we obliged we-are podobiti se im* i podvize no iskati to-resemble REFL to-them and zealously to-seek spsenija, pache ze vseze praznikz poicitati salvation more EMPH than-all holidays to-respect dni vskrbsenija xva, jeze staja day of-resurrection Christ's that-is holy(long) nedelja.

Sunday

'Because of this, brethren, we too are obliged to be like them and zealously to seek salvation and to respect, more than all holidays, the day of Christ's resurrection, that is, the holy Sunday.'

c. Vze tze bo dni pervyi nacatkz bys vidimiei on that for day first beginning was to-seem(long) vsei tvari, vze tze dni blgovesti arzglz all creation on that day he-announced archangel gavrila stei bci vplestenije Gabriel to-holy(long) Mother-of-God incarnation bziye, i vze tze dni vskrse b na$t God's and on that day he-rose Lord God our iz mrtvyxiz. from dead(long)

'For on that day was the first beginning of all visible creation; on that day Archangel Gabriel announced the incarnation to the holy Mother of God; and on that day our Lord God rose from the dead.'

The most obvious problem in example 6 for the notion preverbal=definite, postverbal=indefinite is that there are no indefinites in the passage at all, and yet there are a number of postverbal NP's. In fact, there is not a single indefinite in the entire text CS4, and they are relatively rare in the others as well, especially the non-narrative ones. All of the preverbal NP's in 6 are definite (or generic), however. Now consider 7.
7. a. (OP 164:10-11) Těm že slověňskaa pismena stěiša thus Slavic letters more-holy sq<t> i čstnéiša. they-are and more-venerable 'Thus the Slavic letters are hokier and more venerable.'

b. Štbo moža stvoril ja jes, a holy(short) for man made them he-AUX but grčeskaa Ellini pogani. Greek pagans

'For they were made by a holy man, but the Greek [ones were made] by Greek pagans.'

While 7a does have a definite before the VP stěiša sq<t>, 7b has an indefinite in first position. Clearly, then, there is no necessary connection between preverbal position and definiteness, or postverbal position and indefiniteness. Nevertheless, I believe that some positive statements can be made once we understand why the expected correlations do not appear.

**Why the Hypothesis Fails**

Two assumptions lie behind an expectation that definite NP's will appear before the verb and indefinites after it. First, sentence word order reflects the topic/comment structure of the sentence: specifically, the order is topic-comment. And second, there is a correlation between topic/comment and definite/indefinite, namely, topic=definite and comment=indefinite.

Some definitions first. The term topic, or theme (I will use the two terms interchangeably), includes two subtypes, (1) what the sentence is about, usually a NP; and
(2) the framework in which the sentence is to be interpreted, usually an adverb, adverb phrase, or adverbial clause. Since definite/indefinite is a category of the NP, most of the discussion here will pertain to the first subtype. For declarative sentences the comment, or rheme, is what is being stated about the topic, or in the framework of the topic. It usually contains a central part that forms the core of the communication. Writers in Czech and Russian, following Přemysl Adamec in his classic study on Russian word order, call this the jadro, 'kernel.' This kernel can be the NP whose referent the sentence serves to introduce, the location it serves to pinpoint, etc. As a concrete example, one very likely interpretation of 8 would have yesterday as Topic₂, John as Topic₁, and bought a book as the rheme. With this stress pattern the sentence functions to introduce the referent of a book into the discourse, and a book is the center of the rheme. Borrowing symbols from Adamec, we can represent 8 graphically as 8a.

8. a. \( \text{Adv}^{\alpha} \text{Su}^{\beta}-(V+C)^{\omega} \)

\( \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \text{etc.}, \) mark themes in order of importance (generally corresponding to order of occurrence), and \( \omega \) indicates the

---


2 Ibid.
rheme. There are two themes in 8, the sentence adverb and the subject, and these are separated from the rheme by a dash. The rheme is compound, consisting of the verb and its complement, enclosed in parentheses and connected by a plus sign. The sentence stress falls on the complement.

Returning now to the assumptions stated above, we can observe in example 9 that the first part of 5a does not have the expected order topic-comment.


The subject-comment appears split into three pieces: stranent, the central part of the rheme, has been moved to sentence-initial position (a common focusing device), and někyi and the participial modifier have been separated by the topic. Before any movement rules applied, the sentence might have looked like 10.

10. Tu (že) bě někyi stranent, uměa gramotikiju.

The first part of 5a, then, although it does not conform to the topic-comment order assumption, does contain a comment which is indefinite. But observe the second part of 5d, analyzed in 11.

11. vězmi všeju moju čast.. . is clearly definite, even though it is the central part of the rheme. And 11, an imperative, and 12, the second part of 5a, express their subject-topics by Ø.
We have seen just from the fragment in 5, then, that the first assumption above is not necessarily true, i.e., that sentence word order reflects topic-comment order. Likewise, contrary to the second assumption, the comment can be indefinite or definite. This leaves topic and definite.

Many investigators do, in fact, claim that a topic must be either definite or generic. While this seems usually to be the case, example 13, to me, provides a good illustration of an indefinite topic. It occurs at the beginning of a parable.

13. (LC 10:11-14) Clověk někyjí, počerpř vodu person a-certain having-drawn water
vž morí, vž měšćcě nošaše ju, i in sea in waterskin he-carried-around it and
gržďšesě glagolę kž strannikomž: vidite li he-put-on-airs saying to strangers you-see Q
vodu, ejaže nikto že ne imatř, razvě mene. water which no-one EMPH not he-has except me
Prišedź že edinź mužź pomornikź, having-come CONJ one man resident-of-seashore
i reče kž nemu . . .
and he-said to him

'A certain man, having drawn water from the sea, carried it around in a waterskin and put on airs, saying to strangers, "Do you see this water? No one has it except me!" But a man who lived by the seashore came up to him and said . . .'

The problem here is a terminological one concerning the notion of topic or theme. For those many who equate theme

---

with given, an indefinite specific NP of the type seen in 13 can only be rhematic, since its referent constitutes new information. Li and Thompson use Chafe's definition of "topics Chinese-style:" "Typically, it would seem, the topic sets a spatial, temporal, or individual framework within which the main predication holds."¹ This notion certainly fits the adverbial-type Topic¹ defined above, but it would appear that Early Slavic did not have nominal topics of this type, or that they were extremely rare. Topic¹, "what the sentence is about," corresponds to Chafe's notion "subject."² (I will, however, continue to use the terms topic and theme in order to avoid confusion with the syntactic subject.)

Yet another problem for the hypothesis, in either version, is that there are NP's which occur in both topics and comments that are neither definite nor indefinite. In 6a, for example, the center of the rheme is a series of abstract generics: trud', bzděnije, vsěko vzděržanije, 'work, vigil, every abstinence.' Generic themes occur in 14. (Note also the vacillation between long and short adjectives in this example.)

¹Ibid., pp. 461-466; Chafe, "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Point of View," p. 50.

²Chafe, "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Point of View," pp. 43-49.
14. (CS 65:18-19) Tacēmt bo prazdnikom xošteti Đ 문서
jegda stranu prijati budut nami, when foreign(short) received(short) they-are by-us
jegda alcnu nakrme se, jegda nazii when hungry(long) they-feed REFL when naken(long)
odežjut se they-clothe REFL

'For God wants such holidays: when foreigners are received by us, when the hungry are fed, when the naked are clothed.'

Now compare 15 with 16b. In 15 we see a definite NP (underscored) at the end of the clause, while 16b has an indefinite. The contexts are similar, namely, negated verbs with the negation falling on the adjectives(s).

15. (OP 163:16-18) Něst bo Đ stvoril židovska not-he-AUX for God made Hebrew
ogyka prezde, ni rimska, ni ellinska, но language first nor Latin nor Greek but
sirsky, imže i Adamgla. Syrian with-which also Adam he-spoke

'For God did not make the Hebrew language first, nor Latin nor Greek, but Syrian, which Adam also spoke.'

16. a. (LC 2:6-8) Egda že rodi i mati, vđaša when CONJ she-bore him mother they-gave
i doilici, daby i doila, him to-wet-nurse so-SUBJUNC him she-feed

'When his mother gave birth to him, they gave him to a wet-nurse so that she would feed him,'

b. otročuže ne xotěše jatise po child CONJ not he-wanted to-take PREP
čjuž stsec nikakože, razvě po someone-else's(short) breast not-at-all except PREP
materen, mother's

'but the child did not want to take someone else's breast at all, only his mother's,'
The problem here is that all the underscored NP's are foci of contrast. This is the type of contrast that T. M. Nikolaeva calls paradigmatic: 'not X but Y.' In Russian, she says, NP's receiving the characteristic stress pattern that accompanies this meaning can be definite, indefinite specific, indefinite non-specific, abstract, or generic.¹ Whether or not the prosody of such sentences in EOS was the same as it is in modern Russian, the semantics certainly are the same. (In fact, the relationship expressed by 'not X but Y' probably exists in all languages.) The foci of contrast in sentences 15 and 16b are the adjectives, but the meanings are 'not referent X but referent Y' and 'not referent of type X but referent Y,' respectively.

Finally, compare 16a with 17b. Both have adverbial-type themes containing NP's, but mati in 16a is definite while malo dnii in 17b is indefinite. We can hardly expect NP's in themes of this type to correlate with definiteness. Just because a sentence takes place in a certain framework (in this case a time framework), it does not follow that referents of NP's involved in that framework are necessarily identifiable by the hearer.

Likewise, in 5c both nikogo že and vsmoa dni are part of the rheme, but neither is the center of the rheme. Thus finding both a definite and an indefinite here is hardly surprising. Making a statement implies nothing at all about the referents of the NP's in that statement.

In summary, we have seen two basic reasons why the hypothesis preverbal position=definite, postverbal position=indefinite fails in the EOS texts. First, sentence word order is not always simply topic followed by comment. Pieces of the comment can be fronted, or the whole sentence can be reversed (as in 7b). Second, topics are not always definite and comments are not always indefinite. Both can be either, or generic. NP's which are foci of contrast cannot be expected to enter into correlations with definite/indefinite. And NP's which constitute parts of non-NP themes, or are part of the rheme but not the center of it cannot be expected to correlate with definite/indefinite, either, since this is a category of NP's. It is clear, then,
that nothing simple and absolute can be said about
definite/indefinite and word order in EOS.

**Toward an Explanation**

Despite the negatives in the previous section, it is possible to make some positive statements. First, however, we must remove as many confounding factors as possible, that is, those environments where correlations cannot be expected for semantic and/or pragmatic reasons. Some of these were identified above: NP's which form part of themes which themselves are not NP's, NP's which are part of the rheme but not its center, and NP's which are the focus of contrast. Another environment must also be added: the center of the rheme. This context was already suggested by the second version of the hypothesis. Further evidence comes from looking at the nominal centers of rhemes in the EOS examples in this chapter. Of these, five are definite, four are generic, five are indefinite specific, and four are indefinite non-specific. The high number of definites is hardly surprising. A referent newly-introduced into the discourse need not be one that the hearer cannot pick out (in 17a kr<s>t* toi, for example). It is also quite common for a sentence to function to introduce a class of entities, a general concept, or an entity in general into the discourse (see 6a).

---

1This sample has a much larger proportion of indefinite specifics than would be found in a random sample.
We are left, then, with NP themes. Despite the indefinite in 13, the remaining non-∅ NP themes in examples 5 through 17 (fifteen definites and three generics in this non-random sample) suggest that there may be a correlation after all, even though it is not absolute. In a randomly-chosen narrative text, IC, most of the themes would be pronominal subjects and are therefore deleted. Of the 87 remaining, 85 are definite and 2 are generic. As far as position in the sentence is concerned, in examples 5 through 17, nine are preverbal. In IC 45 precede the verb and 42 follow it. Of those following, 22 are marked as definite, usually morphologically, with a demonstrative, long adjective, or personal or possessive pronoun; but a few are proper names or have relative clauses which connect them to the preceding context. Six of them are accompanied by postposed demonstratives. The situation in the other texts is similar, though there are generally more generic topics. Indefinite topics, however, are relatively rare, both specifics and non-specifics. Sentence 18b contains a non-specific (in terms of individuals).

18. a. (B 17:7-9) i paky o tomw<z> matfēq and then about the-same Matthew eu<g>alist&lt piše<t> vz načalē qie Knigy evangelist he-writes in beginning saying books rz<st>va ūs ūva · šna dvda · šna avraamlē · of-birth Jesus Christ's son of-David son Abraham's 'And then about the same [person] the evangelist Matthew writes in the beginning, 'Books of the birth of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham'"
On the basis of degrees of frequency, then, we can make two positive statements about topics. First, they are almost always either definite or generic, with definite predominating. Second, approximately half of all topics appear to be found in preverbal position. The rest follow the verb, with over half of these being sentence-final. Some postverbal topics are marked with postposed demonstratives.

Turning now to indefinites, IC, LC, OP, and CS1-6 together yield 78 indefinite specifics. Of these, 20 are preverbal, and 10 are thematic and not contrastive. Of the 19 which are preverbal and not contrastive, 13 are morphologically marked as indefinite--with an indefinite pronoun-adjective or a short adjective. Of the 10 indefinite themes, 9 are marked indefinite. Seven indefinite specifics are both preverbal and themes, and all of these are marked indefinite. I found one indefinite non-specific sentence-initial topic in LC and LM combined; it is not marked. The results for indefinite specifics are summarized in Table 6. From the table we can say that there is a tendency for indefinite specific NP's not to be preverbal and a stronger tendency for them not to be topics. Indefinite specifics that are both preverbal and topics are quite rare. The data
indicate that as the chances of finding an indefinite specific in a particular context decrease, the chances of it being marked morphologically increase. Looking at the row percentages, we see that 68% of the 19 preverbal indefinite specific NP's are marked indefinite morphologically, 90% of the 10 indefinite specific topics are so marked, and 100% of the 7 indefinite specifics which are both preverbal and topics are marked. Put differently, the more highly marked an indefinite specific becomes contextually, the more likely it is to signal this fact by being morphologically marked.

TABLE 6
INDEFINITE SPECIFIC, PREVERBAL POSITION, AND TOPIC IN TEN EOS TEXTS (Non-Contrastive NP's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function/Sentence Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total Indefinite Specifics</th>
<th>Percent of Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preverbal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked morphologically</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked morphologically</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preverbal and topic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked morphologically</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What we have, then, is no absolute correlation between definite/indefinite and either sentence word order or topic/comment. Thus neither can be considered an auxiliary means of expressing definite/indefinite in EOS. Nevertheless, there is enough overlap between what is
expressed by means of word order and topic/comment on the one hand, and definite/indefinite on the other, to be able to draw some statistical implications, or what the hearer can reasonably expect. These are summarized in 19.

19. Strength of Implication

The stronger the expectation of a definite or generic NP, the more likely an indefinite is to be marked if it appears. Since NP's of any type occur in both rhemes and postverbal position, these contexts imply nothing about definiteness or indefiniteness.

A direction for further research is suggested by the fact that themes are almost always definite or generic. If EOS word order can be described like that in modern Russian, viz., as a series of basic patterns corresponding to various types of sentences, plus "expressive" transformations, it may be possible to say that definites and generics typically occur

The basic patterns have the element order topic-comment. Since the sentence stress usually falls on the last or most important element of the comment, the stress in these patterns is on the end of the sentence. Derived from them are "expressive variants" of various types, which involve shifting the entire comment or the most important part of it toward the beginning of the sentence. A very clear explanation of the mechanism and its results can be found in I. I. Kovtunova, Sovremennyj russkij jazyk: porjadok slov i aktual'noe členenie predloženija (Moscow: Prosvečenie, 1976). The simplest such variant has the order comment-topic, with the stress at the beginning of the sentence.
in certain positions because themes typically occur there. This would be quite a complex scheme and, of course, would not cover all instances of definite NP's.

Another possible avenue for future work involves collecting some good, multi-faceted descriptions of how one modern Slavic language, e.g., Russian, relates definite/indefinite with other factors, and comparing them point-by-point with EOS. A particularly interesting study of this kind is the previously-cited one by T. M. Nikolaeva on sentence stress and the category definite/indefinite in Russian. She shows that the putative correlation of indefinite with stressed and definite with unstressed does not always work. There are many reasons for this. One of the more important, she says, is that sentence prosody should be seen as having many levels, not all of which relate to the semantic content of the utterance. Rhythmic patterns, for example, may cause the main stress to fall on a word which is not particularly important simply because that word is at the end of a phrase which is important.

Another reason why the correlation does not hold to the extent often claimed is that there are types of sentence stress that most investigators do not consider. She treats five basic stress types:

---

1. "Normal" sentence stress
2. Contrastive paradigmatic: 'not X but Y'
3. Contrastive syntagmatic: 'X did A and Y did B'
4. Topicalization: 'as for X'
5. Emphasis: 'precisely X'

Of these, only the first is usually discussed in studies seeking to determine how definite/indefinite is expressed in Slavic languages without articles. Even with normal stress it is quite possible, she says, to have the sentence stress on a definite NP, as 20a and 20b show. Generics and abstracts also occur (20c, d). Examples are hers, translations mine.

20. a. Mimo esče raz prošel bocman.
   past again he-passed boatswain
   'The boatswain came past again.' (Anaphoric definite, from a story)
b. On esče raz gljanul na solnce.
   he again he-glanced at sun
   'He glanced again at the sun.' (Unique definite)
c. Ja, priznavajus', somnevajus', čtoby moja
   I I-admit I-doubt that-SUBJUNC my
   beseda mogla dostavat' vam u dovol'stvie.
   talk it-could to-obtain to-you pleasure
   'To tell you the truth, I doubt that my talk could have brought you pleasure.'
d. Sobaki vsegda družili s čelovekom.
   dogs always were-friends with man
   'Dogs have always been friends with man.'

Contrastive stress of the paradigmatic type has no direct connection with definite/indefinite. Thus we find indefinite specifics, indefinite non-specifics, definites of

__________________________
1 "Normal" sentence stress is the type found in what I have called the basic patterns.

all types, abstracts, and generics under this type of stress
(in addition to parts of speech other than NP's).

   'Go by yourself the/a little book [and not something else].'
   (Contextually/situationally definite or indefinite non-specific)

   'I see the/a woman [and not the/a man]' (Indefinite specific or contextually/situationally definite)

21. c. Čtenie mne ne dostavljajt udovol' stvie.
   'I don't enjoy reading [but I like something else].' (Abstract generic)

With contrastive syntagmatic stress, definite/indefinite is also irrelevant, she says, but the NP's cannot be indefinite specific. Such NP's are interpreted as either definite or generic. She does not mention indefinite non-specifics.

22. a. Sobaka ljubit xozjaina, koška--dom.
   'The dog loves [its] master, the cat [its] house.' (Definite or generic)

22. b. Šljapu ja kupil v prošlom godu, pal'to--uze sejčas.
   'The hat I bought last year, the coat just now.' (Definite)

Topicalization, or "setting off the theme," also cannot take place with indefinite specifics, although it

1Ibid., pp. 146-147.  2Ibid., pp. 149-150.
can with definites and indefinite non-specifics. For example, 23a is the only possibility with an indefinite specific because 23b is interpreted as definite.

23. a. Ja uvidel na dvore kozu.  
I I-saw in courtyard goat  
'I saw a goat in the courtyard.'

b. Kozu ja uvidel na dvore.¹  
[As for] the goat, I saw [it] in the courtyard.

Emphatic stress can occur on any type of NP. One word is emphasized, but the whole situation is contrasted or set apart. The implication is that this word is precisely the explanation.

24. Tak začem ře ty emu služiš'? Začem? Da, so why EMPH you to-him you-serve why but ved' otec moj emu služil.²  
you-know father my to-him served  
"So why do you work for him? Why?" "But, you know, my father worked for him.'

There are also a number of particles and other markers which interact with stress and definite/indefinite. Of particular interest here are the indefinite pronouns kakoj-to, 'some,' and odin, 'one.' Kakoj-to allows unstressed indefinite NP's to move to sentence-initial position and still be interpreted as indefinite more easily than NP's without kakoj-to. Sentence-initial NP's accompanied by this pronoun can also be stressed themes. Example 25 illustrates the latter.

¹Ibid., p. 150. ²Ibid., p. 151.
Some birds were tirelessly clamoring around [us].

Odin has several meanings, depending on the stress pattern on the NP in which it occurs. The meaning is not always unambiguously one type or another.

26. a. Odin + N = indefinite specific N
   b. Odin + N = (number) one N
   c. Odin + N
      i. With concrete nouns of location = one N; the same N
      ii. With abstract nouns = only this N and nothing more; only. Concrete nouns acquire abstract meaning
   d. Odin + N = limiting. Occurs with any type of noun
      Zolota mne ne nužno, ja išču odnoj istiny.
      'Gold I don't need. I'm looking only for truth.'
   e. Odin + N = one and only one N

Use of Odin in Russian, she says, is similar, though not identical, to that in other Slavic languages.²

Definite and indefinite NP's do not react in the same way to being stressed. Indefinite is more complex and finely differentiated than definite. This suggests, she says, that indefinite is more marked. It also supports the rationality of looking at definite and indefinite as two different categories rather than as members of the same category. Among indefinites the most communicative weight is on the indefinite specific, especially in the singular.

¹ Nikolaeva uses the slash symbol to separate the theme from the rest of the sentence.

² Nikolaeva, "Akcentno-prosodičeskie sredstva vyraže-
It thus attracts the normal (as opposed to contrastive) stress. Emphatic stress occurs when a normally-stressed NP undergoes movement out of end position. Both normal and emphatic stress are associated with a sentence which brings a whole situation into the discourse. Both types of contrastive stress, as well as theme stress (topicalization) occur only in sentences connected to previous context. Generic and definite nouns can both take any type of stress, although proper names, pronouns, and negated NP's with concrete referents behave differently. Finally, she concludes, definite and indefinite should not be viewed as minimal sememes, but rather as bundles of semantic features. These correlate in complex fashion with other syntactic and semantic categories. ¹

Conclusion

We have seen in this chapter that neither word order nor topic/comment should be considered auxiliary means of indicating definite/indefinite in EOS. Word order is not simply a straightforward expression of topic/comment. Even if it were, topics are not always definite and comments are not always indefinite. Both can be either, or generic.

Although nothing absolute can be said about a correlation between definite/indefinite and position in the sentence or the topic/comment structure, one can say that statistically, preverbal position does imply that a NP is not

¹Ibid., pp. 171-174.
indefinite specific, topic implies this more strongly, and
the combination of preverbal position and topic implies it
more strongly still. The rarer an indefinite specific is in
these contexts, the more likely it is to be marked morpholog-
ically if it does appear—with a short adjective or a word
meaning 'a certain.'

No doubt there are additional correlations which
await further research. It seems clear even at this point,
however, that there is no single obligatory and universally-
applicable category which marked definite/indefinite in the
absence of a variable adjective. It was (and still is in
Russian, for example) possible to mark a NP optionally for
definiteness with a demonstrative, or for indefiniteness with a
word meaning 'a certain,' 'some,' or 'one.' These appear to
function in EOS as a sort of "safety net," appearing when the
speaker feels the pragmatic status of a NP needs clarifica-
ton or emphasis. It is probably these, combined with
statistical correlations like those with definiteness and
preverbal position, and definiteness and topic, that allowed
most of the modern Slavic languages to lose the obligatory
marking of definite/indefinite.
The category definite/indefinite is, indeed, expressed in Early Original Slavic. However, it is systematically or obligatorily marked formally, namely, by long and short adjectives, only on a restricted class of NP's. Neither word order nor topic/comment represents an auxiliary means of marking the category. What we find instead is a complex of factors, one or more of which will usually allow the hearer to deduce the pragmatic status of a given NP.

Significance of My Study

My study is, I believe, valuable for several reasons. First, I have used texts that have been little studied from a linguistic standpoint because of their contaminated phonology and, to a lesser extent, morphology. By looking at the history of the manuscripts involved and identifying likely forms of contamination, I have shown that these texts can be used for some types of studies that are not primarily concerned with phonology or morphology.

Second, by using texts that were originally written in Slavic, I have eliminated as far as possible the interfering factor of Greek article usage and word order on the Slavic translations.
Third, I have shown that the use of long and short adjectives in the EOS texts is essentially the same as that in Old Church Slavic.

I have been critical of some earlier investigators for treating all occurrences of articles in languages which use them as manifestations of the category definite/indefinite. When such researchers see that a Greek definite article is not always matched by a Slavic long adjective, they claim that the latter is not a marker for definiteness. Articles are also used for other purposes, on a language-specific basis, so one cannot expect a one-to-one correspondence, even among languages where no one would dispute the presence of real articles.

Fifth, no other writer, to my knowledge, has treated definite/indefinite in Slavic as a pragmatic category, that is, looked at it in terms of what role the category plays in the communication. Flier, for example, uses a semantic definition. When he tries to apply it to plurals, he is forced to make some extremely subtle distinctions on NP's where indentifiability of an individual referent has nothing to do with the communication. He then concludes that the plural neutralized the long/short adjective distinction in favor of the long form. But most of his examples are either generic or indefinite non-specific. His anomalous short generics appear to be influenced by anarthrous NP's in the original Greek. At least with my data, once the indefinite
non-specifics are removed, the plural adjectives in the remaining NP's (including nominalizations) follow the expected pattern.

And finally, because others have used translated texts, or a mixture of translated and original, there has been no attempt, to my knowledge, to relate definite/indefinite to word order or the expression of topic/comment in earliest Slavic.

Summary

To summarize my results, EOS, like OCS, regularly marks definite and generic by means of the morpheme -ju, an enclitic on adjectives. In English works on the subject, this combination is usually called a long adjective. Indefinite is marked by the lack of this morpheme on the adjective, known as a short adjective.

The regularity with which long and short adjectives mark definite/indefinite is obscured by three factors, (1) systematic interference on the manuscripts, (2) syntax, and (3) morphology. Studying the history of both the individual manuscripts and the language of their copyists helps one to eliminate instances where adjective forms have been systematically neutralized. Syntactically, we find that adjectives immediately dominated by S or VP in the tree structure are usually short. But this does not mean they are indefinite: definite/indefinite is a category of the NP. Morphology constitutes the largest source of interfer-
ence in the expression of definite/indefinite. Adjectives formed with certain derivational suffixes have their own rules for using one ending or the other, independent of definite/indefinite. Such adjectives are not infrequent. In addition, a few lexical items simply lack long forms (as well as case endings).

Concerning definite/indefinite and word order, we do not regularly find definite NP's before the verb, nor do we find indefinites consistently after. We do not even regularly find definites preverbally and either definites or indefinites after the verb. There are three basic reasons for this. First, sentence word order does not always express topic/comment simply as topic followed by comment. Second, topics are not always definite and comments are not always indefinite. Both can be either, or generic. And third, there are environments where correlations cannot be expected for semantic or pragmatic reasons.

While nothing absolute can be said about definite/indefinite and word order, one can draw some statistical implications, i.e., what the hearer can reasonably expect. There is a tendency for indefinite specific NP's not be be preverbal and a stronger tendency for them not to be topics. Indefinite specifics that are both preverbal and topics are quite rare. Conversely (and after all the complications are removed), if a NP is not marked to the contrary, preverbal position implies definite or generic to some
extent, topic implies definite or generic more strongly, and preverbal position plus topic implies definite or generic virtually always. Nothing can be said about postverbal position.

In addition, the pragmatic status of a NP can usually be deduced from a complex of other factors. One of these is the semantics of the NP itself. A definite may be a proper name or a pronoun, be modified by a possessive pronoun or possessive adjective, or have a modifier like a relative clause which connects it with the previous context. (Only the first two always mark a NP as definite.) Very likely others can be found by comparing analyses of modern Slavic languages point-by-point with EOS.

Acting as a sort of "safety net" are the optional demonstratives and indefinite pronoun-adjectives meaning 'a certain,' 'some,' or 'one.' These can be used on any morphological type of NP when the speaker feels the need to clarify or emphasize the pragmatic status of the NP. But these optional markers are by no means used on all NP's which have no other indicator of definite/indefinite.

Finally, there are some NP's in the texts where it is simply impossible to tell whether they are definite or indefinite. These do not cause difficulties in understanding the narrative, and are only a problem when one attempts to translate them into a language like English which requires the choice of one article or the other.
Implications for the History of Slavic

Implications for the history of Slavic concern why and how the regular, obligatory expression of definite/indefinite was lost, is being lost, or spread but in a different form. First, obligatory formal manifestation of the category was quite limited in EOS. At best, it appeared only on NP's with adjectives. From this one must assume that at this stage, marking every NP for identifiability was not necessary at all from the standpoint of communication. The category, in other words, had a low functional load from the beginning.

Second, the form in which the category was obligatorily manifested was subject to an ever-increasing amount of interference from sources other than definite/indefinite. This probably began with the phonology: syllables were dropped and case endings plus -je were contracted to the point that many were no longer recognizable as two morphemes. The opposition was then reanalyzed from one of adjective alone versus adjective plus definite article morpheme, to one of one adjective form versus another. This development is evident in the dat. and loc. pl., dat./instr. du. and fem. instr. sg. At the stage represented by both EOS and OCS, many morphological classes of adjectives either did not use one form or the other, or used them seemingly interchangeably. Thus even the limited environment that presumably existed previously for the obligatory expression
of the category seems to have shrunk. The results of this development were either that other factors continued to reduce the environment, slowly or more rapidly; or a different, distinct morpheme came to be added to the long adjective when the meaning was definiteness, and this spread to other types of NP's.

Third, it seems that there is no other obligatory and universally-applicable category which marks definite/indefinite in the absence of a variable adjective. Word order and topic/comment help, but they are not substitutes. It should also be noted that flexible word order and the expression of topic/comment do not make articles absolutely unnecessary: Bulgarian and Macedonian have all three.

And fourth, there existed in EOS and still exist in the modern Slavic languages optional ways to mark definite/indefinite: demonstratives and indefinite pronoun-adjectives. (In Bulgarian and Macedonian the former are what developed into definite articles.) These can be used on any type of NP and depend only on the meaning. Thus in losing the long/short adjective opposition in attributive adjectives, East and West Slavic languages did not lose the ability to mark definite/indefinite, only the necessity.
General Implications

General implications concern the nature of the category definite/indefinite and related notions. First, the opposition definite/indefinite in NP's is not the same as use of definite and indefinite articles in a language like English. Each language with articles has its own peculiarities for using them when the meaning of the NP itself makes them redundant. Investigators therefore should not treat all instances of, for example, noun plus definite article as equivalent.

Second, if the function of definite/indefinite in the speech act is to signal H whether Sp thinks H can pick out the referent Sp has in mind from all those that might be categorized by the description, then definite/indefinite applies only where such a signal is relevant: NP's with speaker reference, or definites and indefinite specifics. The fact that long and short adjective usage in EOS is quite consistent with these two types supports this generalization.

Third, there are certain classes of NP which cannot participate in the opposition definite/indefinite as formulated above. The foremost of these is indefinite non-specifics. These either have no referents or the referents are non-unique. Thus Sp has no referent in mind for H to be able to pick out or not pick out. In EOS we find a great deal of vacillation in this type of NP. The second class is generics. These refer to the kind or species denoted by the
description. But which individuals of the species are involved is irrelevant and usually impossible to determine. Even determining the proportion of the species requires context and knowledge of the world—and may still not be achievable. In the indeterminacy and irrelevance of individual referents, generics have a feature in common with indefinite non-specifics. But the fact that EOS generics usually pattern with definites in adjective form, word order, and topic/comment suggests that generics in general have much more in common with definites. The description of the generic NP distinguishes the species denoted from other species. The hearer can therefore pick out which species the speaker is talking about, even though he cannot pick out referred-to individuals within the species. The EOS data, then, support Carlson's distinction between NP's which denote individuals and those which denote kinds. They also support his notion that kind-words are definite with respect to those kinds.

Finally, many investigators feel that definiteness is more marked than indefiniteness. My data, however, suggest that indefinite specific is more marked than definite. It is true that the definite adjective form is marked. But definite NP's are much more common: the ratio is over one hundred to one in these texts, not including deleted subjects. Furthermore, when indefinite specifics do occur, they are marked overtly more frequently than definites are. Finally, all the Slavic languages whose history includes
generalizing one form or the other for both meanings generalize the long (definite) form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>Accusative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act.</td>
<td>Active voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Codex Assemanianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux.</td>
<td>Auxiliary verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Presbyter Kozma's &quot;Treatise Against the Bogomils&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>Clement of Oxrid's sermon &quot;Заповеданія о праці&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>Clement of Oxrid's sermon &quot;Пованіє на поміт апостола ілі мченика&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>Clement of Oxrid's sermon &quot;Пованіє святого апостола Марка&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4</td>
<td>Clement of Oxrid's sermon &quot;Пованіе епископа Клімента на святого вхідження&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS5</td>
<td>Clement of Oxrid's sermon &quot;Пованіє на предпраці - ніство свята Богородиця&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS6</td>
<td>Clement of Oxrid's sermon &quot;Пованіє превствія владычика наша Богородица&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>Dative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du.</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOS</td>
<td>Early Original Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.</td>
<td>Feminine gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut.</td>
<td>Future tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>Genitive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Three miracles from &quot;Tale of the Iron Cross&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>Instrumental case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Life of Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Life of Methodius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>Locative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW</td>
<td>Life of Wenceslas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Inscription from the tomb of Mostić</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar.</td>
<td>Codex Marianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masc.</td>
<td>Masculine gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neut.</td>
<td>Neuter gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>Nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Old Church Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>&quot;O pismeněx&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa.</td>
<td>Past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>Poxvala to Cyril and Methodius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>Present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ptc.</td>
<td>Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCl</td>
<td>Sermon in Clozianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunc.</td>
<td>Subjunctive mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>Vocative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zogr.</td>
<td>Codex Zographensis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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