

Regina Koycheva

Institute for Literature – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
r-k@abv.bg

From Versification to Phonetics in a Byzantine-Slavonic Context¹

In living memory of Prof. Boryana Velcheva

Abstract

The aim of this research paper is to unravel some unknown sound features of the language of the disciples of St. Cyril and St. Methodius by analyzing the rhythmic structure of four Old Bulgarian canons in 12-syllable verses. Each of the verses in these works follows one of the variants of the dodecasyllable used in the three Byzantine iambic canons by St. John of Damascus, which are briefly presented in the article. The restriction of the line to exactly 12 syllables makes it possible to clarify: a) whether the vocals ъ and ѣ (jers) in a weak position began to disappear as early as the 9th and the beginning of the 10th century; b) whether jers positioned before [j] were syllabic; and c) whether Old Bulgarian hymnographers used contracted endings of the adjectives.

Keywords: hymnography, 12-syllable, verse, Old Bulgarian, phonetics, versification

The method of uncovering unknown sound features of extinct languages by analyzing the rhythmic structure of surviving poetic works in these languages is one of the well-known intersections between versification studies and linguistics. However, for the analysis of Old Bulgarian ecclesiastical hymns, this method has not been applied for extracting data about the first Slavic literary language

¹ The article is written in the frames of “*Sound and Text in Intercultural Context*” joint research project between the Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies (Research Center of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts – ZRC SAZU) and the Institute for Literature at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (BAS). The financial support from ZRC SAZU and BAS is gratefully acknowledged.

until quite recently, since hymnologists are currently still debating whether the disciples of Sts. Cyril and Methodius followed the Byzantine rules for the rhythm of hymnography (a survey of the current state-of-the-art on the topic is offered in Койчева 2024). These Byzantine rules amount to the principles of isosyllabism and homotony. They regulate the relationship between each pattern stanza, the so-called heirmos, and other stanzas built on that pattern, the so-called troparia, which must contain the same number of syllables and stresses in the same positions as in the heirmos. Small deviations from these prerequisites are also permissible (about these deviations see Васильев 1896: 610 – 616). The number of syllables in stanzas from one and the same ode sometimes varies significantly in most manuscript copies of Old Bulgarian chants. This raises doubt on the application of the principle of isosyllabism. The other principle of homotony cannot even be discussed, since the oldest Slavic manuscripts do not contain written signs for accents and almost nothing is known about the nature of the stress in the Old Bulgarian language.

This unfavorable situation for versification studies changed at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century, when the hymnologists Georgi Popov, Maria Yovcheva and Schema-nun Sephora (Vera Tsacheva) published and proved the originality of four Old Bulgarian chants, which were composed according to the model of the iambic canons of St. John of Damascus. The Byzantine model suggests that each verse from these Slavic canons in their primary form most probably consisted of exactly 12 syllables. The limitation of exactly 12 syllables makes it possible to clarify some hitherto unclear issues of Old Bulgarian phonetics, as well as to prove certain extant hypotheses. These possibilities will be addressed here. Before that, however, I will briefly present the mentioned poetic works in their historical sequence.

Today we know of the existence of three iambic canons by St. John of Damascus. They pertain to the feasts of Christmas, Epiphany, and Pentecost (Migne 1864: 817 – 840; O'Connor 1910). The great Syrian hymnographer St. John lived approximately between the middle of the 7th and the middle of the 8th century, when the difference in length among the Greek vowels had long since been obliterated (Allen 1968: 89)² and, accordingly, quantitative versification was no longer inherent in speech. However, St. John of Damascus restored this versification in the mentioned three canons and built their verses in the ancient iambic trimeter on the basis of the old quantities of the syllables (on the rules of iambic trimeter see Милев, Михайлов 1979: 337 – 339). Moreover, he superimposed the Byzantine hymnographic rules of isosyllabism and homotony on this archaic verse organization. The heirmos and the third troparion from the eighth ode of the canon for Pentecost are given below as an example (see table 1). The number of syllables is indicated by digits, stressed vowels (in table 2) – by horizontal lines, unstressed vowels – by arcs, and those syllables, which according to the Byzan-

² I am grateful to my colleague Assist. Prof. Hristo Todorov for referring me to this grammar and securing it for me.

tine hymnographic rules can be considered either stressed or unstressed (Васильев 1896: 610 – 613) – by both signs simultaneously. The differences between the two stanzas in terms of the positions of the stresses are negligible and could be due to my insufficient knowledge (these differences are enclosed within squares in table 2). In order to combine the quantitative verse with the essentially syllabo-tonic verse of the hymnography (although the latter is a syllabo-tonic one of a particular kind), St. John of Damascus abandoned the option of the ancient tribrachium, in which the long syllable of the iambic foot is replaced by two short ones (Милев, Михайлов 1979: 338). Thus, each verse is a dodecasyllable, that is, it contains 12 syllables. The caesura is common, and is most often situated following the fifth or seventh syllable, again according to the pattern of the iambic trimeter. However, there are also verses with a caesura in another position, as well as verses without a caesura. This is clearly traced by the structure and meaning of the text.

Table 1. The heirmos and the third troparion from the eighth ode of the canon for Pentecost by St. John of Damascus (Πεντηκοστή [n.d.]; Johannes Damascenus 1864: 837)

Verse:	Stanza:	Number of syllables and caesura:
	Heirmos:	
I.	Λύει τὰ δεσμὰ / καὶ δροσίζει τὴν φλόγα,	5+7
II.	Ὁ τρισσοφεγγῆς / τῆς θεαρχίας τύπος,	5+7
III.	Ὑμνοῦσι παῖδες, / εὐλογεῖ δὲ τὸν μόνον,	5+7
IV.	Σωτῆρα καὶ παντουργόν, / ὡς ἐνεργέτην,	7+5
V.	Ἡ δημιουργηθεῖσα / σύμπασα κτίσις.	7+5
	Troparion 3:	
I.	Ἦσε προφητῶν / πνευματέμφορον στόμα,	5+7
II.	Σὴν σωματωδῶς, / ὧ Μέδων, ἐνδημίαν,	5+7
III.	Καὶ Πνεῦμα κόλπων Πατρικῶν προηγμένον,	12
IV.	Ἀκτιστοσυμπλαστουργοσύνθρονον σέθεν,	12
V.	Ἴεις ἐνανθρωπήσεως / πιστοῖς σέβας.	8+4

Verses with structure like that of the third line from the cited troparion, that is καὶ Πνεῦμα κόλπων Πατρικῶν προηγμένον, can be interpreted in different ways: either as verses whose caesura does not coincide with the syntactic and semantic division of the text (here, such a caesura would divide the attributive syntagma

κόλπων / Πατρικῶν and the verse would be considered to be of the type 5+7 syllables), or as verses without caesuras in the standard positions (here, for example καὶ Πνεῦμα / κόλπων Πατρικῶν προηγμένον: 3+9), or as verses without a caesura altogether. The last option is preferred in the current study. Eirini Afentoulidou, however, reconstructs caesuras in all verses of the three iambic canons by St. John of Damascus: even in the cited one ἀκτιστοσυμπλαστουργοσύνθρονον σέθεν, where she restores a structure of 10+2 syllables (Afentoulidou 2004: 57). It should be noted that, although the compound word in this verse is maintained in the vast array of editions of the Greek liturgical chants, it is divided into three words in the Patrologia Graeca edition of the canon as ἄκτιστον, συμπλάστουργον, σύνθρονον (Johannes Damascenus 1864: 837)³. The text of the iambic canons by St. John of Damascus in the Patrologia Graeca suffers from some shortcomings: neither the odes, nor the heirmoi are indicated, which is in contradiction with the nature of hymnography.

Table 2. Comparison between the same stanzas by places of word stresses

Verse:	Stanza:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
I.	Heirmos:	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Troparion 3:	Λύ- ει τὰ δεσ- μά και δρο- σί- ζει τήν φλό- γα,											
II.	Heirmos:	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Troparion 3:	Ἦ- σε Προ- φη- τῶν πνευ- μα- τέμ- φο- ρόν στό- μα,											
III.	Heirmos:	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Troparion 3:	Καὶ Πνεῦ- μα κόλ- πων πα- τρι- κῶν προ- η- γμέ- νον,											
IV.	Heirmos:	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Troparion 3:	Ἄ- κτισ- το- συμ- πλασ- τουργ- γόν, ὡς εὐ- ερ- γέ- την,											
V.	Heirmos:	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Troparion 3:	Ἦ- δη- μι- ουρ- γη- θεῖ- σα σύμ- πα- σα κτί- σις,											

³ According to the peer reviewer of the current article, this division aims to facilitate the pronunciation of the line.

In addition to the dual rhythmic organization, that is the application of the hymnographic rules in addition to the restored quantitative versification, the first letters of the verse lines in each of the three iambic canons are linked in an acrostic, which is a quatrain in hexameter. The acrostic of the canon for Pentecost is made up of the initials of 135 verses and is the longest in Byzantine literature as a whole:

Θειογενὲς Λόγε, Πνεῦμα Παράκλητον πάλιν ἄλλον,
Ἐκ Γενέτου κόλπων ἦκας ἐπιχθονίοις,
Οἷα πυρὸς γλώσσησι, φέρον Θεότητος αὔλου
Σῆμα τεῆς φύτλης, καὶ χάριν ὕμνοπόλοις.

(Ποпов 2006: 37)

The underlined passages are the verse beginnings of the already considered two stanzas from the eighth ode. It is noticeable that the first letters of the four lines of the acrostic itself also form the mini-acrostic Θεός ‘God’ (Weyh 1908: 44). It seems that world literature hardly ever preserves poetic work with such a complex structure, as the verse structure of the iambic canons by St. John of Damascus.⁴

These three Byzantine canons, as mentioned, were used as models in the creation of four Old Bulgarian works that have reached us from the end of the 9th and the beginning of the 10th century – two anonymous: for the feasts of Epiphany and Pentecost (Ποпов 2005 and 2006, Ципора 2006), and two with established authorship: for Christmas by Bishop Constantine of Preslav and for St. Apollinaris of Ravenna by St. Clement of Ohrid (Ποпов 1998, Ђовчева 2002 and 2014).⁵ The quantitative organization of the verse was not taken into account, as it was unapt for the Old Bulgarian language. The canon for Pentecost is closest to the structure of the Greek works, because its acrostic is formed by the first letters of all its verses. The acrostic of the Christmas canon is of the same kind, but does not include the heirmoi. The beginnings of the verse lines of these two Slavic works constitute poems, parts of which are given in table 3. The canon for Epiphany has a simpler acrostic, in which each troparion participates with only one letter – that is, its initial, – instead of with the five first letters of its five verses. The plainest one in this respect is the canon for St. Apollinaris of Ravenna: here, only КЛИМ (КЛИМ), the signature for St. Clement of Ohrid, is embedded. Interestingly, this is most likely the chronological order, in which the four works were created (the same order is presented in table 3), or at least the chant in honour of St. Apollinaris should be considered last.

⁴ More about their versification, see in Afentoulidou 2004. About the Byzantine 12-syllable verse, see also Maas 1903, Дикова 2023: 28 – 41 and the literature cited there.

⁵ Other investigations and editions of the four Old Bulgarian canons in 12-syllable verses are found in the following publications: Верещагин 1997; Попов 1997; Верещагин 1999; Верещагин 2001: 421 – 450; Vereščagin et al. 2006: 156 – 197; Попов 2008: 54 – 57; Климент Охридски 2008: 521 – 531; Суботин-Голубовић 2012: 193 – 194.

Table 3. The acrostics of the four Old Bulgarian canons in 12-syllable verse

Canon:	The acrostic is composed of the beginnings of:	Text of the acrostic:
for Pentecost, anonymous, in tone 4	the verses of all stanzas (heirmoi and troparia)	ОТ ОТЦА СЛОВО / ДУХ ПОСЛАЛ ЕСИ ПАРАКЛИТА ЖЕ / СЕ ОБРАЗ[ОМ] ОГНА [А]ПОСТОЛОМ / РАЗДѢЛЛѢСА... (Попов 2006: 38)
for Christmas by Bishop Constantine of Preslav, in tone 1	the verses of the troparia	КАНОН НА РОЖДСТВО ХРСТОВО СТВОРЕН КОНСТАНТИНОМ ПОПОМ ХРСТА РОЖДЕНА / ХВАЛИТЕ СЛОВЕНИ ВСИ НАКО СНИДЕ / Н[А] СПАСЕНИЕ НА[Ш]ЈЕ... (Попов 1998: 8)
for Epiphany, anonymous, in tone 2	the troparia	БОГОАВЛЕНИЕ ТИ / ПО[И]ШТЕ ХРИСТЕ СЛАВИМ (Попов 2005: 21)
for St. Apollinaris of Ravenna by St. Clement of Ohrid, in tone 2	the troparia from the ninth ode	КАЛИМ (Йовчева 2014: 319 – 320)

An important detail for the present study is the fact that each of the verses in these works follows one of the variants of the dodecasyllable used in the three Greek canons. Old Bulgarian word stresses cannot be identified with certainty, because they are not indicated in the earliest Slavonic manuscripts, but the syllabic length of the verse, and consequently, the presence of a caesura and its position, can be a source of valuable linguistic information. With this understanding in mind, only the poetic lines whose 12-syllabic structure can be undoubtedly reconstructed on the basis of the available manuscript copies are included in the current analysis. The separate verses are given without context, since it is not relevant to the purposes of this study. The cited stanzas are indicated by the following system of abbreviations (partially used by Georgi Popov – Попов 1985: 379):

Canon (P – for Pentecost; C – for Christmas; E – for Epiphany; A – for St. Apollinaris)	Ode (1, 3, 4...)	/	Stanza (h = heirmos; 1, 2, 3 = first, second, third troparion; th = theotokion)
---	---------------------	---	---

For example, A 8/3 indicates the third troparion for the eighth ode from the canon for St. Apollinaris of Ravenna by St. Clement of Ohrid; C 3/th refers to the theotokion (a stanza in praise of the Holy Mother of God) for the third ode from the Christmas canon by Constantine of Preslav.

- Р 4/1: се баниѣ мьнѣ / пакъзѣзѣгѣ хрьсте (5+7)
 С 3/1: хота съпасти / блѣдациѣго чловѣка (5+7)
 С 5/h: оцѣщениѣ намѣ / хрьсте вѣдрьно (7+5)
 С 5/1: хрьстѣ владѣка / пришьствѣемь плзти (5+7)
 С 5/1: рѣвниѣ же ѣро / да погоубитѣ (7+5)
 С 6/2: вѣторѣимь обнищаниѣмь си (12)
 С 7/3: съвазанѣихѣ же / мрѣженѣ нѣинѣ (7+5)
 С 8/3: естѣство наше / ис поуствѣихѣ горѣ (5+7)
 Е 3/2: вѣзвращениѣ иорданово нѣинѣ (12)
 Е 5/1: водонѣ очѣцаа / прѣгрѣшенѣ (7+5)
 Е 7/2: трепецѣ рече иоданѣ вѣпиа (12)
 Е 7/2: трѣбоуѣциѣго / твоего крѣщенѣ (5+7)
 Е 8/2: иорданѣ та / и море познавѣша (5+7)
 Е 8/th: егоже прѣжде вѣкѣ / отѣць роди (7+5)
 А 3/2: сладѣкѣми твоими богословесѣ (12)
 А 4/2: мирѣ всѣ обидѣ / ѣко мьнѣи (7+5)
 А 7/1: мѣжителева прѣщениѣ блаженѣ (12)
 А 7/3: оуча богодѣхновенѣми словесѣ (12)
 А 7/th: како понесе / невѣмѣстимѣго (5+7)

(reconstructed according to Попов 1998: 20 – 24; Попов 2005: 50, 53, 57, 59 – 60; Попов 2006: 20; Йовчева 2014: 314 – 315, 317 – 318)

From the above-cited examples, the following conclusions can be derived about Old Bulgarian phonemes and their combinability with one another in the chronological frame of the end of the 9th and the beginning of the 10th century.

1. In hymnography, each vowel functioned as equal in length to the other vowels. Even if they weren't really of the same length, they were counted as such. Therefore, neither the nasal vowels (ж, ѣж, ѡ) with their complex origin and initially two-part composition (Добрев 1969: 242, 245; Велчева 1980: 105) were counted as longer, nor the jers (ь, ѣ), which were short vocals, functioned as shorter than the other vowels. The analyzed chants confirm the opinion of the Bulgarian linguist Boryana Velcheva (Велчева 2001) that it is not justified to define the jers as “ultrashort” (*свръхкратки*), “ultrareduced” (*свръхредуцирани*) and “semivowels” (*полугласни*) – qualifiers used by some scholars in relation to these phonemes (cf. Милетич 1923: 16; Мирчев 1972: 17; Дуриданов и др.: 541; Иванова-Мирчева, Харалампиев 1999: 53; Славова 2017: 72 and others).

2. All weak jers (**bold-faced** in the examples), which disappeared in the later Old Bulgarian speech, were still being pronounced. This view has been accepted without objection in linguistics for a long time (cf. for example Jacobson 1962:

415). However, more recent explorations dispute this and situate the first cases of lost jers already in the 9th century (Смядовски 1993: 92; Иванова-Мирчева, Харалампиев 1999: 54; Лашкова 2004: 145; Шишков 2017: 29 – 30, 34, 70). The hymnographic evidence which is presented in the current study helps to reconsider the matter. Through the classical linguistic analysis of the Old Bulgarian manuscripts, the presence of the weak jers in oral pronunciation can be assumed indirectly by the absence of deviations in the use of the letters for the jers. The chants with isosyllabic verses, however, represent transparent evidence that these sounds were really pronounced, because otherwise the 12-syllable structure of the verses would be destroyed.

3. Jers in position before [j], as well as their successors **ѣ** and **и** (in CAPITAL LETTERS in the examples), were syllabic like all other vowels (the presence of the [j] is proven etymologically: **ръвѣнѣ** < **ръвѣнѣје** (С 5/1), **поустѣиѣхъ** < **поустѣјиѣхъ** (С 8/3), etc.). These phonemes are often called “compressed jers” (*стегнати/стеснени ерове*) and “reduced **ѣ** and **и**” (*редуцирани ѣ и и*) in linguistic literature, and some authors doubt their syllabic function (for example Миклас 2004: 59, 61). The isosyllabic Old Bulgarian verses put an end to such claims and confirm again Boryana Velcheva’s position that “there were no reduced vowels or compressed jers in Old Bulgarian” („редуцирани гласни или стегнати ерове в старобългарски не е имало” – Велчева 2001: 534).

4. When borrowing foreign names, some deviations from the Slavic phonetic rules and in particular from the tendency towards rising sonority were allowed. The name **иоданъ** begins with three consecutive vowels and two hiatuses respectively (as it is seen in E 7/2), which were avoided in Slavic speech from that epoch. The same hiatus is also found in the name of the Jordan River **иорданъ** (E 3/2 and E 8/2), which contains a syllable that ends in a consonant in contravention of the ‘Law of the Open Syllable’. Apparently, it was only after the period of the disciples of Sts. Cyril and Methodius that the form **иорѣданъ** arose, that is, a form which has an inserted jer and which as a result complies with the indicated phonetic rule.

5. Old Bulgarian hymnographers used both uncontracted and contracted endings of the full-form adjectives, ordinal numerals and participles. The uncontracted syllables are underlined, while the contracted ones are enclosed within squares in the verses given above. We find **невѣмѣстимаддо** (A 7/th), but also **владѣддо** (С 3/1) and **трьвѣоуѣддо** (E 7/2) instead of **владѣддо** and **трьвѣоуѣддо**; in the same way we find **въторддми** (С 6/2), **сѣвазанддхъ** (С 7/3) and **поустѣддхъ** (С 8/3), but also **сладзкѣддми** (A 3/2) and **вѣродѣхновенддми** (A 7/3) instead of **сладзкѣддми** and **вѣродѣхновенддми**. The usage of phonetic variants in one and the same text in the service of rhythm is characteristic of poetry in general. The presence of abbreviated endings in the early hymnography necessitates a correction of the conclusion in the academic grammar of the Old Bulgarian language that “the contraction of two identical vowels following one another is obviously a late process in Old Bulgarian” („контракцията на две еднакви следващи една

след друга гласни е очевидно късен процес в старобългарски” – Дуриданов и др. 1991: 546). On the contrary, there were apparently contractions already at the end of the ninth century. Well-deserved recognition must be given to Roman Jacobson for his acknowledgement of this feature. He not only counted the so-called “compressed” jers as forming syllables in his reconstruction of several parts of the anonymous Old Bulgarian Office for St. Constantine-Cyril the Philosopher, but also suggested one contracted inflection (ВЪСЪВЪСЪСЪМЪ, instrumental case, singular) (Якобсон 2000: 339). A similar conclusion about several endings in the famous Old Bulgarian ‘Alphabetical Prayer’ was formulated recently by Ekaterina Dikova (Dikova 2022: 71).

All these phonetic issues will be elaborated in a book of mine which is being prepared at the present time. Although the lingual features, ascertained by the demonstrated method, are subordinate in regard of palaeoslavistic linguistics, they are fundamental for versification studies on the earliest Slavic hymnography. The extracted phonetic data will help to create more precise reconstructions of the numerous Old Bulgarian chants, whose stanzas consist of lines of varying length. It is the only way possible to reach more accurate conclusions on the general question of the extent to which the disciples of Sts. Cyril and Methodius followed the rules of Byzantine hymnography.

The current article interpreted the subject of the project “Sound and Text in Intercultural Context” from the perspectives of linguistics and verse studies. The adaptation of the Byzantine chanted dodecasyllable to the Old Bulgarian hymnography helps us to gather new information about some of the sounds that make up the early Slavic texts. These medieval sounds have long since disappeared, but some of their acoustic imprints have remained embedded into the preserved metered texts.

Bibliography

- Afentoulidou 2004: Afentoulidou, Eirini. Zur akzentuierenden Metrik der dem Johannes Damaskenos zugeschriebenen jambischen Kanones. – In: Hörandner, W., et al. (eds.). *Wiener Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik. Beiträge zum Symposium Vierzig Jahre Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik der Universität Wien im Gedenken an Herbert Hunger*. Vienna: ÖAW Verlag, pp. 45 – 52. [online] https://austriaca.at/0xc1aa5572_0x00071503.pdf [seen 31.01.2025].
- Allen 1968: Allen, W. Sidney. *Vox Graeca. A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dikova 2022: Dikova, Ekaterina. A Byzantine Poetic Form in a Ninth-Century Bulgarian Poem. – *Studia Metrica et Poetica*, IX, No. 2, pp. 63 – 91.
- Jacobson 1962: Jacobson, Roman. *Selected writings. Vol. 1. Phonological studies*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Johannes Damascenus 1864: *Sancti Patris Nostri Joannis Damasceni, monachi*

- et presbyteri Hierosolymitani, Opera omnia quae exstant.* (= Migne, J.-P., P. M. Lequien (eds). *Patrologiae cursus completus [...]*, Series Graeca. Vol. XCVI [96]). Paris: J.-P. Migne.
- Maas 1903: Maas, Paul. Der byzantinische Zwölfsilber. – *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 12, pp. 278 – 323.
- O'Connor 1910: O'Connor, John Bonaventure. St. John Damascene. – In: *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 8. New York: Robert Appleton Company. [online] <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08459b.htm> [seen 20.01.2025].
- Vereščagin et al. 2006: Vereščagin, Evgenij Michajlovič, et al. *Gottesdienstmenäum für den Monat Dezember auf der Grundlage der Handschrift Sin. 162 des Staatlichen Historischen Museums Moskau (GIM). Historisch-kritische Edition*. T. 4 (25. bis 31. Dezember einschließlich des Sonntags nach Christi Geburt). Besorgt von E. M. Vereščagin, A. G. Kraveckij und O. A. Krašennikova. Mit einem Nachtrag griechischer Vorlagen für Hymnen aus den Bänden I-III. Zusammengestellt von D. Christians. Herausgegeben von H. Rothe und E. M. Vereščagin. (= Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bd. 114; Patristica Slavica. Bd. 14). Paderborn–München–Wien–Zürich: Böhlau Köln.
- Weyh 1908: Weyh, Wilhelm. Die Akrostichis in der byzantinischen Kanonesdichtung. – *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 17, 1908, pp. 1 – 69.
- Πεντηκοστή [n.d.]: Κυριακή τῆς Ἀγίας Πεντηκοστῆς [liturgical texts]. – In: *Ἑλληνικὰ λειτουργικὰ κείμενα τῆς Ὀρθόδοξης Ἐκκλησίας. [USA]: Ecumenical Patriarchate. Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America* [Website]. [online] <https://glt.goarch.org/texts/Pen/p49.html> [seen 28.01.2025].
- Васильев 1896: Васильев, Александр Александрович. О греческих церковных песнопениях. – *Византийский временник*, т. 3, с. 582 – 633. [Vasil'ev 1896: Vasil'ev, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich. О греческих церковных песнопениях. – *Vizantijskij vremennik*, vol. 3, pp. 582 – 633.]
- Велчева 1980: Велчева, Боряна. *Праславянски и старобългарски фонологически изменения*. София: Издателство на БАН. [Velcheva 1980: Velcheva, Boryana. *Praslavyanski i starobalgarski fonologicheski izmeneniya*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN.]
- Велчева 2001: Велчева, Боряна. Имало ли е в старобългарски редуцирани гласни и стегнати ерове? – В: Косев, К. и др. (ред.). *В памет на Петър Динев. Традиция. Приемственост. Новаторство*. София: Кирило-Методиевски научен център при БАН, АИ „Проф. Марин Дринов”, с. 531 – 534. [Velcheva 2001: Velcheva, Boryana. Imalo li e v starobalgarski redutsirani glasni i stegnati erove? – In: Kosev, K., et al. (eds). *V pamet na Petar Dinev. Traditsiya. Priemstvenost. Novatorstvo*. Sofia: Kirilo-Metodievski nauchen tsentar pri BAN, AI “Prof. Marin Drinov”, pp. 531 – 534.]
- Верещагин 1997: Верещагин, Евгений Михайлович. Особый парафраз

- канона на Рождество Христово в Декабрьской служебной минее конца XII – начала XIII в. (Публикация источника). – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXI, № 4, с. 18 – 36. [Vereshchagin 1997: Vereshhagin, Evgenij Mixajlovich. *Osoby'j parafraz kanona na Rozhdestvo Xristovo v Dekabr'skoj sluzhebnoj minee konca XII – nachala XIII v. (Publikaciya istochnika)*. – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXI, No. 4, pp. 18 – 36.]
- Верещагин 1999: Верещагин, Евгений Михайлович. Дальнейшее исследование Рождественского парафрастического канона Константина Преславского с иным прочтением концовки его акростиха. – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXIII, № 4, с. 25 – 40. [Vereshchagin 1999: Vereshhagin, Evgenij Mixajlovich. *Dal'nejshee issledovanie Rozhdestvenskogo parafrasticheskogo kanona Konstantina Preslavskogo s inu'm prochteniem koncovki ego akrostixa*. – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXIII, No. 4, pp. 25 – 40.]
- Верещагин 2001: Верещагин, Евгений Михайлович. *Церковнославянская книжность на Руси. Лингвотекстологические разыскания*. Москва: Директ-Медиа. [Vereshchagin 2001: Vereshhagin, Evgenij Mixajlovich. *Cerkovnoslavyanskaya knizhnost' na Rusi. Lingvotekstologicheskie razyskaniya*. Moskva: Direkt-Media.]
- Дикова 2023: Дикова, Екатерина. *Ритъм и наратив. Календарните двустиишия на Христофор Митиленски и техните южнославянски преводи*. София: Институт за балканистика с Център по тракология, БАН, 2023. [Dikova, E. *Ritam i narativ. Kalendarnite dvustishiya na Hristofor Mitilenski i tehните yuzhnoslavyanski prevodi*. Sofia: Institut za balkanistika s Tsentar po trakologiya, BAN, 2023.]
- Дуриданов и др. 1991: Дуриданов, Иван и др. *Грамматика на старобългарския език: Фонетика, морфология, синтаксис*. София: Издателство на БАН. [Duridanov et al. 1991: Duridanov, Ivan, et al. *Gramatika na starobalgarskiya ezik: Fonetika, morfologiya, sintaksis*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN.]
- Добрев 1969: Добрев, Иван. В защита на глаголическите писмена. – *Български език*, XIX, кн. 3, с. 241 – 246. [Dobrev 1969: Dobrev, Ivan. *V zashtita na glagolicheskите pismena*. – *Balgarski ezik*, XIX, No. 3, pp. 241 – 246.]
- Иванова-Мирчева, Харалампиев 1999: Иванова-Мирчева, Дора, Иван Харалампиев. *История на българския език*. Велико Търново: Фабер. [Ivanova-Mircheva, Haralampiev 1999: Ivanova-Mircheva, Dora, Ivan Haralampiev. *Istoriya na balgarskiya ezik*. Veliko Tarnovo: Faber.]
- Йовчева 2002: Йовчева, Мария. Старобългарската служба за св. Аполинарий Равенски от Климент Охридски. – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXVI, № 1, с. 17 – 32. [Yovcheva 2002: Yovcheva, Maria. *Starobalgarskata sluzhba za sv. Apolinariy Ravenski ot Kliment Ohridski*. – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXVI, No. 1, pp. 17 – 32.]
- Йовчева 2014: Йовчева, Мария. *Старобългарският служебен миней*. София:

- Боян Пенев. [Yovcheva 2014: Yovcheva, Maria. *Starobalgarskiyat sluzheben mineu*. Sofia: Boyan Penev.]
- Климент Охридски 2008: *Св. Климент Охридски. Слова и служби*. Съст. П. Петков, И. Христова-Шомова, А. Тотоманова. София: Св. Климент Охридски. [Kliment Ohridski 2008: *Sv. Kliment Ohridski. Slova i sluzhbi*. P. Petkov, I. Hristova-Shomova, A. Totomanova (eds). Sofia: Sv. Kliment Ohridski.]
- Койчева 2024: Койчева, Регина. Оспорваният изосилабизъм на старобългарската химнография. – В: Дараданова, Е. и др. (съст.). *Полемски и избори. Сборник с доклади от Международна конференция „Петнадесети славистични четения”, София, 16–18 юни 2022 г. Том 2. Литературознание. Културна антропология*. София: Факултет по славянски филологии, УИ „Св. Климент Охридски”, с. 26–33. [Koycheva 2024: Koycheva, Regina. Oспорvaniyat izosilabizam na starobalgarskata himnografiya. – In: Daradanova, E., et al. (eds). *Polemiki i izbori. Sbornik s dokladi ot Mezhdunarodna konferentsiya „Petnadeseti slavisticzni cheteniya”, Sofia, 16–18 juni 2022. Vol. 2. Literaturoznanie. Kulturna antropologiya*. Sofia: Fakultet po slavyanski filologii, UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski”, pp. 26 – 33.]
- Лашкова 2004: Лашкова, Лили. *Увод в сравнителната граматика на славянските езици*. София: Емас. [Lashkova 2004: Lashkova, Lili. *Uvod v sravnitelnata gramatika na slavyanskite ezitsi*. Sofia: Emas.]
- Миклас 2004: Miklas, Heinz. Гимнографическите памятници и развитие древнеславянских письменных систем. [Gimnograficheskie pamyatniki i razvitie drevneslavyanskix pis'menny'x sistem.] – In: Žigo, P., L. Matejko (eds). *Браславъ Б/BraSlav 2. Zbornik z medzinárodnej slavistickej konferencie, konanej na Filozofickej fakulte Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave dňa 13. a 14. novembra 2003*. [Bratislava]: KARPRINT, pp. 54 – 63.
- Милев, Михайлов 1979: Милев, Александър, Георги Михайлов. *Старогръцка граматика*. Четвърто изд. София: Наука и изкуство. [Milev, Mihaylov 1979: Milev, Aleksandar, Georgi Mihaylov. *Starogratska gramatika*. Chetvarto izd. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.]
- Милетич 1923: Милетич, Любомир. *Старобългарска граматика с кратък сравнителен оглед към новобългарския език (за средните учебни заведения)*. Девето изд. София: Държавна печатница. [Miletich 1923: Miletich, Lyubomir. *Starobalgarska gramatika s kratak sravnitelnen ogleed kam novobalgarskiya ezik (za srednite uchebni zavedeniya)*. Deveto izd. Sofia: Darzhavna pechatnitsa.]
- Мирчев 1972: Мирчев, Кирил. *Старобългарски език. Кратък граматичен очерк*. София: Наука и изкуство. [Mirchev 1972: Mirchev, Kiril. *Starobalgarski ezik. Kratak gramatichen ocherk*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.]
- Попов 1985: Попов, Георги. *Триодни произведения на Константин*

- Преславски.* (= Кирило-Методиевски студии, кн. 2.) София: Издателство на БАН. [Popov 1985: Popov, Georgi. *Triodni proizvedeniya na Konstantin Preslavski.* (= Kirilo-Methodievski studii, No. 2.) Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN.]
- Попов 1997: Попов, Георги. Новооткрит канон на Константин Преславски с тайнописно поетическо послание. – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXI, № 4, с. 3 – 17. [Popov 1997: Popov, Georgi. *Novootkrit kanon na Konstantin Preslavski s taunopisno poetichsko poslanie.* – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXI, No. 4, pp. 3 – 17.]
- Попов 1998: Попов, Георги. Канон за Рождество Христово от Константин Преславски. – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXII, № 4, с. 3 – 26. [Popov 1998: Popov, Georgi. *Kanon za Rozhdestvo Hristovo ot Konstantin Preslavski.* – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXII, No. 4, pp. 3 – 26.]
- Попов 2005: Попов, Георги. БОГОЯВЛЕНИЕ ТИ ПОИЖИШТЕ ХРИСТЕ СЛАВИМ (Старобългарски Канон за Богоявление). – *Старобългарска литература*, кн. 33 – 34 (Филологически изследвания в чест на Климентина Иванова за нейната 65-годишнина), с. 13 – 63. [Popov 2005: Popov, Georgi. *BOGOYAVLENIE TI POYQSHTE HRISTE SLAVIM* (Starobalgarski Kanon za Bogoyavlenie). – *Starobalgarska literatura*, vol. 33-34 (Filologicheski izsledvaniya v chest na Klimentina Ivanova za neynata 65-godishnina), pp. 13 – 63.]
- Попов 2006: Попов, Георги. Новооткритият старобългарски Канон за Неделя Петдесетница и неговият византийски образец. – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXX, № 3, с. 3 – 48. [Popov 2006: Popov, Georgi. *Novootkritiyat starobalgarski Kanon za Nedelya Petdesetnitsa i negoviyat vizantiyski obrazets.* – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXX, No. 3, pp. 3 – 48.]
- Попов 2008: Попов, Георги. Проблеми на химнографското творчество на Климент Охридски (Към въпроса за пентикостарния състав на староизводните славянски триоди). – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXXII, № 2, с. 3 – 58. [Popov 2008: Popov, Georgi. *Problemi na himnografskoto tvorchestvo na Kliment Ohridski* (Kam vaprosa za pentikostarniya sastav na staroizvodnite slavyanski triodi). – *Palaeobulgarica*, XXXII, No. 2, pp. 3 – 58.]
- Славова 2017: Славова, Татяна. *Старобългарски език*. София: Св. Климент Охридски, 2017. [Slavova 2017: Slavova, Tatyana. *Starobalgarski ezik*. Sofia: Sv. Kliment Ohridski, 2017.]
- Смядовски 1993: Смядовски, Стефан. *Българска кирилска епиграфика IX – XV век.* (= Studia Classica, т. 1.) София: Агата–А. [Smyadovski 1993: Smyadovski, Stefan. *Balgarska kirilska epigrafika IX – XV vek.* (= Studia Classica, t. 1.) Sofia: Agata–A.]
- Суботин-Голубовић 2012: Суботин-Голубовић, Татјана. *Минеј за јул и август из времена краља Милутина – рукопис Дечани 32.* – В: Ристић, Д. (гл. и одг. уредник). *Дечани у светлу археографских истраживања. Зборник радова*. Београд: Народна библиотека Србије, 2012, с. 191 – 202. [Subotin-Golubović 2012: Subotin-Golubović, Tatjana. *Minej za jul i avgust iz vremena*

kralja Milutina – rukopis Dečani 32. – In: Ristić, D. (editor-in-chief). *Dečani u svetlu arheografskih istraživanja. Zbornik radova*. Beograd: Narodna biblioteka Srbije, 2012, pp. 191 – 202.]

Ципора 2006: Схимонахиня Ципора (Вера Цачева). Съобщение за новооткрит старобългарски ямбически канон. – *Богословска мисъл*, XI, № 1 – 4, с. 212. [schema-nun Tsipora (Vera Tsacheva). Saobshtenie za novootkrit starobalgarski yambicheski kanon. – *Bogoslovska misal*, XI, No. 1 – 4, p. 212.]

Шишков 2017: Шишков, Стоян. *Старобългарска декламационна поезия и проза*. Пловдив: FastPrintBooks, 2017. [Shishkov 2017: Shishkov, Stoyan. *Starobalgarska deklamatsionna poeziya i proza*. Plovdiv: FastPrintBooks, 2017.]

Якобсон 2000: Якобсон, Роман. *Езикът на поезията*. София: Захарий Стоянов. [Yakobson 2000: Yakobson, Roman. *Ezikat na poeziyata*. Sofia: Zahariy Stoyanov.]