

Yannis Kakridis
Universität Bern
Institut für Slavische Sprachen und Literaturen
Länggassstr. 49, CH-3012 Bern
kakridis@issl.unibe.ch

PROBLEMS OF LEMMATIZATION IN
BILINGUAL INDICES TO CHURCH SLAVONIC
TRANSLATIONS OF THE 14th CENTURY:
THE CASE OF THE *SYNAXARIA IN TRIODIUM ET
PENTECOSTARIUM*

Lemmatization involves grouping together word-form-tokens to word-form-types and word-form-types to lexemes. In the case of bilingual indices to Church Slavonic translations from Greek, this process has to be carried out for both languages. In addition, the lexicographer must be able to determine the Church Slavonic equivalent of a given Greek form and to assess its appropriateness. Late translations offer an additional difficulty: the reconstruction of words not attested in the Old Church Slavonic canon and which may even not have existed at the time when our oldest manuscripts were written. This paper discusses some common pitfalls of this process. Examples are taken from the Slavonic-Greek and the Greek-Slavonic indices of the edition of the *Synaxaria in triodion et pentecostarion*.

The *Synaxaria in triodion et pentecostarion* — a collection of 31 short texts to be read aloud in church during selected services of the Lenten and Pentecostal period — were written by the Byzantine author Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos at the beginning of the 14th century. The Slavonic translation was made shortly afterwards, in the first half of the 14th century, by the Bulgarian translator Zacchaeus the Philosopher. The earliest witnesses of this translation are MS 23 and 24 of the Slavonic collection of Saint Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai, a Lenten Triodion and a Pentecostarion (Feast Triodion) respectively. Around the middle of the 14th

century, Zacchaeus' translation was reworked, probably in the Bulgarian town of Tărnovo, from where it also reached the East Slavic territories.

Zacchaeus' translation was edited in 2010 by L. Taseva. In accordance with editorial practice in Slavic studies, Taseva reproduces as accurately as possible the text of the two oldest manuscripts and gives variants from other manuscripts (58 in total) which contain the translation of Zacchaeus, either in its original form or according to the redaction of Tărnovo. The Greek text is not reproduced, but can be found in any printed edition of the Τριώδιον and the Πεντηκοστάριον. Of course, the text offered by these modern editions is not exactly the same as the text from which Zacchaeus made his translation. To assess the Slavonic text, it is therefore necessary to turn to the Greek manuscript tradition. In a separate apparatus, Taseva offers Greek variants, mostly from the printed editions and from the Bodleian MS Auct. E.5.14 (1303–1309)¹, probably the earliest surviving manuscript of Xanthopoulos' Greek original. The variants are given wherever the Slavonic translation differs either from the printed editions, or from the Bodleian manuscript, or from both. This means that the apparatus contains sometimes significant fragments of Greek text that have no Slavonic translation (e.g. Taseva 2010:465, 507). Furthermore, when one of the two Greek witnesses (the printed Τριώδιον/Πεντηκοστάριον and Bodleian Auct. E.5.14) omits parts of the text that have been translated, this text is not reproduced. This is especially annoying wherever the omission occurs in the printed edition: in these cases, readers who probably have at their disposal only this text must resort to the index to gain at least an approximate picture of the Greek original (e.g. 436², Sin. 24, 362v, –11, cf. Πεντηκοστάριον, p. 234).

The edition of the *Synaxaria* was hailed as a “crowning achievement of a decade of excellent scholarship” (Sels 2013:449), a work which stands on a par with the well-known editions of L. Sadnik, R. Aitzetmüller and E. Weiher (Ilieva 2013:259). This praise also applies to the indices, which are described as “yet another important contribution of Taseva's careful and precise work” (Miltenov 2012:254). According to another reviewer, they have been compiled with precision and bear testimony to the important work of L. Taseva in the field of Slavic lexicography (Tomova 2012:323).

The reviews contain virtually no criticism.³ We can therefore expect the

¹ <http://www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/dept/scwmss/wmss/online/medieval/auctarium/auctarium.html> (24.04.2016), cf. Taseva 2010:32. On the preceding page the manuscript is erroneously dated to 1305–1309.

² Simple numbers refer henceforth to pages of Taseva (2010).

³ See also Crvenkovska 2013, Dimitrov 2012, Dimitrova 2012 and 2014, Nikolov

indices to the *Synaxaria* to reflect the state of the art in Slavonic lexicography. This is why they have been chosen as the basis for the present analysis.

The first task of a lexicographer is to determine which word forms belong to the same lexeme and which do not (lemmatization). In many cases, this task was obviously beyond the abilities of the author of the indices. Here are some of them:

- The article of **въздвигнѣти** combines forms of this verb with forms of **въздвизати** (**въздвизѣтъ** Sin 23, 158v24; **въздвизѣтъ** Sin 23, 310r26, 385v8), the article of **достигнѣти** combines forms of this verb with forms of **достизати** (**достижѣтъ** Sin 23, 160r3–4);⁴
- In the article of **двигнѣти** there are no forms of **двигнѣти**: the participle **двигнѣди**, which is attested twice in the *Synaxaria*, is a form of **двизати**, not **двигнѣти** (Sin 23, 22r10–11, 38r2);
- The article of **сѣдѣлати** lists several forms of **сѣдѣати** (Sin 24, 109r19, 128v5, 361v23–24, 362r1, 362r19–20), the article of **сѣсти** lists several forms of **сѣдѣти** (Sin 23, 89v23; Sin 24, 10r28, 83v9, 108r19, 222v25);
- Sin 24, 221v15 **от(ъ)риче-ца**, i.e. **от(ъ)ричѣтъ са** (gr. ἀπαρνείται) was lemmatized as **отърици са**, Sin 23, 238r6 **облекѣѣж** (gr. κουφίζων) as **облькынѣти**.⁵ These are forms of **отърицати са** resp. **обльгѣяти** which were put into the lemma of the corresponding perfective verb;
- There is also the opposite mistake: Sin 23, 390r6–7 **сѣѣршѣж са** (i.e. **сѣѣршѣж са**, gr. ταπεινωθέντα) was lemmatized as **сѣѣрѣти**⁶ (instead of **сѣѣрѣти**), Sin 24, 10v7 **поощрени** (gr. διερεθισθέντες) as **поощриати** (instead of **поощрѣти**);
- In view of all this, it doesn't come as a surprise that the article of **дати** presents us also with forms of **даѣти** (**даѣж**, i.e. **даѣж**, see Sin 23, 30v11 and Sin 24, 10r3).

The indices surprise us even with entire articles that contain not a single form of the respective lexeme. The case of **двигнѣти** was already mentioned in 2013.

⁴ Slavonic quotations are given in simplified orthography: all diacritics except **пѣрок** are omitted; superscript letters are inserted in their proper place in the line; abbreviated words are written out in full and missing letters supplemented in brackets; in addition, we replace **і** and **ї** by **и**, **ѡ** by **о**, **ѣ** by **ѣ** and unify the different variants of **юс большой** into **ѣ**.

⁵ Sic! Instead of **облькынѣти**.

⁶ Again, there is an additional mistake in this form: it should be **сѣѣрѣти**, not **сѣѣрѣти**. The confusion of **ѣ** and **ѣ** is not uncommon in the indices; see below for more examples.

tioned above. In Sin 23, fol. 89v6–8 we read:

[JohnChrysostom] κοῦπιно и писанне съблюдаж. и ни же пакы прилеже, писмени.

The corresponding Greek text reads:

[Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος] ὁμοῦ καὶ τὴν γραφὴν διασώζων, καὶ οὐδὲ πάλιν ἐπιμένων τῷ γράμματι. (Τριώδιον, p. 155, 11–12).

In spite of being coordinated with another present participle (съблюдаж) and in spite of being the equivalent of the Greek participle ἐπιμένων, прилеже (=прилежж) was categorized by L. Taseva not as the present active participle of прилежати, but as a form of прилеши, i.e. as an aorist. The same happened to the прилеже of Sin 23, 30r16, which is coordinated with от(ъ)-стжаж and corresponds again to ἐπιμένων (Τριώδιον, p. 29, 31):

старѣи оубо естъ. иже въ добрѣ и въ заповѣдехъ присно в(о)жнихъ прилеже, и николиже от(ъ) него от(ъ)стжаж. (Sin 23, 30r15–17)

Ὁ μὲν οὖν πρεσβύτερός ἐστιν, ὁ ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῷ καλῷ ἀεὶ ἐπιμένων τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ μηδ’ ὅπως αὐτοῦ ἀφιστάμενος (Τριώδιον, p. 29, 30–31).

Even the form прилежжших(ъ) of Sin. 23, 50r11 was put into the lemma of прилеши. In fact, the verb прилеши is not attested at all in the *Synaxaria*. The same is true for сълеши (Sin 24, 361r4 сълежжша for κατακείμενον, Πεντηκοστάριον, p. 202, 33).

On the other hand, there are words in the *Synaxaria* that do not appear in the index. A rather trivial example is the vocative образе о(тъ)нь in Sin 23, 161v2 (Εἰκὼν τοῦ Πατρὸς, Τριώδιον, p. 313, 18), which was changed without apparent reason to отыъ.

The second task of the lexicographer is to determine the canonical form (lemma) of a given lexeme. Again, the indices to the *Synaxaria* surprise us with some rather unorthodox solutions. Sin 23, 23v21–22 прѣд(ъ)оугеτοιє, the past passive participle of прѣдѣоугати (προκατελημμένον, see Τριώδιον, p. 16, 24), was obviously analysed as the present participle of the ghost verb прѣдѣоугатовати. Sin 23, 21v25–26 винослововжжца became through haplography винослововати instead of винослововати. According to the indices, the infinitive of съизеляюєтъ Sin 24, 84r12 is not съизельвати, but съизелявати, and the infinitive of запоржѣаше (Sin 24, 363v14–15) — запоржѣавати (instead of запоржѣати). The mistakes are not limited to verbs: the nominative of Sin 23, 22r19–20 краєгранесци is, according to the indices, not краєгранески but the highly im-

plausible краеграно.⁷ The adverb скрочно (Sin 24, 362r27) is transformed into съкръвно; it is in fact derived from the adjective съкръвно, which in turn goes back to съкровъ 'hideout, refuge'.

An additional source of mistakes is Taseva's decision to present the lemmata in the form they (would) have in the *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského* (Prague) and the *Starobългарски речник* (Sofia). Thus, all Middle Bulgarian forms are relegated to the status of occasional deviations from the norms of Old Church Slavonic. Is this a viable solution? What is the infinitive of the aorist истры in истры in власы свонди нозъ его истры (Sin 24, 31v3–4)? Taseva suggests neither истрѣти nor истрыти, but истрыти, which is certainly not Old Church Slavonic. Apart from such inevitable compromises, the indices to the *Synaxaria* contain also numerous blunders: обгытѣль (instead of обнтѣль), вепль (instead of въпль), ослогонение, ослогоньствне (instead of осьлогонение, осьлогоньствне), нѣдрьникъ (instead of нѣдрникъ), съотжждение (instead of съотожждение), въжеши (alongside въждеши), изреши (alongside раздрюшити), etc.

Some mistakes are systematic. Taseva claims to eliminate the secondary [dz]: „Вторичен африкат s не се зачита (свѣровиднѣши>звѣровиднѣ, польса>польза [sic!])“ (542). Whereas the [dz] of звѣрь is a later development, the [dz] of польса goes back to the third palatalization of the velars; in this word, it is [z], not [dz] that is secondary. In contradiction to her own principles, Taseva writes throughout польза, непользньство, къназь, and also подвижатиса, растръзати, протазати, отъбѣзати (in the last verb, the [dz] is due to analogy; still, it cannot be regarded as secondary, since it did not arise from [z]). Furthermore, Taseva obviously is not able to keep apart ѣ from я: тъ же (sc. Jesus), маллово оухо ицѣлѣтъ (Sin 24, 45r25–26) was lemmatized as ицѣлѣти instead of ицѣлѣти. The same mistake is repeated in Sin 23, 89r2, Sin 24, 68r14 and Sin 24, 222v29; ицѣлѣти is another word of the index that is nowhere attested in the *Synaxaria*. In the same vein, we find възпомышлѣти, срамлѣти, промышлѣти са alongside поставлѣти, съставлѣти, оуподоблѣти; прѣтварѣтиса, but сътварѣти. One cannot but wonder what an *index a tergo* of Taseva's creative lemmatizations would look like.

Needless to say, there are also (besides numerous typos) mistakes in the lemmatization of the Greek text. Together with the translator, Taseva regards the ἔφθη of ἔφθη γὰρ καὶ πρότερον ὡσεὶ δέκα μυριάδας Χριστιανῶν διαφθείρας Χοσροῆς “Chosroes had already managed to kill about a hundred thousand Christians” (Τριώδιον, p. 695, 28–29) as a form of φημί, not φθάνω (cf. Sin 23, 390r10–11: рет(ε) во са и прѣжде, како до десѣт(ь) тѣмъ христианъ растанъ хорон). The translation of ἀπολύτων by

⁷ In Middle Bulgarian, neuters on -нѣ regularly take the ending -ми in the instrumental plural, see Duridanov (1956:133).

от(ъ)погѣша жимѣмъ in the same context (Τριώδιον, p. 695, 29–30 = Sin 23, 390r,12) leads to the lemmatization of the former as ἀπολύω (instead of ἀπόλλυμι). The ἐπιβεβηκώς of Τριώδιον, p. 815, 31 and 816, 10 (cf. вѣѣдѣ viz. вѣѣдѣ in Sin 24, 10r13 and 10v2) belongs, according to the indices, not to ἐπιβαίνω but to the ghost verb ἐπιβιβαίω, the καθήμενος of Τριώδιον 155, 20 not to κάθημαι but to καθίστημι (cf. Sin 23, 89v23 ѣдѣдѣ). In view of such mistakes, it does not come as a surprise that more complicated cases have not been analysed properly. In the Πεντηκοστάριον we read (p. 83, 28): παρήκασι δὲ ταῦτα πάντα οἱ Εὐαγγελισταὶ ἀναγράψασθαι “The writers of the Gospel failed to mention this”. The form παρήκασι belongs to the verb παρίεμαι ‘praetermittere’ – either as third person plural of the aorist (instead of παρεῖσαν, cf. the singular: παρήκα, παρήκας, παρήκε) or, more probably, as third person plural of the perfect (with η instead of ει). The manuscript from which Zacchaeus made his translation certainly had παρείκασι which he mistook as a form of παρεικάζω ‘liken, compare’, hence his translation (Sin 24, 129v24–26): оуподѣ(о)вншж же ѣд си вѣѣдѣ бл҃гоуѣстїи напнсаѣти. Taseva, blissfully unaware of all this, regards παρήκασι as a form of παρήκω!

This last example points to another weakness of the indices. In principle, imprecise equivalents are marked in the index with an empty (◊) and incorrect equivalents with a full diamond (◆). Although none of the numerous meanings of παρήκω (‘to have come alongside, to lie beside, stretch along; to reach or extend to or towards; to come forth, appear; of Time, to be gone by, past’) can make of this verb a correct equivalent of оуподѣвншж, there is no corresponding mark in the index. The equation of ραζογμѣнѣ = συνεκτικός ‘fit for holding together’ is equally considered normal, even if it is obvious that the translator confused the Greek adjective with συνετός ‘quick at apprehending, understanding, intelligent, sagacious’. In the Πεντηκοστάριον (p. 340, 7) Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos writes: δόξα ἐπικούρειός τις ἐκράτει, “there prevailed a certain Epicurean tenet”. The translator confused ἐπικούρειος with ἐπικουρικός ‘auxiliary’ and translated this as слава нѣкаа помошнѣа одрѣжаше (Sin 24, 250r12–13). Again, the equation помошнѣнѣ = ἐπικούρειος appears without a diamond in the index. The translation of θέλγουσα (Τριώδιον, 29, 36) with палашн (Sin 23, 30r26) was equally considered unproblematic, even if it is obvious that the translator (or perhaps some scribe) confused θέλγω ‘to stroke with magic power, to charm, enchant, spell-bind’ with φλέγω ‘to burn, to scorch’.

In addition, there are many instances of unproblematic (albeit somewhat free) translations that were marked as wrong in the indices to the

Synaxaria. In the Πεντηκοστάριον we read (340, 19–20): Νίψασθαι δὲ αὐτὸν προτρέπει, ἵνα μὴ τις τῇ ἐκεῖθεν γῆ καὶ τῷ πηλῷ δώῃ τὴν θεραπείαν “He (Jesus) urges him (the blind man) to wash his eyes, so that nobody should think that the earth and the clay of that place could cure (blindness)”. The verb δίδωμι is used here not in its literal meaning, but as a verb of propositional attitude (cf. the similar development in the meaning of the English verb *to attribute*). Zacchaeus’ translation makes perfect sense: да не кто тамошнеж, землеж и брениемъ нещюгоетъ цѣлеж (Sin 24, 250v3–5). Nevertheless, in the index непыщевати is marked as an incorrect Slavic equivalent. Equally unjustified is the marking of погрѣзити as an equivalent of βαπτίζω ‘to dip repeatedly, dip under’ and заπεριγύρειν as an equivalent of κυρώω ‘to make valid’ with a black diamond. The empty diamond, which signals “free” or even “imprecise” translations is also used by Taseva with undue strictness: безмъзднѣ is a quite unproblematic equivalent of ἀδέκαστος ‘unbribed’, събѣтитѣ of ἀπόβασις in its meaning ‘result, issue’, etc.

In fact, the proper evaluation of the equivalents cannot be achieved without a thorough knowledge of the Church Slavonic tradition. In the case of the author of the indices to the *Synaxaria*, this knowledge is obviously lacking. The text devoted to Pentecost Monday in the Πεντηκοστάριον (p. 531, 3) informs its readers (or rather, hearers) that the Holy Spirit is called ὅτι ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, φωναῖς ἀλαλήτοις πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, “because He makes intercession for us to God with voices which cannot be uttered”. Any medieval reader would recognize here the quotation from Rom. 8,26, and so did Zacchaeus who translated: яко молитъ сѧ о нас(ъ) гласы, незыглаголанъици къ в(о)у (Sin 24, 370r11–12). Even if the Apostolus Christopolitanus has прѣповѣдають and the Synodal Bible ходатайствоуетъ, the translation of ἐντυγχάνειν with молити сѧ is perfectly legitimate; in fact, it appears in the modern Serbian version of Vuk Karadžić (сам дух моли се за нас уздисањем неискзанијем).⁸ Sadly, the whole meaning of the passage, together with its Biblical context, remained obscure to the author of the indices who decided without further ado to mark the equivalence of ἐντυγχάνω = молити сѧ as incorrect. For similar reasons, we cannot agree with the qualification of the translation of θριαμβεύειν ‘triumph, lead in triumph’ with ѡвнчати as “imprecise” or even “free”. This is a standard equivalence in the Church Slavonic translations that has its origin in the Epistle to the Colossians (2,15).

Sometimes the mistakes in the indices are the result of an erroneous syntactic analysis. Even simple constructions can cause trouble to our le-

⁸ Kałużniacki 1896:124; Novyj Zavět 1959:558; Karadžić 1974 (1847):312.

xicographer. In Sin 23, 160v15–16 we read: *ѣмоу же прѣмо, ѡφηλα поставишѣ* (Τριώδιον, p. 312, 29–30 οὗ κατέναντι τὸν Θεόφιλον ἔστησε). Taseva didn't recognize that *прѣмо* is here, in imitation of *κατέναντι*, a postposition and sets up a separate entry for *прѣмо* + genitive (*прѣмо ѡφηла*). In Sin 23, 150v14–15 *нєразоумѣжшюу* (*διαπορουμένου*, Τριώδιον, p. 292, 25) obviously was not recognized as a *dativus absolutus*; it appears in the index not as a word form of (*нє*)*разоумѣти*, but as the nominalized participle *нєразоумѣани!*

In view of all this, it seems superfluous to engage in a theoretical discussion about the principles on which the indices were built. Still, one point merits discussion. Taseva decided to separate passive and reflexive uses of *ca*-verbs (544). She is obviously unaware of the fact that *ca*-verbs cover a broad range of meanings that cannot be put into just two categories. But even if we grant this, her solutions prove very often to be wrong: so, she regards as passive the *нєдоумѣжшюу ca* of Sin 23, 150v8 (Τριώδιον, p. 292, 22 *διαπορουμένου*); the *лишиша (-шѣ, -ше) ca* of Sin 23, 40r14 and 52r18, even if it contrasts with the *лишень быс(тъ)* of 89v24; the *прилагахъ ca* of Sin 23, 385v12 (τοῦ μνησὶ ζῶντι, χριστοῦ *прилагахъ ca* = πολλοὶ αὐτὸν ὀρώντες, Χριστῷ προσετίθεντο, Τριώδιον, p. 795, 37–38); and even the *вѣстрѣгнѣ ca* of *от(ъ) онѣдоу самовластно вѣстрѣгнѣ ca* (Sin 24, 16v6, Τριώδιον, p. 831, 16–17 *κακείθεν αὐτεξουσίως ἀναρῶαγείς*). This means that a reader who wants to investigate the use of *ca*-verbs in the *Synaxaria* has to check out every single verbal lemma in the index — an uneconomic solution which could have been easily avoided.

Our analysis is not exhaustive, but even the results obtained so far warrant the following conclusion: The indices to the *Synaxaria* are not an example of “excellent scholarship”, but rather the opposite. They should be used with great caution and cannot serve as a basis for comprehensive dictionaries of Church Slavonic.

The causes of this are threefold. First, the fact that the author listed in her doctoral dissertation the name of the East Bosnian town of *Goražde* (< **gorazd-j-e*) as an example of the Bulgarian development of **dj* into [žd], rises in our opinion the question of the author's competence in this subject (in historical linguistics).⁹ Second, there is a certain tendency to discard instances where former nasal vowels are not written with *jus*; our author probably regarded the preservation of *а* and especially *ѣ* as proof of the Bulgarian character of the translation.¹⁰ The third cause of the shortcomings of the indices is bad editorial practice. Taseva contends that her aim

⁹ See Taseva 1998:56.

¹⁰ The extent to which *ѣ* and *а* are being replaced by *ε*, *ο*γ etc. is also underestimated by Popova (1999).



was to document Zacchaeus' translation, but the basis of her edition are the two earliest manuscripts. This fundamental flaw is carried over into the indices. It is not clear whether the object of lexicographic description in the indices is Zacchaeus' language or the language of the scribes of Sin 23 and 24, who may already not have been able to tell apart *прилеже* from *прилежа* or *сѣде* from *сѣда*. To a certain extent, it is their confusion that lies at the root of the confusion that reigns in the indices. We can illustrate this if we turn to another edition. Even if Taseva nowhere tells her reader, a version of the *Synaxaria* that is very close to Zacchaeus' text had been printed many times before as part of the Church Slavonic Triodion resp. Pentecostarion. In a Triodion that was printed in Moscow in 1649–1650 (Zernova 1958:71, № 224) the passages from the *Триодъ постная* quoted above read:

Старѣйшии оубо естъ, иже в' добрѣ и в' заповѣдехъ присно б(о)жнихъ прилѣжа (= Russian Church Slavonic for *прилежа*), и николи же от(ъ) него от(ъ)стоупаа (fol. 23r)

[John Chrysostom] в' коупѣ. и писанне соблюдаа, ниже пакы прилѣжа писмени (fol. 113v)

It may sound like a paradox, but a Church edition of the 17th century in some respects provides a more useful tool for the study of Church Slavonic translation techniques than the copying of individual manuscripts that prevails in Slavic studies nowadays.

Acknowledgments: David Britain, Simeon Dekker, Céline Fournier, V. B. Krys'ko.

References

- Crvenkovska, Emilija. 2013. Review of Taseva (2010). *Slavistični studii* 15–16, 475–478.
- Dimitrov, Kamen. 2012. Review of Taseva (2010). *Byzantinoslavica* 70, 361–367.
- Dimitrova, Margaret. 2012. Review of Taseva (2010). *Scripta & e-scripta* 10–11, 494–495.
- Dimitrova, Margaret. 2014. Review of Taseva (2010). *Slovo* 64, 223–229.
- Duridanov, Ivan. 1956. *Kām problemata na razvoja na bālgarskija ezik ot sintetizām kām analitizām*. Sofija. Also in: *Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet. Filologičeski fakultet* 51:3, 1955. 87–272.
- Ilieva, Tatjana. 2013. Review of Taseva (2010). *Palaeoslavica* 21:2, 250–259.
- Kałużniacki, Aemilianus. 1896. *Actus epistolaeque apostolorum palaeoslove-*



- nice. Ad fidem codicis Christinopolitani saeculo XII^o scripti edidit Aemilianus Katužniacki.* Wien.
- Karadžić, Vuk Stefanović. 1974 (1847). *Novi zavjet gospoda našega Isusa Hrista.* Beograd: Prosveta (Sabrana dela Vuka Karadžića, Knjiga deseta. Priredili Vladimir Mošin, Dimitrije Bogdanović).
- Miltenov, Yavor. 2012. Review of Taseva (2010). *Orientalia christiana periodica* 78, 252–254.
- Nikolov, Georgi. 2013. Review of Taseva (2010). *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 106, 1213 (Nr. 5155).
- Novyj zavět. 1959. *Novyj zavět g(ospo)da našego Ii(su)sa Chr(i)sta. The New Testament in Slavonic.* Cambridge: University Press.
- Popova, Tanja. 1999. Kolko račice sa pisali Posten (23) i Cveten (24) triod ot manastira „Sveta Ekaterina“ v Sinaj? *Palaeobulgarica* 23:2, 41–52.
- Sels, Lara. 2013. Review of Taseva (2010). *Byzantion* 83, 444–449.
- Taseva, Lora. 1998. *Bălgarska toponimija ot grăcki i srăbski srednovjekovni dokumenti.* Sofija: RIK “Litera”.
- Taseva, Lora. 2010. *Triodnite sinaksari v srednovjekovnata slavjanska knižnina. Tekstologično izsledvane. Izdanie na Zakcheevija prevod. Slovoukazateli.* Freiburg i.Br.: Weiher.
- Tomova, Elena. 2012. Review of Taseva (2010). *Starobălgarska literatura* 45–46, 318–323.
- Zernova, Antonina Sergeevna. 1958. *Knigi kirillovskoj pečati, izdannye v Moskve v XVI-XVII vekach. Svodnyj katalog.* Moskva.
- Τριώδιον κατανυκτικόν. 2010. Περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν ἀνήκουσαν αὐτῷ ἀκολουθίαν τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μεγάλης Τεσσαρακοστῆς. Ἔκδοσις Γ'. Ἀθῆναι : Ἀποστολικὴ Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος.
- Πεντηκοστάριον Χαρομόσυνον. 2010. Περιέχον τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πάσχα μέχρι τῆς τῶν Ἁγίων Πάντων Κυριακῆς ἀνήκουσαν αὐτῷ ἀκολουθίαν. Ἔκδοσις Γ'. Ἀθῆναι : Ἀποστολικὴ Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος.

Problemi lematizacije u dvojezičnim indeksima crkvenoslavenskih prijevoda iz XIV. stoljeća na primjeru *Sinaksara u triodu i pentekostaru*

Sažetak

Sinaksari u triodu i pentekostaru kratki su tekstovi o osnovnim blagdanima pashalnoga ciklusa. Godine 2010. izišlo je izdanje njihova crkvenoslavenskoga prijevoda, nastaloga u XIV. stoljeću i sačuvanoga u dva rukopisa zbirke samostana sv. Katarine na Sinaju. Ovaj je članak posvećen analizi slavensko-grčkih i grčko-slavenskih indeksa koji prate izdanje crkvenoslavenskoga prijevoda. Ukazuje se na mnogobrojne pogreške u indeksima: krive analize gramatičkih oblika, normalizirane oblike koji ne odgovaraju staroslavenskoj normi, površnu evaluaciju prevodilačkih ekvivalenata i dr. Neke pogreške imaju elementarni karakter, kao što je, na primjer, zbrka u upotrebi znakova <ѣ> i <ѣ>. U konačnici indeksi sadrže niz leksema kojih nema u vrelima. Oni, dakle, ne mogu poslužiti kao pouzdan izvor za sastavljanje rječnika crkvenoslavenskoga jezika XIV. stoljeća.

Ključne riječi: Crkvenoslavenska literatura, sinaksar, indeks, lematizacija, 14. stoljeće

Keywords: Church Slavonic literature, Synaxarium, index, lemmatization, 14th century

