

Marija Paunova
Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Macedonia
mpaunova@ukim.edu.mk

Declension of nouns in the texts from the Ohrid Literary School

The Old Church Slavonic language had a rich system of noun forms. However, in the history of the inflected system of nouns there were innovations and changes noticed in the canonical manuscripts, which were later confirmed and intensified in the Church Slavonic period. These changes led to loosening of the declension and later to shedding of the synthetic way of expressing the relations between the words. This radical transformation of the grammatical structure took a longer period of time, from IX up to the XIV Century, because the above mentioned activities gave a concrete result and were finished by the XV Century according to Duridanov (Česko, 1970:11).

The disintegration of the synthetic flexion of the nouns according to Ugrinova-Skalovska (1978:87-91) is made through the following processes: mixing of the stems, an increasingly frequent use of case forms with prepositions, the wrong use of the case form with inadequate prepositions, the greater use of the general case form (mostly accusative) and similar. The above-mentioned processes resulted in reorganisation of the noun paradigms. As a result of the mutual influence (mixing) of the noun stems and the case suffixes of the nouns, the number of the noun stems was reduced; the unproductive noun bases were eliminated; the difference between the palatal and the non-palatal noun declension was eliminated; the functions of some cases were expanded; certain inflections were not expressed; some inflections were crossed, etc.

These developments were caused by various factors and thus, when talking about the declension system of the nouns, we must inevitably take into account the contacts with the neighbouring, above all, the Balkan languages; the penetration of the characteristics of the vernacular in the written language; the influence of the morphologic analogy, as well as the influence of the phonetic rules. Taking into account the mentioned factors we will explain how the system of case forms of nouns reacted.

The development in the history of the noun case system will be illustrated with an accent on the declension composition of those texts related with the activities of the Ohrid Literary School, starting from the 12th century until the beginning of the 15th century. The subject of the research will be the representative monuments, more precisely: Dobromir's Evangeliary, Bitola Triodion, Bologna Psalters, Zagreb Triodion, Radomir's Psalters, Macedonian Gospel.¹

The paper will focus mostly on the comparison of the noun system in the previously mentioned Church Slavonic texts with a traditional situation. At the same time it will focus on those forms that display innovations in relation to the canonical paradigms.

¹ The examples for this article have been taken from the publications of the manuscripts: S. Pop-Atanasova, *Лингвистичка анализа на Битолскиот триод*, ИМЈ, Скопје. 1995; R. Ugrinova-Skalovska, V. Despodova, *Добромирово евангелие II*, Скопје -Прилеп, 1998; E. Crvenkovska, *Загребски триод*, ИМЈ, Скопје, 1999; L. Makarijoska, *Радомиров псалтир*, ИМЈ, Скопје. 1997; V. Kostovska, *Македонско четвооевангелие*, ИМЈ, Скопје, 2003. Examples for Bologna Psalters are taken from Česko, E. V. 1970. *История болгарского склонения*, Издательство „Наука“ Москва and Georgievski, G. 2001. *Македонистички студии*, Менора, Скопје.

This will be an attempt to show if and to what extent the texts of the Ohrid Literary School follow the general tendency for deviation from the condition typical for the canonical texts.

In order to demonstrate the deviations from the Old Church Slavonic norm, the forms of the nouns from the above mentioned text will be presented according to their gender denotations. We take into account the tendency in the history of noun declination to unite the different stems and their case paradigms by gender (Česko 1970:90). As Česko believes, the unification by gender denotation is not absolute subordination of one type to another, because flexions from different types of changes are chosen in order to preserve the different functions of the forms. We decided to review the deviations in the declinations by the gender of the nouns also because of the current situation of declinations by gender². We look at the stems in which each of the three genders can appear and focus on the changes by cases in accordance with their sequence in the paradigm³. We think that in this way we will get a more complete and more systematic idea about the deviations in the case system of nouns.

The masculine nouns

In the history of declination of nouns there have been a series of linguistic novelties and deviations from the general, codified norm of the Old Church Slavonic language. The masculine nouns gravitate towards that general tendency, so that the undermining of the case system and the demolition of the synthetic elements of the language are a result, as we have mentioned previously, of a process of influence, i.e. the mixing of the different noun stems and the different case endings (Česko 1970:113).

The most pronounced influence on the **o-/jo-stem** nouns is that of the **ŭ-stem**, which according to Duridanov (1993:171) is conditioned by the equal flexion of some cases (nom. and accus. sg. of -z and accus. pl. of -zi) and the general grammatical gender.

The permeation of the **ŭ-stem** in the **o-stem** is registered through a large number of documented forms in *the dative singular* of -ови (beside the archaic forms of -оу). This morpheme spread to other declinations, beyond the -ŭ-stem nouns, at the start of the Old Slavonic period, especially among the personal names, in foreign words, as well as among some common nouns denoting living creatures: адамови 90r, братови 95v (Bit)4; архитриклинови 126b15, иссо̀ви 8b8, 49b14, 116b15, снѡ̀ви 136a9, 137a5 (Dbm); давзидови 25.3, спѡ̀ви 8.4, 45.4, члѡ̀кови 44.2 (Bon); глигориѣви великому̀ и славному̀ 23r2, ѡ̀ако и петровы 15r22, пилатовы 157v (Zag); авраамови 110v/9, бѡ̀ви 34/3, 37v/7, 61/3, дѡ̀дѡ̀ви 10/7 (Rdm); ѡ̀сиѡ̀ви Mt15,1, ѡ̀со̀ви Mt15.26, Mt26,49 (Mkd). Some nouns are found only in their older form: пилато̀у, ио̀ано̀у, носифо̀у, симо̀но̀у (Dbm). In the Zagreb Triodion there is a contaminated form of the dative inflexion to the o-stem (-оу) and the ŭ-stem (-ови): самьсо̀ново̀у рѣвнова̀ла еси ѡ̀ дшѣ 97v4. We quote a limited number of examples with the singular dative inflexion from ŭ-stem of the inani-

² This refers to those Slavonic languages that kept the synthetic flexion.

³ The paradigm of R. Ugrinova-Skalovska, *Old Church Slavonic Language*, University of Cyril and Methodius – Skopje, 1979, has been used. In the Old Church Slavonic textbooks the sequence of the cases in the paradigm is not the same.

4. The subject of the research are Church Slavonic texts of the Ohrid Literary School. Abbreviations of the mss are used in this paper: Dbm - Dobromir's Evangeliary; Bit - Bitola Triodion; Bon - Bologna Psalters; Zag - Zagreb Triodion; Rdm - Radomir's Psalters; Mkd - Macedonian Gospel. The used abbreviations of the manuscripts have been taken from the review of abbreviations of sources by RSCM, IMJ – Skopje, tome III, 2001, 208.

mate nouns, objects, in cases of personification (Vajan 1952:113): грѣхови 67r2x, постови 50v, змови 94v (Bit).

The inflexions of the *ŷ*-stem enter other cases too: in *genitive singular* there is the inflexion –оу: страшнааго херѡвимѡ и чюднааго серафимѡ и мирѡ тѣрца 77v (Bit); in *nominative plural* are confirmed the forms домовѣ, даровѣ, бѣсовѣ (Bon)4, родовѣ Mt1,17 (Mkd). According to Duridanov (s. Česko 1970:118) in some manuscripts the nominative plural forms of –ови are the result of the contamination of the flexion –и of the o-stem and the flexion –овѣ of the *ŷ*-stem: жидови, грѣхови (Bon). In *genitive plural* the widely spread ending –овъ has been confirmed: грѣховъ 41v, 94v, 96v (Bit); воловъ 5a6, домовъ 87a2, снѣвъ 92a7 (Dbm); вѣковъ, грѣховъ, жидовъ (Bon); ѿ грѣховъ 148/16, 148v/3-4 (Rdm); градовъ Mr6,33, Mt14,13, родовъ Mt1,17 (Mkd). In *instrumental plural* there are forms with the inflexion –ми: грѣхъми 8r, 44r (Bit); грѣхъми 40-4, 80-2 (Bon). Duridanov (s. Česko 1970:115) sees the reason for borrowing the flexion –ми in the need to avoid the homonymy of the nominative and the instrumental after replacing зѣ with и. Vajan (1952:111) talks about generalisation of the plural inflexion for the instrumental –ми to all masculine nouns ending with –ъ.

Among the nouns **jo-stem** the inflexions of the *ŷ*-stem are usual: in *dative singular* евѣфатаєви 83r, елисєви 34r, моисєви 18r, 95v (Bit); архиеєви 174a10,13, 174b7,11, иєєви 46b3, кєсарєви 9b20, 10b15, 105a2, мжжєви 31a2 (Dbm); кєсарєви 54.4 (Bon), ѡцєви и дѡви 188r18 (Zag); црєви 30v/2,65/1 (Rdm); моисєви L9,33 (Mkd); in *nominative plural* врачєвѣ 87v/2, 164/7-8 (Rdm); in *genitive plural* врачєвъ Mr5,26 (Mkd). Contaminated plural forms in nominative are noticed in Bologna Psalters: врачєви 251.6, жидови.

The influence of the **ī-declension** on the nouns of the **jo-declension** is exemplified in the plural forms: in *nominative plural* there is the inflexion –иє/ –иѣ: црїє 65v/2,4,6,7 (Rdm); мжжїє Mt12,41, Mt14,35, L11,32, пастырїє L2,8, L2,15, L2,20, фарїсїє Mt15,12 (Mkd). The inflexion –єє is rare: архиеєє Mt27,6, Mr14,53, Mr15,3, фарїсєє Mr7,3, їоудєє Mr7,3 (Mkd). Georgievski (2001:40) stresses that in the Church Slavonic text in the Macedonian area the inflexion –єє is a rare occurrence. Somewhere in *genitive plural* –єи is used (made with vocalisation of the *jer*) of the *ī*-stem instead of the old form of –и: въ стѣпьєнь блѡдѡ пиша ѡ стѣхъ врачєи 9r (Bit); ѡ алтирєи 1/19, 1v/7-8 (Rdm). In vocative singular the inflection –иє is confirmed: црїє 58/4, мжжїє 144v/14 (Rdm).

The *jo*-stem nouns in Bitolski Triodion have some interesting formations in *vocative singular*. The forms of –ю have been registered: врачю 84r, избавитєлю 84r, most probably because of the softness of the preceding consonant (S. Pop-Atanasova 1995:36).

The singular vocative form Zagreb Triodion is well preserved with the o-/jo- stem nouns: бє 70v12, ѡчє 140r1, хє 7r16.

In the word властєлє 32-4 (Bon) the nominative plural form is formed on the basis of the consonant stem.

Some nouns ending with **-тель** and **-арь** make *dative singular* forms with the inflexion –ови of the **-ŭ-stem**: **винареви** 82b3 (Dbm), и приведе **ройтелеви** 193v16 (Zag); **мытареви** 112v/14 (Rdm). *Nominative forms in plural* are for either according to the old state on –е (rarely): **прогонителе** 86v, **тврѣдителе** 87г, **хранителе** 87г (Bit); **дрзжателе** 113-4 (Bon) or according to **ŷ-stem** on –не: **законѹчителне** 46v/14-15, **мытарне** 39b12, 56a1, **рыбарне** 45a15 (Dbm); **слоужителне** 115г3, **оучителне** 106г3 (Zag); **свѣдѣтелине** 154v/14 (Rdm); **дѣлателне** Mt21,35, **законѹчителне** L5,17, **рыбарѿе** L5,2 (Mkd). In the plural forms we can see the influence of the **o-/jo-stem** nouns: **с митарн** 102г16, **прѣмѣдриж оучителн** 22v25 (Zag) (the replacement of **ѹ>i** has been done phonetically).

The **ŷ-stem** nouns underwent most changes under the influence of the **o-/jo-stem**. It is a fact that the interaction was registered even in the Old Slavonic canon Duridanov (s. Česko 1970:119), so that the Church Slavonic language in this process of mixing of the stems has progressed to such a degree that it is difficult to separate the original **ŷ-stems** (Duridanov 1993:172). Even though the nouns of the type **сѹинѹ** were already on the road to disappearance, the typical endings of the **ŷ-stem** had the tendency to spread to the other stems (Vajan 1952:111).

Forms of the **ŷ-stem** nouns display hesitation between their own inflexions and the inflexions of the **o-/jo-stem**. Not infrequently in the Macedonian Church Slavonic manuscripts parallel forms are documented. The old flexions are witnessed: in *genitive singular* **отъ домоу** 31b11, **мжъска полоу** 36a19 (Dbm); **мироу** Mt25,34 (Mkd); in *dative singular* **мировы** Mt18,7 (Mkd); in *nominative plural* **дарове** (Bon); in *genitive plural* **домовъ** 5/6 (Dbm). In the Zagreb Triodion there are a certain number of nouns with the parallel use of inflexions from both stems (Crvenkovska 1997:34). In *dative singular* is found **идѣшти мирови** 76г17, but also **ѿцѣщенне мироу** 113г15, then the noun **грѣхъ: ѿ грѣхъ** 14г10, но і ѿ различнихъ **грѣховъ** 14г17 (Zag) i sl.

The case flexions of the **ŷ-stem** nouns are not carefully maintained in the following examples: in the *genitive singular* there often is –а (with both inanimate and animate nouns) instead of the expected inflexion –оу: **ѿца** и **сна** и **стго дха** 76г, **сна твоего** 85г (Bit); **вола** 83a14, **дома** 158a5, **сна** (Dbm); **меда** 27.1 (Bon); **сна твоего** 17v6 (Zag); **дома его** 140v/4 (Rdm); **вола** L13,15, **мира** L12,30, **сѹина** Mt10,37, Mt12,5, Mr10,35 (Mkd); in *dative singular* the inflexion –оу pervades: **снѣ своемѣ** 20v, **ѿцѣ** и **снѣ** и **дхѣ стомѣ** 48г, **снѣ маринѣ** 90г (Bit); **сноу** 71-1a (Bon); **донеси сноу своему** 154г6 (Zag); **сноу** 112v/16, 130v/19, 132/6 (Rdm).

The only example of *accusative singular* with the inflexion –а of the **o-stem** **сна** 148v/6 (Rdm), confirms the interruption of the Old Slavonic tradition of distinguishing inanimate/animate nouns by forming the singular form in accusative. The old accusative forms are back for the inanimate nouns and they coincide with nominative ones. The reasons according to Duridanov (s. Česko 1970:124-125) are: either mechanical copying of the oldest original or the phonetic concurrence of **ж** with **а** and with that of accusative and nominative of the feminine nouns, which by analogy was most probably transferred to the masculine nouns as well; or a strong process of forming a general nominative-accusative case form is underway. The archaisation of forms of the inanimate nouns surprised Conev (s. Česko 1970:125) because this archaic feature is kept despite the numerous novelties.

The noun *сѣинѣ* has vocative forms along the *o*-stem: *сѣнѣ* 45v, 46r, 49r (Bit); *сѣнѣ* Mt8,29, Mt9,17, Mt15,22 (Mkd). In the locative singular forms visible is the influence of the non-palatal vowel declension: *въ мирѣ* 24r (Bit); *тѣрѣцѣ прѣстѣ въ ѿци и сѣнѣ и сѣимѣ дѣѣ* 34v1 (Zag); *мирѣ* Mt25,13, L11,21, L14,32, *сѣнѣ* Mr9,12, L18,31 (Mkd). The formant *-ov-*, which is characteristic for the *ŷ*-stem nouns in dative singular, in nominative and genitive plural, can be seen as part of the stem in other forms in plural, to which the case inflexion is added Makarijoska (1997:68): in *dative plural* *сѣнѣомѣ* 107/7, 118/12,119/10 (Rdm); in *locative plural* *домовѣхѣ* (Bon). The vocalisation of the strong jer is the reason for the appearance of the form for locative plural *-охѣ*: *въ сѣнѣохѣ* 88v/3 (Rdm).

Even in the Old Slavonic the *ŷ*-stem makes forms according to the ***o-/jo-stem*** and the *ŷ*-stem, especially in genitive and dative singular in order to get rid of the existing syncretism of these forms Duridanov (s. Česko 1970:120). The enforcement of the flexions of the other stems on the *ŷ*-stem nouns is visible: in *genitive singular* the forms with *-ѣ/-а*: *сѣ пѣтѣ* 131a18 (Dbm); *огнѣ* 106.3 (Bon); *ѿ гѣ* 19/12, 20/15, 130/10, *ѿгнѣ* 134/17 (Rdm); *гѣ* Mt1,22, Mt23,37, L10,27, *ѿгнѣ* L12,49 (Mkd); in *dative singular* the inflexion *-ови* of *ŷ*-stem: *гѣи* 23v, 87v, 95r (Bit); *гѣи* 30b7, 37a21, 94b10, *ѿрѣви* 114a6 (Dbm); *ѿрѣви* (Bon), *гѣи твоѣмоу* 97v18 (Zag); *гѣи* 6v/10,11,12 (Rdm). The forms in *dative singular* on *-оу* of *o-/jo-stem*: *къ гѣу* 18r, 34r, 50r (Bit); *гѣу* 158/15, *къ гѣу* 146v/9,10, *по пѣтѣ* 103/14, *ѿгнѣ* 56/13 (Rdm); *гѣ* Mr4,10, Mr10,20, L19,8, *пѣтоу* Mt22,16, *ѿгнѣ* L4,39 (Mkd); in *accusative singular* there is *гѣ* 111/14, 158v/18, 153/13 (Rdm). In *vocative singular* there are forms in *-и, -е*: *гѣи* 95/13, 123v/3, *гѣ* 72/12 (Rdm).

In the plural forms they keep their forms unchanged. In *nominative plural* the inflexion *-нѣ, -и* is used: *тѣтѣнѣ* 154a17 (Dbm); *людиѣ* 50/8, 56/1, 129/5, *люди* 50/8,157v/14, *пѣти* 165/15 (Rdm); in *genitive plural* *-ени, -ии* is used: *людиѣ* 154v/7, *люди* 97v/16 (Rdm); in *accusative plural* a form of *-нѣ* has been confirmed: *людиѣ* 164/2 (Rdm).

The **masculine vowel a-/ja- stem nouns** which in nominative singular end with *-ни/-ѣни* have transformed their inflexion: *сѣдѣнѣ* L12,58 (Mkd). The activity of a phonologic factor (*ѣ>и*) is noticed in *genitive singular*: *ѿоми нѣ ѿставѣ* 174r24 (Zag).

The consonant stems were scarce to be kept as stable. That is why even in the canonical period (Vasič 2005:7) they are under the influence and gravitate towards the other productive stems. Especially distinguished is the influence of the *ŷ*-stem, which is justified, having in mind the same gender and some equal inflexions (Makarijoska 1997:70).

Very rarely in *nominative singular* there is the old form of *-ѣ*, for which, according to Ugrinova-Skalovska (s. Makarijoska 1997:70), there is evidence that it disappeared even before the X Century: *камѣ* 13r (Bit); *камѣ лѣжѣше* 159a8 (Dbm). Nominative with the form of accusative *-ѣ* instead of *-ѣ* is found: *оставленѣ еѣтѣ камѣнѣ* 25b8 (Dbm) *камѣнѣ* 109/9, *пламенѣ* 82/7, 115v/113 (Rdm). In the form for *genitive singular*: *ис камѣни акроѿома* 17r (Bit) we can see the influence of the *ŷ*-stem nouns, and in the case of *камѣнѣ* 25a14, 102b18 (Dbm) the old inflexion with *-е* has been used: *камѣнѣ* 25a14, 102b18 (Dbm). Just so as the *ŷ*-stem nouns form the *singular form of dative* with *-ови*: *днѣви и пѣтѣ* 37b19 (Dbm), but the influence of the vocal

o-/jo-stems is also possible: днѣо Mt6,34 (Mkd). An interesting formation is when the word-forming suffix morpheme -ов/-ев is combined with the inflexions of the dative consonant stem: пища бгатааго дшж пламеневи прѣдасъ 50v (Bit). An example of the equation of *accusative singular* with nominative (-ы) is registered in the Dobromir gospel: кѣто отъвалитъ намъ камы 25b5, возъмѣте камы 159a9 (Dbm).

The influence of the ĭ-stems is confirmed on the masculine nouns with a consonant stem in the oblique **cases** in *locative singular* на камени 93r (Bit); на камени 53a15, 102b19, 104a20 (Dbm); на камени Mt7,24, Mt13,20, L21,6, при корѣани L3,9, въ пламени L16,25 (Mkd), but the old forms with –е are also use: ѿ корене твоего 65r13 (Zag). It is possible that the singular form for locative with –и was acquired from the jo-stem (Crvenkovska 1997:34). Then in *nominative plural* дѣние 15a17 (Dbm); камение 51r12,64v7, 78v29 (Zag); ѿрѣние 91v/15, 105/15, 105v/13 (Rdm); днѣе Mt24,22, Mr13,19, L2,22 (Mkd); in *genitive plural* –ени: ѿ днѣи 97v/14, днѣи 97/7, 106/19 (Rdm) or –ни: днѣи Mt4,2, Mt11,12, Mr2,20 (Mkd).

The following changes affected the masculine nouns: *doubling of vowels, contraction of vowels, elimination of the differences between the palatal and the non-palatal declension*.

Doubling of vowels occurs in the case inflexions for *nominative and accusative plural* of the o-/jo-stem nouns: : въ вѣкыи вса 37r, во дворыи 8r, похотныж плодыи 31r (Bit); мжжѣи Mr6,44, народѣи L5,3, ѿчениции Mt18,1 (Mkd); in *instrumentale plural* съ члѣкыи 27v (Bit). The same occurrence is confirmed in the case of the noun слоуга (a-stem): вса слугыи 85r (Bit).

Contraction of vowels occurs in masculine nouns of various stems: in *genitive plural*: дни 36a9, 65a6, 96a3 but also днѣи 130a14 and днѣи, днѣи (Dbm); мжжи 132a17 but also мжжи, днари 57a3 but also днари (Dbm); in *dative singular* къ сжди L12,58 (Mkd).

Even though the tendency to *eliminate the difference between the palatal and the non-palatal declension* and vice versa is most prominent with the feminine nouns, examples of influence of the non-palatal on the palatal declension have also been noticed in the masculine nouns in these cases: in *locative singular* with the inflexion -ѣ instead of –и: авѣаѣрѣ Mr2,26, ѿ князѣ Mr3,22 (Mkd); in *instrumental singular* with –омь instead of –емь: съ мосѣмь и арономь 10r, мосѣмъ 33r, незикиломь прѣкомь 85v (Bit); in *acustative plural* with thw onflexion -зи: поставишж князы по всеи зѣми 32/1, коньцы еж ты основа 88v/16 (Rdm).

The influence of the palatal vowel declension on the singular vocative form in the non-palatal stems is pointed out by Pop-Atanasova (1995:35): кѣтѣ стѣ 67v. Then the tendency for equating the palatal and the non-palatal stems is visible in: *genitive singular* съ ѿного полоу ѿрданѣ Mr3,8 (Mkd); in *instrumentale singular* гладемь оумираж 117r21, ѿдръжими зѣло гладемь 40r24 (Zag); гладемь 159v/5 (Rad).

The neuter nouns

Deviations from the traditional state are noticed in the neuter nouns.

Most intensive is the influence and then the equation of the declension of the **consonant –es- stem nouns with the o-stem nouns** (Koneski 1982:135). According to Duridanov (1988:8) the es-stem nouns lose the characteristic suffix –es-, and with that the specific flexion for the

consonant stems. This occurrence is registered even in the Old Slavonic texts, and is confirmed in the manuscripts with Macedonian provenience in Church Slavonic. The reasons according to Ugrinova-Skalovska (1979:79) are: the equal forms for nominative, accusative and vocative and the equal number of syllables.

In the form for *genitive singular* these examples have been seen: тѣла (Dbm); дрѣва польска 75r10 (Zag); нѣба 90/2, тѣла 113v/1, шка 158v/8 (Rdm); дрѣва Mt3,10, L3,9, L21,29, дѣла Mt 11,2, Mt23,5, Mt25,16 (Mkd) with the characteristic inflexion –а of the o-stem. In *dative singular* the inflexion –оу is confirmed: дрѣвѣ прѣстомѣ 47v (Bit); дѣлоу L23,51, тѣлоу Mt6,22, Mt6,27, L11,34 (Mkd), but in *acustative singular*: тѣло 43v/15 по і тѣлесѣ 149/17 (Rdm). In *locative singular* there is –ѣ from the o-stem: на дрѣвѣ 21r, 38r, на нѣбѣ 45r (Bit); of the noun око – въ оцѣ 52b1, 5, 6 (Dbm); ѣзди на тѣлѣ моемъ положи 4v5 (Zag); въ оцѣ Mt7,4 (Mkd). In *instrumental singular* the inflexion –омъ was accepted which according to Georgievski (2001:45) is found in many other older manuscripts: дрѣвомъ 20v2x, 36r (Bit); шкомъ 84/6 (Rdm); дѣломъ L11,48, L23,41, L24,19, окомъ Mt 18,9, словомъ Mt 18,16, Mt 22,15, Mt 25,15 (Mkd). Plural forms in *genitive* have been confirmed: ѿ неприазнихъ дѣлъ 69v12 (Zag) and in *locative* with –ѣхъ: ѿ дѣлѣхъ ми 34v (Bit). In the example ѿ всѣхъ дѣлѣхъ своихъ 167v19 (Zag) the plural inflexion for genitive is used with the locative inflexion –ѣхъ under the influence of the pronoun following it (Crvenkovska 1999:35).

In the manuscripts with consonant stems the archaic forms with an expanded stem are preserved. Apart from this it is possible to add to the expanded consonant stem case inflexion of the vowel o-/jo- stem or the ĭ-stem (most frequently in genitive and locative singular): чюдесемъ твоимъ 99v (Bit), до вѣременѣ 42b4, имене моего ради 14a12, 107a18, 107b10, до коньца нѣси 15a19, съ нѣси 107a13, по і съ нѣсе 96b4, словесе его 137b19 (Dbm), ѿ имени 29/12, 29/19, 89/10, имену 35/7, 41/14, 101v/9, на нѣбѣ 60v24, по словеси 28v19, исцѣление чюдеси 38r22 (Zag), тѣлесѣ 149/17 (Rdm), дрѣвеса Mг8,24, очеси Mt7,3, словеси L9,29, тѣлеса L24,3, шчета Mt12,10 (Mkd).

With the –es-, –en- and –et- stem nouns there are forms according to the **ĭ-declination**. For example: in *genitive singular* подобнаа вѣмени 109b4, съ нѣси 107a13, до коньца нѣси 15a19 (Dbm); имени Mt10,22, L21,17 (Mkd); in *locative singular* на нѣси 4a16, 72a4, 89a3, въ оцѣси 52a19 (Dbm); на нѣси 114/13, 126/19, 127/10 (Rdm), ѿ имени Mг 9,39, L9,49, L10,17, на нѣи Mt6,10, L11,2, L15,7, ѿ отроуати Mt2,8, L2,17 (Mkd). The forms for genitive and locative singular with –и according to Duridanov (s. Česko 1970:121) are formed under the influence of the ĭ-stem and appear even in the Old Slavonic period, mostly in the Macedonian manuscripts.

Imenkite село и ѹадо во Radomiroviot psaltir во lokativ mno`ina se javuvaat so nastavkta –ахъ: въ селахъ 76/132, 83/4, въ ѹадахъ 161v/3. –не мора

In *genitive dual* it is interesting to note the form of the noun око as: ѡуѡ which according to the opinion of Ščepkin (s. Makarijoska 1997:71) is either taken instead of the literary ѡуиѡ or the further phonetic change of the form оуьѡ .

The inflexions of the **palatal vowel stem** deviate before the inflexions of the **ī-declination**. In the Bologna Psalters and in some of the other texts the inflexion for *genitive singular* -єи is systematically applied to the jo-stem nouns which end with -иє instead of the old -ни: МНОЖЬСТВОМЪ ВЪЗѢИХАНЕИ МОИХЪ 26r10, ꙗко сѣ мѣрдѣ многихъ прѣгрѣшенеи 54v16 (Zag); БЕЗАКОНЕИ 24/3, 77v/16, 122v9, ѿ прѣгрѣшенеи 52/10-11, съгрѣшенеи 104v/15 (Rdm). The inflexion -єхъ is confirmed in one case of *locative plural* ВЪ ЖИЛИЩЕХЪ 42/12 (Rdm). It is possible that this inflexion was derived with a vocalisation of the jer (Georgievski 2001:45).

An interesting example of the ū-stem is registered in *dative singular in the non-palatal vowel stem*: ИГОВИ 2.2 (Bon). Kuljbakin (s.Česko 1970:120) talks about permeation of the dative form -ови of the ū-stem to the neuter nouns. According to Vajan (1952:113), the neuter nouns can appear with this inflexion when they are personified.

A frequent occurrence in the neuter nouns, especially of the **-jo-stem with -ie** is the **contraction of vowels**. Examples of contraction of vowels are noticed in *locative singular* and *genitive plural* ВЪ БѢГОВОЛЕНИ 146/16, знамени сѣи 111v/8, ВЪ ШБИЛИ 7v/9, ВЪ ШБИЛУЕНИ 24/10 (Rdm); жити L16,11, по прѣдани Мг 1,14 (Mkd). In *locative plural* apart from the contracted forms (-нихъицхъ): ВЪ ПИСАНИХЪ Мт21,42, шпребданихъ L1,6 (Mkd) there are also non-contracted forms ВЪ СКРОВИЩИХЪ 111v/15 (Rdm).

The feminine nouns

In the declination of the feminine a-/ja-stem nouns the changes are not great (Rusek 1964:20). The **ja-stem** nouns ending with **-ни/-зни** there is only transformation of the singular inflexion for nominative -а/-ѣ/-ѣа: мѣлнѣ 96a7 (Dbm), мѣлнѣ Мт6,4, рабинѣ Мг 14,69 (Mkd). In some manuscripts the old inflexions are used: рабыни 113a3, самарѣныни 131b5 (Dbm); грѣзѣни бо оу бѣ не оудзварѣет са 35.12а, прѣтѣ пилатомѣ бо стоѣше праведнѣи сѣдѣни въ сеомѣ мироу 38.2с (Bon). Duridanov (s. Češko 1970:114) believes that the singular inflexion in the Old Slavonic language is replaced only with personal names, while in the Church Slavonic it is spread to other nouns. The reason for this is the tendency to form one paradigm in the feminine ja-stem nouns.

Vocative singular with -є is well preserved: вѣѣ 8r9, дѣѣ 101v29, мѣрѣ 64r3 (Zag). The plural form for *genitive* из волеи 89r20 (Bon) is made with the vocalisation of the strong semivowel.

During the phonetic replacement of зѣ with и with the a-stem nouns the forms in *genitive singular* appeared. ѿ работи 20r6 (Zag); in *nominative plural* жени придошѣ помазати та 165v19 (Zag).

With the **-ī-stem feminine nouns** we can see the inflexion -єи (<ъи), beside -ни in *genitive plural*: ѿ напастеи 3v, ѿ похотеи 18r, ѿ стѣстеи 90r (Bit); заповѣдеи 27v27, 63v28, 64v18 (Bon); ѿ напастеи 48r4, 57v5, сластеи 18r17, 66v26, нѣихъ стѣстеи 33r2 (Zag); ѿ заповѣдѣи 21/4 ѿ напастеи 52v/5, ѿ скръбеи 14/2, 14/16, хлѣбѣи 27v/15 (Rdm); ѿ рабынеи Мг14,66 (Mkd). With vocalisation of the jers the following forms were made: *instrumentale singular* (-ѣмь-ѣмь) стѣтемь 74v5 (Bon); *genitive plural* with -єи (above mentioned); *dative*

plural (-ьмъ>-емъ) стѣтѣмъ 46r3, 74v5 (Zag); in *locative plural* (-ьхъ>-ехъ) в похотехъ 54r14, въ скръбнехъ 59v17 (Zag).

The scarce **-ū-stem** nouns with -ū(-ъв-) underwent assimilation of the productive noun stems (a-stem and ĭ-stem). Even in the Proto-Slavic period they were under the constant influence and were attracted by the a-stem nouns (Duridanov 1993:173). In *nominative singular* the archaic forms лубы 173a12, свекры 81b3,4 (Dbm) are confirmed in certain examples, but usually the archaic forms are not present. We will also mention the nominative and the vocative singular form with -ъвє: сѣа естѣ цркви 53v/3 (Rdm). An interesting case is the appearance of *nominative and vocative singular* with an inflexion of nominative plural with -ъви: сѣа цркви 32r, цркви впиеть ти х̄є 64v (nominative) и весели сѣ и р̄д̄у сѣ цркви б̄жиа 49r (vocative). The form in nominative singular with the -ь flexion: црквь 127b13 (Dbm); прѣстаа кровь полиа сѣ 67r3, ти еси в̄ кровь 71v20, въ кровь прѣложи сѣ 24r8 (Zag) is under the influence of the accusative form.

Apart from the old *genitive inflexion in singular* with -ъвє: крвє 61b7,13, ис црквє 122a3,127a8, 151a4 (Dbm), the -ъви is also used. The influence of the ĭ-stem or the a-stem is possible after the transformation to зѣи (Crvenkovska 1999:35). For example: крви 112a7, 142a11 (Dbm); избави ма ѿ крви 104v18 (Zag); црквы Mt12,5, Mt21,12, L1,21 (Mkd). In *accusative singular* with vocalisation of the semivowel (also usual for the canonical texts) -ъвь -овь the form на свекровь 81b3,4 (Dbm) was achieved. This is a violation of the syncretism of the accusative with the nominative form. The influence of the a-stem in the singular form for accusative can be seen in the example свекръвж L12,53 (Mkd). Makarijoska (1997:70) talks about expressing accusative with a genitive-accusative form with -вє even in some Old Slavonic manuscripts, which is also confirmed in the Dobromir's Evangelary: лубьвє б̄жиж 75b17, лубьвє имате 166a7 (compare with genitive singular лубьвє 138a7, 168a22).

The influence of the ĭ-stem nouns is noticed in: *locative singular* въ лубьви 168b14,16,18 (Dbm); въ лубзѣи 74v15 (Zag); въ цркви 7/10, 16/16 (Rdm); in *nominative and acusative plural* смоквиє 112/1, 163v/1 (Rdm).

The **-er-stem feminine nouns** mainly don't have changes that would show that they inclined towards certain more productive groups (Kostovska 2003:29), i.e. there is no great influence of the other stems. Even the Old Slavonic manuscripts (Mošin 1954:45) confirm that the feminine nouns with a consonant stem have a mix of two forms of *accusative singular* with -є and -ь: чѣти оца твоего и мр̄є 98b4, ли братиѣ ли сестры ли оца ли мр̄є ли женѣ ли чада 5a3, на матерь 84b3 (Dbm).

The -ь forms are regular, while those with -є might be under the influence of the genitive inflexion and might express accusative with the genitive-accusative form of the o-stem. Frequently in the Church Slavonic language the consonant stem feminine nouns often use the genitive form with the meaning of accusative under the influence of the masculine nouns, Duridanov (s. Češko1970:124).

We will present the forums for *nominative and accusative plural* with –а (ja-stem) instead of –и: дьщера ироденскы 35/11, пожрѣшж дьщера свож 116v/10 (Rdm).

There is **doubling of vowels** in the vowel stem nouns: in *genitive singular* ѿ мжкыи 45r (Bit); in *nominative and acustative plural* славыи 33r, на слъзыи 35r, въ пѣстыини 89r (Bit); звѣздни Mr13,25, пагоуби Mt24,7, сестрии Mr10,29 (Mkd).

In the manuscripts of the Ohrid literary school there is concurrence of the flexion of various cases i.e. new syncretism forms appear because of the deviations from the regular use of the nasals. **The lack of distinction or the mixing (replacement) of the nasals** is an important phonetic factor which, in the case of feminine nouns, led to the appearance of an accusative flexion in genitive singular with the a-/ja-stem nouns: изъ твож жтробж 8r, изъ жтробж ти 16v,17v (Bit); и братиѣж и сестрь и оца и матерѣ 87b9, и жены и чадъ и братиѣж 87b9 (apart from the regular братиа (Dbm); изведи из темницж дшж мож 141-8a (Bon); and the other way around, accusative singular borrows an inflexion of genitive –а instead of ж: и еже творити сз искрзнимз благостзина и любовь 36-3, твож вола 43r4, кротыции же наследатз земля 36-11 (Bon). After the soft sounds ь, ѣ, с, у, ш in accusative singular there is the replacement ѡж: прострѣ десницж свож (Bon. Cant. I,12), пропиная небо ѡко и кожж 57-4b, и потокомз пиштж твож напоиши ж 35-9 (Bon). An exception in some manuscripts is the sound ~ after which the nasal а is preserved: въ притчѣа 59/17 (Rdm). –а instead of –ж is used in the palatal change in instrumental singular: плащѣнищѣа 178b8 (Dbm).

The general tendency for **equating the palatal and the non-palatal declension** is most frequent with the feminine nouns. The influence of the non-palatal stem on the palatal is seen in the permeation of the case inflexion for *genitive singular*, where instead of the expected –а there is –ы (or –и after the replacement зыи): изъ хъбы ѡдежы (Bit); ползгы Mr5,26, ѡтроковици Mr5,40 (Mkd). The permeation of the forms of the non-palatal change in the palatal one can be seen in: *nominative plural* where –ы appears (even the –и instead of зы achieved phonetically).

The non-palatal stem deviates before the inflexions of the palatal stem in *accusative plural* съвѣразоужше икона 41r26, слъза втоли 132r27 (Zag).

Among the a-/ja-stem and ĭ-stem nouns apart from the non-contracted forms there also some made with **contraction** into case inflexions for: *instrumental singular* –ж (made after the inter-vowel j was lost, thus equating with accusative singular): иродъ беззаконоваще съ иродиадж 70r (Bit); съ дружинж свож 22b1, тож мѣрж 52a11, виѣжж палицж 113b3 (Dbm); съ вѣрж 42v7 (Zag); силж 64/16, надежж 135v/1, истинж 165/19 (Rdm). According to Duridanov (s.Češko 1970:137-138) when the forms for instrumental and accusative singular coincide the meaning is often eclipsed. The instrumental singular form without contraction (–оѣж, –еѣж) appears in these examples: вѣрож 21v, истинож 75r, силож 2r (Bit); вѣрож 2v15, с похвалож 127v19, съ славож 127v14 (Zag).

There is contraction of vowels in the other singular forms: for *genitive singular* прѣмо газофилакзы Mt12,41 (Mkd); for *locative singular* въ лады Mt14,33, Mr1,19 (Mkd). The

contraction of the plural form in genitive (-ни >-и) resulted in: заповѣди Мг7,8, кости L24,39 (Mkd).

The forms for duality often find their right place: ѿ ногъ ѿразить са 70г, ржцѣ си простеръ на кртѣ 25г, чистама шчима и встѣнама же цѣловати 38г (Vit); по ланитама оударѣет са 160v3, аз же ржкама и ногама свазанъ вихъ 94v7, шѣма странама 90г2 (Zag). The irregular use of plural instead of the dual is found in: дванадесате апль 48v10, идѣхъ веселами ногами 169г14, шбанадесате швещъ 153г23 (Zag). The noun оустѣна can have a parallel plural and double form: оустнѣ оубо подвижашъ 97v29, but also встанами цѣловати 63v1 (Zag). The forming of the dual form of the personal names is most interesting: шба марка покриваго 21v5, б ма ѿѣорма 22v13 (Zag).

Conclusion

We mentioned that this paper will attempt to show if and to what extent the texts of the Ohrid school follow the general tendency for deviation from the state characteristic for the canonical texts, with an accent on the declination of the nouns. After analysing the situation in individual manuscripts it is found out how much this process is expanded in the texts of the Ohrid centre. The general tendency of hesitation and dislocation is prominent in the Ohrid manuscripts, while further on the simplification of the flex system of the nouns. The numerous renewed forms in the frames of the noun paradigms of the different declination types are proof that this process is not optional. The productive noun stems have preserved well the old state, while prominent among the unproductive ones is a certain hesitation which is mainly confirmed in most Old Slavonic and editorial texts.

In the case of the *masculine nouns* the mixing of the o-stem with the ŭ-stem is most confirmed. Koneski (1982:134) notices that the spreading of the two-syllable inflexions with the formant/suffix –ov- is the most distinct occurrence in the process of stem equation. The inflexions of the ŭ-stem are not transferred with the same intensity in all manuscripts to the o-stem nouns. The most widely spread is the dative singular inflexion, while less so is the plural inflexion for nominative. In genitive plural the forms according to the ŭ-stem are very rarely found. Influence of the ĭ-stem is noticed mostly in nominative plural and sporadically in genitive plural. The flexions of the ŭ-stem are confirmed in a limited number of examples of the o-/jo-nouns. The singular forms for genitive, dative and locative of the ŭ-stem underwent changes according to the o-/jo-stem. Forms of the palatal and non-palatal vowel stem in genitive and dative singular (sometimes the ŭ-stem has influence in dative) can be seen among the ĭ-stem nouns. The instability of the consonant stems, which is noticed even in the canonical manuscripts, in the manuscripts of the Ohrid literary school is seen in the permeation of the case endings of ĭ-stem and more rarely of o-/jo- stem and ŭ-stem in locative singular and the plural forms of nominative and genitive.

The analysis shows that there is a tendency for uniting the masculine nouns in one paradigm.

The scarcity is the reason for the non-preservation of the consonant stems in neuter. There is aspiration for equation of the –es- consonant stems with the forms of o-/jo-stem, mostly in the singular paradigm (genitive, dative, locative, instrumental singular). However, we cannot speak about complete equation because in some manuscripts there are insignificant deviations and preservation of the old forms (for example in the Zagreb Triodion. There are also numerous parallel forms as well as formations when the expanded stem is kept, while the case endings of the vowel stems are accepted. The nouns of the ĭ-declination influenced the consonant stems in genitive and locative singular. The same stem in genitive plural influenced the neuter nouns ending with –нѣ.

The review of the declination of the feminine nouns shows that the old forms were well preserved among the productive name stems. In the ĭ-stem in genitive plural we can see more often –ѣи, and –ѣи, –ни more rarely. The ū-stem nouns frequently have forms close to the a-stem and the ĭ-stem (regularly in genitive and locative singular, more rarely in nominative and accusative plural). The feminine consonant nouns were preserved. The difference between the palatal and non-palatal declension deviates. With the hesitation of the regular distribution of the nasals there is concurrence of the flexions of different cases, as well as the use of the inflexion of one case in another. This redistribution is mostly between genitive and accusative singular.

At the end, to summarise, the system of forms is a compromise between the older state and the newer additions or changes (Ugrinova-Skalovska 1992:75). In the older manuscripts of the Church Slavic literature the examples that illustrate the deviations are optional and testify about the start of this process. The deviations in the noun system of forms in the more recent literary monuments Ribarova (1990:167) are regularly and widely represented.

References:

- Vajan, A. 1952. *Руководство по старославянскому языку*, Издательство „Иностранно литературьы" Москва.
- Vasić, S. 2005. *Именице сугласничких основа у Маријином јеванђељу*, магистарски рад, Косовска Митровица.
- Georgievski, G. 2001. *Македонистички студии*, Менора, Скопје, 38-50
- Despodova, V. 1980. *Кон прашањето за развојниот процес од синтетизам кон аналитизам во макеонскиот јазик*, Мј XXXI, Скопје.
- Duridanov, Iv. 1988. *Старобългарскиот език в синхронија и дијахронија*, Славјанскафилологија, том 17, БАН, Софија, 5-18.
- Duridanov, Iv. 1993. „Развој на склонитбените типове в праславјански и старобългарски език", во: *Граматика на старобългарскиот език*, БАН, Софија, 170-176.
- Duridanov, Iv. 1993. „Значење и употреба на падежите. Падежна реакција. во: *Граматика на старобългарскиот език*, БАН, Софија, 455-466.
- Duridanov, Iv. 1993. „Наченки на аналитизам" во: *Граматика на старобългарскиот език*, БАН, Софија, 551-554.
- Jerković, V. 1984. *Старославенска норма у гласовном и морфолошком систему*, 33. Jugoslavenski seminar za strane slaviste (1-21.VIII 1982), Zadar.
- Koneski, Bl. 1982. *Историја на македонскиот јазик*, Култура, Скопје.
- Kostovska, V. 2003. *Македонско четвооевангелие*, ИМЈ, Скопје.
- Makarijoska, L. 1997. *Радомиров псалтир*, ИМЈ, Скопје.
- Mihaljević, M. 2004. „Deklinacija imenica u najstarijim hrvatskoglagoljskim fragmentima, *Glagolica i hrvatski glagolozam, Zbornik radova međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa povodom 100. obljetnice staroslavenske akademije i 50. obljetnice staroslavenskog instituta (Zagreb-Krk 2.-6. listopada 2002.)*, Zagreb -Krk, 625-636
- Mošin, Vl. 1954. *Македонско евангелие на поп Јована*, Скопје.
- Pop-Atanasova, S. 1995, *Лингвистичка анализа на Битолскиот триод*, ИМЈ, Скопје.
- Ribarova, Zd. 1986. „Охридските традиции и јазикот на македонската средновековна писменост" во: *КлиментОхридски: студии*, НУБ, Скопје, 56-77.
- Ribarova, Zd. 1991a. „Оформување на македонската редакција на црковнословенскиот јазик, *Предавања на XXIII семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура во Скопје и Охрид 1990*, Скопје, 149-156.
- Ribarova, Zd. 1991b. „Македонската писменост во 13 век", *Предавања на XXIII семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура во Скопје и Охрид 1990*, Скопје, 167-176.

- Rusek, J. 1964, *Deklinacija i użycie przypadków w triodie Chłudowa*, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków
- RCSM - Речник на црковнословенскиот јазик од македонска редакција, Институт за македонски јазик- Скопје, св.І, 2000; св.ІІІ, 2001.
- Stojmenović, Š. 1998. „Деклинација именица у Служби и Житију Стефана Дечанског во: *Зборник на Фиолошки Факултет- Скопје*, Скопје.
- Ugrinova-Skalovska, R. 1972. „Јазичните особености на книжевните споменици од Охридската школа" *Предавања на V семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура во Скопје и Охрид 1972*, Скопје, 20-27.
- Ugrinova-Skalovska, R. 1976. „За некои особености на македонската варијанта црковнословенскиот јазик, *Slovo, Časopis staroslavenskog instituita u Zagrebu, Zagreb*, 175-184
- Ugrinova-Skalovska, R. 1979. „Морфолошки одлики на црковнословенскиот јазик во македонските книжевни споменици", *Предавања на XI семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура во Скопје и Охрид 1978*, Скопје, 85-93.
- Ugrinova-Skalovska, R. 1979. *Старословенски јазик*, Универзитет „Кирил и Методиј" - Скопје.
- Ugrinova-Skalovska, Despodova 1998, *Добромирово евангелие II*, Скопје -Прилеп, 75-81.
- Crvenkovska, E. 1999. *Загренски триод*, ИМЈ, Скопје.
- Češko, E. V. 1970. *История болгарского склонения*, Издательство „Наука" Москва