

LAJOS SZÓKE

On the use of active participles in Modern Church Slavic

In general Modern Church Slavic (MChSl) the use of the participles does not seem to follow a clear system but if we think a little more deeply about the reasons for certain uses, we may come to some conclusions. In our short study we shall try to reveal these rules comparing the MChSl forms (18th century) with those of the Old Church Slavic (OChSl). At the same time we have to keep in mind the external motivating forces, the influence of contemporary literary Russian and the techniques of the correctors making „amendments” in Gospel texts in the course of the 17th and 18th centuries.

The difficulties with short and long forms of the participles are to be found already in OChSl as their distribution was not complementary but overlapping. This indicates that these participles were not definitely separated from each other, sometimes alternating in identical situations (Růžička 1963: 13). Generally long participles (and adjectives as well, see Толстой 1957, Якубинская-Лемберг 1957) were used for the expression of definiteness and short ones for indefiniteness. In later centuries this was reinterpreted as the contrast between attributive and predicative relations. In the 18th century, when the language of the Gospels was definitely „codified”, the correctors in their work must have relied on the practice of contemporary Russian. The overall impression is that they substituted the short participles for long ones in non-predicative positions. The problem with this is that they were not consequent in their work and, in addition to this, long forms were used by them even in places where their presence was not justified. Although the basic intention of these corrections was to follow the Greek models, the ideology of Hesychasm in the 18th century, however, being not effective any more, the new texts moved away from the forms of the Greek protographs. The number of the original participles was reduced also by the use of relative clauses in their place (Ильминский 1888). Participles were especially frequent in written prose works of the ancient languages, which was due to the syntactic compression participles were capable of. This compactness, on the other hand, presupposed a more exact understanding of the context. Therefore, when analysing the forms of the participles, it is not enough to consider their function in the given sentence but we have to take into account the whole context.

The number of long participles was about one quarter of all participles in the OChSl Gospel texts (see Mutalimova's calculations on the basis of the Codex Marianus: Муталимова 1968). Due to the above mentioned corrections this proportion has changed and their distribution was somewhat regularized, although several short forms still survived in attributive function.

The active participles, with their noun and verb characteristics, could perform several functions in MChSl. They could be subject (S), subject complement (SC), object (O), object complement (OC), pre- and postmodifier of a noun or noun substitute (M), adverbial modifier (adv. M). Their relationship to the subject or the verb, accordingly, also could be different which was only complicated by the aspect of the verb.

Our examples will serve to reveal the relationship between the new forms and the old function. As under the influence of literary Russian in pl. gen., dat., instr. and loc. almost all forms were substituted by long forms, we shall concentrate on the use of participles in sg. (sometimes with forms in nom. and acc. pl.). In our study we shall not deal with the active participles formed with the help of the suffix *-l-* as they do not go into constructions with long forms. It well may be that some of the participles have the semantic value of an adjective, formally, however, we treat them as participles. We also shall not discuss the *Dativus absolutus* as the participle in it usually preserved its original (contracted) form.

1. Participles in the function of subject

- (1) слышавъѣи же и не сотворивъѣи подобенъ естъ челоувѣку создавшемъ храмниъ EB Lk 6:49, Zog: слышавыѣи не творь
- (2) имѣай заповѣди моя и соблюдаай ихъ, той естъ любай ма EB Jn 14:21, Zog: имѣим ... съблюдаим
- (3) се, изыде съай, да съетъ EB Mt 13:3, Zog: съим
- (4) прѣемъѣи же единъ, шедъ вкопа (его) въ землю EB Mt 25:18, Zog: примьѣи

The participles in the function of a subject were in reality substantivized participles substituting a noun with a temporary or a permanent feature. In our examples the subject-participle of (1), (2) and (4) refers to a person with a temporary feature. In the example (3) the characteristic feature is more or less permanent. This compactness of meaning is already resolved in most of the modern Slavic translations: Slovak (1969) – (1) ten, kto počul a neučinil, (2) Kto má moje prikazania a ostricha ich, (4) ten, ktory dostal; Serbian (1981) – (1) А који слуша а не извршује, (2) Ко има заповјести моје и држи их, (4) А који прими; Ukrainian (1962) – (1) А хто слухас та не виконує, (2) Хто заповіді Мої має та їх зберігає, той любить Мене, (4) А той, що одного взяв. The archaic Russian translation (1979), however, mostly preserves the participial structures: (1) слушающий и неисполняющий, (2) Кто имеет заповеди мои и соблюдает их, (4) получивший же. The translations with relative clauses make it clear that the participle is always defined by an action (temporary or permanent). This definiteness demands the long form of the participles in MChSl. The situation is different if the defined noun as a subject is present in the sentence (about the modifiers see later). Formally these participles are identical with those func-

tioning as adverbial modifiers. Their different function and meaning will be clear only from the constituents (and their meaning) of the sentence.

A special group of participles is represented by the structure **ВЪСАКЪ** plus participle. The complexity of this phrase comes from the fact that in OChSI the adjectives after this determiner are usually in short form but the participles in long (Flier 1974: 142).

- (5) **ВСАКЪ ЖИВЪЙ И ВЪРЪАЙ ВЪ МА** EB Jn 11:26, Zog: **ВЪСЪКЪ ЖИВЪИИ И ВЪРЪАИИ ВЪ МА**
- (6) **ВСАКЪ СЛЪШАВЪЙИ Ѡ ѠЦА И НАВЪИКЪ** EB Jn 6:45, Zog: **ВЪСЪКЪ СЛЪШАВЪИИ ОТЪ ОЦА И НАВЪИКИ**
- (7) **ВСАКЪ СЛЪШАИ СЛОВЕСА МОА И НЕ ТВОРА ИХЪ** EB Mt 7:26, Zog: **ВЪСЪКЪ СЛЪШАИИ СЛОВЕСА МОЕ И НЕ ТВОРА ИХЪ**

In MChSI, however, the participles are in long forms, but the form of the adjective depends on its position. In postposition: **ВСАКО ДРЪВО ДОБРОЕ ПЛОДЪИ ДОБРИ ТВОРИТЪ** EB Mt 7:17, in preposition: **И РЕКЪТЪ ВСАКЪ СОЛЪ ГЛАГОЛЪ** EB Mt 5:11.

2. Participles as object

- (8) **ВИДЪША БЪСНОВАВШАГОСА СЪДАЩА И ѠБОЛУЕНА И СМЪСЛАЩА** EB Mk 5:15, Zog: **ВИДЪША БЪСНОВАВЪШААГО СА СЪДАШТА**
- (9) **И ВИДЪ МОЛВЪ, ПЛАУЩЪИАСА И КРИУЩЪИА МНОГѠ** EB Mk 5:38, Zog: **И ВИДЪ МЛВЪ, И ПЛАУШТА СА И КРИУШТА**
- (10) **АЩЕ ЛЮБИТЕ ЛЮБАЩЪИА ВЪИ** EB Lk 6:32, Zog: **ЛЮБИТЕ ЛЮБАШТАИИ ВЪИ**
- (11) **ОБРЪТЕ ВЪ ЦЕРКВИ ПРОДАЮЩЪИА ОВЦЫ** EB Jn 2:14, Zog: **ОБРЪТЕ ВЪ ЦРЪКВЕ ПРОДАШТАИИ ОВЪЦА**

The active participles in the function of objects in MChSI have long forms, similarly to those in the function of subjects, and the reasons for this were also the same, as here we have to do with substantivized participles substituting a noun with a temporary or a permanent feature (Večerka 1961: 19). OChSI, however, has short forms as well, which seems to suggest that OChSI had more strict criteria for the use of long forms. The participles with long forms in OChSI have all complements which define them: in example (8) **СЪДАШТА** is the complement of the participle **БЪСНОВАВЪШААГО** (OC). In examples (10) and (11) the active participles are used in a transitive sense and have their object, which also gives a kind of definiteness to them.

3. Participles as subject complement

- (12) **АЗЪ БО ЕСМЪ СТАРЪ, И ЖЕНА МОА ЗАМАТОРѢВШИ ВО ДНЕХЪ СВОИХЪ**
ЕВ Lk 1:18, Zog: **И ЖЕНА МОѢ ЗАМАТОРѢВЪШИ**
- (13) **НЕ ВЪ БО БѢДЕТЕ ГЛАГОЛЮЩИИ** ЕВ Mt 10:20, Zog: **НЕ ВЪ БО ЕСТЕ**
ГЛЮШТЕІ
- (14) **И ТОЙ БѢ ПОМАВАА ИМЪ** ЕВ Lk 1:22, Zog: **І ТЪ БѢ ПОМАВАА ИМЪ**
- (15) **И СЕ, БѢДЕШИ МОЛУА И НЕ МОГИИ ПРОГЛАГОЛАТИ** ЕВ Lk 1:20, Zog: **І**
СЕ, БѢДЕШИ МЛЪУА
- (16) **И БѢ ОУА ИХЪ** ЕВ Lk 4:31, Zog: **І БѢ ОУА**
- (17) **БАШЕ ЖЕ ОУА** ЕВ Lk 13:10, Zog: **БѢ ЖЕ ОУА**

The occurrence of short forms in these cases is conditioned by the presence of copulative verbs the obligatory parts of which are these participles. As predicative components they are usually short even in OChSl. Whatever the tense of the copulative verb is, the participle emphasizes the duration of the action indicated by the participle. According to these considerations, in example (13) we have a continuous action in the future. But as participles also have noun features, in the combination of these characteristics the noun seems to take the upper hand producing a substantivized participle. In example (12) the prefixed past participle with the copula in the present refers to a present state characteristic of the subject (**ЖЕНА** – my wife well stricken in years – Bible 1970). From examples (16) and (17) it becomes clear that the forms of the copula like **БѢ** and **БАШЕ** in combination with present participle do not involve relevant differences. Unquestionably the imperfect **БАШЕ** and the present participle reflect in the highest degree the duration of the action in the past; Lk 4:31 – and taught them, Lk 13:10 – was teaching (Bible 1970).

4. Participles as object complement

- (18) **СЕГО ШЕРѢТОХОМЪ РАЗВРАЩАЮЩА ИЗЪИКЪ НАШЪ** ЕВ Lk 23:2, Zog:
РАЗВРАШТАЖШТА
- (19) **ЕМШЕ СИМОНА ... ГРАДУЩА** ЕВ Lk 23:26, Zog: **ГРАДЖШТА**
- (20) **ВИДѢ ДХА БЖІА СХОДАЩА ИКЪ ГОЛЪБА** ЕВ Mt 3:16, Zog: **СЪХОДАШТЬ**
ОУЗРѢША ИИѢА ХОДАЩА ПО МОРИУ И БЛИЗЪ) КОРАБЛА БЪВША ЕВ Jn
6:19, Zog: **ХОДАШТА ... БЪВЪША**

In this combination the relation between the noun phrase and the verbal is similar to that of a subject and verb (predicate). The grammatical object of the finite verb (*verba sentienti*) is at the same time the logical subject of the verbal (participle). As the function of the participles in these structures is predicative, the short form seems to be justified in both OChSl and MChSl. The accusative-plus-participle construction is analogous to the accusative-plus-infinitive construction of Greek

and Latin. Due to the double function of the object this construction is described sometimes as *raising* (Nichols–Schallert 1983: 221).

- (21) И СЛЫШАСТА ЕГО ОБА ОУЧЕНИКА ГЛАГОЛЮЩАГО ЕВ Jn 1:37, Zog: ГЛАГОЛЮЩЪ
 (22) ЕДИНЪ $\bar{\omega}$ КНИЖНИКЪ, СЛЫШАВЪ НХЪ СТАЗАЮЩИХСА ЕВ Mk 12:28, Zog: СЛЫШАВЪ И СЪТАЗАИШТА СА
 (23) ω БРѢТЕ НХЪ СПАШИХЪ ЕВ Mk 14:37, Zog: ω БРѢТЕ И СПАШТА
 (24) ω БРѢТОСТА ЕГО ВЪ ЦЕРКВИ, СѢДАЩЕГО ЕВ Lk 2:46, Zog: ω БРѢТОСТЕ I ВЪ ЦРЪКВЕ СѢДАШЪ
 (25) АЗЪ БО УДЪХЪ СИЛЪ ИЗШЕДШЮ ИЗЪ МЕНЕ ЕВ Lk 8:46, Zog: УЮХЪ СИЛЪ ИШЪДЪШЪ ИЗЪ МЕНЕ

Although the short forms of participles are common in this combination, examples (21), (22), (23) and (24) prove that MChSl has changed these forms for long when the object of the sentence was a pronoun. The genitive accusative also contributed to these changes. In this way the long forms have nothing in common with definiteness or attributiveness that they were usually used for.

- (26) ω БРАЩЕТЕ МЛ(А)НИЦА ПОВИТА, ЛЕЖАЩА ВЪ ИСЛЕХЪ ЕВ Lk 2:12, Zog: ОБРАШТЕТЕ МЛАДЪНЦЪ ПОВИТЪ ЛЕЖАШЪ ВЪ ЁСЛЕХЪ

The *accusative with the past participle* construction was used only after special verbs and the passive participle occurred in short forms. We cited this example (26), however, not for the sake of the passive participle but in order to show that the second (active) participle *лежаща*, under the influence of the first, is also short.

5. Participles as premodifiers of a noun or of a noun substitute

The number of attributive participles used before the noun is very small in both OChSl and MChSl. The adjectives and participles in this function were used in postposition and participles standing before the subject had the meaning usually of an adverbial modifier:

- (27) И ВОЗЗРѢВЪ ІНѢ ГЛА ОУЧЕНИКОМЪ ЕВ Mk 10:23

Although the premodifiers of the noun phrase served as attribute and in MChSl for this the long (marked) forms were used, still we find examples with short forms in this position:

- (28) ТОГДА ПРИВЕДОША КЪ НЕМУ БѢСНЮЩАСА СЛѢПА И НѢМА. ЕВ Mt 12:22

Commonly the premodifier occurs in the long form. In example (29) the short form of the OC indicates that it is the logical SC of the word *рабъ*.

- (29) **И ВОЗВРАЩЕША ПОСЛАНИИ ШЕРѢТОША БОЛАЦАГО РАБА ИЗЦѢЛѢВША**
ЕВ Lk 7:10
- (30) **И ЗАДѢША МИМОХОДАЩИ НѢКОЕМЪ СІМОНЪ КУРИНЕЮ, ГРАДЪЩИ СЪ**
СЕЛА ЕВ Mk 15:21

In (30) the premodifier **МИМОХОДАЩИ** could not be in contrast with the short form of the postmodifier **ГРАДЪЩИ** which supports the short form of the premodifier.

6. Participles as postmodifiers of a noun or of a noun substitute

- (31) **ПОДОБЕНЪ ЕСТЬ ЧЕЛОВѢКЪ, ЗИЖДЪЩИ ХРАМИНЪ** ЕВ Lk 6:48
- (32) **ЕМШЕ СІМОНА НѢКОЕГО КУРИНЕА, ГРАДЪЩА СЪ СЕЛА** ЕВ Lk 23:26,
Zog: **ГРАДЪШТА**
- (33) **ПРИВЕДОУЪ СЫНА МОЕГО КЪ ТЕБѢ, ИМЪЩА ДЪХА НЕМА** ЕВ Mk 9:17,
Zog: **ИМЪШТЬ**
- (34) **СЛЫШАВЪИИ ЖЕ И НЕ СОТВОРИВЪИИ ПОДОБЕНЪ ЕСТЬ ЧЕЛОВѢКУ**
СОЗДАВШЕМЪ ХРАМИНЪ ЕВ Lk 6:49
- (35) **НАРОДЪ ЖЕ СТОИИ И СЛЫШАВЪ** ЕВ Jn 12:29, Zog: **НАРОДЪ ЖЕ СТОИИ**
СЛЫШАВЪ

Participles in the function of postmodifiers usually occur in the short form in Church Slavonic as the postmodification is in reality a kind of assertion (SC) about the noun it modifies. Examples (34) and (35), however, have long forms, which needs special explanation. In example (34) the modified noun **ЧЕЛОВѢКЪ** was already used in the sentence in the form of a substantivized past participle, and these were in the long form. Consequently, the marker of the defined noun will be a long postmodifier. In example (35) the short form of the participle could have indicated a verbal adverb as well, and in order to avoid possible misunderstanding the MChSl uses the long form. Apart from a small number of postmodifiers with long form, in MChSl the nominal participles predominate.

7. Participles as adverbial modifiers

- (36) **ИЗЪДЕ ЖЕ ВОНЪ ИИСЪ, НОСА ТЕРНОВЕНЪ ВѢНЕЦЪ** ЕВ Jn 19:5, Zog:
НОСА
- (37) **И ХОТАЩЕ ЕГО ОУБИТИ, ОУБОАСА НАРОДА** ЕВ Mt 14:5
- (38) **ШВѢЩАВЪ ЖЕ ИИСЪ РЕЧЕ** ЕВ Lk 10: 30
- (39) **СЛЫШАВЪ ЖЕ НАРОДЪ МИМОХОДАЩЕ, ВОПРОШАШЕ** ЕВ Lk 18:36
- (40) **ПРИДОША НА ГРОБЪ, НОСАЩА АРОМАТЫ** ЕВ Lk 24:1
- (41) **СЫНЪ ... РАСТОУИ ИМѢНИЕ СВОЕ, ЖИВЪИИ БЛАДНУ** ЕВ Lk 15:13

MChSl preserved the morphological characteristics of participles in the function of an adverbial modifier (about the exceptions see Буличъ 1893: 374, and

also our example (37)). Therefore, sometimes it is impossible to differentiate them from participles used in other functions (cf. (36) and (41) which could also be post-modifiers). Verbal adverbs in MChSI have mostly short forms and usually precede the subject.

Contemporary grammars had little influence on the formation and use of participles as it was the canonical corpus on the basis of which they had formed their paradigms. The situation, however, was more complicated as the authors of these grammars (Zizanyj, Smotryc'kyj) compiled their works with pragmatical aims and thus they described all functional variants of the Church Slavic language. This resulted in the paradigms of the participles containing forms characteristic of the non-canonical texts, showing up a strong influence from the living language.

The overall impression that the short forms of participles were substituted by long ones in MChSI is not supported by the facts. It is true, however, that many of them, especially those in attributive use and in pl. in the oblique cases had been changed. A lot of them were substituted only in the course of the latest corrections of the canonical texts. The *Ostrog (Ostrih) Bible* (1581) for example has much more short-form active participles than the *Elisabeth Bible* (1751). Examples (42)–(62) illustrate these changes in the Gospel of Mark.

- (42) бѣ же ѿаннѣ ... ѿдѣй акрѣды ЕВ Mk 1:6, ОВ: ... адѣы
 (43) бѣ бо оуа ихъ ѿкѡ власть имѣй ЕВ Mk 1:22, ОВ: имѣы
 (44) и оужасошася вси, ... глаголющѣмъ ЕВ Mk 1:27, ОВ: глаголющемъ
 (45) и не могущѣмъ имъ приближитися ЕВ Mk 2:4, ОВ: не могущемъ
 (46) и мимоградѣй видѣ левию ЕВ Mk 2:14, ОВ: мимоградѣы
 (47) бѣ тамѡ челоуѣкъ сѣхѡ имѣй рѣкъ ЕВ Mk 3:1, ОВ: имѣы
 (48) и глѣ челоуѣкъ сѣхѡ имѣщемѡ рѣкъ ЕВ Mk 3:3, ОВ: имѣще (verbal adverb)
 (49) бѣвшей печали ЕВ Mk 4:17, ОВ: бѣвши (dat. abs.)
 (50) и печали бѣка сегѡ ... вхоуашѣе ЕВ Mk 4:18, ОВ: вхоуаше
 (51) видѣ ... криуашѣа многѡ ЕВ Mk 5:38, ОВ: криуаше
 (52) бѣвшей сѣбѡтѣ ЕВ Mk 6:2, ОВ: бѣвши
 (53) мгози слышашѣи ЕВ Mk 6:2, ОВ: слышаше
 (54) ирѡдѣ ..., вѣдѣй его ЕВ Mk 6:20, ОВ: вѣды
 (55) и видѣша ихъ ѿдѣшихъ ЕВ Mk 6: 33, ОВ: ѿдѣша (л > л after the hard ш)
 (56) бахѡ ѿкѡ овцы не имѣщѣе ЕВ Mk 6:34, ОВ: не имѣще
 (57) и видѣ ихъ страждѡщи ихъ ЕВ Mk 6:48, ОВ: страждѡще
 (58) прѣнде къ нимъ , по морю ходѣй ЕВ Mk 6:48, ОВ: ходѣа
 (59) и изшѣдшѣмъ имъ ЕВ Mk 6:54, ОВ: изшѣдшемъ (dat. abs.)

- (60) и видѣвше иѣкѣихъ ..., ѡдѣицхъ EB Mk 7:2, OB: ѡдѣце (by mistake with -ѣ)
 (61) сходащѣмъ же нмъ EB Mk 9:9, OB: сходащемъ (dat. abs.)
 (62) онъ же вѣдый ихъ EB Mk 12:15, OB: вѣды
 (63) и возлежащѣмъ нмъ и ѡдѣщѣмъ EB Mk 14:18, OB: возлежащемъ нмъ и ѡдѣщемъ
 (64) ѡбръѣте ихъ спацихъ EB Mk 14:37, OB: спациа (see example 51)
 (65) бахѣ же и жены издалеца зраца EB Mk 15:40, OB: зраце (see also 57)
 (66) минѣвшеи сѣбѣѡтѣ EB Mk 16:2, OB: минѣвши

Most of these changes had already taken place in the *Moscow Bible* (1663), e.g. (42) ѡдѣй не, (45) не могущѣмъ, (47) нмѣй, (54) вѣдый. The more archaic Ukrainian variant of Church Slavic preserved the short forms for a long time, especially in dat. abs. and in the form of animate accusative: (60) ѡдѣца NZ 1641.

The modern archaisers of the Church Slavic language therefore are for the reestablishing of the short forms (Плетнева 1998: 67–73). The participles and their forms in MChSl also illustrate that the Church Slavic language of the canonical texts is not homogeneous. But the same irregularities are to be found also with the adjectives (short vs. long forms).

In our study we could not go into details and therefore restricted ourselves only to the major functions and examples illustrating their forms.

REFERENCES

Bible:

(OB) 1581 – БІБЛІА [Ostrog].

(NZ) 1641 – НОВЫЙ ЗАВѢТЪ [Vil'no].

1663 – БІБЛІА [Moskva].

1962 – *Біблія або книги святого письма старого и гогово заповіту*. Лондон: Британське і Закордонне Біблійне Товариство.

1969 – *Svatá Biblia čiže Sváté písmo starého i nového zákona*. Praha: Nákladem Biblickej spoločnosti britickej a zahraničnej.

1979 – *Библия, книги священного писания Ветхого и Нового завета*. Москва: Изд. Московской патриархии.

1981 – *Библија или Свето писмо старогa и новогa завета*. Београд: Издање Британског и иностраног библијског друштва.

(EB) 1993 – БІБЛІА СРБЪУЪ КНИГНІ СВАЩЕННАГО ПИСАНІА ВЕТХАГО И НОВАГО ЗАВѢТА. САНКТПЕТЕРБУРГЪ, 1901. (Репр. Российское Библиейское Общество, 1993.)

Flier, S. Michael 1974, *Aspects of nominal determination in Old Church Slavic*. The Hague – Paris: Mouton.

- Nichols, Johanna – Schallert, Joe 1983, The pragmatics of raising in Old Russian and Common Slavic. In: *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists*. Columbus: Slavic Publications, 221–246.
- Quattuor Evangeliorum Codex Glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*. Ed. V. Jagić. Berlin, 1879. (Abdruck: Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.)
- Růžička, Rudolf 1963, *Das syntaktische System der altslavischen Partizipien und sein Verhältnis zum Griechischen*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Večerka, Radoslav 1961, *Syntax aktivních participií v staroslověnině*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Буличъ, С.К. 1893, *Церковнославянские элементы въ современномъ литературномъ и народномъ русскомъ языкѣ*. Петербургъ. (Nachdruck und Nachwort von Peter Kosta. München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1986.)
- Ильминский, Н. 1888, *Материалы для сравнительнаго изученія церковно-славянскихъ формъ и оборотовъ, извлеченныхъ изъ Евангелія и Псалтыри*. Казань.
- Муталимова, М. 1968, *Причастия в Мариинском евангелии. Автореферат*. Ленинград.
- Плетнева, А.А. 1998, Дискуссии о церковнославянском языке в конце XIX века. Позиция архаизаторов. *Вопросы языкознания* № 5, 67–73.
- Толстой, Н.И. 1957, Значение кратких и полных прилагательных в старославянском языке (на материале евангельских кодексов). *Вопросы славянского языкознания* 2, 43–122.
- Якубинская-Лемберг, Э.А. 1957, Употребление кратких и полных прилагательных в старославянском языке. *Ученые записки Ленинградского университета* 197. Серия филологических наук 23, 92–109.