

Cynthia M. Vakareliyska

Methodological Issues in Editing the Curzon Gospel

This paper discusses the methodological issues that I encountered in compiling an edition of the western Bulgarian 14th-century Curzon Gospel (hereafter ‘C’, British Library Add. MS 39628; Vakareliyska 2008), and how I resolved them. The issues were greater in number and in some ways more complex than those I am dealing with currently in compiling a second expanded and corrected edition of the related Dobrejšo Gospel (‘D’; first edition: Conev 1906). First, unlike D, the C manuscript has an intact menology that required analysis. Second, C replaces the source that it shares with D and the Banica Gospel (‘B’, printed transcription edition: Dogramadžieva, Rajkov 1981) with an unrelated source for the first half of the Book of Matthew. Third, the orthographic system of the primary C scribe not only is idiosyncratic, but reflects a broader leveling of the mid-vowels in the dialect represented in the manuscript than any other manuscripts I could find, hence requiring a comprehensive analysis of the interplay between orthography and phonology. Fourth, one third of C is effectively a palimpsest, in which a later editor added accent and breathing marks above the text in the first portion of the Books of Matthew and in two-thirds of John, and made many textual changes in those parts of the manuscript in an attempt to conform its textual version – which, in the Book of John, it shares with D and B – to a different textual version. This required quite a few editorial decisions regarding how to represent the original text vs. the added changes. Finally, a number of other methodological issues arose as the result of my initial preparation of the book as a one-volume analysis, which I then expanded into an edition volume and an analysis volume.

The methodological issues and their resolutions are presented in sections 2 through 7. Section 1 provides a brief background to how the edition came about.

1. *The Context of the Edition*

I first came across the C manuscript at the British Library in 1991, a year out of graduate school, as part of a research project looking at patterns in case-marking errors in Bulgarian Church Slavonic manuscripts written during the period when the Middle Bulgarian vernacular was losing its nominal case paradigm. C became the focus of that study because of its great number of what appeared to be case-marking errors as a result of substitutions among the letters representing the OCS mid-vowels. In order to refer to verse locations

in the text of C, I needed to consult a transcription edition of another Bulgarian Church Slavonic gospel from the same general period that included modern chapter/verse conventions. For this purpose I ordered from the stacks Dogramadžieva and Rajkov's (1981) edition of B, which I knew of from Horace Lunt's 1984 critique.

As I was comparing C line by line to B, I began to notice that most of the textual anomalies that were pointed out in the annotations of the B edition (including garblings, omissions of text, and homoioteleuta) were occurring in the same locations in C. From these close correspondences it was obvious that the two manuscripts must be very closely related, so I wrote to Horace Lunt, with whom I had studied in graduate school, offering to send a microfilm of C to him in case he might want to write an article on the relationship between C and B. He responded that since it was I who had noticed the relationship, I should be the one to report it. Knowing that this was my first experience working with a Church Slavonic manuscript, he then sent me a long separate letter explaining, among many other things, the importance of studying tetraevangelia lection by lection, of paying attention to the rubrication of the verses, and of always analyzing the entire manuscript, including any menology or synaxaria.

I published an introductory article in 1994 that presented samples of parallel anomalies in the text of C and B. I had thought naïvely that the article would take about two weeks to complete; in fact, because I had to compare the entire C manuscript closely with B and their mutual close relative D in order to discuss their three-way relationship, it took two years. Since the manuscript had not been discussed in the scholarly literature, with the exception of several short catalogue entries (e.g., Cleminson 1988) and reproductions of paleographic samples, it fell to me to give it an identifying title in the article. I named it after the Hon. Robert Curzon, because it was from Curzon's private collection that had been donated to the British Library, and it had been brought to England by Curzon himself from Mt. Athos in 1837 (see Vakareliyska 2008, II: xi).

At that time, I viewed C primarily as a supplement for portions of B that were now lost. Thus my next undertaking was an annotated transcription of the C version of all the missing B portions outside Matthew, which was from a different textual tradition (Vakareliyska 1996). In order to demonstrate its textual similarity to B and D, I undertook a word-by-word comparison with a sampling of other gospel manuscripts. Working on the supplement to the B text, I encountered and solved many of the methodological problems that were later involved in the full edition of C – although, as shown below, the second time around I resolved some of those problems differently.

2. *Did the Manuscript Warrant a Full Edition?*

Because the immediately striking characteristic of C was its unusually close similarity to B, and there was already a published transcription edition of B, at first it appeared that an edition of C would be superfluous, particularly in light of the recent influx of editions of not particularly remarkable Slavic gospel manuscripts in the 1980's (see Lunt 1984). The occasional textual mismatches among C, B and D could be dealt with in a series of further articles.

In the process of comparing the entire texts of C, B and D word for word, however, certain major distinguishing features of C came to the fore that suggested the potential appropriateness of an edition after all. The most prominent of these were (a) the first half of C's Book of Matthew, which represented a third textual tradition, not corresponding to the equivalent text in either B or D; (b) the second half of Matthew, which, unlike B's Book of Matthew, shared with D the original textual version that had accompanied Mark, Luke and John in the shared ancestor to D, B, and C ('DBC'), and preserved the text of numerous folios now lost from D; (c) C's highly idiosyncratic orthographic system, which I could not find in any other manuscripts; and (d) the menology, in which about half the commemorations were identical in content and textual formula to B's, while the other half were from a different source. Each of these sections of the manuscript could be published in transcription in a series of articles similar to the mini-edition, but it seemed to make more sense to publish them together with the rest of the C text, which I had already transcribed for my own purposes. Moreover, C's status as the only datable manuscript in the DBC family (on the basis of its Easter/Sexagesima table, which begins at 1354) suggested that a transcription of C would be a more reliable source than the editions of B or D for dating other Bulgarian Church Slavonic manuscripts by paleographic, orthographic, morphological and lexical features.

3. *Scope of the Edition and Analysis*

From the beginning, the purpose of the edition and accompanying analysis volume was limited to a comparison of C to B and D, a rough reconstruction of the DBC ancestor, and a further comparison of the DBC Gospel version to other Slavic gospels. The study had four goals, with respect to the Gospel text: (a) to show that C, B, and D constituted a close family of Bulgarian liturgical tetraevangelia; (b) to identify the distinguishing features shared by all three Gospel versions, and in this way to offer a rough reconstruction of the hypothetical shared DBC ancestor; (c) to identify distinguishing features shared by C and B alone, and on this basis to offer a rough reconstruction of the later hypothetical CB ancestor; and (d) to identify the distinguishing features of C that were not shared by B or D. Because together C, B, and D constituted the first identified family of Bulgarian gospel manuscripts, the focus was on the features of that family and the transmission of the Slavic Gospel tradition. That being said, I am very glad that further efforts have been undertaken to locate the translation version shared by these three manuscripts within the Greek tradition of Gospel transmission (see Alberti 2015).

Although I had originally intended the scope of the menology comparison to be limited to Slavic calendars, I found some major correspondences between the shared portion of the C and B menologies and the menology to Bulgarian apostolus № 882 in the Bulgarian National Library, which included the rare Western commemoration of Arnulph, Bishop of Metz on July 18 (first identified in B by Šniter [1995]; see also Miklas, Šniter 1998; Miklas 1988). Moreover, the menology to apostolus № 882 had been identified as reflecting the Constantinople Typikon tradition (Koceva 1984; Koceva, Atanasov 1991). This meant that I needed to

compare the C and B menologies to the Constantinople Typikon and other Greek sources, because they reflected the Constantinople Typikon tradition more closely than most of the other Slavic menologies I had collected. As a result, the comparative corpus for the menology portion of the edition was expanded to include Greek calendars in addition to Slavic ones.

4. *Formatting and Representation of Later Emendations*

The formatting of the transcribed text followed traditional conventions for the most part. Each line of manuscript text on the page was numbered, and modern chapter and verse numbers were inserted into the text as superscripts. The even-numbered pages of the edition each contained the transcription of a single folio side of the manuscript, with comparative annotations on the odd-numbered pages. In the menology portion of the edition, however, the size of the comparative corpus usually resulted in runover of the annotations, sometimes for several pages. In these cases, the annotations were continued on the even-numbered page so that they would not face the transcription of the following manuscript folio side. In instances where the extended annotations ended on an even-numbered page, the following odd-numbered page was left blank so that the manuscript transcription could resume on the next even-numbered page. Each transcription page and its accompanying annotation page(s) bore a header providing the Gospel Book, the inclusive chapter/verse numbers for that folio of the manuscript, and the folio number.

I produced the transcription well before a Unicode system had been developed for Old Cyrillic fonts. The font I used was Sebastian Kempgen's MacCampus Old Cyrillic font set MethodSeries, which had become available after I began the transcription in 1991. On my editor's recommendation I used a shaded font style to designate red letters in the manuscript, rather than boldface as in the 1996 mini-edition. I surrounded the liturgical rubrics in curly brackets in order to make them easily distinguishable from the Gospel text, and left the Ammonian chapter numerals in the margins without brackets. Notes on the shapes of ornamental letters and the size of letters that were taller than a line in height were included together with the comparative collation in the annotations on the facing page.

A major formatting issue was how to represent the emendations by later scribes in the transcription. On the first eight extant folios of Book of Matthew, and in two-thirds of the Book of John, a later editor had added accent and breathing marks over the text, had emended vowel letters to conform with traditional spelling, and had edited the Gospel text heavily in order to make the version in C conform to a different Slavic gospel version. In the published transcription of the mini-edition, I had dealt with this issue by inserting the textual emendations, in parentheses, directly into the text, in an outlined boldface white font: e.g., А(ѣ > ѣ)МБ¹. There were three problems with this approach, however: (a) the outline around the characters did not show up well in the published version, and in some locations

¹ Since the outlined white font option is not available in later versions in Microsoft Word, it is represented here by underlining.

it was illegible; (b) the inserted parentheticals disrupted the text; and (c) there was no way to put the later diacritics into outlined font without affecting the characters below them, or otherwise to make them visually distinguishable from the transcribed original text. For this reason, in the mini-edition I had left the diacritics in the same font as the transcription. For legibility purposes, I did this also in the full edition, but this time I recorded all the other emendations in the lower margin of the transcription page, rather than in the transcription itself. The notes were ordered by line number of the manuscript text, and reproduced all non-diacritic emendations in the order in which they occurred in the line, separated by dashes. Instead of adding parentheticals as I had in the mini-edition, I reproduced each affected word in its entirety, replacing the original affected portion with the emendment instead of the original letters. Portions of a word or text that were erased were surrounded by angle brackets in the transcription. Where erased letters were illegible even under ultraviolet examination, I represented them in the transcription with a low horizontal line for each letter space, e.g. <_ _ _ >.

A related issue was how to indicate the later editor's many emendations of the *jus minor*, which represented both nasal vowels in C's orthographic system, to *jus major*. Since these emendations did not involve erasures of the original text, I represented them by underlining the affected *jus* directly in the transcription.

I counted between 8 to 12 other later hands that had also contributed emendations to the manuscript, on the basis of ink shades and letter formations. This was a very difficult task, because I am far from a specialist in paleography, so I stressed in the introduction to the edition that my attributions of individual emendations to the various later editors were open to question. Of course, the identification of later hands was based on a determination of their distinguishing paleographic and orthographic characteristics. These I described also in the introduction to the edition. I identified the individual editors alphabetically by descending order of the substantiality of their contributions, with the editor of the portions described here above as Editor A. As with Editor A's emendations, I recorded the emendations by the other editors in the lower margin of the transcription page, preceded by with the alphabetical label of the editor.

Another issue was how to represent the text of the top lines of folios 11r-19r, which had undergone smoke and water damage and were largely illegible. I used ultraviolet light and multi-spectral-imaging analysis with video spectral comparator to decipher the underlying text to the extent possible. I reproduced the illegible textual fragments in a smaller font size, surrounded by parentheses. For these I used the canonical Codex Zographensis text and orthographic system, since the first half of C's Matthew version, and B's entire Matthew version, were independent replacements of the original DBC version, and D was missing this part of Matthew. In instances where only part of a word was legible, I reproduced the illegible letters in a smaller font, surrounded by parentheses, and relied, where possible, on the Zographensis for the spellings, rather than trying to second-guess which vowel letters the C scribe had used. I reproduced the damaged portions of the text conservatively: if I was not able to decipher a letter, even if I knew which letter it should be, I treated the letter as illegible.

Elsewhere in the transcription, unerased illegible letters that could be reasonably determined from context were left unbracketed and were followed by a question mark: e.g., Дб?нб.

5. *Paleographic Detail*

Another general methodological issue was the degree to which paleographic details should be reproduced. I did not attempt to create special glyphs for unusually shaped letters that carried no phonological information that differed from the usual letter shape. On the other hand, Sebastian Kempgen generously created for me a blended jus glyph \mathfrak{c} , which did have phonological significance in *c*, and added it to the MethodSeries Old Cyrillic font. The blended jus, which is now part of the Unicode Old Cyrillic system also, is used sporadically in *C* to represent a iotated nasal vowel of either kind. It was often difficult to determine whether a jus shape in *C* was intended as a regular jus minor (which represents either nasal vowel in *C*'s orthographic system) or a blended jus. I treated these ambiguous forms conservatively as regular jusy in the transcription, but indicated the ambiguities in the annotations on the facing page.

A related issue was the representation of superscript letters and the later-inserted breathing marks and accents. The diacritical marks had been added hastily and often were ambiguous in shape. Instead of reproducing the ambiguous markings in the shapes that would be expected in a canonical OCS manuscript, I tried to reproduce them as they actually appeared. Here too, I noted any ambiguities in shape in the critical apparatus.

As in the mini-edition, I positioned the superscript letters in abbreviations and the diacritical marks exactly where they occurred in the manuscript, rather than where they would appear in the word if they were not in superscript. For this I relied on Sebastian Kempgen's MacCampus MethodTwo superscript font and keyboard and his newly-introduced accompanying MethodCentered font and keyboard, which positioned superscripts, including diacritical marks, between letters rather than directly above a letter as MethodTwo did. There were two reasons behind the decision to position superscripts where they occurred in the manuscript. First, placing the superscript letter at the end of the high-frequency abbreviation for *reče* in the interests of reader-friendliness (e.g., рѣ^ѣ) looked artificial to me, because medieval Slavic scribes did not commonly write abbreviations that way. Second, and more important, the positioning of superscript letters by the *C* scribe often affected the placement of the diacritics by the later editor.

6. *Critical Apparatus*

Compiling the annotations to the transcription entailed a different set of methodological issues regarding the selection of the comparative corpus and the degree of detail in the comparisons.

6.1. *Comparative Corpus*

The primary task of the annotations was to support my claim that C was closely related to B and to D, which Conev (1923) had already correctly identified as a close relative of B. This required comparing the C version with B and D word by word in their entirety, including the liturgical rubrics, synaxaria, and menologies (in C and B); and further comparing both the C and DBC versions to a representative corpus of other Church Slavonic gospels. The analysis of the comparisons in the annotations was made in a separate volume on the linguistic and textual features of C (Vakareliyska 2008, 11).

For the 1996 transcription of the text missing from B, I had assembled a modest manuscript corpus just large enough to demonstrate that the textual tradition that C and B shared differed in significant ways from the traditions of the canonical OCS tetraevangelia and of other later Bulgarian tetraevangelia. For this reason I had limited the corpus to the canonical OCS codices Zographensis and Marianus, the Macedonian Dobromir Gospel, generally dated to the 12th century, and the eastern Bulgarian Ivan Alexander Gospel (also from Curzon's collection, and dated only two years after C's probable year of completion). A major goal of the full edition, however, was to identify and reconstruct the features of the hypothetical ancestor DBC. Moreover, while assembling the annotations, I had recently found that the lection rubrication in DBC was most similar to that in certain Serbian long lectionaries, suggesting possible textual influence from the long lectionary gospel tradition also. For this reason I expanded the scope of the corpus to include long and short lectionaries in addition to tetraevangelia.

The final corpus was comprised of twelve sources: B; D; the OCS codices Zographensis, Marianus, and Assemanianus, the Savvina Kniga and the Vatican Palimpsest; the Ostromir Gospel; the later Bulgarian Vraca, Koxno, and Plovdiv lectionaries; and two representatives of the Serbian Miroslav family of long lectionaries: the Vukan and Hilandar long lectionaries. I expanded the subcorpus of later Bulgarian gospels, but limited it to versions that reflected the old Ohrid tradition. I included the Bulgarian Vraca and Plovdiv lectionaries despite the fact that they were both very carelessly copied, partly in order to demonstrate that the C scribe's slavish copying and unthinking errors were not unique among Bulgarian gospels of the 13th and 14th centuries. The Vraca Gospel had additional significance in that its orthographic system was the closest to C's of all the published Bulgarian gospel editions.

In selecting the subcorpus of long lectionaries, I included the Vukan and Hilandar gospels because their rubrication corresponded most closely to DBC's. I did not include the Serbian Miroslav Gospel itself, or the related Macedonian Carpin Gospel, because the purpose of the collation was not to compare the members of the Miroslav family to each other (this had already been done in the annotations to Rodić and Jovanović's 1986 edition of the Miroslav Gospel). In the interests of time and space, I also did not include short lectionaries such as the Macedonian Priest John lectionary gospel (edition: Mošin 1954), and I omitted the Dobromir liturgical tetraevangelion and the Ivan Alexander narrative

tetraevangelia from this corpus in this round, because although both reflected an Ohrid tradition, I had already found that neither had significant textual similarities to the DBC version (cf. my misimpression in Vakareliyska 1996 that the Dobromir Gospel was distantly related to DBC). I chose not to include the Serbian Nikola tetraevangelion or Raško tetraevangelion for the same reason, since again, the purpose of the comparison was to identify the distinguishing features of C and DBC, and not to compare all the members of the corpus to each other.

The first half of C's Book of Matthew is from a non-DBC source and is textually idiosyncratic or anomalous in places. I had compared the most unusual textual variants in this portion of the text with their equivalents in roughly 125 published and unpublished Bulgarian, Serbian, and East Slavic gospel manuscripts, largely while collecting the corpus for the menology annotations in Bulgaria and Russia in 1992 and 1995, respectively, but I did not find any of C's Matthew idiosyncracies in any other gospel manuscripts, with the exception of the Savvina Kniga, which contained some lexical idiosyncracies in the same locations where C had different idiosyncratic variants (see discussion in Vakareliyska 2008, II: 203-210; 2007).

6.2. *Orthographic and Other Variations*

Although minor morphological and syntactic variations are not usually recorded in a critical apparatus because their use varies from scribe to scribe, I compared these in the annotations in order to facilitate a rough reconstruction of the hypothetical CB and DBC antigraphs, to the extent possible. These included the presence or absence of conjunction or pronoun *i*, and the variations between past participle and aorist forms, and productive vs. old aorists. On the orthographic level, I recorded differences between C and the other manuscripts in word-initial ю/ию, я/иѧ and ѣ/ю distributions; consonant cluster truncations (e.g., *ѠДр/Ѡр*); superfluous jers in *ѧСЬМЬ* for *ѧСМЬ*, particularly because these sometimes coincided with B and D; and reflexes of Greek *αυδ-* and *αυγ-* in proper names, where B and C often differed. I did not generally note lowered strong front jers, omitted jers (except where a strong jer was omitted), or tense jers. I also did not compare common vowel letter substitutions that reflected dispalatalization of consonants (e.g., *и/ы, оу/ю*), except where there were significant correlations with B.

6.3. *Menology Collation*

A considerably larger comparative corpus was necessary for the menology, because in addition to their shared CB source, which was based on a short version of the archaic 9th-10th-century Constantinople Typikon, the C and B menologies each reflect a separate supplemental source for the more minor feasts in the second half of the Church year².

² After examining more Greek calendars in 2015, I am now inclined to think that C replaced some of the shared entries from the CB antigraph in the second half of the year with its supplemental source. If D had a menology, it is now missing, together with most of its remaining synaxarion.

Since relatively few Slavic menologies have been published, this required two four-month stays in Bulgaria and Russia, respectively, hand-copying the commemorations from over 125 mostly unpublished calendars. Because of time and space considerations, I limited the hand-copied Slavic corpus mostly to menologies rather than including all calendar genres, although when I found a co-occurrence in the Zograph Trephologion (also known as the Draganov Menaion) of the rare Western commemoration of Arnulph, Bishop of Metz that B and C share (identified in B by Šniter [1995]; see also Miklas, Šniter 1998), it became clear to me that families of related calendars can transcend calendar genre. For the same reasons I limited the comparison to the saints' commemorations themselves, and did not compare the pericopes in the menology with any other calendars besides B.

The menology collation included the major Constantinopolitan calendars³, since apostolus № 882 and other Bulgarian menologies reflect them; and both Baronius's 1586 edition of the *Martyrologium Romanum* and the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (de Rossi, Duchesne 1894) for the Western saints found in C and B that are not part of the Eastern Orthodox tradition. In light of Miklas's (1988) hypothesis that the Latin commemorations in B (which co-occurred in C) likely originated in Italo-Greek calendars that later made their way to Bulgaria, I also added to the calendar corpus Kulič's 1992 collation of Greek calendars in Italian collections.

Because the commemorations in medieval Eastern Orthodox calendars of saints vary staggeringly, a data management system was needed in order to search and compare the calendars in the corpus. David Birnbaum very generously designed the blueprint for a searchable electronic collation of menologies, which I began to develop in connection with the edition, by inputting the texts of all the commemorations in an individual menology and tagging them for generic and specific saint's name, saint's gender, calendar date, calendar tradition (e.g. general, Western, Bulgarian, Serbian), and other features⁴. Processing a single calendar took several months, however, since in addition to the transcription and tagging, many of the commemorated figures had to be identified through library research and comparison with other calendars in the corpus. Although several graduate students assisted me by transcribing and tagging calendars for course credit as a practicum in digital humanities, the collation work proceeded too slowly for me to take full advantage of it during the compiling of the edition. As a result, for most of the calendars in the corpus I had to do date-by-date comparisons of my handwritten archive notes.

For the content of Greek and Slavic calendars that I did not have access to in the original or in a complete edition, I used Archimandrite Sergij's *Polnyj mesjaceslov Vostoka* (Spasskij 1901). That collation has its limitations: it often provides only a sample of all

³ The ninth-/tenth-century Constantinople Typikon ('CT') in the Holy Trinity version (Matéos 1962) and the Patmos version (Krasnosel'cev 1892) and the later tenth-century Menology of Emperor Basil (*Il Menologio di Basilio II. Cod. Vaticano Graeco 1613, II. Tavole*, Torino 1907).

⁴ The idea of creating a digital database to manage the large calendar corpus was suggested to me by Horace Lunt (personal communication, 1995).

the calendars that share a specific commemoration, and it contains many errors. For this reason, I reproduced Spasskij's manuscript codes, which include periods, to indicate those calendars for which I had had to rely on his collation, whereas I did not use periods in the codes of the calendars that I had examined firsthand or in full editions.

Although neither Kulič's nor Spasskij's collation generally includes the textual formulae of individual calendars' commemorations, this was not a major problem for the annotations. Because of space limitations, I generally compared textual formula only among C, B, 882, ZT, and, where relevant, CT.

An issue for both the menology annotations and the chapter on the menology in the analysis volume was the language in which the saints' names should appear. In the end I used English variants of the names, since the language of the annotations and of the two volumes as a whole was English. This resulted in using the Latin forms of most of the Greek saints' names, because the Latin variants were adopted into English. For the honorifics and official titles of the individual saints, I relied on Holweck's 1924 biographical dictionary of saints.

6.4. *Synaxaria and Liturgical Rubrics*

Because C and B have nearly identical synaxaria, the annotations compare the text of C's two synaxaria only with B and with the remaining portion of D's one extant synaxarion. For the same reason, the annotations compare the textual formula of C's liturgical rubrics only to those in B and D, although they indicate where the incipit and explicit occur in the other gospels.

7. *Index Verborum*

The main reason for adding an index verborum to the edition was the considerable range of C's spellings of the same word or morphological form. I began collecting all the variants of individual words for my own purposes, in order to look for patterns in the distribution of vowel letters (which are discussed in chapter 2 of the commentary volume of the edition), but it seemed likely that a collection of all the orthographic variants of a single lexeme in one location would also be useful for readers, particularly those who might wish to compare C's orthographic system to that of other manuscripts. Moreover, C contained numerous Graecisms and dialect words, some of which were not shared by B or D, that could be found easily if there were an index.

In the header to each lexeme in the index verborum, I used canonical OCS spelling to the extent possible, rather than trying to produce a close-to-standard spelling in C's single-*jet*, single-*jus* orthographic system. For verbs, the header consisted of the infinitive or third-person plural nonpast form, whichever provided more information on the basic stem. For irregular verbs, I listed both forms in the header. For the OCS basic forms, I relied primarily on Lunt's (1959) OCS glossary and Sadnik, Aitzenmüller 1955. I followed the OCS headers with the Greek equivalents, for which I relied on Lysén 1995, Nestle, Aland 1985, and the Zondervan interlinear Greek-English version of Nestle, Aland 1988. In many instances a

single OCS verb corresponded to a variety of Greek verbs in different Gospel verses, but assigning the proper Greek variant to each occurrence of the lexeme in C would result either in repetition of the appropriate Greek equivalents, if the C variants were kept in numerical order by Gospel chapter/verse, or in reorganization of the C variants by Greek equivalent rather than by order of occurrence. This was the most difficult part of the edition for me to produce, because I did not have any formal training in Greek and was unable, despite my efforts, to engage a specialist to check the Greek forms.

I did not record all the locations of the highest-frequency functors, including the prepositions *vī*, *na*, and *kū* and conjunction *i*, since that would provide little to no significant information while taking up pages. I did, however, include headers for those functors, together with their spellings in C, if these differed from the canonical OCS spelling (e.g., C ВЪ; и, і, і). I included every occurrence of OCS *nū*, because it is sometimes written in C as НА (В НѦ), reflecting the vernacular; I also included every instance of the pronouns *i* and *iže* in their various inflectional forms because certain of those forms are overused in C.

Forms like НА (for OCS conjunction НЪ) or the noun КОУРА (for OCS КОУРЪ) that are not attested in OCS and are not common in Bulgarian Church Slavonic I marked in the index verborum with a preceding asterisk. I provided headers for those forms, but cross-referenced them to the headers for the closest canonical OCS form, if there was one, and listed the occurrences of the C form under the canonical OCS header. In cases where more than one lexical variant for a single OCS lexeme occurs in C in different verse locations (e.g., canonical OCS ИЮДЕИ and Preslav-associated ЖИДОВИНЪ; КОУРА, АЛЕКТОРЪ, КОКОТЬ, and ПЪТЬЕЛЬ for КОУРЪ), I cross-referenced the other forms at the end of the entry.

The index verborum was limited mainly to the lexemes in the Gospel text, but I added several items from the synaxaria that exhibited orthographic or morphological variation. Where there was no attested OCS or Bulgarian Church Slavonic equivalent, as in the case of the Graecism *МЕТИМОНЪ/*МЕ-ФИМОНЪ, the header consisted of the C lexeme.

I departed from the tradition of providing folio and line numbers for the locations of the forms in the index verborum, because I had found this an extraordinarily unhelpful reference in Jagić's 1883 edition of the Codex Marianus and other editions of Biblical manuscripts. Since the transcription of C in the edition marks the modern chapter and verse numbers in the text, I used these as the locators and saw no reason to add folio and line numbers also.

8. Conclusion

It would not have occurred to me to undertake the study of C and the edition without Horace Lunt's encouragement and bewildering confidence that I would be able to pull it off somehow, despite having no preparation besides his OCS course. If I had realized when I took on the task that it would take me 15 years, there is no way I would have started it. In the beginning it was exciting beyond description to work with the manuscript firsthand and observe its unusual features as they revealed themselves sequentially – particularly the

continuing parade of errors and anomalies shared with B, which was breathtaking and at first made me question my sanity, because I knew from the orthography that the manuscript I was looking at could not be the same manuscript as B. After the first few years, however, my initial reaction to each new major idiosyncratic feature (e.g., the orthographic system, the cobbled-together Matthew version, the patchworked menology) was horror and near-despair, because it meant that the project now required additional years of study of yet another new subject that I knew nothing about, and collection of yet another large comparative corpus. In the end, however, I'm very glad that I was so clueless about the magnitude of the task that I undertook it, because the journey with C was an adventure the likes of which I had never had and surely will not have again.

Abbreviations

Add. MS	Additional Manuscripts.
B	Banica Gospel.
C	Curzon Gospel.
CB	hypothetical shared ancestor of C and B.
CT	Constantinople Typikon.
D	Dobrejšo Gospel.
DBC	hypothetical shared ancestor of D, B, and C.
OCS	Old Church Slavonic.

Literature

- Alberti 2015: A. Alberti, *The Banica, Dobrejšo and Curzon Gospels in Light of the Greek Text*, in: A. Kulik, C.M. MacRobert, S. Nikolova, M. Taube, C.M. Vakareliyska (eds.), *The Bible in Slavic Tradition*, Boston 2015, pp. 271-310.
- Baronius 1586: C. Baronius Soranius (ed.), *Martyrologium Romanum ad novum kalendarii rationem, ex ecclesiasticae historiae veritatem restitutum. Gregorii XIII. Pont. max. iussu editum. Accessertunt notationes atque tractatio de Martyrologio Romano*, Roma 1586.
- Cleminson 1988: R. Cleminson (ed.), *The Anne Pennington Catalogue. A Union Catalogue of Cyrillic Manuscripts in British and Irish Collections*, London 1988.
- Conev 1906: B. Conev (ed.), *Dobrejšovo četveroevangele. Srednobălgarski pametnik ot XIII v.*, Sofija 1906 (= Bălgarski starini, 1).

- Conev 1914: B. Conev (ed.), *Vračansko evanĝele*, Sofija 1914 (= Bălgarski starini, 4).
- Conev 1923: B. Conev, *Knjižovni starini ot Elena*, "Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet. Istoriko-filologiĉeski fakultet", XIX, 1923, 7, pp. 1-33.
- de Rossi, Duchesne 1894: I.B. de Rossi, L. Duchesne (eds.), *Martyrologium Hieronymianum ad fidem codicum adiectis prolegomeni, Ex Act. SS. Novembris*, II, Bruxelles 1894.
- Holweck 1924: F.G. Holweck (ed.), *A Biographical Dictionary of the Saints with a General Introduction on Hagiology*, St. Louis 1924.
- Jagiĉ 1883: V. Jagiĉ [Jagiĉ] (ed.), *Quattuor evangeliorum versionis palaeoslavenicae Codex Marianus glagoliticus*, Berlin 1883 (reprint: Graz 1960).
- Koceva 1985: E. Koceva, *Cerkovnye ustavy i izučenie slavjanskix rukopisej X-XIV vv. Predvaritel'nye zameĉanija*, "Polata Künigopisnaja", XIII, 1985, pp. 44-49.
- Koceva, Atanasov 1991: E. Koceva, A. Atanasov, *Osobenosti v südüržaniето na Apostol № 882 ot Narodnata Biblioteka 'Sv.Sv. Kiril i Metodij' v Sofia*, "Kirilo-Metodievski Studii", VIII, 1991, pp. 293-319.
- Kossek 1986: N.V. Kossek, *Evangeliе Koxno. Bolgarskij pamjatnik XIII v.*, Sofija 1986.
- Krasnosel'cev 1892: P. Krasnosel'cev (ed.), *Tipik Cerkvi sv. Sofii v Konstantinopole (IX v.)*, "Letopis' Istoriko-filologiĉeskogo obščevstva pri Imperatorskoj novorossijskoj universitete. Vizantijskoe otdelenie", II, 1892, pp. 163-254.
- Kuliĉ 1992: Ja. Kuliĉ, s.J. (ed.), *Ricerca sulle commemorazioni giornaliere bizantine nei menei*, Roma 1992.
- Lunt 1984: H.G. Lunt, *On editing early Slavic manuscripts: The case of the Codex Suprasliensis, the Mstislav Gospel, and the Banica Gospel*, "International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics", XXX, 1984, pp. 7-76.
- Lunt 1959: H.G. Lunt (ed.), *Old Church Slavonic Glossary*, Cambridge (MA) 1959 (1969²).
- Lysén 1995: I. Lysén (ed.), *Greĉesko-staroslavjanskij konkordans k drevnejšim spis-kam slavjanskogo perevoda evangelij (codices Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus, Ostromiri)*, Stockholm 1995 (= Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Slavica Upsaliensia, 36).
- Matéos 1962: J. Matéos, s.J. (ed.), *Le Typikon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croix № 40, X^e siècle: Le Cycle des doux mois*, I, Roma 1962 (= Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 165).
- Miklas 1988: H. Miklas, *Kyrillomeethodianisches und nachkyrillomeethodianisches Erbe im ersten ostslavischen Einfluß auf die südslavische Literatur*, in: K. Trost, E. Völk, E. Weden (eds.), *Symposium Methodianum. Beiträge der Internationalen Tagung in Regensburg (17-24 Apr. 1985) zum Gedenken an den 1100. Todestag des hl. Method*, Neuried 1988 (= Selecta Slavica, 13), pp. 437-471.

- Miklas, Šniter 1998: H. Miklas, M. Šniter, *Imena i dati. Predvaritelni rezultati ot izsledvaneto na t. nar. 'zapaden fond' v slavjanskite mesecoslovi*, in: A. Miltenova (ed.), *Medievistika i kulturna antropologija. Sbornik v čest na prof. Donka Petkanova*, Sofija 1998, pp. 27-36.
- Mošin 1954: V. Mošin (ed.), *Makedonsko Evangelie na pop Jovana*, Skopje 1954 (= Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti. Institut za makedonski jazik. Stari tekstovi, 1).
- Nestle, Aland 1985: E. Nestle, K. Aland et al. (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart 1985²⁶.
- Rodić, Jovanović 1986: N. Rodić, G. Jovanović (eds.), *Miroslavljevo jevanđelje. Kriičko izdanje*, Beograd 1986 (= Srpska Akademija nauka i umetnosti. Institut za srpskohrvatski jezik. Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpsko naroda, I odeljenje, 32).
- Sadnik, Aitzenmüller 1955: L. Sadnik, R. Aitzenmüller (eds.), *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten*, Den Haag 1955 (= Slavistic Printings and re-printings, 6).
- Spasskij 1901: Arxiepiskop Sergij (Spasskij), *Polnyj mesjaceslov Vostoka*, II, Vladimir 1901.
- Šniter 1995: M. Šniter, *Sveti Arnulf i kral Arnulf*, "Palaeobulgarica", XIX, 1995, 1, pp. 15-21.
- Vakareliyska 2008: C.M. Vakareliyska, *The Curzon Gospel*, I. *An Annotated Edition*, II. *A Linguistic and Textual Introduction*, Oxford 2008.
- Vakareliyska 2007: C.M. Vakareliyska, *Parallels Between the Savvina Kniga and Curzon Gospel Versions of the 'Walking on Water' Lection, Mt 14: 22-34*, "Palaeoslavica", XV, 2007, 1, pp. 340-344.
- Vakareliyska 1996: C.M. Vakareliyska, *The Lost Banica Gospel Folia from Luke and John: Equivalent Passages from the Curzon Gospel with Comparative Annotations*, "Polata Künigopisnaja", XXX, 1996, pp. 50-177.
- Vakareliyska 1993: C.M. Vakareliyska, *A Preliminary Comparison of the Curzon and Banica Gospels*, "Oxford Slavonic Papers", XXVI (N.S.), 1993, pp. 1-39.
- Zondervan 1988: *The Zondervan Parallel New Testament in Greek and English*, Grand Rapids 1988¹⁰ (1975¹).

Abstract

Cynthia M. Vakareliyska

Methodological Issues in Editing the Curzon Gospel

This paper discusses the methodological issues encountered in compiling an edition of the western Bulgarian 14th-century Curzon Gospel, and how they were resolved.

Keywords

Bulgarian Church Slavonic; Old Church Slavonic; Gospels; Manuscript Editions.