

3/N THE PSALTER OF DIMITRI THE *OL'TAR'NIK*

c. 12th c.

Parchment codex, 145 folios, 135 × 110mm, text 105 × 80mm, 24-26 lines to a page.

All the gatherings are quaternions, with the exception of the third, which is a binion, and the fourth, which comprises 6 folios. The penultimate folio of the last gathering (No 19) is missing, which makes it impossible accurately to determine the content of the last part of the manuscript, for the odes are also missing. One might tentatively conjecture that the manuscript is entirely lacking its last part, which as a rule would have comprised the odes. Indeed, the gap could be even bigger, if one imagines that at this point, after the Psalms and the odes, certain *typica* from the Divine Office were also included, as is the case with the other Sinai Glagolitic Psalter (MS 2/N).

Between folios 141 and 142 three smaller bifolia have been inserted (141a, 141b, 141c, and three blank folios), 85 × 68mm, text 60 × 50mm. Both the material and the text of folios 1, 52, 144, and 145 are somewhat damaged.

The writing is rounded Glagolitic, in yellowish ink. The initial letter of each Psalm is equivalent to four normal letters in height but does not project into the margin. With minor exceptions, the strokes of the initials consist of double lines, the space between which is filled with chain-like or spiral decorations. The larger strokes of the initials are further embellished with stylised plant motifs. These initials and the titles of the various texts are on a yellow ground.

As far as the orthography is concerned, this new Glagolitic monument differs considerably from the well-known Sinai Psalter (MS 38/0). The use of the letters **Ѡ** (=I) and **Ѣ** (=H) is variable and inconsistent, and also, while the nasals **Ѥ** (=A), **Ѧ** (=L), **Ѩ** (=Z), and **Ѭ** (=K) are employed, there is also a tendency to make them into vowels (*мою, твою, etc.*). Another orthographic feature which helps to designate the codex's origin both chronologically and geographically is the indiscriminate use of *jer* (Ѡ) and *jor* (Ѣ), though the latter is more prevalent: **ѠЗДРАДОУЕТѢ** (fol. 26^v), **ѢЗДРАДОУЕТѢ** (fol. 27^v), **НОЩЕ, ДЕНЕ** (fol. 134^v). The tendency to turn the *poluglas* (reduced vowels) into vowels is another aspect of the orthographic tendencies mentioned above — e.g. **ДѢНѢ** → **ДЕНЕ**, **КѢГДА** → **КОГДА** (fol. 16^v). All these points indicate that this is a South Slavonic literary monument (see E. F. Karskij, *Славянская кирилловская палеография*, Moscow 1979, pp. 313-23, and P. Djordjić,

Старословенски језик, М. Срpska 1975, p. 48). The orthography in this manuscript varies considerably, unlike that of the Sinai Psalter, which preserves the original orthography more authentically; and this, together with the extensive use of Cyrillic, chiefly in the headings (ПСАЛМЪ, ДАВЪДЪ, ѿ ДАВЪДА ѿГ ѿ ДАВЪДА etc.), persuades me that it is of a later date than the Sinai Psalter.

Another important feature of this codex is the fact that its binding has survived; it is of the Byzantine type and may be the original binding. It comprises two boards, which are of the same dimensions as the pages, covered with leather.

The style of the handwriting and the orthography —which, as I have said, is not uniform throughout the manuscript— indicate that two scribes copied this codex. The first, scribe A, wrote folios 1^v-2^r, 3^r, 35^v-141^v, 142^r-145^v. His chief distinguishing characteristic, apart from his tall, upright, or slightly forward-sloping script, is that he shows a marked preference for the letter **Ѡ** (=I). **Ѣ** (=H) is non-existent to begin with, and though he does subsequently use it, it is in very rare and irregular instances.

Ѡ The second scribe, B, wrote folios 2^v and 3^v-24^r, and apart from his rounder, forward-sloping script, he is chiefly characterised by his use of the letter **Ѣ**. He uses **Ѡ** only as an initial letter and in a few other rare cases.

Scribe A, then, wrote the second page (1^v), part of the third (2^r) and fifth (3^r), and scribe B wrote the fourth page (2^v) and continued from the seventh (4^r) onwards; this frequent and abrupt interchange of the two scribes at the beginning of the manuscript, together with certain gaps covering either whole pages or parts of pages —most of which were subsequently filled with notes— leads to the strong suspicion that the two scribes worked on the codex simultaneously. If, indeed, one bears in mind the fact that the sequence of the text is not interrupted by the gaps, then one must suppose that they were left deliberately to be illuminated later on. When it became clear that the illumination was not going to be done, a reader, ДАВЪДЪ ОЛТАРЬНИКЪ, filled most of the gaps with his own notes.

Contents: The Psalms of David (1-151)

fol. 1^v-145^r: The 150 Psalms of David

Inc. БЛАЖЕНЪ МАЖЕ ІЖЕ НЕ ІДЕТЪ...

Des. ... ВЪСЪКО ДАХАНІЕ ДА ХРААНТЕ Г<ОСПОД>А.

fol. 145^r-145^v: Psalm-151, *ex numeris*, by David's own hand

Inc. ДАВЪДЪ ВЪХЪ ЕК ВРАТІ МОИ...

The end is damaged and illegible.

Notes:

fol. 1^r: (full page) АХЪ ДАВЪДЪ ГРЪШНИКЪ ОЛТАРЬНИКЪ |

At this point, which is the end of a line, there is no indication that the text continues. Over the surviving letters **оа** there was probably a **Ѡ** indicating that the word had been abbreviated. On searching through various Old Slavonic dictionaries (Miklosich's and others), I have been unable to find any word beginning

fol. 34^v: Approximately the top third of fol. 34 has been cut off, and while fol. 34^r bears the text of Psalm 24 (verses 5-8), fol. 34^v is blank, except for a brief note. The orthography and the style of the handwriting are the same as those of the person who wrote the preceding notes. However, if the letters *o a z* are remnants of the word *ноамъ*, then this must be an interpolation by a deacon named Ioan.

че аншх м<о>ам : алаѣ : гак<а>сх : ж|с<в>л>т<с>и>х<с> : г<о>спод>и оуслъши дѣк :
оа[.]|х рлех твои [ε]смх азх :

fol. 140^r: On the bottom half of the page:

грг<о>рне —with the letters *ва* above it— молъшъ те в<о>г>а : да ви при|шолъ
къ гробу въскрѣ|ситъ лъзарѣ : и въскрѣ|сен и : тако и азх м<о>ам | тм г<о>
спод>и : да въскрѣ|ши | ам : смрети мо|ья : да постигнъ : ста|ти о деснъх и
слоу|шатъ гак<а>сх твои | глаг<о>амъши

fol. 140^v |продѣте в<а>гословени оца м|оего : и вѣдими кротоки : и м<н>лос|редъ : ѣко
же възстѣ влѣднѣ|н : въ [...]во [...]моу симона прока|женнаго : излѣн очима монма
с|лзъши ѣко же излѣлъ еси тон|ѣже новѣ твои омиши власи о|тнри отъпоустнъх
сх мироу|х тебе м<о>ам г<о>спод>и не<о>усе> хр<и>сте вседръж|нтелюу : да отъ
поустнши вса | грѣхъи мо|ья : прѣжде даже не | оумрѣ : и да не порадоуетъ сь |
оумъ нев<о>амъ мон : и тебе м<о>амъ с<в>л>тн петре : нже дръжнш|и ключъ ц<а>
р<в>ствоу нев<е>сноум|оу. и да ми раддрѣши грѣхъи | мои на земли и даждъ
ми | г<о>спод>и не<о>усе> хр<и>сте крѣпостъ с<с> не<е>в<е>се | да побѣждъ днѣвола
в|хдъщаго и вораща сь сь | мною : м<о>амъ вса с<в>л>тнъ | анѣ<е>ли и арх<а>
нѣ<е>ли | м<о>амъ вса с<в>л>тнъ патр|нархи : и вса с<в>л>тнъ | твою пр<о>
р<о>кн : и вса с<в>л>тнъ ап<о>ст<о>ли : и | м<ж>ч<е>никъи.

fol. 141^r азх д<х>мтрши писахъ се | не оумѣла.

The strange thing here is that the text of the Psalm follows on directly from fol. 140^r to fol. 141^v: fol. 140^r —Psalm 144, verses 14-16; fol. 141^r— Psalm 144, verses 17-21. This means that (in accordance with what has been said at the beginning of this description) the scribe must have had some reason for deliberately leaving half of fol. 140^r and all of fol. 140^v blank.

fol. 144^v: full-page continuation of the previous note:

исповѣдникъи и постникъ|и вса с<в>л>тнъ д<о>ух>ови : и вса с<в>л>тн|нъ
извѣрннъ твою : да въ|сходатъ м<о>амти за ма грѣх|енаго : и прихвѣла
тѣ г<о>спод>а : | нже прѣдъ в<о>г>амъ денъ и ношъ | испрѣстѣтъ въпнъше и |
глаголѣ|ше : с<в>л>т<с> : с<в>л>т<с> : с<в>л>т<с> : г<о>спод>а саваот|а : да м<о>
амтъ за ма да възмо|гъ дѣти всѣмъ безко|ннмъ монмъ ѡже есмъ с|творилъ :
отъ юности мо|ья дондъ ношъ нѣго днѣ : | и нинѣ м<о>амъ сь къ тебѣ г<о>спод>и
н|с<о>усе> хр<и>сте | нево еси | щедоръ | и м<н>лостнѣх и м<н>лосрѣ>дъ : всѣмъ|х
прихвѣлѣшнмъ и|ма твою въ истинъ м<о>амъ тм : и прошъ г<о>спод>и да оус
лншиши м<о>амъ твою | и живи ц<а>р<с>твоу и [снн]|омъ и с<в>л>тнмъ
д<о>ух>омъ.

A significant feature of the codex's many notes is the uniformity of handwriting and orthography. As far as the orthography is concerned, only *Ѣ* is used for the

sound /i/, which indicates a certain connection with scribe B, or at least that scribe B influenced the orthography of the man who wrote the notes.

Fortunately for scholars and researchers, the writer of these numerous Glagolitic notes somewhat exceptionally gives his name and function. Indeed, he does so twice, thereby allowing us to be certain of his identity: on fol. 1^r by the phrase **азъ димитръ грѣшникъ олтареѣникъ**, and on fol. 141^r by the phrase **азъ дѣхъмитри писахъ се**. It is most significant and revelatory of the Slavs' early spiritual environment that the monk who wrote the notes bears the name Dimitri and has St Demetrius **отъ солоуна** (fol. 1^r) as his patron saint. Of course, we know from the *Life of Methodius* that St Demetrius's memory was particularly revered by the two Thessalonican missionaries who created the Slavonic alphabet and introduced literature and Christian worship to the Slavs. Methodius's biographer tells us that on the feast of St Demetrius, 26 October, "и свѣтѣю възношенію тѣнною съ канѣосѣмъ сконѣ възнесѣ, сътвори память свѣтѣаго димитриа" (ed. P. A. Lavrov, *Материалы по истории возникновения древнейшей славянской письменности*, p. 77). This information, of course, is supported by the Canon to St Demetrius, which is attributed to Methodius, and which survives in an Old Slavonic text of the *Menaia* in a Russian manuscript dating from 1096 (see R. Jakobson, 'Methodius's Canon to Demetrius of Thessalonica and the Old Church Slavonic *Hirmoi*', *Sbornik praci Filosofické Fakulty Brněnské University XIV* (1965), *Řada Uměnovědná*, F. 9, pp. 115-21). Here in this manuscript, however, we have one of the oldest testimonies to the Slavs' response to the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition they inherited both on a monastic and on a secular basis. (For more about the cult of St Demetrius of Thessaloniki amongst the Slavs, see D. Obolensky, 'The Cult of St Demetrius of Thessaloniki in the History of Byzantine-Slav Relations', *Balkan Studies* 15,1 (1974), 3-20, including further relevant bibliography.)

Another important detail for our acquaintance with Dimitri and the Slavonic monastic tradition of his time is his capacity of **олтареѣникъ** — insofar, of course, as my restoration of the word is absolutely correct, for, as I have said above, only the first two letters (**оа**) have survived. This is a rare term in Slavonic vocabulary. On the basis of a seventeenth-century Serbian text, Miklosich translates it as the Greek *ιερέως* or the Latin *sacerdos* (F. Miklosich, *Lexicon Palaeoslovenico-Graeco-Latinum*, Vienna 1862-1865; cf. P. Pl. de Meester, *De monachico statu iuxta disciplinam byzantinam*, Vaticanum 1942, pp. 280-1, including relevant bibliography). However, this term — which literally means "one who serves at the altar" — seems to have been very rarely used to characterise a priest in the Eastern Church. A priest was a **свѣштенникъ**, and it would not have been easy for Dimitri, if in fact he was a priest, to be so original as to replace this holy title which he received with his tonsure with that of **олтареѣникъ**.

On the other hand, in the eastern monastic tradition there does exist the corresponding term *βηματούργος*, which refers to the monk whose duty it is to serve at the altar. It is noteworthy that this term is encountered in the practice of Mount Athos, while the Slavonic text which has preserved the term **олтареѣникъ**, and on which Miklosich bases his definition, comes from the same geographical area, Serbia. Although the Serbian text is of a much later date, its uniqueness — as

far as I know, at least— permits one to conclude that it has preserved a local tradition within the Slavonic monastic tradition. Indeed, it may be that this local tradition dates back to the time of our own Dimitri, the owner and user of the Glagolitic Psalter. It may also be that Dimitri avoids mentioning his capacity of priest out of modesty and uses the title of his function.

If the above hypothesis is correct, then this detail may be a further indication that the Psalter is of South Slavonic origin. Of course, we are still in the realms of hypothesis, because the *оцѣтарѣникѣ* Dimitri, who used it and left us so many notes about his personal life, says nothing about the monastery in which he lived. All that may be gathered from the end of his first note (fol. 1^r — damaged at this point) is that he lived in a cell bearing the name of the Mother of God. The narrative also reveals that this cell was on a great mountain inhabited by wild beasts, bears, wolves, and foxes, and it seems that Dimitri had to defend his flock as well as himself from wild beasts. And so, while in his first note (fol. 1^r) he addresses his patron saint Demetrius and mentions the presence of the wild beasts, in the second note (fol. 2^r) he writes a special prayer for the protection of his flock from the wolves.

The other notes, on folios 2^r (from *помилуѣ господи снѣ домѣи* onwards), 3^r, 140^{r-v}, and 144^r, seem to constitute one continuous prayer. The invocation of St Gregory (fol. 2^r and 140^r) is significant here, leading one to think that the phrase *снѣ домѣи* might refer to several cells belonging to a monastery which had this saint as its patron. Dimitri includes various set expressions in the prayer, which he seems to have taken from other known prayers. Indeed, some of these phrases —such as “*печѣтѣ дѣрѣ сѣатѣго дѣухѣ*” (fol. 2^r) and “*сѣатѣ, сѣатѣ, сѣатѣ господѣи сѣаѣотѣ*” (fol. 144^r)— are strongly reminiscent of prayers usually spoken by a priest. This allows one to suppose that Dimitri might also have been a hieromonk.

It is also interesting that other phrases in the notes recall prayers by Basil the Great —for instance, “*младенѣца оутѣши...*” (fol. 3^r)— or phrases from the New Testament which had become common in the prayers of the Church —for instance, “*прѣдѣте вѣлѣгословеннѣ оца моего*” (fol. 140^v)— or traditional elements — for instance, “*и тебе моаж сѣатѣи петре, иже дѣрѣжиши ключѣ царѣствоу нексноу моеу*” (fol. 140^v). Maybe, when all this has been carefully studied and the texts have been found from which Dimitri borrowed in order to compose his own prayers (NB: a study of the Glagolitic notes in the Sinai Psalter of Dimitri is already well under way), it will be possible to examine more clearly this particular example of the progress towards independent Slavonic creativity in the field of free ecclesiastical writing.

It is still unknown when these notes were written. It should be said right at the outset that in cases such as this, when there are no clear chronological indications, every statement is made with caution. The opinions formulated will approach the truth insofar as the apparent facts under scrutiny are an accurate reflection of the truth.

And so we find ourselves faced with the unique phenomenon of notes, and no small number of them, written in Glagolitic script. In the early period from which the classic monuments in this script survive (tenth-eleventh century) such a phenomenon is quite unknown. And herein lies their great importance. For Dimitri, who

uses the Glagolitic Psalter as an official Church book for the week-day services, appears to be so familiar with this script that he prefers it to Cyrillic even in his personal notes. It is indeed interesting that not once does he write a Cyrillic letter by mistake although he includes the Greek and Latin alphabets. This could mean that where he lived Glagolitic was still a living script in everyday use at that time.

Another very interesting feature of Dimitri's notes is the three alphabets mentioned above — at the end of the first page, he has written out the Greek, the Latin, and the Glagolitic alphabets in that order. Although the manuscript is damaged at this point and the letters Δ, Ε, Ζ, Θ, Ι are no longer legible, it is clear that the first alphabet is the Greek and not the Cyrillic because the Α is followed by Β, not Ε. Concerning the Glagolitic alphabet, it is noteworthy that the writer knows that both Ҁ and ҆ represent the sound /i/, but prefers to use ҆ himself. From the latter's position in the Glagolitic alphabet, before к, it seems that he considers it to correspond to Η (eta), which he places before К (kappa). (Concerning the use of Ҁ and ҆ and their correspondence to the Greek letters Η and Ι (eta and iota), see J. Vajs, *Rukovět hlaholské paleografie*, Prague 1932, pp. 65-6; cf. also E. F. Karskij, *Славянская кирилловская палеография*, Moscow 1979, p. 356.) On fol. 2^r Dimitri precedes his note with the Latin alphabet alone. The question we must ask is whether or not there was some specific purpose behind the writing out of these alphabets; and if so, what?

We know, both from the *Life* of Cyril and from the *Life* of Methodius, that the Glagolitic script was not accepted by the Latin clergy (*Житие Константина*, XV and XVI, and *Житие Мефодия*, VI, ed. Lavrov, pp. 28 and 30, and 72 respectively). In the *Life* of Methodius in particular the Slavonic script is discussed together with the resistance of the Latin clergy, who maintained that "не достоятъ никотороумоуже ѡзѣикоу имѣти воукѡвъ своихъ, разѣкъ Б҃жен и Грѣкъ и Латинѣ, по Платѡвоу писанию, ѡже на крѣстѣ г҃осподни написа". Of course, it is well known that Pope Adrian II, in a letter to the Princes Rostislav, Svetopolk, and Kocel in 869-70 (*ZM* VIII; cf. Grivec, *Konstantin und Method*, p. 257, and Duthilleul, *L'Évangélisation des Slaves*, pp. 3-4) and Pope John VIII, in a letter to Prince "Sventopolco" in 880 (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae VII*, pp. 223f), both condemned the false principle of Trilinguism and supported the use of Slavonic. But subsequently the fortunes of the Slavonic language changed, for Pope Stephen V in 885 and Pope Gregory VII in 1080 condemned it in the name of the Church of Rome. Consequently, there is every justification for indications of such oppression later on when the two missionaries' disciples and their successors were active.

Of course, in this case, we are not dealing with the three alphabets referred to by Cyril and Methodius's opponents; instead of the Hebrew we have the Slavonic Glagolitic alphabet. One could, however, assert that we have here a solution to the problem posed by the opponents of the Slavonic alphabet, after the positive stand taken by Popes Adrian II and John VIII. Thus the Slavonic script is not only vindicated but also replaces Hebrew as the third religious language. The Slav monk's sequence is appropriate then — first Greek as the language of the great missionaries and the foundation of Slavonic literature, and then Latin as the language of papal power and possibly jurisdiction. Next to these holy languages he

then places Slavonic, which was sanctified by the missionary work of the two brothers from Thessaloniki. Their work was undertaken at the command of the Patriarch of Constantinople, with which Pope Adrian was in agreement; as Constantine-Cyril's biographer informs us, the latter blessed the Slavonic books and used them when he conducted the holy liturgy (Житие Константина, XVII, ed. Lavrov, p. 64).

Let me now sum up my observations with a view to pinpointing as closely as possible the time when this unique Glagolitic monument was written.

To begin with, it bears so many similarities to the well-known Glagolitic Sinai Psalter (MS 38/0) that one may with certainty consider this latter manuscript to be its primary source. To be specific, apart from the general points already noted, a brief comparison with the known eleventh- and twelfth-century Slavonic Psalters (Sinaiticum, Pogodin's, the Bologna Psalter, and Čudov's: the most recent photographic edition of the first, as we have seen, is by M. Altbauer, *Psalterium Sinaiticum*; the second and third have been published by V. Jagić, *Psalterium Bononiense*, Vienna - Berlin - St Petersburg 1907; and the fourth by V. Pogorelov, *Čudovskaja Psaltyr' XII veka*, St Petersburg 1910) shows that it accords perfectly with the Sinai Psalter. It possesses all the details specified by Lépissier which led him to assert that the original Slavonic translation of the Psalter was done from the traditional Greek text and that it was later modified on the basis of the Latin text which was in use in the West (J. Lépissier, 'La Traduction vieux-slave du Psautier', *Rev. des Ét. Slaves* 43, 1964, p. 72). My own conclusions derive from Lépissier's observations, specifically the passages Ps. 9₂₁, 17₇, 17₁₈, 7₁₄, 61₈; here, and in many other places, the writer pinpoints specific differences between the Sinai Psalter and the other Slavonic Psalters, and between the Slavonic Psalters and the text of the Septuagint. It is now up to specialists to conduct an extensive study of this Psalter and to compare it with the other known Psalters, and thereby reach specific conclusions regarding its source and the linguistic and spiritual traditions which have left their mark on this interesting literary monument. Its close resemblance to the Sinai MS 38/0 on the one hand, and its simplified language on the other, indicate to me that this Psalter belongs to the same tradition as, though it is clearly of later date than, MS 38/0.

However, the manuscript's linguistic simplifications and variants and its orthography are clearly South Slavonic variations; and as we have seen, the information contained in the notes written by the *d'après nous* βηματάρης agrees with this. This detail rules out any possibility of the manuscript's belonging to the Western tradition, which in Croatia would mean that it was of a much later date. Consequently, the use of Glagolitic in the South Slavonic region does not permit us to venture beyond the twelfth century, because Cyrillic prevailed absolutely after this and therefore there would be no justification for the use of a Glagolitic Psalter, nor —and how much less so— for Dimitri's notes in this defunct script.

Consonant with this dating is the echo of the struggle for the establishment of Slavonic as a holy script on an equal footing with Greek and Latin. For the problem of the Slavonic language's recognition by the Latin priests —which may have worsened during the period when Cyril and Methodius's disciples were being persecuted and may have persisted into the time of their successors— obviously

no longer existed in the thirteenth century, by which time the Slavs had irrevocably entered the sphere of influence of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (see J. Tardanidis, *Η διαμόρφωση του αυτοκεφάλου της Βουλγαρικής Εκκλησίας, 864-1235*, Thessaloniki 1976).

The inserted section (fol. 141a-141c) is a collection of various medical prescriptions for poisoning, pains, injuries, etc. and was clearly written by a different scribe. He seems more experienced in the use of Glagolitic and his orthographic style is quite different from that of the rest of the codex. He uses both **Ѣ** and **Ѥ** and is a talented calligrapher. Apart from the large initial letters of paragraphs, which project into the margin, his text is ornamented with a head-piece in the form of a chain decoration (fol. 141a^r) and he also uses ligatures (**Ѣ** = ml) and abbreviations and intersperses his text with Cyrillic letters.

fol. 141a^r **Врачѣ вѣкозминнаа :** | This is the heading, which is followed by the chain-pattern head-piece.

Обѣ ринѣ на врачѣ вѣ. | трѣдоби: | соушкше | : вѣ винѣвѣ зварѣ | ше испити : рѣпнѣ
вѣ | анкаго листѣе ото | коу : сѣтлѣкше : а коренне его ѣзѣѣ : | Рѣдоковѣ сѣтлѣкше |
мѣтромѣ пити : | Доугѣ глаба то : трѣ | савици : | Бгда же на отроумѣ | ходитѣ,
то не поущаѣ | тѣ сѣ коу : оскѣта вѣан | каго : сѣма естѣ вѣ гла | вахѣ : да того :
ѣ : сѣтлѣ | кше вѣ винѣ дати : испити : | Бгда пѣсѣ вѣсѣнѣ оуѣстѣ | ан вѣлкѣ

fol. 141a^v **зми него || маѣчѣѣкоренне :** | Бгда вѣдетѣ чѣковѣ > коу | таже ка жтробѣ : |
ан отокѣ : ан прохѣ | да не вѣдетѣ : то ко | венне товарити | вѣ винѣ : того чашѣ |
испити : | И то вѣдѣти : | ѣще не вѣдетѣ про | ходавѣ скорѣѣ то | цѣлѣ солѣ вѣри | ти
сѣ медомѣ : то | же вѣложити вѣ | прохѣде : | I ѣще сѣ ѣзѣа хѣпѣ | четѣ : то покренѣ |
но листѣе люво | коренне сѣтерѣше : | тоже сѣпатѣ на ѣзѣл : ||

fol. 141b^r **ѣще ногѣ изломитѣ :** | ан изеннетѣ | торѣжанѣ мѣкѣ | ти дроздѣлѣ прѣвазѣ | тѣ : |
Отогѣ вѣрнѣнѣ : вѣрнѣ | ше прѣвазѣти : рѣватѣѣ : | ѣще ѣще начѣнѣ вѣлѣти :
ан глаба : то вѣло | те | мѣнѣнѣти жѣлѣцѣ : мѣкѣ полѣпѣкше платѣ | до оушѣю :
прѣвазѣти : | ѣ егда вѣно течѣтѣ : | то зодѣ | истерѣше : | ти сѣти : сѣлоимѣ : | сѣ
мѣшѣше : ансѣ ти | рати : | Дѣтицю егда во [..] ст [..] ||

fol. 141b^v **анка жтробѣ :** ан рѣ | стѣ : то рѣанѣ мѣкѣ : | ти дроздѣлѣ | прѣвазѣти : | Жтробѣѣ :
чрѣмошѣ стрѣу | поу зѣлоумѣю : | Коню егда вѣдетѣ чѣх | вѣ : цѣвѣ | конѣско | | коу
его вѣложити | вѣ ѣзѣл : | Бгда дѣснѣ гнѣ | ѣтѣ : то чѣвѣх | но коуанѣ сѣтѣ | рѣ
наспѣи : |

fol. 141c^r **ѣще срѣцѣ вѣки чрѣвѣ ѣдатѣ :** топла || тѣ на чистѣ : платѣ оу | рѣзѣкше : ти лѣжи -
цѣ новѣ : положити | на тѣ | менѣ : прѣво | е платѣ тоже на не | мѣ лѣжницѣ : тоже |
ѣдѣти : | Бгда кашѣлетѣ чѣ | о > вѣ > кѣ | то оманѣ вѣрнѣнѣ | ше вѣ винѣ : I : Чѣи |
волиѣти : да единѣ | испѣтѣ : | ѣще глаба сѣ [..] тѣнѣ || вѣдетѣ : то онѣча | мѣти

fol. 141c^v **латислао :** | лювѣнѣ сѣ олюво | лоу : тѣмѣ же пома | зати : Бгда вѣдетѣ стоу | дѣницѣ :
то зѣчѣ | мѣдѣѣждѣ : ти | лоу : ти коузицѣ | хѣвѣ : жѣгѣшѣти | мѣдѣ : тѣ чѣлѣ
со | лѣ : а чѣрѣ прѣвазѣти сѣрѣлѣ мѣдѣ

I do not know when or where these prescriptions were written, though it seems reasonable to suppose that they were written in the Holy Land for Slav monks who were not familiar with the conditions there. However, such a hypothesis can be borne out only by a comparison between these prescriptions and similar ones

found in the Greek, Arabic, and other manuscripts from the region. Moreover, it is quite possible that they originated in the place where дълтъръ the олтъръннкъ lived; as his notes indicate, such dangers were never very far away.

Създана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія

Въ 12-мъ столѣтіи 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія

Въ 12-мъ столѣтіи 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія

Въ 12-мъ столѣтіи 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія

Въ 12-мъ столѣтіи 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія

Въ 12-мъ столѣтіи 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія

Въ 12-мъ столѣтіи 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія

Въ 12-мъ столѣтіи 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія
создана въ 7-мъ мѣсяцѣ 12-го столѣтія

8. MS 3/N (fol. 21r), THE PSALTER OF DIMITRI THE OL'TAR'NIK, 12th c.