

# Old Russian Reception of South Slavic Literature: Morphology of the Name in the Hand-Written Building of the 11<sup>th</sup> Century

Julia V Kapralova

Kazan Federal University, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication

## Abstract

The article considers the phenomenon of Old Russian texts as the reflection of the polyethnic linguistic space during the development of the ancient Bulgarian heritage, in the process of the Old Russian literary norm development and at the same time the growing Russification based on the ancient Russian texts of the 11<sup>th</sup> century (in electronic form). For the first time, using the diachronic, comparative and quantitative methods of study, as well as the elements of structural analysis, exhaustive statistics (by the means of computer technologies) is established for the distribution of genitive, dative and instrumental case singular forms. The obtained results are presented from the point of view of the linguistic-cultural influence of the ancient Slavic languages and as the reflection of the linguistic and cultural identity of the Old Russian people. The main purposes of such linguistic analyzes: 1) the satisfaction of fundamental historical linguistics needs in a voluminous and new material reliable for further study; 2) the experimental data on such microperiods are needed to test the generally accepted theoretical concepts on the dynamics of linguistic units 3) and for the reconstruction of Ancient Rus language grammatical system of the XIth century.

**Key words:** Electronic texts, Polyethnic space, Language identity, Historical linguistics, Ancient Russian language of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, Nominal declension

## INTRODUCTION

As is known a language is a unique dynamic system, changing in all time directions (both in vertical and horizontal temporal sections). The diachronic studies of a language allow us to reveal the facts and the patterns of not only linguistic, but also historical and cultural significance: the origin of source dating and dialectological features are proved [1, 2]. In addition to the grammatical and communicative aspect of a language (in this case, it is no matter an ancient or a modern one), it is also the means of thinking and it designates a particular culture; That is, it reveals the linguistic identity of native speakers, as well as the whole worldview that connects all speakers of a particular language in any historical and temporal space.

The cultural values of a particular society are expressed in a language [3]. Old Russian society and the Old Russian language space, was polyethnic one, like modern society, incorporating the linguistic heritage of the Old Slavonic and Proto-Slavic languages and, of course, the Old Bulgarian language (from which the first Old Russian texts were copied, due to which these ancient Bulgarian monuments were preserved). This genetic connection of the majority of Old Russian manuscripts with the South Slavic writing causes their great importance for paleo Slavic studies, the Russian studies of language history and culture in general [4]. In the early and new works on the historical grammar of Russian language, the scientific thought that the Church-written manuscripts of the Old Russian written heritage present unique East Slavic features and the earliest examples of innovations is developing consistently [5]. The study of the Slavonic-Russian writing of the 11<sup>th</sup> century allows one to approach the original system of grammar of the ancient Russian language, as well as to discover some nascent trends in the development of the literary language. Such a reconstruction of linguistic historical reality is possible only on the basis of comprehensive, complex data. In this study, the use of the statistical method was

Access this article online



www.ijss-sn.com

**Month of Submission** : 04-2017  
**Month of Peer Review** : 05-2017  
**Month of Acceptance** : 06-2017  
**Month of Publishing** : 09-2017

**Corresponding Author:** Julia V Kapralova, Kazan Federal University, Russia. Phone: +91-89196487565. E-mail: afina.pallada@mail.ru

carried out using computer technologies, which in its turn became real due to the cooperation of the Kazan Federal University with the Sofia University named after St. Kliment Ohridski (Bulgaria).

Today, computer technologies and corpus linguistics give fundamentally different tools to researchers, which contribute to an active development of a new scientific trend in Slavonic philology - electronic paleo Slavic studies (digital or computer *иґґґ*) and electronic medieval studies: diachronic texts consisting of medieval source digital version are created [6]. «As a whole, this multilevel complex of the ancient texts' representation and their IT-processing modules demonstrates the benefits of the manuscripts' Internet-edition over their print versions. At the same time, the Internet-editions are a kind of outline and prototype of the manuscript's print version» [7]. A new scientific and also a general cultural phenomenon is born after the appearance of literary monument online editions. Hardly accessible or completely inaccessible manuscript books of the Middle Ages become a universal world heritage [8]. The continuous sampling of forms and quantitative analysis made it possible to put forward new concepts of the ancient Russian language linguistic structure of the eleventh century: first of all, they helped to discover the correlation of the Old Russian book norm and the real dynamics of speech, and besides to reproduce the functioning of causality in the Old Slavonic and Praslavian languages more clearly.

## METHODS

This original research was possible due to the unique project "Trondheim-Sofia Corpus of Old Slavy" concerning the creation of an electronic version of the ancient Russian texts of the 11<sup>th</sup> century from handwritten originals, with the preservation of all structural, phonetic, spelling and grammatical features [9]. The study of the book monument by Putyatina's euchology was based on the electronic version of the text created by the scientific-research group of the Udmurt University [10]. Thus, all the preserved Slavic-book manuscripts of the Old Russian language of the 11<sup>th</sup> century served as the research material (20 written monuments of church-book style with a number of genre subtypes).

1. Liturgical written memorials: *Evangelija*: *EvO* - Ostromirivo gospel 1056-1057, 294 sp; *Eva* - Arkhangelsk gospel of 1092, 178 sh.; *EvT* - the Tourov Gospel, 10 sh; *Euchologys*: *Min S.* - a service euchology, September, 1095-1096, 176 sh.; *Min Oc.* - a service euchology, October, 1096, 127 sh.; *Min. N.* - a service euchology, November, 1097, 174 sh.; *MinP* - service, May (Putyatina's euchology), 135

sh.; *MinD* - a service euchology, June (Dubrovsky's euchology), 15 sh.

2. Hagiographical written memorials: *KL* - Kondrat's life, 2 sh.; *FL* - Fekla's life, 2 sh.; *PS* - Paterik Sinai, 184 sh.
3. Religious and didactic written monuments: *Anthologies*: *Ant. 1073* - Svyatoslav's anthology of 1073, 266 sh.; *Ant. 1076* - Svyatoslav's anthology of 1076, 277 sh.; *Explanatory psalter*: *PsB* - Bychkovskaya - psalter with fortunate additions, 9 sh.; *PsE* - Eugen's psalter, 22 sh.; *PsCh* - Chudovsky psalter, 176 sh.; *Teaching literature* (including the works of solemn speech): *AP* - Antiochus monk pandects, 310 sh.; *VL* - Victorov's leaf, 1 sh.; *ZIB* - Bychkov's zlatostruy, 4 sh.; *GB* - Thirteen words by Grigory Bogoslov, 377 sh.

During the work with a body of ancient Russian texts of the XI<sup>th</sup> century, the following methods were used: 1) the diachronic method (allowed to determine the place and epy meaning of inflectional flexion variation in the context of the Old Russian language dynamics (the 11<sup>th</sup> century); 2) comparative method and the analysis of non-standard contexts (contributed to the definition of grammatical, semantic and stylistic conditions of variational form functioning within identical syntactic expressions); 3) the quantitative method (made it possible to analyze the distribution of language units in terms of their use frequency, the compatibility with other forms and the distribution in other texts); 4) The elements of the structural method (helped to carry out the synchronistic analysis of unit correlation with different language levels (phonetics, grammar, syntax) [11].

## RESULTS

The body of the old Russian books and the preserved written fragments of the 11<sup>th</sup> century made it possible to restore the initial state of the grammatical system and determine the trends in the development of the book-literary language on the basis of an exhaustive sample of forms, since all possible variants that functioned in the Old Russian language were identified. The variational nature is predetermined by the symbiosis of spontaneous and innovative forms existence and does not always imply (as, for example, synonymy) the interchangeability of units. The variability of different-level speech units is one of the most unique and characteristic features of old Russian literature norm.

Let's consider the features of dative, instrumental, genitive and locative cases functioning in the electronic old Russian texts of the of the 11<sup>th</sup> century.

### Dative Case Singular (Hereinafter - DC Singular)

The quantitative analysis of the same word form use with a random ending in *-ови* (*-еви*) or *-ы* (*-ю*) showed that in the

Slavic-Russian (or Old Russian) texts of the 11<sup>th</sup> century the word forms with the inflectional index -y (-ю) dominate: 1807 forms on -y (-ю)/422 forms on -ови (-еви) (19%).

However, the written language of the early Russian Middle Ages has an acceptable degree of variability at the functional-grammatical level, and this indicates the effect of normalization ongoing process in the Old Russian language. What is the reason of the scribe's preference in a particular inflection choice in the dative case?

The flexion -ови (-еви) has implicitly represented stylistic specificity, contributes to the development of the lexical-grammatical category of personal determinism. From the semantic-syntactic position, the inflexion of the DC singular -ови (-еви) has the tendency to express subject-object relations, the interaction of a subject and an object relation ("his mother Mary of Josephus" 248 р. EvO; "but pray to the Lord" 186 Ant. 1073; «къ родови приведець будещи» 161d GB).

The variative flexures of DC sing. -ови (-еви) and -y (-ю) have formed some kind of opposition, in which the DC sing. on -y (-ю) is a neutral member, and the DP on -ови (-еви) is semantically labeled. This was one more reason to fix the endings of the dativus -ови (-еви) successfully in the ancient Russian language of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, as the cultivation of variance helped the scribes to achieve certain communicative goals. The use of flexion on -ови (-еви) at this stage of linguistic consciousness development was a normative phenomenon for the medieval linguistic and cultural picture. The ancient Russian scribes choose the forms on -ови (-еви) consciously, opposing them to the forms on -y (-ю), thereby strengthening their functional-grammatical preferences for the solution of the required communicative tasks and expressing their own world picture. In this way, medieval linguistic identity manifests itself in the interaction of two linguistic cultures: "archetypálny model poznania sveta tak, ako sa zro dil v hlbínach mýtu, tvorí základ naivného i jazykového obrazu sveta, pričom si zachováva svoj význam v normatívno-hodnotovom priestore súčasnej kultúry» [12]. It should be clarified, however, that this works most productively in book texts, in the field of sacred language activity. Outside the framework of a book text, the markedness with the help of the flexions -ови (-еви) is leveled and emptied semantically.

By the middle of XI century, the number of these word forms increases to 20% (EvO 1056-1057), and by the end of the period under study, the increment of inflectional new formations in DC singular is already obvious. - 38% (EvA 1092 - 41 forms, Min s. 1095-1096 - 48 forms, Min. around 1096 - 26 forms, Min. n. 1097 - 24 forms). The peculiarities

of such dynamics, unconditionally, point to the fact that by the beginning of the eleventh century the dative case of a single number on -ови (-еви) is a completely formed linguistic phenomenon, which functions actively and also gets even a more developed character towards the end of the eleventh century.

### The Genitive and Local Case Singular (Hereinafter - GC and LC Singular)

The analysis of variational endings distribution in GC and LC singular in the collection of the Slavic book historians of the 11<sup>th</sup> c. allowed to come to the following conclusions:

- 1) The set of Slavic-Russian written texts of the 11<sup>th</sup> century determined the circle of lexemes of the mixed declension on \*-ǫ/\*-ǫ with the domination of names with an undoubted basis on \*-ǫ: (a) undoubted names of the bases on \*-ǫ: вѣрхъ, домъ, медъ, вѣрхъ, полъ, сынъ; (b) probable names of the bases on \*-ǫ: родъ, чинъ;
- 2) In the analyzed texts, the examples of GC singular and LC singular variational flexibilities formal interaction are met usually. GC singular - 1908 forms on -a//89 forms on -y (5%), in the LC singular 1001 form on -e//118 forms on -y (10.5%);
- 3) Variative forms on -y GC sing. and LC sing. are observed exclusively in the masculine gender, thereby contributing to the development of the gender opposition m.g./n.g., f.g. ("въ субботу не отрешить ли волю своего ли осъляте от ясли" 60b EvA, "недалече сущу отъ дому посла къ нему сотъникъ" 95d EvO). Morphological inflectional variability has definite independence and not only weakens, but, on the contrary, it is strengthened by the appearance of new significant grammatical and semantic-syntactic oppositions.
- 4) It is established that the inflectional-marked forms on -y GC sing. and LC sing. are distributed mainly in the texts of liturgical genre orientation: in gospels, in euchologies (43% in GC and 39.3% in LC) and in the Svyatoslav's anthologies of 1073 and 1076 (19.1% in GC and 29% in LC).

Scientific research showed that the texts of the liturgical (God-serving) character in separate cases are an irreplaceable source of linguistic processes study because of their special genre nature: the copying of canonical manuscripts can contribute both to the change in the lexical composition and to the adjustment of syntagma grammatical structure. There is no doubt that these godly marked texts were a distinctive linguistic "polygon", in which many features of Russian grammar changed and developed.

Thus, in the handwritten memorials of the eleventh century the basis of the Old Russian book-literary language

is developed, and the process of grammatical variants existence is vividly represented, which in its turn forms the norm of book text hierarchy and reflects the action of general linguistic laws and processes.

### The Instrumental Case of the Singular Number (Hereinafter - IC Singular)

The analysis of IC sing. variance of masculine and neutral gender (hereinafter referred to as m.g. and n.g.), first conducted on the material of all Church Slavonic-Old Russian sources of the eleventh century, indicates that the Eastern Slavonic inflexion of the IC. m.g. and n.g. sig. -ѢМЬ permeates in the basics on \*-Ѣ from the basics on \*-Ѣ earlier than the inflection -ѢМЬ in the basics on \*-јѢ. The oppositions on the solidity/softness of a base, as well as the generic belonging of a name, determine this complex grammatical process. The gender classification predisposes the development of the old Russian substantive name: n.g. nouns with the ending on -ѢМЬ/-ѢМЬ make 31.1% (176 forms: КѢЛИЧѢСТВОМѢ 107b, РАВНОСУЩѢСТВОМѢ 10a, ХОДАТАИСТВОМѢ 31b., Min. s.; ЛИЦЕМѢ 150a, 156b, 158a, 168a EvA) of the total number of m.g. nouns with the ending on -ѢМЬ/-ѢМЬ (565 forms: ДУХОМѢ 25.2, 31.1, 40.1, 42.1, 42.2, 88.2, 114.1, КОНЬЦЕМѢ 45.1, 70.2; КРѢСТОМѢ 14.1, 29.1, 58.2 MinP), the names of n.g. on -ѢМЬ/-ѢМЬ make 34.4% (238 forms: ЛИЦЕМѢ 1b, 4a; СРѢДЬЦЕМѢ 6s ZIB) of the total number of m.g. names ending on -ѢМЬ/-ѢМЬ (692 forms: БОГЕМѢ 10c, 338a, 360a; ГЛАСЕМѢ 189b; ГНЕВЕМѢ 262d GB). In the percentage relationship, the distribution data of n.g. and m.g. with different finals are practically equal (-ѢМЬ/-ѢМЬ 31,1% and -ѢМЬ/-ѢМЬ 34,4%).

It should be noted that the monuments have a certain relationship between the genre of a written source and the grammatical form of IC sing. units. Thus, the old Russian word forms with the ending -ѢМЬ/-ѢМЬ of m.g. and n.g. predominate in liturgical books (euchologies (53%), gospels (11%)) and in religious-didactic manuscripts (especially in the anthology of 1073 (27%)). This linguistic fact can be associated with a certain activity of these manuscripts use in religious application: the daily use of sacred texts opens up more opportunities for the penetration of living speech elements. The relevant results contradict the generally accepted view that spelling is observed most thoroughly in the canonical (master) books for service reading (gospels, psalters, service euchologies), rather than for secret (private) reading.

## CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the electronic texts of the Slavonic-Russian manuscripts of the 11<sup>th</sup> century 1) revealed the earliest examples of the of case form variability in the dative,

genitive, local and instrumental cases singular; 2) the quantitative parameters, morphological and general grammatical regularities in the distribution of variational forms were determined (the relation with the grammatical gender, the character of the base and the composition of a flexion is established); 3) the dependence of form variation quantitative parameters from the chronological irregularity of the sources was calculated: Putyatin's euchology and the Ostromir's gospel as the earliest ancient Russian monuments demonstrate the closeness of the Old Slavonic tradition and reflect a more archaic state than, for example, the Novgorod service euchologies and the Arkhangelsk gospel, written at the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> century.

The study of the nominal declension singular of the early old Russian period from the point of view form variability made it possible not only to reveal the correlation of the Old Russian literary book norm and the real dynamics of speech, but to give a clearer idea of the case system functioning in the old Slavonic and in the proto-Slavic language. For historical grammar, the study of liturgical texts, rewritten from South Slavic prototypes, gives no less, if not more substantial material, than, for example, letters and other legal documents [13].

This complex-body study made it possible to conclude that some case word forms have a close connection with the entire structure of a case paradigm, and are able to exist at some point on their own (this is expressed in the expansion or the dissipation of case-based syncretism schemes).

There are also the differences in the speech dynamics of the case forms. A large number of word forms of the dative case singular on -ѢМЬ (-ѢМЬ), discovered in the electronic books of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, and the single examples in -ѢМЬ in the genitive and local cases singular showed clearly that the process of variation in genitive and local case began before the analogous phenomenon of variation in genitive and local case singular.

The statistics of variational form distribution indicates that the development of new dative case in -ѢМЬ should be attributed to the proto-Slavic era, and the functional changes in genitive and local cases definitely refer to the written epoch in its already developed form. The flexional variations of one case within a single language system had a significant impact on other cases. Thus, the early process of variation in the dative case provided the support for inflectional variations in other case forms, in particular in the dative and the local cases.

The corpus method and a continuous selection of language units allowed us to describe the distribution system of

variational forms of the old Russian nominal declension not as a linear structure consisting of the sum of individual components that need to be sequentially decomposed into constituent elements in order to analyze, but as related aggregates that must be analyzed on a common language background.

## SUMMARY

The consequence of this kind of research is the conclusion that it is difficult to penetrate into another linguistic-cultural, figurative-semantic, polyethnic environment, even with the use of all possible practical and theoretical approximations (for example, computer and corpus linguistics).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

The performance of statistical calculations using the font of the electronic corpus CyrillicaBgEpigraph was made possible through the assistance in its obtaining from the Sofia University, named after St. Climent Ohridsky, in particular Assoc. Prof., Ph.D. Tsvetana Raleva and Associate Professor, Ph.D. Anna Lipovskaya. In this regard with these, I would like to express my gratitude for the assistance provided to the authors of the explored electronic corpus.

## REFERENCES

1. Zholobov O. The corpus of the Old Russian copies of the Paraenesis of Ephraem Syrus. II: RNB, Pogod. 71a//Russian Linguistics. – 2009. – Vol. 33. – pp. 37–64.
2. Zholobov O. The corpus of the Old Russian copies of the Paraenesis of Ephraem Syrus. III, 1: BAN 31.7.2//Russian Linguistics. – 2011. – Vol. 35. – pp. 361–380.
3. Dufva H. Dialogia suomalaisuudesta//S. Laihiala-Kankainen, S. Pietikäinen, H. Dufva. (ed.) Moniääninen Suomi. Kieli, kulttuuri, identiteetti. Jyväskylä: Soveltavan kielentutkimuksen keskus. – 2002. – pp. 21–38.
4. Zholobov O. From Proto-Slavic to Old Church Slavonic: on Perfective Imperfect//Voprosy Jazykoznanija. – 2016. – N 3. – pp. 64–80.
5. Krysko V.B. Russian-Church Slavonic manuscripts of the 11<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries as the source on the history of Old Slavonic and Old Russian languages: new data//Slavic linguistic knowledge. XIIIth International Congress of Slavists. Reports of the Russian delegation. M.: Indrik, 2003. – pp. 337-355.
6. Baranov V.A. Full-text databases as the basis for electronic editions of medieval manuscripts in the Internet: requirements, implementation, perspectives//Scripta & e-Scripta: The Journal of Interdisciplinary Mediaeval Studies. Vol. 6. – Sofia: “Boyan Penev” Publishing Center; Institute of Literature, BAS, 2008. – pp. 47–64.
7. Zholobov O. Present tense forms variability in the Paroemiarion Zacharianum. Zeitschrift für Slawistik 2016. – N 61(2). – pp. 305–321.
8. Zholobov O. The synthetic indicative in Cyril and Methodius’ sources (the internet edition of the Paroemiarion Zacharianum dating from 1271), in: Russian Linguistics. 2016. – N 40. – pp. 153–172.
9. SofiaTrondheimCorpus. URL: <http://mime.hf.ntnu.no/SofiaTrondheimCorpus>, free of charge. Checked on 20.02.2017.
10. Manuscripts.ru. URL: <http://www.manuscripts.ru>, free of charge. Checked on 19.01.2017.
11. Galeev T., Solovyev, V. Methods of application of modern text corpora in the study of the morphological system of Russian verbs unification of 1 productive (irregular) class of verbs. Quantitative model based on google books//Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods. – SI. – 2016. – pp. 177–180.
12. Bochina T.G., Adamka P. Provyrb and Mythopoeic Model of the World [Prislovie a myto-poeticky model sveta]//XLIinguae. – 2015. – Volume 8, Issue 2. – pp.18–28.
13. Erofeeva I.V., Rakhimova D.I. Extralinguistic phenomena categorization in medieval culture (illustrated by the words with the root MIR)//Journal of Language and Literature. – 2015. – Vol. 6, Is.2. – pp. 330–333.

**How to cite this article:** Kapralova JV. Old Russian Reception of South Slavic Literature: Morphology of the Name in the Hand-Written Building of the 11<sup>th</sup> Century. *Int J Sci Stud* 2017;5(6):166-170.

**Source of Support:** Nil, **Conflict of Interest:** None declared.