PRETERITES IN THE IZBORNIK FROM XIIIth CENTURY

PRETÉRITOS EN IZBORNIK DEL SIGLO XIII

Elvira Kh. Shayakhmetova[1], Oleg F. Zholobov[1], Mariia O. Novak[1], Yana A. Pen'kova[2]

[1]*Kazan Federal University*
[2]*Vinogradov Institute of Russian Language*
e-mail: ozolobov@mail.ru
Tel.: +79872379381

abstract

The article presents a study of preterital forms system in a handwritten Old Russian Izbornik (National Library of Russia, Q. p. I. 18), from the first half of the 13th century. The manuscript has an unusual composition, representing a collection of exegetical texts on the Old and New Testament. The Izbornik is interesting, in particular, by a presentation of erotapocritical exegetic forms. Besides, the codex contains fragments from earlier manuscripts including Izbornik 1073 and Izbornik 1076 what allows observing the dynamics of grammatical forms for about 150 years. An online edition of the manuscript was accomplished at Kazan Federal University. This machine-readable publication is accompanied by various search modules and indexes and located on the "Kazan digital collection" page of the "Manuscript" portal. The authors present the past tense forms analysis in Izbornik for the first time. The research showed a particular distribution and discorce functions of preterital forms in this unique composition. The analysis of preterites in Izb gives essential data for comparison with the preterital system in Tolstovskii Sbornik from the 13th century.

Keywords: Old Russian book culture, 13th-century Izbornik, preterites, variety, discource.

El artículo presenta un estudio del sistema de formas preteritales en un antiguo ruso nacido en Izbornik (Biblioteca Nacional de Rusia, Q. p. I. 18), de la primera mitad del siglo XIII. El manuscrito tiene una composición inusual, que representa una colección de textos exegéticos sobre el Antiguo y el Nuevo Testamento. El Izbornik es interesante, en particular, por una presentación de formas exegéticas erotapocríticas. Además, el códice contiene fragmentos de manuscritos anteriores, incluidos Izbornik 1073 e Izbornik 1076, lo que permite observar la dinámica de las formas gramaticales durante aproximadamente 150 años. Se realizó una edición en línea del manuscrito en la Universidad Federal de Kazan. Esta publicación legible por máquina está acompañada de varios módulos de búsqueda e índices y se encuentra en la página "Colección digital Kazan" del portal "Manuscrito". Los autores presentan por primera vez el análisis de formas de tiempo pasado en Izbornik. La investigación mostró una distribución particular y funciones de discorde de las formas preteritales en esta composición única. El análisis de pretéritos en Izb proporciona datos esenciales para comparar con el sistema preterital en Tolstovskii Sbornik del siglo XIII.

Palabras clave: cultura del libro ruso antiguo, Izbornik del siglo XIII, pretéritos, variedad, fuente.

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to analyze and describe the preterits usage peculiarities in a handwritten Old Russian Izbornik (National Library of Russia, Q. p. I. 18), from the first half of the 13th century, known as an exegetical Izbornik. It presents an anthological type of Old Russian book production. The manuscript contains works of a religious and didactic content of various genres and various authors. Most of the texts are translations from Greek. The heterogeneity of content and the ascent of texts to different protographs predetermine the language variability in the preterite system. On the one hand, they preserve the characteristics of previous texts and earlier grammatical traditions. On the other hand, they reflect the processes taking place in living Old Russian language.

One of the archetypes and sources (including self-titling) of the collection is Izbornik 1073. The largest volume is occupied by fragments from the Psalter with the exegetical comments of Pseudo-Athanasius of Alexandria. Fragments of the extended version of Vita Constantini, Nikita from Heraclea's comments on Gregory the Theologian's sermons, Gregory the Great's homilies on the Gospel, lexicographic excerpts are recognized as the earliest. There is a fragment of the Old Russian metropolitan Clement Smolatich's epistle in Izbornik and an anti-Judaic treatise "Speeches to a Jew about the God's Son incarnation," which probably is a result of an East-Slavic translation [1, p. 301].

Methods

Izbornik from the 13th century (from now on – Izb) is published online and is available at the "Manuscript" portal ("Kazan digital collection" page) [2; 3].

All machine-readable "Manuscript" editions are equipped with various search modules, direct, converted, and quantitative indexes what allows using of corpus linguistics methods in the study, including quantitative method, relying on a total sampling of forms [4; 5; 6].

The research presented in this paper deals both with the synchronous description and the diachronic method in the framework of comparison to data from other written sources, associated with Cyril-Methodius and later written traditions [7].

Results and Discussion

Variation of Aorist Forms

Cyril and Methodius sources and West-Bulgarian codices that descended them inherit athematic aorist forms of the verb *rešti* (the *rěxъ*-type) and an additional ending -*tъ* in 2–3 Sg. aor., mainly from monosyllabic stems *jati*, (*na*)*čati*, (*za-, ras*)*pęti*, *klęti*, *žiti*, (*u*)*mrěti*, (*pro*)*stręti*, (*po*)*žrěti*, *piti*, *viti*, (*vъs*)*pěti* [8, p. 316; 9, p. 164–168]. In the East Bulgarian tradition, athematic forms, as a rule, were replaced by thematic ones, of *rekoxъ*-type, without any final addition (*nača*, *prija*, and suchlike). In Old Russian written sources, there are different quantitative configurations of variable types. Most often the ending -*tъ* occurs in aorist forms with nasal vowel stems what allows considering such forms as a part of the Old Russian written standard.

In Izb, there are only athematic aorist forms of the verb *rešti* / *reči*: *rěxъ* (ff. 25, 77, 78, 97, 102 v., 116 v., 184 v., 185 (2x), 186 (2x), 187 v., 193 v., 194, 194 v., *rěxomъ* 141 v., *rěša* 3, 63 v., 79 v., 149 v., 157 (2x). This feature indicates the relationship of texts with the Cyril-Methodius and Western Old Slavonic traditions. Contexts with the 1Sg. forms used in this collection are of the same type: nine entries occur in "Speeches to a Jew about the God's Son incarnation." All these examples present a model "*azъ že rěxъ* <+indirect speech>." Five other examples are within the Psalter quotations, where *rěxъ*-forms directly enter the quoted text.

The using of exclusively archaic aorist forms from the verb *rešti* points to its close connection with the Cyril-Methodius tradition. However, only stems with a nasal vowel have an addition -*tъ*, following the East Slavic tradition. Verbs with other stems have only variants without -*tъ*: *umre* 35 v., 149, 160, 156, *prostre* 90, 101 v., *vъspě* 142 v. (2x), *pi* 4. Forms with -*tъ* and without -*tъ* are equally frequent: *prijatъ* 4 v., 74, 81 v., 82 v., 123, *pojatъ* 155 v., 159, 160, *vъz'atъ* 21 v., *jatъ* 159, *rasp'atъ* 73 v., *kl'atъ* 106, 132 v., *začatъ* 85, 85 v., 157 v., *načatъ* 47 v. **vs.** *prija* 27, 32 v., 35, 37, 49 v., 144, 175 v., 187, 192 v., *vъsprija* 22, *rasp'a* 5 v., 130, 150 v., *kl'a* 127 v., *vъz'a* 187, *zača* 157, *nača* 28.

These forms are distributed variously. Samples from the exegetic Psalter contain a relatively large number of forms with the ending -*tъ* what is primarily due to the large volume of this text. Demonstratively, however, there are no forms without -*tъ* in this section of Izb. Forms with an additional -*tъ* are also multiple in a smaller passage "And from Genesis" (ff. 154 v.–168 v.). At the same time, both chapters contain the athematic aorist of the verb *rešti*.

A different trend is reflecting in the passages "And from the Gospel" (ff. 24–34 v.) and "Speeches to a Jew about the God's Son incarnation": they combine athematic aorists of the verb *rešti* and aorist forms without -*tъ*.

Imperfect Forms

The so-called augmented imperfect is one of the

imperfect forms, which, along with the perfective imperfect, most often attracts the attention of researchers. A. Timberlake identifies two fundamental principles of the augment imperfect usage: before the enclitic *i* 'him' in sandhi situations and before other enclitics [10]. In Izb, there are 290 imperfect forms, including 200 3Sg. and 90 3Pl. In 290 examples, 24 forms have the additional -*tъ*: 7 3Sg. and 17 3Pl. The *tъ*-forms distribution only partially depends on the enclitic rule: in Sg., only three of seven forms have an additional -*tъ* before the enclitics *že, ju, s'a*. In Pl., four forms receive -*tъ* before the enclitic *i*, and five more receive it before other enclitics: *bo*, *že*, *ja*. Thus, the augmented imperfect forms in Izb make up about 8.3% of the total number of used imperfects of the 3rd person. The enclitic rule explains only half of these cases.

A perfective imperfect in Izb occurs only in one passage, which also stands in Izbornik 1073 [11, p. 73]. In Izb, in comparison with the text of 1073, the form of the perfective imperfect *bud'aše* was added.

Unfused imperfect forms are preserved in Izb only in rare cases, in verbs *byti* 'to be' and *iměti* 'to have.'

The imperfect forms of verbs with the -*i(ti)* stems preserve the alternation of the consonant, new forms without alternating occur only in two cases: *privod'axu* 182 v. and *prinos'achutь* 6 instead of the expected *privožaxu* and *prinošaxu(tь)*.

Perfect Forms Distribution

There are 91 perfect forms in Izb, including 46 forms of 3Sg. and 37 forms of 2Sg. It relates Izb with the Codex Suprasliensis but differs from other Old Slavonic texts. 2Sg. forms are most frequent in Psalter quotes and in "Speeches to a Jew," composed in a dialogical form. 3Sg. forms are presented in erotapocritical and exegetical contexts, as well as in Psalter quotes. The majority of contexts contain copular elements (including the clitic *je*). Some forms do not have copulas: 3Sg. (15 forms), 2Pl. (once), and 3Pl. (twice).

Since Izb contains exegetic texts, many perfect forms occur in contexts of "quotation – comment" type. Preterites show a different distribution in such contexts. Frequently, the aorist and perfect forms distribution have a discursive nature, delineating "zones" of psalm quotes and comments:

92 v.	p(salm). **vъšьlъ jesi** na vysotu **plěnilъ jesi** plěnъ.	c(omment). vъšьdъ na krьstъ x(risto)sъ plěni d'javola
30	reč(e) g(ospo)dь. jako **utailъ jesi** ot premudryxъ razumъ. i **otkrylъ jesi** mladencemъ.	c(omment). otъ knižnikъ. i ot popovъ židovskyixъ. *utai* věděnьje
78	ps(alm). Tělo že **svьršilъ jesi** mně.	c(omment). vъplъščь s'a g(ospo)dь. Svoje tělo *da* vъ naslaženije č (e)l(o)v(ě)ku
69 v.	p(salm). vъ s(ъ)ln(ь)ci *položi* selo jego.	c(omment). … tъ bo **dalъ jestъ** s(ъ)ln(ь)c'u sijanije
116	bezvěstьnaja i tajnaja premudrost'ju tvojeju *javi* mi.	c(omment). pror(o)čьstvъmь reče **ukrasilъ** m'a **jesi**
167 v.	iže i vъ glubokuju starostь. glubokaja *izvěšča*.	c(omment). na poslědn'uju bo i glubokuju starostь. **napisalъ jestъ** i̅š̅ (s)lovesъ. jaže čudna i xvaly dostoina

Also, perfect forms denote non-localizable situations [12]. Cf.: p(salm). inokъ vidivii **pojalъ** i **jestъ**. c(omment). d'javolъ **požralъ** židovskyja sъnъmy 102, *rastъrza* vretišče. i **prepojasalъ** m'a **jesi** vesel'jemъ 37 v.

Aorists and perfects can be used as homogeneous parts of the sentence with a subtle functional difference: jedinu ot skotъ zemnyxъ *obrěte* sebě zmьju sъsudъ i xodataicu. i toju **ispustilъ** živyi tъ gla(s) vъ uši jevgy 154; ezekija s'a **jestъ rodilъ** preže gl(agol)anija proročьskaja. to ot d(ě)vy li s'a **jestъ rodilъ** ezekija. ili silu *prija* damaskovu … ili *sv'aza* c(ěsa)r'a asuriiskago 187.

Izb contains a fragment of John Chrysostom's exegesis of the Matthew Gospel, which corresponds to the fragment from Izbornik 1076. This fragment consists of conditional clauses with a repeating structure "if you have done something in the past, then from now on act differently." In Izbornik 1076, this fragment uses both perfect and aorist forms (three and four entries, respectively). In Izb, perfect forms prevail, and only the last clause contains an aorist. Probably, the scribe tried to unify verb forms. Perhaps perfect forms seem more natural to him in the non-factive contexts of conditional subordinate clauses.

Izbornik 1076, f. 39	Izb, f. 125 v.
Zlatoustago ježe otъ matfea.	Zlatoustag ot matfьja

Sъtvorite reče plody dostoinьny pokajanija. rekše **grabilъ jesi** štuždaja. to daždь uže iže i svoja. *bludi* li. čistotojǫ živi i vъzdьržanijemь. **korilъ li jesi** i **bilъ**. to bl(a)goslovi uže kor'aštaja t'a. i bl(a)gоděi bijǫštiimъ t'a. *pita* li *s'a* i *upiva*. alъči i vodǫ pii. *viдě* li bludьnama očima dobrotu štužu. to otъvrati oči svoi ne gl'adati bezumija	Stvorite r(eč)e plody dostoiny pokajanija. rekše **grabilъ li jesi** čužaja. to uže i svoja razdavai. **bludilъ li jesi**. to uže č(is)totoju živi. i vъzdьržanьjemь. **ukar'alъ li jesi** kogo. ili **bilъ**. to bl(a)goslovi uže kor'aščago t'a. i dobro tvori bьjuščemu t'a. **pitalъ li s'a jesi** za utrьky. ili **upivalъ s'a jesi**. to uže alči i vodu pii. *viдě* li bludnama očima dobrotu čužu. to uže otvraščai oči svoi. i ne gl'adai bezumьja

Some perfect forms introduce direct speech. Probably, in this case, they act as markers of a discourse change: ne plъtьsky jasti i piti povelěvajetь sbornikъ. nъ d(u)x(o)vьně. iže bo **je** vъ pritčaxъ **glagolalъ**. ne prel'ščajte s'a sytostьju utrobьnoju 39 v.; i samъ bo g(ospo)dь **glagolalъ**. bl(a)ž(e)ni viдěvъše i věrovavъše 196.

Perfect can be in contrast with other preterites, denoting a permanent situation. In this case, simple preterites convey the sense of specifically localized events in the past: r(eč)e pavьlъ. stavъ posreдě arijeva ledu. muži afiněistii. c(omment). vъ afiněxъ preдь idolьskoju c(ь)rk(ъ)vьju **ležalъ** kamenь velikъ. na nemьže stoja arii učaše l'udi. i učenьjemь jego mnozi omračiša s'a. i samъ s'a omrači. i togo radi kamenь tъ narečetь s'a arijevъ ledъ 178.

Pluperfect

In Izb, pluperfect forms occur quite rarely in several functions. First, they can convey the sense of sheer precedence in the past: čto radi sudar' ne sъ rizami položenъ bys(tь) nъ osobь. c(omment). poneže kajafa. **dalъ** i **b'aše** na pogrebenьje. i jako nedostoina otluči i g(ospo)dь 24; i mn'ašetь ju l'uboдěju sušču. **pokryla** bo **b'aše** lice svoje. i ne pozna jeja 156 v. Also, pluperfect forms can oppose a past situation to a subsequent one. Such usage is similar to the typical pluperfect meaning 'discontinuous past' [13, p. 28]: věšča bo i preдъstojaščimъ. ne tri li **b'axomъ** muža **vъvьrgli** vъ peščь. … to kako reče azъ .д̅. vižu 165; kako ne znaja li jego vъprašajetь. jegоže **pokazalъ bě** pьrstъmь … i jegоže predi teka **poвěдалъ bě** i **věдалъ** 48 v. At the same time, pluperfect forms can convey a particular meaning 'not yet,' appropriate in the Old Russian written standard [13, p. 188]: ne u bo **b'axu vъkusili** jazyci těla i krъve x(risto)vy. i sego radi tajaxu gladъmь i žažeju 106 v. In some contexts, pluperfect forms have the meaning of a cancelled result: židove bo **b'axu prisadili s'a** kъ b(og)u věroju i otъlomiša s'a… a my jazyci preže **prisadili s'a b'axomъ** kъ běsomъ. … i prisadixomъ s'a kъ svoiskoi maslici 177.

In Izb, there are also l-forms of the verb *byti* functioning without a copula in a pluperfect meaning of the discontinuous past [14, p. 146–147]: Livanъ že gora žьrtvišče idolьskoje preže **bylo**. nyně že žilišče s(v'a)tyxъ 3 v.; preže bo ot židovъ u b(o)ga **bylo**. s(v'a)tyxъ. semь

tys'ačь. a po rasp'atьji množьstvo beščislьnoje 177. It is quite unusual that the form *bylъ* functions as a copula with a nominal predicate: ugodnaja bo b(o)gu **ne byla vědoma** židy i jeretiky 16; in particular, it works as an indicator of a retrospective shift with the 'frame past' meaning: c(ь)rky bo **byla roskopana** navъxodonosorъmь. i op'atь sъzdana k'urъmь. a pritvorъ **bylъ** solomonь **ne roskopanъ** 63.

Summary

The online edition of Izb allows implementing a thorough analysis of the language parameters of the manuscript using computer technologies.

In Izb, an unusual distribution of various aorist forms takes place. The most frequent verb that introduces direct speech exclusively uses sigmatic aorist forms of the *rěxъ*-type, usually connected with the Western Slavic tradition. On the contrary, the aorist forms without *-tъ*-ending prevail according to the Eastern Bulgarian tradition and the East Slavonic usage.

Imperfect forms of 3Sg. and 2Pl. frequently have an additional ending *-tь*. Significantly, they do not correlate with the special rules for the -xu-forms usage before the enclitic *i* 'him,' in contrast to liturgical texts. Perhaps not all these forms are associated with the Russification of South Slavonic translations, since -tь-forms are observed, for example, in South Slavic copies of the Didactic Gospel by Constantine of Preslav [15-17].

Perfect forms are used very rarely in the usual resultant meaning. They occur in the contexts typical for aorist usage, and in some cases are syntactically correlated with aorist forms. In such contextual conditions, the perfect – as opposed to the aorist – designates a non-localized action or acts as a marker of the discourse modes. When compared with similar readings in Izbornik 1076, Izb demonstrates a substitution of the aorist with the perfect, which indicates an extension of perfect forms usage in the first half of the 13th century.

Pluperfect forms are rarely used in Izb and have several meanings inherent to Slavonic manuscripts, including the meaning of discontinuous past, cancelled result, and unfulfilled event. L-forms of *byti* verb also occur in the pluperfect meaning, functioning as copulas

of nominal predicates.

Conclusions

The complicated system of past tense forms in Old Russian was changing, influenced by the living language. The Izb language analysis confirms that the aorist remained one of the primary forms of the temporal system, the development of aorist and imperfect continued in the written linguistic register. At the same time, perfect forms actively enter the text carrying a variety of subtle semantic and discursive nuances. In some contexts, the perfect has a neutral aoristic meaning. In Izb, the ancient Old Slavonic written features and the casual East Slavic features of the living speech combine. The analysis of preterites in Izb gives essential data for comparison with the preterital system in Tolstovskii Sbornik from the 13th century (National Library of Russia, F. p. I. 39).

Acknowledgements

References

1. Reinhart J. 'Drevnerusskii antiiudejskii traktat, iego grecheskii original i problema iego proiskhozhdeniia', *Trudy Instituta russkogo iazyka im. V. V. Vinogradova. Vol. 5. Lingvisticheskoe istochnikovedenie i istoriia russkogo iazyka*, gl. red. A.M. Moldovan, Moskva, 2015, p. 289–333.

2. Kazan collection of digital editions of Slavic-Russian written sources from the 12th-14th centuries, 2007–2018, Kazan Federal University, Paleoslavic Laboratory, IAS "Manuscript", 2007–2018 (http://manuscripts.ru/mns/portal.main?p1=54; 17.06.2018).

3. Izb – Izbornik – Izbornik from the 1st half of the 13th c. Codex (National Library of Russia, Q.p.I.18, 196 ff.; online-version prepared by E. Kh. Shaiakhmetova (http://manuscripts.ru/mns/main?p_text=96367132; 18.06.2018).

4. Solovyev V., Ivanov V. "Dictionary-based problem phrase extraction from user reviews", *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 2014, v. 8655, pp. 225–232.

5. Solovyev V.D., Kibrik A.A., "How can computer technologies help linguistic typology?", *HERALD OF THE RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES*, 2015, vol. 85, is.1, pp. 33–39.

6. Martiyanov D.A., Galiullin K.R., "Russian proverb corpora of the 18th century: Variation problem", *Journal of Language and Literature*, 2015, Vol. 6, Is. 2, pp. 104–108.

7. Žolobov O., "Present tense forms variability in the Paroemiarion Zacharianum d. 1271 (to the parchment internet-edition)", *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 2016, Vol. 61, Is. 2, pp. 305–321.

8. Pichkhadze A.A., Perevodcheskaia deiatel'nost' v domongol'skoi Rusi: lingvisticheskii aspekt, Moskva: Rukopisnye pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi, 2011, 403 c.

9. Zholobov O., "The synthetic indicative in Cyril and Methodius' sources (the internet edition of the Paroemiarion Zacharianum dating from 1271)", *Russian Linguistics*, 2016, Vol. 40, Is. 2, pp. 153–172.

10. Timberlake A. "On the Imperfect Augment in 'Slovo o polku Igoreve'", *Roman Jakobson: Texts, Documents, Studies*, Ed. by H. Baran et al. Moscow, 1999, pp. 771–786.

11. Zholobov O.F., "From Proto-Slavic to Old Church Slavonic: on perfective imperfect", *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 2016, No. 3, pp. 64 – 80.

12. Plungian V.A., Urmanchieva A.Iu., 'Perfekt v staroslavianskom: byl li on rezul'tativnym?', *Slověne*, 2017, Vol. 6, Is. 2, p. 13–56.

13. Sichinava D.V., Tipologiia pliuskvamperfekta. Slavianskii pliuskvamperfekt, Moskva: AST-PRESS KNIGA, 2013, 384 p.

14. Dahl Ö., Tense and Aspect Systems, Oxford: Blackwell, 1985. 213 p.

15. Krys'ko V.B., Mol'kov G.A. "Iazykovye osobennosti Uchitel'nogo evangeliia Konstantina Preslavskogo i iego drevneishego spiska", *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, 2017, Vol. 73, Is. 2, pp. 331–395.

16. Kenan, K. X. (2018). Seeing and the Ability to See: A Framework for Viewing Geometric Cube Problems. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 13*(2), 57-60. https://doi.org/10.12973/iejme/2695

17. Murzinova, K. E. A., Koblanova, A., & Ansabayeva, D. A. A. (2018). Prosodical means applied in communicative relations. *Opción, 34*(85-2), 61-96.