The perfect tense in manuscript of the 13th century

El tiempo perfecto en manuscrito del siglo XIII

O tempo perfeito no manuscrito do século XIII

Written by:
Elvira Kh. Shayakhmetova
Oleg F. Zholobov
Kazan Federal University, Leo Tolstoy Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication
E-mail: info@ores.su

Abstract

This article reflects the result of perfect form semantics study in the collection of words and teachings (RNL, F.p.1.39) of the 13th century, which was carried out within the framework of the project devoted to the evolution and the functioning of an ancient Russian verb. Most of the manuscript is occupied by Kirill Turovsky's words. Besides, it contains the oldest South Russian translation of "Tales of Aphroditian." In this regard, the attention of researchers was mainly paid to the contents of the collection, and not to its linguistic and morphological characteristics. The work is the part of a comprehensive analysis of Tolstoy's collection linguistic features. We have determined that in the source, as in many other works, the overwhelming number of perfect forms is represented by the 2nd and the 3rd person singular, but, unlike the "traditional" use of the 3rd person forms without a link, the collection has only few forms without a link. The formulation of a single meaning, which could explain all the contexts of the use and non-use of perfects, is impossible for us. Presumably, perfect conveys a certain complex of subjectively colored meanings, connected, on the one hand, with emotionally expressive isolation of an action or an event, and on the other hand - with an evidence or with a reference to a known information / source.

Keywords: complex preterites, perfect, the semantics of verbal forms, Old Russian language, ancient Russian monument of the 13th century.

Resumen

Este artículo refleja el resultado del estudio semántico de forma perfecta en la colección de palabras y enseñanzas (RNL, Fp1.39) del siglo XIII, que se llevó a cabo en el marco del proyecto dedicado a la evolución y el funcionamiento de un antiguo verbo ruso . La mayor parte del manuscrito está ocupado por las palabras de Kirill Turovsky. Además, contiene la traducción más antigua del sur de Rusia de "Tales of Aphroditian". En este sentido, la atención de los investigadores se centró principalmente en los contenidos de la colección y no en sus características lingüísticas y morfológicas. El trabajo es parte de un análisis exhaustivo de las características lingüísticas de la colección de Tolstoy. Hemos determinado que en la fuente, como en muchas otras obras, la abrumadora cantidad de formas perfectas está representada por la segunda y la tercera persona del singular, pero, a diferencia del uso "tradicional" de las formas de tercera persona sin un vínculo, la colección tiene pocas formas sin un enlace. La formulación de un significado único, que podría explicar todos los contextos del uso y no uso de los perfectos, es imposible para nosotros. Presumiblemente, perfecto transmite un cierto complejo de significados subjetivamente coloreados, conectados, por un lado, con el aislamiento emocionalmente expresivo de una acción o un evento, y por otro lado, con una evidencia o con una referencia a una fuente / información conocida.

Palabras clave: preterios complejos, perfecto, la semántica de las formas verbales, idioma ruso antiguo, monumento ruso antiguo del siglo XIII.

Resumo

Este artigo reflete o resultado da perfeita forma semântica de estudo na coleção de palavras e ensinamentos (RNL, Fp1.39) do século XIII, que foi realizada no âmbito do projeto dedicado à evolução e ao funcionamento de um antigo verbo russo . A maior parte do manuscrito é ocupada pelas palavras de Kirill Turovsky. Além disso, contém a mais antiga tradução para o sul da Rússia de "Tales of Aphroditian". A esse respeito, a atenção dos pesquisadores foi principalmente paga ao conteúdo da coleção, e não às suas características lingüísticas e morfológicas. O trabalho é parte de uma análise abrangente das características linguísticas da coleção de Tolstoi. Determinamos que na fonte, como em muitos outros trabalhos, o número esmagador de formas perfeitas é representado pela 2ª e 3ª pessoas do singular, mas, ao contrário do uso "tradicional" das formas de 3ª pessoa sem um link, a coleção tem apenas alguns formulários sem um link. A formulação de um significado único, que poderia explicar todos os contextos do uso e não uso de perfeitos, é impossível para nós. Presumivelmente, o perfeito transmite um certo complexo de significados subjetivamente coloridos, conectados, por um lado, com o isolamento emocionalmente expressivo de uma ação ou um evento e, por outro lado, com uma evidência ou com uma referência a uma informação / fonte conhecida.

Palavras-chave: preteritos complexos, perfeitos, a semântica das formas verbais, língua russa antiga, antigo monumento russo do século XIII.

Introduction

The research was conducted with the aim to study the semantic and the functional status of perfect in the Compilation of the XIIIth century, the morphological features of which had not been analyzed previously. The questions about the peculiarities of preterital form functioning are still debatable, and more and more scholars are moving away from the "traditional" understanding of the meaning of perfect lately.

Methods and Material

The material of the study, the results of which allowed to write this article, was the Collection of Words and Teachings, also called "Tolstoy", (RNL, F.p.1.39). The manuscript dates back to the 13th century and most of it is occupied by the words of Cyril Turovsky. Besides, it contains the oldest South Russian translation of the "Tale of Aphroditian". In this regard, the attention of researchers was mainly paid to the contents of the collection, and not to its linguistic and morphological characteristics. The work is the part of a comprehensive analysis of Tolstoy's collection linguistic features.

The research was carried out using a digital photocopy of the manuscript provided by the Russian Scientific Library, in which the original of the collection is kept. The text of the collection is written in the late charter, and it is the book of 184 pages.

In the course of the study, we conducted a continuous sample of perfect forms and analyzed the contexts of their use. The results of the research were correlated with the concepts of perfect forms use in various sources available in historical linguistics.

The quotations from the manuscript are given in a simplified form, the abbreviations are restored, and a-iotated is transmitted through the letter "я".

Results

The problem of the ancient Russian complex preterite semantics, in particular, perfect, actively attracts the attention of scholars, because the perfect forms evolved into an universal preterite. Besides, with the increase of linguistic material and the introduction of previously unexplored manuscripts into the scientific circulation, it becomes clear that the understanding of the Slavic perfect semantics as "the state referred to present time, which is the result of past action" (Borkovsky V.I., Kuznetsov P.S, 2006), in one form or another cited by many scholars, including foreign ones (Schmalstieg W. R, 1983; Lunt H.G, 2001), is not completely satisfactory. Besides, a similar understanding of the Slavic perfect "reproduces its understanding in Indo-European studies" (Zholobov O.F, 2016). The studies show that the Slavic perfect in the overwhelming number of cases does not

correlate with the Greek perfect and has "some other meaning" (Kuznetsov A.M, 2014; Novak M.O, 2016; Słoński S, 1926; Krzysztof M, 2006). In the works devoted to the study of the functionally semantic status of perfect, researchers, as a rule, find it difficult to single out a specific limited set of meanings that would unconditionally explain the reason for perfect form use/non-use in all contexts (Novak M.O, 2016; Gasparov B.M, 2003; Kuznetsov A.M, 2013).

The manuscript under study contains 150 examples of perfect form use. The bulk of the perfect forms is made up of 3rd person singular (78) and 2nd person singular (55). A relatively large number of perfects is associated with the genre features of the collection, the prevalence of narrative, dialogical and preaching contexts in it (in particular, with the instructions for the deeds of God: ѥгоже днесь самъ богъ въспомѧноулъ и призрѣлъ и помиловалъ 16b). The remaining forms are much less common: 1st person singular - 3, 1st person plural - 3, 2nd person plural - 6, 3rd person plural - 4. The overwhelming number of forms is used with a link (135), which points to the text book register, of which only 16 contain a link in the preposition. Without a link, 3rd person singular (13) and 3rd person plural (2) forms are used.

In the text we encountered the examples of aorist and perfect use in one context as homogeneous members. Such examples are often found in various sources, which leads researchers to the idea that the forms of the aorist and the perfection are not opposites and about a possible implementation of undifferentiated action in the past by perfect (Kuznetsov A.M, 2014; Novak M.O, 2016).

да быша глаголали тако. велии ѥси господи и чюдьна дѣла твоя. яко посѣтилъ ѥси насъ милостию. и створи избавлениѥ людемъ своимъ. 27б

кто се ѥсть царь славы. с толикою на ны пришелъ властию. погоубилъ ѥсть кнѧзѧ тьмы. и всѧ ѥго въсхытилъ скровища. разби смертьныи градъ. 13а

богъ господь и яви сѧ намъ. и посѣтилъ есть насъ въстокъ свыше. 54б

The forms of perfect met us in the same row and with present time forms: … глаголахоу. что створимъ галилѣяниноу семоу. яко оуже отврѣщи хощеть богоданыи моисѣѥвъ законъ. и старьчьская прѣдания въ посмѣхъ

положилъ ѥсть. а рыбарѣ тивериадьскаго ѥзера невѣгласы соуща. яже по собѣ нынѧ водить. честьнѣише архиѥрѣи и фарисѣи створилъ ѥсть. и съ церкве продающихъ овца и голоуби изгонить. а мытарѣ и грѣшьникы приимая въ жьртвьникъ въводить 27б. In this example, the forms of perfect and the present tense are grouped in pairs, thus syntactic parallelism is formed: the Galilean laughed at the senile traditions, and made the fishermen "bishops"; he makes the merchants leave the church, and welcomes sinners to the altar.
Also, the perfect can be related semantically to the future: они же глаголаху ожила есть. и потомь не наречеть сѧ ира. но оураниѧ. великое бо солнце възлюбило ю есть. 57б. That is, the action indicated by perfect is the cause of the event, which, from the position of the speaker, will occur in the future.

In 2nd person perfect is actively used to describe the actions of the saint, with whom a "mental dialogue" is conducted: ты же радоуя сѧ на своѥю рукоу христа бога носилъ ѥси. … того же ты въ плащаницю обилъ ѥси тѣло. блажю роуцѣ твои иосифе. на нею же сына божия и всѣхъ творца дьржалъ ѥси тѣло. … нъ самого бога приѥмъ от крьста. въ своѥмь гробѣ радоуя сѧ положилъ ѥси. 14а. Also in plural: премоудрии ловьци… достоиноу троуда мъздоу прияли ѥсте. прославили ѥсте на земли христа сына соуща божия. 45а.
Using perfect in the direct speech, an action is transmitted, previously indicated by the aorist: и посадивъ отець сына на престолѣ. и своѥю вѣнча ѥго десницею. въспѣвающемъ сице серафимомъ. положилъ ѥси на главѣ ѥго вѣнець от камения драгаго. славою и честью вѣнчалъ ѥси ѥго. славоу и вельлѣпотоу възложилъ ѥси на нь. 36б.

In 3rd person the most common subject performing an action and indicated by perfect is God and divine power: God the Father, Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ, the name of the Lord, the Cross, the wreath, the great sun (54 examples from 78). Rare perfects are used to describe the actions that have nothing to do with sacral or transcendental:

уже помысли колико странъ нынѣ живущих. колико измерло есть преже 180б;
при моисии рекшимъ не прелюбуи. мужь в пещь влѣзъ скверновати дерзнулъ 150а.

In these examples, we can distinguish "emphasizing", contrasting meaning of perfect: many countries are alive and many countries died; Moisei said not to sin - but a man dared. A similar meaning is also present in the interrogative construction with the perfect of the 2nd person: отвѣщаша жьрци съ фарисѣи. въ грѣсѣхъ родилъ сѧ ѥси весь и ты ли ны оучиши. 30а: you were born in sins but you dare teach us.

The emphaticity of a perfect is clearly implemented in interrogative sentences: почто въсталъ ѥси от немощи. почто ицѣлѣлъ ѥси от недоуга. почто прѣмѣнилъ сѧ ѥси от болѣзни. 21а; especially in rhetorical: вы же глаголасте … намъ явленое таити … или нѣсте почюли колико искушение приимше асуриискο 60б.

Discussion

An unclear functional content, the variation of perfect forms, their relative rarity, the initial use almost in dialogical and direct speech only, suggests a certain subjective meaning, that they convey, connected with the perception of a speaker. In scientific circles, such theories are actively promoted: the forms of perfect "presuppose that a reader has certain information", the source of which may be a previous text, the fund of general knowledge, or logical interference (Petrukhin P.V, 2004); a perfect often has a summing value, representing events not as they occurred in time, but as they are reflected in memory (Klenin E, 1993). The information denoted by perfect is always referred to "objective knowledge" (Schooneveld C.R, 1959). perfect had the value of certitude and testimony (Zholobov O.F, 2016); perfect is comprehended in symbolic rhetorical parameters, as a form conveying the "act of faith", narrating about the situations of a "mystical nature", further broadens the meaning, conveying the extraordinary nature of a situation, the emphatic statement and the question, and also the reference (Gasparov B.M, 2003).

Grammatical meaning, as well as the semantic one, "is not delineated by some compact semantic complex, but unfolds in the form of unidirectional analogous translations of meaning from the well-known to a partially similar to it" (Gasparov B.M, 2003). Thus, it can be assumed that the perfect form, in particular, in the manuscript under study, has a set of values implemented in speech and with a certain logical connection between each other. This set of values can be divided into two conditional groups - an emphatic isolation and the transfer of evidentiality, which, however, are related, since witnessing is undoubtedly more expressive than a simple naming of an action or an event. The values of perfect are unevenly distributed between the book and the colloquial everyday language usage. In the book sources perfect serves the situations associated with the sacred and promotes the development of oratorical pathos. In colloquial language, probably, the meaning of confirmation had greater development, "general knowledge" and the transmission of known information.

The unifying component of all values is their subjectivity, since the listed meanings require information evaluation by a speaker. At the same time, the correlation with a speaker generates a "connection with the present," since the speaker evaluates the past event from the "present".

Conclusions

Narrative, dialogic and pro-behavioral contexts prevail in the collection of the XIIIth century, and in this regard the forms of perfect are represented in sufficient quantity. The bulk of examples are the forms of 2nd and 3rd person singular, the use of 3rd person singular without a verbal link is extremely rare, which is conditioned by the church-book character of the manuscript.

In 2nd person plural the greatest number of examples describe the actions of a person (in particular, the saints or God) with whom a dialogue is conducted, including "mental" one. In 3rd person singular most of perfect forms indicate the actions of God or divine power. Among the remaining examples, the perfects are singled out, the use of which transfers the selection of a designated action or an event, including in such syntactic structures as rhetorical question, opposition and concurrency. Also the manuscript has the examples of aorist and perfect form use as homogeneous members.

When you solve the issue of perfect form semantics, scientific discussion goes farther from the "classical" understanding of perfect, which is not recognized as encompassing all the variants of text form existence, and is also criticized for semantic identification with the Indo-European perfect.

All shades of perfect meaning combine their subjectivity, the connection with the assessment of a situation by a speaker. Probably, the semantic core of the perfect forms is the emphatic isolation of an action or an event, as well as the witnessing and the referring to the source of information. The meanings of perfect are not evenly distributed between the book and colloquial everyday language. In book sources, including the studied collection, perfect serves the situations connected with the sacred and fosters the development of oratorical pathos.

Acknowledgements

References

Borkovsky V.I., Kuznetsov P.S. (2006). Historical grammar of Russian language. Moscow: KomKniga, - 512 p.

Schmalstieg W. R. (1983). An Introduction to Old Church Slavic. Columbus: Slavica,– 314 p.

Lunt H.G. (2001). Old Church Slavonic Grammar / 7th revised ed. – Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter,– 264 p.

Zholobov O.F. (2016). The functioning of complex preterites in the monuments of ancient times // Scientific notes of Kazansky University. Ser. Humanities, - V. 158. book 5. - pp. 1234-1245.

Kuznetsov A.M. (2014). Perfect and other preterites in direct speech on the material of Mariinsky Gospel // Acta Slavica Estonica V. Works on Russian and Slavic Philology XVI. Anthropocentrism in language and speech / Ed. in charge I.P. Kulmoy. - Tartu: Tartu University, - pp. 273-284.

Novak M.O. (2016). Perfect forms in the Old Slavonic translation of the Apostle (on the material of the lists of XIIth - XIVth centuries) // Bulletin of Volgograd State University. Ser. 2: Linguistics. -- V. 15, No. 2. - pp. 69-74.

Słoński S. (1926). Tak zwane perfectum w językach słowiańskich // Prace Filologiczne. – №10. – S. 6–31.

Krzysztof M. (2006). The Syntax of Compound Tenses in Slavic. Doctoral Dissertation. Utrecht: LOT,– 321 p.

Gasparov B.M. (2003). Observations on the use of perfect in ancient church Slavic texts (On the issue of grammatical meaning nature) // Russian language in the scientific aspect. - No. 1. - pp. 215-242.

Kuznetsov A.M. (2013). Perfect in the Laurentian Chronicle // VALODA–2013. Valoda dazadu kulturu konteksta. Zinatnisko rakstu krajums XXIII. – Daugavpils: Daugavpils Universitates Akademiskais apgards "Saule"– pp. 53–62.

Petrukhin P.V. (2004). Perfect and pljuskvamperfekt in the Novgorodian first chronicle according to the synodal list // Russian Linguistics.– №28. – pp. 73–107.

Klenin E. (1993). The Perfect Tense in the Laurentian Manuscript of 1377 // American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists. – Bratislava, August – September 1993. Literature. Linguistics. Poetics. – Columbus, Ohio,– pp. 330–343.

Schooneveld C.R. (1959). A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System. Slavistic printings and reprintings. Leiden University. Mouton,– 171 p.