



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Maria V. Ermolova

**ON SOME VERBAL FEATURES IN
THE WEST RUSSIAN CHRONICLES
(CONSTRUCTIONS “БЫТИ +
PARTICIPLE IN -ЪШ- / -ВЪШ-”,
PLUPERFECT)**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LINGUISTICS

WP BRP 96/LNG/2020

ON SOME VERBAL FEATURES IN THE WEST RUSSIAN CHRONICLES (CONSTRUCTIONS “БЫТИ + PARTICIPLE IN -ЪШ- / - ВЪШ-”, PLUPERFECT)

This article analyzes some verbal features in the West Russian Chronicles (WRC) (15–16th cc.). The 1st part examines contexts with the construction “*быти* + participle in *-ъш-* / *-въш-*”. This construction is extremely uncommon for Old Russian texts, nevertheless the very possibility of its use is important for understanding the history of the development of the temporal system in Russian. The material of WRC allows us to widen the list of contexts with this construction with two more examples.

The 2nd part discusses the functions of pluperfect forms. Rare forms of pluperfect with the linking verb in the aorist form are found in WRC which is quite unexpected for a late text. This article discusses possible explanations for this phenomenon. As for the semantics of the pluperfect forms, all of the basic pluperfect meanings are presented in WRC. The comparison of the contexts with these meanings with the material of the other chronicles allows us to draw a number of conclusions about the history of the pluperfect’s development in Old Russian and its dialects.

JEL Classification: Z.

Keywords: Old Russian language, West Russian Chronicles, past active participle, pluperfect.

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics. Faculty of Humanities. School of Linguistics. E-mail: maria-anna2121@yandex.ru.

1. Introduction

The West Russian Chronicles (WRC) are “short chronicles containing legends about events concerning the former Lithuanian state” [Karsky 1894/1962: 208]. WRC were created in Smolensk and Polotsk in the 14–16th centuries. This article examines the Suprasl Chronicle (1519; hereinafter Supr.), the Vilna Chronicle (the end of the 15th century; hereinafter Vil.), the Chronicle of the Archaeological Society (16th century; hereinafter Arch.), the Uvarov Chronicle (the first quarter of the 16th century; hereinafter Uv.), the Academic Chronicle (mid-16th century; hereinafter Ak.), “Litovskomu rodu pochinok” (hereinafter LRP) in the 16th century manuscript².

WRC are written in Old Ruthenian, which is a literary adapted “supra-regional variety of the Belarusian and Ukrainian languages of the middle period” [Moser 2002: 221]. In spite of the difficult identification of the genesis of Old Ruthenian and the question of its normalization, the analysis of certain forms functioning in a particular text (in our case, WRC) seems justified: Old Ruthenian, being a literary language, in any case “is based on living language, changing with it” [Smirnova 2011: 19]. Studying certain phenomena of the written West Russian language, we can draw conclusions about the processes that took place in the dialects that formed its basis.

This article analyzes some of the verbal features noted in the chronicles. Section 2 presents the contexts with the constructions “*быти* + participle in *-ѣш-* / *-вѣш-*” which are rarely found in Old Russian texts, section 3 discusses the features of the functioning of pluperfect forms.

2. Constructions “*быти* + participle in *-ѣш-* / *-вѣш-*”

The constructions “*быти* + participle in *-ѣш-* / *-вѣш-*” are extremely uncommon for Old Russian texts. In addition to the three examples discovered by Potebnya [1888/1958: 138–139], and four examples described in Skachedubova [2018], we know two more contexts from the Charter of Oleg Ryazansky in 1371³:

(1) ꙗко ꙗко князь великий шлѣхъ ивановичъ. сгадавъ ѣсмь съ своимъ шцѣмъ. съ в(д)кою с васильемъ и съ своими боѣры....далъ ѣсмь шцѣ своему арсѣню манастирь

² The texts are reproduced according to the edition [PSRL, vol. 17].

³ The text is reproduced according to [Reader on the history of the Russian language: 91].

сѣю бѣи на шлговѣ. въ свободѣ до юго живота – “I, Grand Duke Oleg Ivanovich, made an agreement with his father, with Vladyka Vasily and with his boyars ...”;

(2) а возрѣвъ ѥсмь въ дании грамоты – “and when I revived the certificate, I looked at [read] the missives”.

The material of WRC allows us to widen this list with two more examples:

(3) Supr. 90 ꙗꙑзю великому ꙗгаилоу. ничего не вчинилъ. не роушивъ есмо ни
скарбовъ его ни ста(д) а сами оу мене не в нѣтствѣ ходатъ. толко за малою сторожею – “I
did nothing to the great prince Yagail; I did not rob his property or herds. And they are not in
captivity but only under a small guard”;

(4) Ak. 181 и взѧ его и нача его лѣчити многими лѣкаръствы и главѣ емѣ постриже ранѣ ра(ди) зане много р(а)нень и щчаѣ всѧ бе живота – “and took him, and began to heal him with many medicines, and tonsured him because of his wounds as he was badly injured and had lost hope of survival”.

Although the construction is rarely found in monuments, the very possibility of its use is important for understanding the history of the development of the temporal system in Russian. The participle in *-ѣи-* / *-ѣиши-* with the verb *бѣиши* in the present (examples (1–3)) or past (example (4)) tense could be used as a marginal alternative to the forms of perfect and pluperfect, respectively. Like perfect forms the construction of a participle with the verb *бѣиши* in the present tense was used in various perfect meanings (for the meanings of perfect in Old Russian see, for example, [Shayakhmetova, Zholobov 2017: 1170], [Plungyan, Urmanchieva 2017b]). In examples (1–2) we are dealing with effective semantics: (1) “I agreed (= we are in agreement) and, as a result, I give a monastery”, (2) “I looked at the old letters (= now I know their content) and I will order you to comply with the conditions prescribed there”. In the context of (3) an existential meaning⁴ is presented, a statement about the presence (in our case, the absence) of a situation at a certain moment in the past. In (4) the analyzed construction has a classic pluperfect meaning and expresses the previous effective action: “tonsured him as he was badly injured and had lost hope of survival”.

⁴ This meaning is included in the spectrum of perfect meanings in different languages; it was also characterized by a perfect in Old Slavonic (see [Plungyan, Urmanchieva 2017a: 31]).

These examples, in which the construction “*быти* + participle in *-ѣш-* / *-ѣш-*” has perfect or pluperfect semantics, confirm the hypothesis expressed in Ermolova [2020] about the functional synonymy of participles in *-ѣш-* / *-ѣш-* and *-л-* forms.

3. Pluperfect

3.1. The form

In the history of the Russian language, there is a distinction between the “bookish” pluperfect, where the verb *быти* stands in the imperfect or aorist from the imperfect stem (ср. 3 л. *бѣше(тъ)* / *бѣ шѣлъ*) and the “Russian” or super-compound where the verb *быти* is in the perfect⁵ ((*есть*) *былъ шѣлъ*).

Over time bookish forms were replaced by super-compound ones. It is natural that in WRC there are only 3 “bookish” forms for 45 pluperfect forms, while 2 of them represent one ancient context repeating the context from the Suzdal chronicle (the third is considered in (10)):

(5) Supr. 11 б ѡна же рече не хощю розоути робичища. но ꙗрополка хощю. бѣ бо Рогволодъ пришелъ. изамориꙗ имѣ бо власть свою в Полѣцкоу (the same context see in Uv. 81) – “Rogvolod was a person who had come from across the sea and was in charge in Polotsk” (compare Suzdal chronicle 99 б: ѡна же ре(чѣ) не хощю розути робичища. но ꙗрополка хощю. бѣ бо Роговолодъ перешелъ из заморьꙗ).

The linking verb in the pluperfect form was usually either in the aorist from the imperfect stem or in the imperfect. Sitchinava [2004] in his article on the origin of the Slavic conditional mood from the pluperfect, based on typological data, suggests the existence of the once Proto-Slavic pluperfect form with *быхъ*. Later such forms were also discovered in Old Russian texts ([Krysko 2011: 830-831; Skachedubova 2019: 218-219], [Sitchinava (in press)]). According to Sitchinava's hypothesis the construction of the conditional meaning is associated with “the inherent development of pluperfect constructions towards surreal semantics” [Sitchinava (in press)]. It seems that it is in this context that the following examples from WRC should be considered:

⁵ V.I. Chernov believes that the super-complex form was formed by a combination of the auxiliary verb *бѣлѣ*- and the perfect of the noble verb [Chernov 1961: 16].

(6) Vil. 446 b Ви(л)невци же тог(д)а не вдашасѣ емѣ. зане бы тогда пра(в)доу да(л) королю Скиргайлѣ;

(7) LRP 493 Виленцы (ж) тогда не дашасѣ емѣ зане бы тогда правдѣ да(л) королю Скиригаилоу ш(н) же тогда не во(з)мѣ Вилне и поиде к магистрѣ и (с) своею княгинею и съ своими кнѣ(з)ми. и ѿтолѣ нача воевати Лито(в)сѣю землю с Немецкою помощию. ти оу(ж) взѣ(л) бы Лито(в)ские земли по рекѣ по Велию Полотескѣ гра(д) зда(л)сѣ емѣ – there is no doubt that the analyzed forms have a pluperfect meaning (see below (10) and (11)). However, the auxiliary verb *быти* is presented neither in the form of an imperfect aorist nor perfect but in the form of *бы*. There are several possible explanations for this phenomenon, but all of them are hypothetical since there is not enough material to recognize any of them as more or less probable.

In these contexts, one can see the archaic form of pluperfect with an auxiliary verb in the aorist and consider the usage of the singular form *бы* (instead of plural *быша*) to be erroneous. The aorist and the imperfect in the language of the chronicles are clearly artificial, these forms often contain errors, therefore it can be assumed that the scribe made a mistake rewriting the text and replaced the alien form *быша* with a more familiar form *бы*.

Sitchinava notes that in Russian since the 16th century the usage of the particle *было* instead of *бы* has been possible with modal verbs: *надо было, надлежало было, могло было* instead of *надо бы, надлежало бы, могло бы* [Sitchinava 2013: 223, 279]. Examples of such use are considered a mixing the pluperfect *было* and the subjunctive *бы* [ibid.]. Sitchinava notes that “perhaps some late examples of mixing pluperfect and subjunctive mood can also be explained by the semantic evolution in the direction of modality inherent in the first”; “if the pluperfect *был* is synonymous with a certain class of verbs to *бы*, the confusion could theoretically extend to other contexts” [Sitchinava (in press)]. It can be assumed that if the pluperfect in the original forms could be used instead of forms of the subjunctive mood, then the forms of the subjunctive mood were also used instead of pluperfect forms. With such an explanation, the use of *бы* instead of *быша* becomes clear: by the time of writing of the analyzed texts, it would have already become a particle in the subjunctive mood and would not change. The disadvantage of this hypothesis is that besides the cited examples, similar examples are not mentioned in the literature. The following context should be recognized as the result of contamination and error (the meaning of the considered form is analyzed in (20)):

(8) LRP 487 Нѣто паки бы(л) оу великого кнѣзѣ Ш(л)герда паробокѣ неволной холо(п) звали его Воиниломѣ первое бы(л) пекрако(м). Потомѣ оустави(л) его ѣ

собѣ постелю стлати. и воды пити подати собѣ. Потомъ паки полюби(л)сѣ бы(л) емѣ ве(л)ми да(л) бы(х) емѣ Литѣ дръжати и повѣле(л) бы(л) его в добрые – the auxiliary is used in singular form instead of plural. However, the last consonant is an ascender, and it is quite possible that we are dealing with an error of the publishers (the ascenders *х* and *л* can be confused), and *был* is hiding behind the one given in the edition *бых*.

3.2. Semantics

In the history of the development of the pluperfect in Old Russian several basic meanings are distinguished. All of them are presented in the WRC.

Recent research agrees that the “bookish” Old Russian pluperfect was originally not just a taxis time denoting a pre-past action [Gorshkova, Khaburgaev 1981: 304], but had the aspectual meaning of perfectness in the past [Sheveleva 2007: 216]. As to whether the Russian pluperfect had a resultative meaning, opinions differ. Petrukhin and Sitchinava believe that the super-compound form was used primarily to indicate the irrelevant past [Petrukhin, Sitchinava 2006: 234-235; Sitchinava 2013: 196-197]. Sheveleva believes that the “new” and “old” forms differed not in meaning, but in use: “The old and new pluperfect are [...] distributed not by the meaning, but by more or less characteristic types of use: old pluperfect is a form, first of all, of a narrative, a new one, first of all, of direct speech” [Sheveleva 2007: 245].

In the 15–16th centuries, in the dialects of the Center, the Russian pluperfect is not used in resultative contexts, but as a marked means of expressing an anti-resultative meaning [Sheveleva 2009]. In the South West Russian texts, according to Zhukova and Sheveleva (based on the material of the Peresopnitsia Gospel and “The Passion of Christ”) for super-compound forms the resultative meaning is the most characteristic [Zhukova, Sheveleva 2010]. This is also noted in the studied chronicles. In total, 6 resultative contexts were found repeated in different chronicles (a total of 17 forms out of 43):

(9) Ув. 10 и какъ к Вилни приехавъ. кѣзѣ Кестоутиѣ дѣдю своего. шковавши ко Кревоу послалъ и оусадили оу вижю. а кѣзѣ великаго Витовта шставили были еще оу Вилни и тамо оу Креве пѣтаа ноци. кѣза вѣликаго Кестоутиа оудавили. коморники кѣзѣ великаго ѣкаиловы (the context is repeated in Ac. 177 b, LRP 490 b, Arch. 64) – the main line of the narrative is the story of the capture and murder of Prince Kestut: “he chained his uncle, sent him to Krev and put him in a tower”. Further,

the main line of the narrative shifts away with the use of a pluperfect form: “but they had left the Grand Duke Vitovt in Vilna” (this happened before Kestut was imprisoned). After that, the narrator again returns to the main storyline and continues the story of Kestut: “and there in Krev on the fifth night the komorniki of the Grand Duke Jagail strangled the Grand Duke Kestut”;

(10) Uv. 20 Вилневци(ж). тогда не оудашаса ёмоу. зане(ж) тогда были королю правд □ дали и Скиргайлоу (the context repeats in Supr. 98 with an erroneous form бѣ дали of the “bookish” pluperfect with a link in a singular instead of plural, also in Vil. and LRP, the examples are given in (6–7)) – “Vilnius then did not submit to him, because they had sworn allegiance to the king and Skirgail”;

(11) Supr. 98 б ѿтоле нача воевати Литовскоу землю. с Немецькою помо(ч)ю. и оуже взаль бы(л) Литовской земли. по Велию рекоу а и Польтексь вдаса ёмоу. и оузриль король и кнзь великий Скиригаило. ꙗко вже невозможно оудержати земли Литовъскы ꙗ пре(д) великимъ кнземъ Витовтомъ...бѣ поможе великому кнзю Витовтоу. и побежени быша Литовъски вои (the context repeats in Uv. 20, Ак. л. 182, Vil. 446 b, also LRP. 493, the example is considered in (7)) – “and he began to conquer the Lithuanian land with German help, and [by that time] had already conquered the Lithuanian land to the river Viliya and Polotsk surrendered to him, the king and Grand Duke Skirgailo saw that it was impossible to keep the Lithuanian land in front of the Grand Duke Vitovt”;

(12) LRP 492 б и нача его лечити главꙗ емꙗ постриже ра(н) длꙗ зане(ж) много ране(н) ꙗчаꙗ(л) бы(л) собѣ живота – this context coincides with the context from Ak. 181 (see commentary (4));

(13) Arch. 91 вода была ве(л)ми великая в Смоленскꙗ все мѣсто поняло было мало не дошла до Покровское горы – “There was a flood in Smolensk, the whole city had been flooded, [the water] almost reached the Pokrovskaya mountain”;

The resultative meaning is also presented in (5) with a “bookish” pluperfect form: “Rogvolod was a person who had come from across the sea and [as a result] was in charge in Polotsk”.

Rarer than the resultative meaning, the “bookish” pluperfect had the anti-resultative meaning [Plungyan 2001] and denoted an action that was later canceled or was not achieved at all: Nypatian Chronicle 180 и много дѣнь ѿполониша. иже бахуть взали половци “and they released from custody a lot of persons, who had been captured by Polovtsi” – the action бахуть взали “captured” was later canceled, because prisoners were released (see [Sheveleva

2007: 237]). The same meaning was one of the main ones for super-compound forms in Old Russian (for its originality or secondary nature, see [Petrukhin, Sitchinava 2006; Sheveleva 2008]).

In the 15–16th centuries in the dialectal zone of the Center the “Russian” pluperfect had exclusively anti-resultative semantics, “changing gradually into the conjunctive mood with particle *бы*” [Sheveleva 2009: 29]. In dialects of South-West Russia of the 15–16th centuries this meaning, on the contrary, was on the periphery [ibid: 39]. In the studied texts, 6 anti-resultative contexts were found, repeated in different chronicles (13 forms out of 43):

(14) Supr. 89 кнѣзь великий Ягаило далъ бы(л) По(л)тескъ братоу своему. Скиригаилоу и шни его не принали (the context is repeated in Ak. 173, Vil. 439, LRP 488) – “Prince Yagailo gave Polotsk to his brother Skirgail, but they (the Polotsk people) did not accept him”;

(15) Uv. 45 б. и король почалъ присылатиса к великому кнѣзю Витовтоу. рекъ што еси на(м) да(л) половицю По(д)льскои земли оу к тысячехъ пенези и мы дали были оу к же тысячехъ па(н)у Спыткѣ и пани Спыткова ѿ(в)довела. а дети малы. и ѿ Татаръ земли некому боронити. и ты ѿдаи к тисачеи пенѣзеи. а города побери за себе (the context is repeated in Supr. 105) – “the king began to send ambassadors to the Grand Duke Vitovt, saying: “You gave us half of the Podolsk land for 20,000, and we gave 20,000 to Pan Spytku, and his wife is now a widow, and the children are small, and there is no one to defend the land from the Tatars. Give us back 20,000, and take the towns for yourself”;

(16) Arch. 80 и мешкаючи емѣ в Великко(м) Лѣ(ц)кѣ и хотѣ(л) бы(л) на себя корѣнѣ во(з)ложить, и его неприятели Поляки не перепѣстили емѣ корѣны – “and living in Velikiy Luchka, he wanted to crown himself, but his enemies, the Poles, did not allow him”. In the following, Jagiello first conspired with the Germans against Vitovt and Kestut, but then swore allegiance to them:

(17) Sup. 90 шнѣ же рече сѣоу своему кнѣзю великому Витовтоу ты мнѣ не вѣрилъ. а се тые грамоты. записалися были на на(с). но бѣ насъ ѿстерегълъ. но кнѣзю великому Ягаилоу. ничего не вчинилъ...и кнѣзь великий Ягаило. великому Витовтоу. и дади своему великому кнѣзю Кестоутию што николи противоу его не стоѣти (the context is repeated in Uv. 2);

(18) Sup. 104 Подольскаѣ земля не хотела была. послушна быти кнѣза великого Витовта. и Литовской зе(м)ли какъ же пре(д) ты(м) послушна была (the context

is repeated in Uv. 45) – “Podolsk land did not want to submit to Vitovt, as it was earlier”. Further it is reported that Vitovt conquered it;

(19) Arch. 74 и князь Оедо(р) Ко(р)ятови(ч) не хотѣ(л) бы(л) слѣжити кнзю Витовтѣ со всею землею Подо(л)скою, и кнзъ Витовтъ пошо(л) со всѣмъ воиско(м) Литовскимъ к Подо(л)ю...I вси города побра(л) воеводѣ кнзя Оедора поима(л) – “Fedor Koryatovich did not want to serve Prince Vitovt with the Podolsk land, and then Prince Vitovt went with all the Lithuanian army, conquered all the cities and captured the governor and prince Fedor”.

In the WRC, the number of contexts with an anti-resultative meaning is the same as the number of contexts with a resultative meaning, and it is not possible to speak about the predominance of one or the other meaning on the basis of this material.

The super-compound form of the pluperfect, since ancient times, has been characterized by the meaning of the discontinuous past or, in the terminology [Petrukhin, Sitchinava 2008], the remote past (it is found in birch bark manuscripts of the 12th century [Zaliznyak 2004: 176], [Petrukhin, Sitchinava 2006: 200-204]). “The difference between this meaning and the usual past action [...] is in underlining the lack of connection with the present and, most likely, in the emphasizing the real fact of the action’s existence” [Sheveleva 2009: 38].

In the dialects of the Center this meaning disappears in the 15–16th centuries and gives way to the anti-resultative one, but in the South West Russian dialects it is used very widely (according to Zhukova and Sheveleva [2010] describing the language of Peresopnitsia Gospel and “The Passion of Christ”). In the WRC, however, there are only 3 contexts with the meaning of the discontinuous past (15 forms in all):

(20) Supr. 87 b – 88 некто пакъ бы(л) оу великого кнза Шлгирда. паробокъ неволны холопъ звали его В(о)идоломъ. первое бы(л) пекаромъ. потомъ вставили его постелю слати. и водоу давати собѣ пити. и потомъ пакъ полюбилисьа быль емоу даль бы(л) емоу Лидоу держати. и повель бы(л) его в добры(х). потомъ по животе великого кнза Шлиг(и)рда двѣ ли лѣте миноуло. кнзъ велики ѿгаило поведеть его велми во высокы(х) и дать за него сestroу свою ро(д)ную кнжню Марию (the context repeats in Ak. 172, Vil. 439, LRP 487, Arch. 60; in some examples, the context is shortened and there are only one or two pluperfect forms) – the first part of the fragment is a departure from the main subject of the narrative. Before that, the author says that the Grand Duke Olgerd died, and then goes back to the events that happened much earlier: “Olgerd had a servant, Voidilo. At first, he was a baker, then he

was charged to make the bed and serve the prince's drink. The prince liked Voidilo and gave him to rule the town of Lida and exalted him". The author returns to this story to make the facts reported further clear: two years after Olgerd's death the Grand Duke Jagiello married his sister Maria to Voidilo. The pluperfect forms are used for verbs that signal the elevation of Voidilo, i.e. its emphasizing function, noted by researchers in a super-compound form in general, and in West Russian monuments in particular;

(21) Ув. 10 б по смрти пакъ кнзѣ великаго Кестоутиа пошлеть кнзь великий ѣкаило. кнза великаго Витовта во Крево(ж). и женою. и велить его твердо стеречь в комнату. помщаѣ Воидила. што были за него сestroу свою дали (the context is repeated in Ak. 177, Vil. 444, LRP 490) – Voidilo was killed by order of Prince Kestut. After Voidilo's death, Prince Jagailo captured his son Vitovt and his wife, in revenge for the murder of Voidilo, "to whom he married his sister". For the last action, the pluperfect form is used. It is the discontinuous past (the action happened much earlier than the events described), at the same time it seems important to the writer.

A particular realization the "Russian" pluperfect meaning of the discontinuous past is the function of a "shift of the starting point" [Petrukhin, Sitchinava 2006: 201-202]. In this case, it can denote the first action in the narrative chain, referring to a past unrelated to the present, and has an emphasizing component focusing the reader's attention on the plot's "tie-in" (for more details, see [Zhukova, Sheveleva 2010]). This function of the pluperfect, widely presented in Peresopnitsia Gospel and "The Passion of Christ" [Zhukova, Sheveleva 2010], is marked by only one form in the WRC:

(22) Sup. 27 б и тоу оубиень бы(с) и(х) воевода Спиридонъ. и епи(с)ъ и(х) и другый же Навгородецъ. Избыславъ ѣкоуновичъ. сии наѣхалъ многожду бишася. едины(м) торопомъ и торо(пм) посече много. не имѣѣ во сер(д)ци и паде ѿ роукоу его. неколко вси дивиша(с) силѣ его. и храбрости. трети же Иѣковъ. Полочанинь ловъчи ѣ кнза и бѣ си наѣхалъ на полкъ с мечемъ и моужествова(л) штыиде. и хвали его кнзь – this fragment describes the murdered warriors and heroes in the battle. The first is the governor Spiridon. The second is Izbyslav Yakunovich from Novgorod. The chronicler describes his heroism and death: he fought with one ax, hacked many and everyone marveled at his strength and courage. The third is Jacob from Polotsk, the hunter of the prince. What follows is a story about what he did in the battle. To indicate the first action in the story about Jacob, the pluperfect form is used: he ran into the regiment with a sword and left, and the prince praised him.

Thus, the number of pluperfect contexts with the meaning of the discontinuous past in the chronicles was half the number of anti-resultative or resultative ones. If we take into account the absence of the resultative meaning of the pluperfect in those Ukrainian dialects where it has survived [Tolstaya 2000: 137], as well as in Polish [Kowalska 1976], along with the fact that both in the Ukrainian dialects and in Polish (from the Middle Polish period), the remote past meaning is widely represented (see the same works), the situation in the studied texts should be recognized as more archaic than in the Peresopnitsia Gospel and “The Passion of Christ”: in the WRC, the resultative meaning prevails while the meaning of the discontinuous past is peripheral. In addition, it seems logical to draw a conclusion about the development of the meaning of super-compound forms from the resultative to the discontinuous past, which complies to the generally accepted ideas about the simplification of the temporal system in the East and West Slavic languages and the disappearance of the old forms expressing grammatically the result. This statement does not contradict the fact that in the birch bark manuscripts of the 12th century, as well as in the most ancient Russian chronicles, super-compound forms have predominantly the meaning of the discontinuous past (on this basis, Petrukhin and Sitchinava believe that the “Russian” pluperfect did not have the resultative meaning and originally expressed the remote past [Petrukhin, Sitchinava 2006]). It is possible that the restructuring of the old temporal system and the changing of the *-l-* form into the finite one took place in the western area later than in the Central Russian and North Russian dialects. This is also evidenced by the fact that contaminated forms such as *видѣлем* (1PL), *уналесь* (2PL), *почалихмы* (1PL) appear in Ukrainian in the 16–17th centuries [History of Ukrainian language 1978: 325], and in Polish forms such as *postawylesz*, *radowalysmy*, *praviechmy* from the end of the 15th century. [Anan’eva 1994: 245].

References

Anan'eva, N.E., 1994. Istoriya i dialektologiya pol'skogo yazyka. [History and dialectology of Polish language]. Moscow: Moscow State University.

Chernov, V.I., 1961. Plyuskvamperfekt v istorii russkogo yazyka sravnitelno s cheshskim i staroslavjanskimi yazykami. Avtoref. diss... kand. filol. nauk [Pluperfect in the history of Russian language in comparison with Czech and Old Church Slavonic. Author's abstract of a phil. cand. diss.]. Leningrad: LGPI im. Gertsena.

Gorshkova, K.V., Khaburgaev, G.A. 1981. Istoricheskaya grammatika russkogo yazyka [Historical grammar of Russian]. Moscow: «Vysshaya shkola».

Karskij, E.F., 1894/1962. Trudy po belorusskomu i drugim slavyanskim yazykam. [Works on Belorussian and other Slavic languages]. Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR.

Kowalska, A., 1986. Ewolucja analitycznych form czasownikowych z imiesłowem na -Ł w języku polskim. [Evolution of the analytic verbal forms with the *l*-participle in Polish language]. Katowice.

Krysko, V.B., 2011. Morfologicheskie osobennosti zhitijnoj chasti Sofijskogo prologa. [Morphological features in the Sofia's prologue's hagiographies]. Slavyano-russkij prolog po drevnejshim spiskam. Sinaksar' (zhitijnaya chast' Prologa kratkoj redakcii) za sentyabr'-fevral'. T. II: Ukazateli. Issledovaniya. M.: Azbukovnik, 2011. S. 798–837

Moser, M., 2002. Chto takoe «prostaya mova»? [What is Ruthenian language?] Studia Slavica Hung., 47/3-4. 2002. P. 221-260.

Petrukhin, P.V., Sitchinava, D. V., 2006. «Russkij plyuskvamperfekt» v tipologicheskoy perspektive. [«Russian pluperfect» in the typological perspective]. Verenitsa liter: K 60-letiyu V. M. Zhivova. Moldovan A. M. (ed.). Moscow: Yazyki Slavyanskoi Kul'tury, 2006. Pp. 193–214.

Plungyan, V.A., 2001. Antirezultativ: do i posle rezultata [Antiresultative: before and after the result] // Grammar theory researches. Vol. 1. Grammatical categories. Moscow: Russian dictionaries, 2001. Pp. 50–88.

Plungian, V.A., Urmanchieva A. Yu., 2017. Perfekt(y) v «Povesti vremennyh let»: tri perfektnye konstrukcii. [Perfect(s) in the Primary Chronicle: Three perfect constructions]. Mezhdunarodnaya nauchnaya konferentsiya «Russkii glagol» (k 50-letiyu vykhoda v svet knigi A. V. Bondarko i L. L. Bulanina). Tezisy dokladov. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, 2017. Pp. 124–125.

Plungian, V.A., Urmanchieva, A. Yu., 2017a. Perfekt v staroslavjanskom: byl li on rezul'tativnym? [Perfect in Old Slavonic: Was it resultative?]. Slověne = Slovĕne. International Journal of Slavic Studies. 2017. Vol. 6. No. 2. Pp. 13–56.

PSRL t. 17. Polnoye sobraniye russkikh letopisey. T. XVII. Zapadnorusskiye letopisi. [Complete collection of Russian chronicles. Vol. XVII. West-Russian Chronicles]. Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury, 2008.

Potebnya, A.A., 1888/1958. Iz zapisok po russkoi grammatike [From essays on Russian grammar]. Vol. I–II. Moscow: Uchpedgiz.

Shayakhmetova, E.Kh., Zholobov, O.F., 2017. Funkcional'no-semanticheskie osobennosti perfektnykh form v sbornike XIII veka. [Functional-semantic features of perfect forms in a 13th-century Old Russian manuscript]. Uchenye zapiski Kazanskogo universiteta. Seriya Gumanitarnye nauki, 2017, 159, 5: 1163–1174.

Sheveleva, M.N., 2007. «Russkiy pluskvamperfekt» v drevnerusskikh pamyatnikakh i sovremennykh govorakh [«Russian pluperfect» in the Old Russian texts and modern dialects] // Russkiy yazyk v nauchnom osveshchenii. 2007. №2. Pp. 214–252.

Sheveleva, M.N., 2008. Eshche raz o istorii drevnerusskogo pluskvamperfekta. [Once again on the history of the Old Russian pluperfect]. Russkiy yazyk v nauchnom osveshchenii. 2008. № 2 (16). Pp. 218-246

Sheveleva, M.N., 2009. Pluskvamperfekt v pamyatnikakh XV-XVI vv. [Pluperfect in the texts of XV-XVI centuries]. Russkiy yazyk v nauchnom osveshchenii. 2009. № 1 (17). Pp. 5-43.

Sitchinava, D.V., 2013. Tipologiya pluskvamperfekta. Slavyanskii pluskvamperfekt. [A typology of pluperfect. Slavic pluperfect]. Moscow: AST-PRESS.

Sitchinava, D.V., 2004. K probleme proiskhozhdeniya slavyanskogo uslovnogo nakloneniya. [On the slavic conditional mood's origin]. Issledovaniya po teorii grammatiki, 3: Irrealis i irreal'nost'. Moscow. Pp. 292–312.

Sitchinava, D.V., in press. Drevnerusskie indikativnye formy so vspomogatel'nykh *byh*: k interpretatsii i spisku primerov. [Old Russian indicative forms with the auxiliary *byh*: on the interpretation and list of examples]. In press.

Skachedubova, M.V., 2018. K voprosu ob otrazhenii perfekta na -shi v pamyatnikakh severo-zapadnogo regiona. [On the representation of perfect in -ši in the manuscripts of Northwest Russia]. Izvestiya RAN. Seriya literatury i yazyka, 2018, 5: 31–36.

Skachedubova, M.V., 2019. Funktsionirovaniye -l-formy v drevnerusskom narrative (na materiale rannikh letopisey). [Functioning of the -l-form in Old Russian narrative (based on early chronicles)]. Phil. cand. diss. V.V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute, Moscow.

Smirnova, E.A., 2011. «Prosta mova» kak lingvisticheskij fenomen (rekonstrukciya glagol'noj sistemy na materiale Evangeliiya Tyapinskogo). [Ruthenian language as a linguistic phenomenon (reconstruction of the verbal system based on the Tyapinskiy's Gospel)]. Phil. cand. diss. Moscow.

Tolstaya, M.N., 2000. Forma plyuskvamperfekta v ukrainskikh zakarpatskikh govorah: mesto vspomogatel'nogo glagola v predlozhenii. [Pluperfect form in Ukrainian transcarpathian dialects: the place of the auxiliary verb in the sentence]. Balto-slavyanskije issledovaniya. 1998–1999. Vyp. 14. Moscow: Indrik. S. 134–143.

Yermolova, M.V., 2010. O sootnoshenii -l-form i prichastiy na -sh- / -vsh- v drevnerusskom yazyke. [The relationship between l-forms and -ŕš-/ -vŕš-participles in Old Russian]. Voprosy yazykoznaniya. 2020. №3. P. 78–100.

Zalizniak, A.A., 2004. Drevnenovgorodskii dialekt [Old Novgorod dialect]. Moscow: Shkola «Yazyki Russkoi Kul'tury».

Zhukova, T.S., Sheveleva, M.N., 2010. «Novyy» plyuskvamperfekt v pamyatnikakh Yugo-Zapadnoy Rusi XV-XVI vv. i sovremennykh ukrainskikh govorakh v sravnenii s velikorusskimi (v soavtorstve s T. S. Zhukovoy) [«New» pluperfect in the Southwestern Russian texts XV-XVI cc. and modern Ukrainian dialects in comparison with Russian] // Voprosy russkogo yazykoznaniya. 2010. Vyp. 13. Pp. 171–191.

Maria V. Ermolova
HSE University. Faculty of Humanities. School of Linguistics. Docent.
E-mail: maria-anna2121@yandex.ru.

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

© Ermolova, 2020