

LINGUOCULTURAL CONSTANTS OF SLAVONIC TYPICAL TEXTS

Victoria Cholan

Ph.D., Postdoctoral Student, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
e-mail: victoria_cholan@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0001-5329-1604

Vira Ponomarova

Ph.D., Associate Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
e-mail: 4091859@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0003-1880-4691

Summary

The subsystem of the linguistic cultural constants formed at the early stages of the ethnic genesis and correlated with the subsystem of the ethnos' moral and ethical values expressed by linguistic means, represents the basis of each idioethnical linguistic system, since it reflects the existential perception of the world and oneself in it as an individual linguistic personality and the community of individuals as a whole.

The formal and semantic structural plans of the basic constants, expressed by linguistic units of the ancient Indo-European origin, are associated with Indo-European roots. It is the ancient Indo-European root (the first root) of a linguistic unit of the lexical level as a component of a textual construction that often acts as an etymon (archetype) in the etymological reconstruction of a lexical unit. In turn, the primary meaning of the Indo-European root (the formal-semantic basis of the lingual cultural constant) necessarily correlates with the ancient sacred symbol-image that exists in the collective-individual consciousness of the ethnos, possibly from the pre-literary period, sacred for the ethnos, sometimes with several symbol-images forming a semiotic sacred-mythological linguistic subsystem.

The subsystem of the linguistic cultural constants characterizing an ethnos contains information on its ontological peculiarities: its language system and its cultural profile as a set of the linguistic unity, the type of thinking and the nature of textual information perception.

Consequently, the social dynamics of the linguistic cultural constants, represented by the translated Typical, or Statutory canonical Christian texts in the Slavic Liturgical discourse of the Kiev Russian at the end of the tenth century determines the specific stability of the purposeful verbal impact as the content of the Slavic-speaking communicative process that took place during the Christianization of the society of Kievan state.

Keywords: subsystems, primary meaning, Indo-European root, verbal sacred image.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/4302>

1. Introduction

Taking into consideration the research of A. J. Greimas and J. Courte, we consider the corpus of the Church Slavonic Typical texts in the early medieval East Slavic Liturgical discourse as a sociodynamic subsystem of linguocultural constants (*Varbot, 1963: 194–212*). The scope of the concept of the linguocultural constants, introducing scientific circulation by Yu.S. Stepanov, covers the stable principles of culture in the broadest context, and first of all, the alphabetic principles (principles of creating an alphabet) which are projected onto an integral multi-level system of the ethnic group representations as a whole and its individual

about the image of the world order (*Stepanov, 2013: 13, 17, 83–89*). According to A. N. Leontyev's hypothesis, the multidimensional linguo-psychological organization of the world order is reflected in the structures of the collective and individual ethnic consciousness with the help of the linguocultural constants through five quasi-dimensions, which include the coordinates of space, time and the subsystem of meanings embodying the results of the cumulative social practice. According to the linguists, the significances of the units of the lexical level of the native language – intensions – are also included in the subsystem of the linguocultural constants, since a constant represents a stable unit in a series of variables that does not change its values. So the information about the denotation contained in the linguistic sign and communicated by it remains unchanged, or is taken as unchanged (within the scope of the research tasks) (*Leontjev, 1959: 63–91*).

So, the purpose of the article is to identify the initial meanings of the linguistic units representing the linguocultural constants of the canonical Christian texts, linking together the phenomena of the linguistic order, including the irregular and non-standard ones, phonetic and semantic laws, and their deviations, various contaminations, features of the functioning of a lexeme as a structural component of a text unit in the early medieval Slavic Liturgical Discourse.

2. Subsystem of the linguocultural constants

In our study, we consider linguocultural constants as basic mental quantities with an axiological potential of unchanging meanings, constantly structuring the collective (and individual) linguistic consciousness of an ethnic society and an individual. Singled out on the basis of the stable principles of culture and manifested by the idiopathic system of the language in the texts, they carry conceptual information on the ideological values of a particular ethnic (national) community about the world and other people, about themselves and their activities.

As is known, the subsystem of the linguocultural constants is sociodynamic. More precisely, in the communicative process, the stages of formation, storage, transmission, perception of the constants are regulated by the general cultural profile, the specifics of the native language system, and the type of thinking of the addressee of the texts. In turn, the sociodynamics of the subsystem of existentially significant linguocultural constants, which is actualized by the mental sphere of the individual linguistic personality and the ethnic community as a whole, containing verbalized concepts of the real and ideal worlds, determines the specifics of the semiotic stages of the generation and reception of a text by the addressee – addressee(er), which are linked to each other, and therefore stipulates the stability of the verbal impact on the addressee.

In the coordinates of the linguistic geography of the Kievan Rus state in the second half of the tenth century as the spatio-temporal center of the location of the collective addressee of texts (the East Slavic (heterogeneous) ethnic community) this subsystem was transformed into a genetic matrix of the stable long-term verbal influence, which is carried out by activating protogrammatic forms of the collective and individual linguistic consciousness of the addressee of texts dating back to the ancient Indo-European roots. It is the ancient Indo-European root (first root) of a linguistic unit of the lexical level as a component of a textual construction that often acts as an etymon (archetype) in the etymological reconstruction of a lexical unit. In turn, the primary meaning of the Indo-European root (the formal-semantic basis of the linguocultural constant) necessarily correlates with the ancient sacred symbol-image that exists in the collective-individual consciousness of the ethnos, possibly from the pre-literary period, sometimes with several symbol-images that form a semiotic sacred -mythological language subsystem.

There is an independent theory (although it has received an ambiguous assessment in scientific linguistics) according to which a certain sacred language, close to Vedic Sanskrit, existed and was supported throughout the Indo-European linguistic area. This sacred language seemed to be the source of the relative unity of linguocultural constants throughout the entire area of the Indo-European language and indirectly, through the primary meanings of the Indo-European roots of the ancient sacred symbols that are related to them, the images reflected in the further history of the Indo-European languages (*Pizany, 1968: 3–21*). There is a unity, that in the process of reconstructing the primary forms and meanings of the ancient Indo-European root, allows ambiguous solutions in some cases, explained by the presence of not one, but several heterogeneous semasiological connections in a word, in which, according to M.M. Makovskiy, psycholinguistic categories of the ancient religious (including pagan) mentality (*Makovskiy, 2013: 6, 72*).

From our point of view, the specificity of the linguocultural constants of the Church Slavonic Typical texts as the first written canonical Christian monuments in the early medieval Slavic Liturgical discourse is determined by the unique synergy of super-complex, multi-level semiotic and linguistic systems (subsystems).

3. Synergy of semiotic and linguistic systems

In turn, each of the selected semiotic and linguistic systems (subsystems) contains its inherent means of forming and verbalizing linguocultural constants inherent in the respective cultural and linguistic area. These include:

- macrosystem of the sound (oral) common Slavic language, common to the entire Slavic ethnic family of tribes;
- writing as an artificial or conventional sign system and cultural phenomenon, naming the units of the oral language.

Herewith, the regularity noticed by A. A. Volkov is manifested, when in relation to “oral language” (in this case, common Slavic), – “written language” (Church Slavonic), other writing systems (Cyrillic, Greek) are included;

- a subsystem of signs for converting texts of an oral language into texts of a written language. This is a sign subsystem of the oral language, in which the signs of the Cyrillic letter are named, using special designations of letters and signs, for example, alpha, beta, verb, etc.;
- sign-semiotic subsystem of the military verbal communication. This is a kind of oral verbal communication, which is designed to provide and support the dominant joint military activity for the multiethnic East Slavic society, which is especially significant in the universe of Kievan Rus.

When identifying interacting semiotic and linguistic systems (subsystems), the factor of complicating the functioning of the translated Church Slavonic Typical texts mentioned in the works of E. A. Selivanova is taken into consideration. In our study, this is a factor of the mediation of the original of Church Slavonic Typical texts by the preliminary double translation: from Hebrew into Ancient Greek (Septuagint), then from Ancient Greek into Church Slavonic. This factor determines the combination of the positions of the translator of the canonical texts, respectively, from the Hebrew (Semitic) language into the ancient Greek language and the translator from the Ancient Greek into the Church Slavonic language, as well as the interpreter of the Greek originals of these texts.

It is worth mentioning an important observation for our research, relating to the ancient Greek version of the Typical Texts. It is noted that the first Old Slavonic (Church Slavonic)

texts, presumably of the Aprakos Gospel and the Psalter, translated by a team of philologists under the leadership of Equal-to-the-Apostles brothers Cyril and Methodius from about 863 to 885 on Mount Olympus in Bithynia, where the Slavs lived, characterize some phonological, morphological and lexical features the Greek language of Asia Minor. These include the use of the Greek folk vocabulary of the Asia Minor origin, the reduction of the consonants, the introduction of the Greek words left without translation into the structure of texts as direct borrowings, such as the term *τυπικόν* and others.

The purpose of the verbal influence of the Church Slavonic Typical texts is the formation of standards of superethnos speech activity, transmitted from generation to generation, based on a holistic idea of their status in the universe of the state (ideology, army, education, trade) as a part of the Universe.

4. Typical, or Statutory text corpus

As already mentioned, from the end of the tenth century in the East Slavic Liturgical discourse of the Kievan Rus (as a state-political and relatively unified ethnocultural integrity) the Typical, or Statutory text corpus, according to the tradition formed in Byzantium, were primarily formed by the texts of the Gospel, Epistles and Acts of the Apostles of the type of incomplete aprakos. It should be clarified that only in the Church Slavonic Liturgical discourse, the borrowed Greek term APRAKOS, morphologically represented by a masculine noun, is used to nominate compositional and architectonic varieties of the Typical texts intended for proclamation on Sundays and holidays, the dates of the celebration in honor of an event, starting from the Easter period. More precisely, the texts of the Aprakos are organized by calendar, and not by chapters, in the canonical order established at the Laodicean Council. The oldest surviving Slavic Christian manuscripts, monuments of the eleventh century, written in Cyrillic, Savvina's book, Ostromir Gospel, Archangel's Gospel, named Aprakosy.

Along with the borrowed substantive APRAKOS, in the Slavic Liturgical discourse format, the adjective in the singular form of the neuter APRAKOSNE (plural – APRAKOSNE) is used, formed according to the Slavic word-formation scheme (Greek basis APRAKOS + suffix *-n-* + inflection), as an attributive component only in noun phrases, where the position of the main member is mixed with the singular neuter GOSPEL and / or MESSAGE (Apostle).

According to A. Ch. Kozarzhevsky, the term APRAKOS is a derivative of the ancient Greek adjective *ἀπράγμων*, which is translated using the Slavic equivalent with the meaning of idle (doing nothing); according to I. I. Sreznevskiy, this term is associated with a stable Greek phrase *ἀπρακτος ἡμέρα* (plural. *ἀπρακτοὶ ἡμέραι*) – *свободный (от работы) день, праздничный день* (Sreznevskiy, 1989).

In the East Slavic lexical fund, there are semantically identical old Slavic equivalents to borrowings: *праздънь* with the meaning *праздничный, торжественный*; *праздь* with the meaning *свобода > праздникъ (праздънь + subject suffix-ик- / праздь + suffix-н- + subject suffix-ик-) – день торжества / день, свободный от труда > неделя, недельный (< *nedělja) > (negative particle не + verb stem делати + суффикс -j- + флексия) – нерабочий, праздничный день (day when they don't do anything) > воскресенье as праздничный день. The researchers believe these values are the secondary ones, evolved from earlier meanings.*

So the meaning and the form of the lexeme *праздънь*, developed from the proto-Slavic **porzďьnъ – empty (unoccupied)*. Ancient Proto-Slavic combination *-or-* between consonants was transformed into a combination, characteristic of the common Slavic language *-pa-* (*праздънь < *porzďьnъ*), and in the East Slavic language – in a full-voiced combination *-oro-*:

порожьнь (укр. порожній): < *празднь < *porzdнь with a secondary meaning *sterile, aimless*. (Sreznevskiy, 1989).

In the Typical Texts, the Slavic adjective *празднь – праздный* is used to translate a number of Greek lexemes *ἀμοτρος, ἀργος, ἔρημος* and others. For instance «λέλω δέ ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶν ρήμα ἈΡΥΟΝ (ἀργόν), ὁ ἂν λαλήσωσιν οἱ ἀνῦρωποι ἀποδώσουσι περὶ αὐτὸ λόγον ἐν ἡμέρα χρίσεως» (Greek text of the Gospel of Matthew; chap. 12, 36) – «Глаголю же вам яко всяко СЛОВО ПРАЗДНОЕ, еже аще рекут человеци, воздадят о нем слово в день судный» (Slavic text of the Gospel of Matthew; chapter 12, 36); «τότε λέγει Επιστρέφω εἰς τὸν οἶχόν μου, ὅθεν ἐξῆλθὼν εὕρισχει σχολάζοντα, σεσαρομένον χαί χεχορημημένον» (Greek text of the Gospel of Matthew; chap. 12, 44). – «Тогда речет: возвращуся в ДОМ мой, отнюдуже изыдох: и пришед обрящет ПРАЗДЕН, пометен и украшен» (Slavic text of the Gospel of Matthew; chapter 12, 44); «εἶδεν ἄλους ἐστώτας ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἈΡΟΓΟΥΣ» (Greek text of the Gospel of Matthew; chapter 20, 3, p. 130). «...vide ины, стояци на торжици ПРАЗДНЫ» (Greek text of the Gospel of Matthew; chapter 20, 3).

It is worth emphasizing that in the Slavic Liturgical discourse, the borrowed terms *АПРАКОС, АПРАКОСНОЕ* are used only for naming specifically fragmented – festive – texts of the Gospel and the Epistle of the Apostles. Obviously, they are these lexemes, originating from the most ancient Indo-European roots, with which, according to M.M. Makovsky, the corresponding cultural and historical symbols, sacred to the ethnic community, are correlated, prototypes that form the basis of the world outlook of the ethnos. They activate the existentially significant linguocultural constant of HOLIDAY in the structure of the linguistic consciousness of the recipient (individual, collective) (Makovskiy, 2013: 69).

Along with the *aparakos* Gospels and the Apostolic Epistles, the Typical, or Statutory text corpus includes the other important texts (books) of the Lenten and Colored Triodi, the Psalter with a section on 20 kathisma and biblical songs. In addition, the text corpus under study included the *Paremiynik*, the *Service Menaea*, the *Chetya* (collections of the statutory readings of the Minean, triode, seven-day and daily liturgical circles), *Octoichs Izborny*, *Paraclitic*, *Irmologii*, *Service Book*, *Trebnik* and *Book of Hours* for the ancient Greek text of the ancient Greek word, which are supposed to be pronounced during daylight hours. The first basis of the ancient Greek composite *ὠρολόγιον* is formed by the noun *ώρα*, which is translated into Old Church Slavonic with the basic meaning of time or hour; the second basis of the composite is the participle from the verb *λέγω*, translated by one of two available meanings: to speak; collect. If we assume the production of the Greek verb *λέγω* from the Indo-European root *kel- / *kol-, meaning to sound or to call, we can make a conclusion about the primacy of the meaning of the semantically close meaning of the verb “to speak”. (Varbot, 1963: 194 – 212). Then the literal translation of the ancient Greek composite *ὠρολόγιον* is “the sounding hour” (*час звучаицуй*), or named (*названный*), or proclaimed – the hour of the Word – *час Слова*.

It is worth adding that the Greek lexeme *ώρα* with the meaning “time” is associated with the Indo-European root *ar- / *er-, which is the basis of the Indo-European words *kure-tor – “four”, *uer- up, “to rise”, *uer- “snake”.

As M. M. Makovsky points out, the meanings of these Indo-European words are primary, since they correlate with ancient sacred images or symbols on which linguocultural constants are based, and which are valuable for the collective consciousness of the ethnic groups developing in the Indo-European linguistic area. Thus, the image of “the snake” was considered to be a symbol of the Divine who created the Universe, personifying the “true present” time – cherished now, or now – when the Divine created the Universe. All sacred actions in ancient times were interpreted as taking place in true, present, divine time. The snake was also a symbol

of the Number, personifying the Divine Universe: the number four and a multiple of eight are symbols of the Divine integrity (Makovskiy, 2013: 9).

Therefore, according to the Hebrew tradition, the praise of God by the members of society – the proclamation of thanksgiving prayers to God – had to be fourfold, since it was associated with the Jewish principle of counting discrete daytime, which is based on the division of the day into four parts, which is recorded in the Book of Nehemiah: «И стояли на своём месте, и ЧЕТВЕРТЬ ДНЯ читали из Книги Закона Господа Бога своего, и ЧЕТВЕРТЬ исповедывались и поклонялись Господу Богу своему» (Book of Nehemiah, chapter 9, 3). And although the Hebrew texts reflect the collective understanding of the concept of the unstable duration of each of the four parts of the day depending on the length of the day, in Greek and translated Church Slavonic Typical texts these parts are equated to hours and are called “часами”, more precisely, “hours of prayer”: the first, third, sixth and ninth hour. These Jewish day parts – “hours” correspond to the modern “six”, “nine” o’clock in the morning, “twelve” o’clock noon, “three” o’clock in the afternoon, differentiated according to the Roman principle of counting discrete daytime, which is based on a twelve-hour daylight period.

It should be emphasized that the verbalization of the linguocultural constant of the absolute Divine TIME through the linguocultural constant of the discrete time in the Church Slavonic Typical texts is based on two different traditions of counting the day, taking into account either the Hebrew account, or the Roman (modern) account.

So, the principle of the Hebrew reckoning of the discrete daytime, which is based on the division of the day into four parts: the Jewish clock, is used in the texts of the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, Mark. For example: «καὶ ἐξελθὼν περὶ τὴν ΤΡΙΤΗΝ (τρίτην) ὭΡΑΝ (ώραν) ...» (Greek text of the Gospel of Matthew, chapter XX, 3). -.«И изшед в ТРЕТИЙ ЧАС...» (Slavic text of the Gospel of Matthew, chapter XX, 3); «И когда настал ЧАС, Он возлег и двенадцать Апостолов с Ним...» (Gospel of Luke, chapter XXX, 14).

The principle of the Roman (modern) counting of the discrete daytime, which is based on a twelve-hour period of the day, is applied in the Gospel of John, for example: «He asked them: В КОТОРОМ ЧАСУ стало ему легче? Ему сказали: вчера В СЕДЬМОМ ЧАСУ горячка оставила его. Из этого отец узнал, что это был ТОТ ЧАС, в который Иисус сказал ему: сын твой здоров, и уверовал сам и весь дом его» (Gospel of John, chapter V, 52, 27); «Они пошли и увидели, где Он живёт и пробыли у Него день тот. Было ОКОЛО ДЕСЯТОГО ЧАСА» (Gospel of John, chapter I, 39).

The texts also record other meanings of this lexeme, which functions in the structure of the utterances and as an independent linguistic unit, as *ώρα ἡ* – “the season”, “time”, and as the basis of the complex words formed in a morphemic way, for example, *ώραια ἡ* – “the proper time”; *ώραίος* – “ripe”. As you can see, in the East Slavic Liturgical discourse, there are functional and semantic differences between the lexemes “hour” and “time”.

5. Conclusions

The multifaceted architectonics of the first written Church Slavonic Typical texts in the Liturgical discourse of the early medieval Kievan Rus is the result of the synergy of the super-complex, multi-level semiotic and linguistic systems (subsystems), which determines the specific interaction of the linguocultural constants inherent to the corresponding cultural and linguistic areas to which the original and translated written versions of these Christian canonical monuments are dated.

In the textual structure the linguocultural constants are represented by common Slavic and borrowed (Greek, etc.) linguistic units belonging to the common Indo-European area and thus associated with ancient Indo-European roots, leading to their primary meaning. The Indo-European roots correlate with the ancient polycultural sacred symbols, or images, the activation of which with the help of verbalized linguocultural constants provides a cooperative effect influencing the collective-individual consciousness of an ethnic community.

References

- Varbot, G. G. (1963) *O slovoobrazovatelnom analize v aetimologicheskome issledovaniiakh. [On word-formation analysis in aetymological research]. Aetimologia. Issledovania po russkomu i drugim iazikam Etymology. Studies in Russian and other languages. M., P. 194–212. [In Russian].*
- Greimas, A. G., Rourte G. (1983) *Semiotika. Objasnitelny slovar terii jazika. [Explanatory Dictionary of Language]. Semiotika. M. 312 p. [In Russian].*
- Leontjev, A. N., Leontjev A. A. (1959) *O dvojakome aspekte jazikovich javlenij. [On the double aspect of linguistic phenomena]. Nauchnije dokladi vishej shkoli. Filosofskije nauki. Vol. 2. P. 63–91. [In Russian].*
- Makovskiy, M. M. (2013) *Indoevropeskaja aetimologija. Predmet – metodi – praktica. [Indo-European etymology: Subject – methods – practice]. M., Knizhny dom «LIBROCOM», 352 p. [In Russian].*
- Pizany, K. V. (1968) *K indoevropeskoy probleme. [Towards the Indo-European problem]. Voprosi jazikoznania. Vol. 4. P. 3–21. [In Russian].*
- Sreznevskiy, I. I. (1989) *Slovar drevnerusskogo jazika. V triech tomach, v schesti knigach. [Dictionary of the Old Russian language]. Reprintnoje izdanije. M., 5237 p. [In Russian].*
- Stepanov, Y. S. (2013) *Konstanti. Slovar russkoj kulturni. [Theory Constants Dictionary of Russian culture]. Kniga. M., 752 p. [In Russian].*