Th. Daiber, Dr. habil., Professor of Slavic Linguistics and Cultural Science

Justus Liebig-University, Gießen, Germany

Т. Дайбер, доктор, профессор славянского языковедения и культурологии

Гиссенский университет имени Юстуса Либига, Германия

VARIANT READING AND RECONSTRUCTION.
GRECISMS IN THE LIVE OF CONSTANTINE-CYRIL

The article is concerned with variant readings in the Live of Constantine-Cyril and differentiates three causes which provoke them: unusual lexical entities, unusual morphosyntactic constructions and loan translations, all connectable with Greek influence. In some cases, the variant readings may only be explained by reconstruction of the calque which has induced them.

В статье говорится о разночтениях в Житии Константина-Кирилла в свете трех различных причин: необычные лексические единицы, необычные морфосинтаксические конструкции и кальки, все связанные с возможным влиянием греческого языка. Некоторые разночтения, пожалуй, только можно изъяснить на пути реконструкции кальки, которая их побудила.

Keywords: Live of Saint Constantine-Cyril; variant reading; grecism.

Ключевые слова: Житие св. Константина-Кирилла, разночтение, грецизм.

Some variant readings in the Life of Constantine-Cyril (LCC) can be explained as resulting from a misunderstanding of words the scribe was not familiar with. Words of foreign origin may trigger a chain of transfiguration. The verb послаша (LCC VI:1 [1, see apparatus]), as Dvorník [2, p. 93-96] has shown, is reconfigured from the noun палаша which in its turn renders a Byzantine title for a member of military service. Because independent (Arabic in this case) sources testify for the same historic person the form "balata", there is little doubt, that Old Church Slavonic палаша is a Slavic loan word for gr. παλατίνος.

Foreign words are best candidates to provoke variant readings but fortunately assumptions as to the original wording principally seem possible. Authors only differ in the question to which extend regular sound change should be of prime importance. In the given example a regular phonological transition from Greek to OCS must assume some dialectal features, either on the giving Greek or on the borrowing Slavic side. But having a clear statement about a historic fact which is testified by other texts as well, in this case should turn the scales.

A second class of variant readings occurrs with solely Old Church Slavonic words. LCC II:7 displays the readings надѣю се бозѣ/ на бога/ о бозѣ. Greek πιστεύω can be constructed without prepositional dative like in Acts 16:34, but otherwise appears with a preposition, too [3, p. 1330]. In the light of later grammaticalization as in Russian it is tempting to classify the phrase without preposition as archaic. But the original wording must not necessarily be the most archaic wording. Can the phrase without preposition надѣю се бозѣ be called a grecism? Then надѣю се о бозѣ may be a grecism, too, compared with LCC II:5 и тако жиста о господи which resembles ὑπὸ Κυρίου like in Mth 1:22. And finally the form with preposition надѣю се на бога may also display Greek influence, because на is regularly translating Greek ἐν [4, p. 344]. Confined to only the text of LCC there is little chance to convincingly single out a reading in II:7 as the original one. Reference to the oldest Biblical translations gives no definite hint as to the use of a preposition with надѣѧти сѧ. Psalterium Sinaiticum (PsSin) shows the verb with and without preposition in the same verse 118(117):8 добро есть надѣѣти сѧ г(оспод)ѣ неже надѣѣти сѧ на чл(о)в(ѣ)ка [4, p. 347]. At least, the sentence suggests, that the preposition на could have appeared in LCC II:7 and the construction о бозѣ probably is a contamination from the immediately forgoing о господи in II:5. But the quoted Psalm verse leaves open the question, if the construction without a preposition more likely is the original one.

The Psalm verse from PsSin makes things more complicated. We leave aside, that the difference in the use of the preposition could be caused by a variant reading

in a special branch of LXX (which I could not verify, but most translations do not repeat the verb "to trust"). But there could be a difference in meaning between надѣѧти сѧ with and without preposition. For example, the German phrases "Ich vertraue ihm" and "Ich vertraue auf ihn" tend to express each a slightly different meaning. The first utterance rather expresses holistic confidence into a certain person, while the second expresses firm believe, that a person will perform a certain action. LCC II:7 does not speak about faith in general but about a certain action to happen. Of course, an analogy to a modern language does not say anything about semantic differences in OCS (if it would, надѣю се на бога in II:7 is the most probable original reading); the considerations only should demonstrate the danger we are facing. Selecting out the prepositional phrase "о бозе" as a contamination between II:5 and II:7 does not touch meaning; possible semantic differences however between надѣю се бозѣ and надѣю се на бога don't allow to classify these variant readings as simple substitutions but now they have to be called editorial work caused by stylistic or pragmatic considerations.

It is not the goal of this contribution to narrow down possible semantic differences between надѣю се бозѣ and надѣю се на бога. The example only should demonstrate a second class of variant readings, where linguistic argumentation may pick out one of the extent variants as the most probable original reading. While probability in picking out variants at least is based on demonstrable wording in manuscripts, there is a third class of variant readings where such a selection amongst preserved readings is not possible. It may well be the case that neither of the variants displayed in the preserved manuscripts still represents the original wording. In the course of the manuscript tradition of LCC with its gap of 600 years between the death of Cyril and the appearance of the first preserved copy of his Live (Vladislav the Grammarian, 1469) a great number of variant readings could have had taken place we will never have knowledge of but only see secondary traces in the preserved copies.

The third class of variant readings is the most enigmatic one and arguments quickly get an air of speculation.

In LCC III:23 Constantine asks a wandering grammarian to be accepted as his pupil: добрѣ наѹчи ме хѹдожьствѹ граматичьскомѹ. The variant readings understand добрѣ as an adverb and add a fitting verb to achieve добрѣ дѣа which itself secondarily gets transformed into the vocative добродетеле. Some salutation, for sure, is expected at the beginning of Constantine's speech, and a vocative would fit. Giving the double pronunciation of glagolitic /ѣ/ as /ja/ and /ä/, is it too speculative to see in добрѣ a phonetic grecism with resemblance to end-accented greek ὠγαθέ? In fact, such graphical representation of a phonetic (most probable dialectal) realisation would only occur if the author of LCC had Greek as his mother-tongue - and this just seems to be the case.

In LCC VI:19 the author of LCC lets Cyril say, that мнѡзїи въ пѹчинѹ тѹ въходеть … и възвращають се. It is quite impossible to go down to the depths of the sea and return back to the coast. A morphological analyse of въ-ходеть realises that it is a loan translation from either ἐπι-βαίνω or ἐμ-βαίνω (as in Mk 8:13), both verbs having the meaning "to embark" [3, pp. 512, 587] and additional notion of a water craft is not needed. The Greek meaning attached to the Slavic verb gives the sentence a logical form ("embark on the high sea and return") and such a grecism only is produced by a Greek not by a Slavic author.

The example VI:19 did not provoke variant readings, most probably because the overall metaphorically used concept of seafaring is not breaking without understanding the 'real' Greek meaning, but it demonstrates that the assumption of grecisms in LCC is not an illusory resort for otherwise inexplicable readings.

In LCC IV:5 it is said of Constantine that he behaved како би въ земл'ныхь небесьнаа прѣмѣниль. Following the meaning of прѣ-мѣнити "to exchange" the translations let Constantine exchange mundane things for celestial ones or substitute mundane things with celestial ("loco terrestrium caelestia permutaret" [1, p. 174]). But also in Slavic the concept exchange consists in changing 'something with or into something', but it does not consist in changing something within something else (въ земл'ныхь). The locative case of земл'ныхь is demoting the meaning of exchange.

The OCS prefix прѣ- translates Greek προ- or προσ- [4, p. 533]. And maybe in the original wording not мѣнити had been combined with the prefix but имѣти which gives Greek προσ-έχω = "to focus one's attention on' [3, p. 1430]. If this is the case, the locative phrase въ земл'ныхь is understandable: Constantine behaved, "as if in mundane (things/ affairs) he focussed on celestial (things/ affairs)".

Maybe I am mistaken in this kind of reconstruction, as such an explanation should be called. But the example VI:19 suggests that a Greek authored the original text of LCC and it is a probable scenario, that the following Slavic scribes had little chance to understand the meaning of his eventually loan translations. A reconstructed *прѣ-имѣти could not but be transformed into something more understandable and if this goal could be achieved by changing some letters instead of paraphrasing the whole sentence the price would not have seemed to high to make the changes. So, the third class of variant readings in LCC seems to consist of wordings, which all are symptoms of a problem which itself only can be reconstructed.

Every example from LCC in this short paper was connected in one or another way with possible Greek influence. But not every example can be called a grecism. It is needed to differentiate between calques and imitations meant to appear as an integral part of the target language on the one hand, and on the other hand any intentionally used foreign lingual means for the sake of displaying the престижность языка-источника [5, p. 79] and meant to explicitly refer to the donor language. There is a long-standing problem how to differentiate between original and loan syntax in the case of translations. On the lexical level, most research deals with, words fall into substitution classes, and in principle the use of an etymologically foreign word is taking place either in contrast to an already existing native word with the same meaning, or the foreign word is introduced because the target language lacks a word for the given concept. On the syntactic level we are not dealing with clear cut linguistic entities, defined by substitution classes, but with predications, which activate cognitive processes to make meaningful, coherent connections between words, and habituation to a certain syntactic construction may dominate grammatical rules. Even

if a morphosyntactic construction has been triggered by language contact the language user may classify it rather a stylistic marker than a 'foreign' element.

References

1. Grivec F., Tomšič F. (1960). Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses. Fontes. Zagreb : Staroslavenski Institut.

2. Dvorník F. (1993). Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance. raha : Orbis. 443 pp.

3. Bauer W. (1988). Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur, ed. K. Aland, B. Aland. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter, 6th ed.

4. Ceytlin P. M., Vecherka R., Blagova E. (1994). *Staroslavyanskiy slovar' (po rukopisyam H-HI vekov)* [Old Slavic dictionary (from manuscripts of the 10th century)]. Moscow: Russkiy yazyk (in Russ.).

5. Pichkhadze A. A. (2007). *Russkiy yazyk v nauchnom osveshhenii* [Russian in scientific coverage], no. 1(13), pp. 73–84 (in Russ.).