

Dobrovský's *Institutiones*... and the Church Slavic Grammars Published in Austria and Hungary

LAJOS SZÖKE

Eszterházy Károly Főiskola, Angol Tanszék, Eger, Egészségház u. 4., H-3000
E-mail: szokel@ektf.hu

Abstract: In order to show the influence Dobrovský's *Institutiones*... had on the contemporary grammars of the time, it was necessary for the author of this study to define the type of Church Slavic described in the book. As the first part of the *Institutiones*... is a comparative study of the Slavic languages he focusses on the grammar proper. The analysis shows that Dobrovský describes an older type of Church Slavic present in the first printings and used especially in Ukrainian typographies. The influence is manifest in all Church Slavic grammars published in the 19th century in Austria or Hungary with the exception of Eumén Szabó's grammar (in the works of Tirol, Zaharijadis, Lutskey, Joannovics and Dobrjanskij). The Serbian authors (Tirol, Zaharijadis, Joannovics), describing the Russian recension of Church Slavic, have been less influenced.

Keywords: A. Dobrjanskij, J. Dobrovský, M. Lutskey, E. Joannovics, A. Mrazović, Dm. Tirol, G. Zaharijadis, Church Slavic grammar, Russian recension, Ukrainian recension

Though generations of linguists have been concerned with the study of Dobrovský's works and all anniversaries provided a good opportunity to sum up the results, still his scientific legacy even today may offer Slavists material for further research.

In the present study I shall restrict myself to the examination of the role and influence Dobrovský's *Institutiones*... has exerted on Church Slavic grammars published in Austria and Hungary in the 19th century. The significance of his work has already been evaluated in relation to Church Slavic grammars written before its publication and also in relation to the first grammars of the native Slavic languages.

It is important to notice, however, that in most of these evaluations Dobrovský's *Institutiones*... is compared to "grammars" while the *Institutiones*... is something more than the traditional grammars usually used at that time. It should not be forgotten that the great works of the new science, the comparative-historical linguistics, were published only shortly before (Havránek 1953, 16). No wonder, therefore, that he follows the principles of this line and, as a result, the *Institutiones* ... gives not only a grammar of Church Slavonic but, at the same time, is a comparative description of the Slavic languages (dialects) as well.

The *Institutiones*..., however, was not his first work of this type. In 1813 he published his book *Entwurf zu einem allgemeinen Etymologikon der slawischen Sprachen* (Prague) in which he already proved his predilection for the comparative analysis of languages. Here he relied on monosyllabic words (Wurzel-

sylbe) or on very short free morfemes which, according to him, with the help of prefixation and suffixation gave the basic vocabulary of all Slavic languages.

In the *Institutiones*... his comparison is based on both the fonemic and grammatical structure of the Slavic languages but he also provides a detailed analysis of the lexis, similar to that of an etymological dictionary. The application of this well proved method, however, seems to be complicated in this work by other circumstances. One of these is that he could not rely on the most ancient documents of Old Church Slavic (they were discovered only in the middle of the century). The other one is that his comparative method concerns the description of contemporary Slavic languages as codified in the first grammars and dictionaries and the Church Slavic language which is the starting point for all comparison. From our point of view the difficulty lies with the Church Slavic as presented in his analysis. The examples and data he gives about the Slavic languages testify to the fact that he intends to provide a synchronic analysis (data from older stages of the languages concerned are very rare). The description of Church Slavic, however, does not fit into this method as it is represented both in its historical and geographical diversity. During his travels in Russia and Italy (Machovec 1953, 99) he was able to study Church Slavic books of various redactions both according to time and region, and see the differences holding between them. He clearly differentiates the South Slavic (Serbian and Galgolic) and the Russian redactions but he does not go into details concerning the Russian variant. Without being named, however, the Ukrainian characteristic features of Church Slavic are present in the books analysed by Dobrovský. On page 56 he even underlines the differences in stress in books printed in Kiev in the 17th century. Nevertheless, it is hard to say which variant of Church Slavic he is trying to prescribe in his paradigms published in the second part of his comprehensive grammar. He must have realised that the South Slavic redaction of Church Slavic belonged already to the past and the overwhelming majority of liturgical books were printed in the eastern redaction. These considerations may suggest that his “grammar” is the description of the Russian redaction of Church Slavic and some scholars seem to accept it (Dostál 1954. 142). Still, several questions arise as to the period he focussed on and the regional characteristics he relied on.

At the time he made his travels and collected his material many documents of Old Church Slavic had not yet been discovered; and also to many of those which had been discovered he had no access. In spite of this fact he does describe the most ancient characteristic features of the language both on a fonological and structural level (e.g. the nasal vowels, the use of the jers, some morphological and syntactic peculiarities, the use of the supin etc.). Being aware of the past development of Church Slavic in the eastern part of *Slavia Orthodoxa*, he could not accept its modern variant codified in the Elisabethan Bible in the second half of the 18th century. Neither could he adopt Smotryč'kyj's forms

although he cites them frequently. Although Smotryc'kyj's grammar and his paradigms described the eastern variant of Church Slavic, it was not a grammar of liturgical Church Slavic which Dobrovský's *Institutiones...* was intended to be. In Smotryc'kyj's grammar the numerous parallel flexions were taken from different non-ecclasiastical documents which stood outside the sphere of Dobrovský's interest. While in the historical description of the Church Slavic his indebtedness to Smotryc'kyj's grammar is unquestionable, in the second, prescriptive part, Dobrovský gives something special, individual. Some scholars pay more attention to the first part and forget to underline the importance of the second (Jagić 1885, 26, Nejedlý 1953, 14–14). But the fact that some canonical sources were common both for Smotryc'kyj and Dobrovský (for example the *Ostrog/Ostrih Bible*) may support the idea of Dobrovský's indebtedness to Smotryc'kyj'. We should not, however, forget that Dobrovský used not the first edition of this grammar but its later variants transformed already according to the latest standard of the Russian Church Slavic (1648, 1721, 1755, see Horbatsch 1964). The main difference between Smotryc'kyj and Dobrovský therefore lies in the purpose of their grammars; while Smotryc'kyj reflected the Church Slavic in its polyfunctional form (hence the several possible representations for one inflexion), Dobrovský wanted to prescribe the forms of the liturgical variant in his paradigms. What may seem to be common are those inflexions of Smotryc'kyj which preserve the archaic forms not yet influenced by the native Slavic Languages (mostly those of the *Ostrog Bible*) in the first edition of this grammar. As the later editions and copies modified these forms, it is more probable that the influence of the *Ostrog Bible* was more considerable than it is thought. The nominal inflexions but also the verb forms given in the second part of his book, however, do not always correspond either to the standard of the *Ostrog Bible* or to the usage of the modern Russian Church Slavic.

Whatever the suppositions may be, only an analysis of the forms used in Dobrovský's paradigms will give information about the type of Church Slavic he intended to describe. Some conclusions can already be drawn from his historical investigations where he presents the possible forms and, very often, underlines the most common of them. The best way to illustrate this is to take the loc. pl. inflexions of the nouns ending in a hard consonant (masculine and neuter): -ѣхъ, -єхъ, -охъ, -ахъ all of which were used in Church Slavic books in the previous centuries independently of their former stem. Dobrovský's contribution is that he points out the most ancient (-ѣхъ) and the most productive (-ахъ), but he does not give any explanation as to the reason of this phenomenon. He must have seen that the -єхъ inflexion was on the first place (among the possible variants) in Smotryc'kyj's grammar and it was also common in the *Ostrog Bible*: въ селєхъ Mk 5. 14, лицемѣрєхъ Mk 7. 6. In spite of this in his paradigms he uses the -ѣхъ inflexion in loc. pl.: рабѣхъ, сыновѣхъ, ѿромѣхъ and even in the soft variant: царѣхъ. On first thought this decision may indicate that he follows the

Russian Church Slavic (but not the non-liturgical type where the -ахъ is spread). Later examples and their comparison with the standard of the *Elisabeth Bible* will show that this was not the case.

The fact that one grammatical morpheme of a noun (for example the loc. sg.) could be realised by four different inflexions in Church Slavic does not mean that this language existed without any codification. The grammars and dictionaries of the time (Zyzanij, Berynda, Smotryc'kyj) reflect this situation as they describe the Church Slavic as a multifunctional language. As the example of the loc. pl. inflexions shows, their distribution depended on the genre, the redaction, and the century the book was printed in. It is also important, that in the changed prosody of the Russian language only the stressed vowels were important and the noun endings were usually unstressed. That is why in all four endings only the vowel is variable. As Dobrovský relied on the written variant of Church Slavic, he ignored the dependence of phonemes on the position of stress (at least in Russian Church Slavic).

On page 466 in his paradigm we find the declension of the nouns **сѣнь** and **домъ** which in older documents changed according to the -ѣ- stem. As the number of nouns belonging to this type of declension was very small, the influence of other types of declension already in the Old Church Slavic period seemed to be inevitable. Due to this influence the forms of these nouns display a mixed paradigm in the *Elisabeth Bible*, in the singular with inflexions from the -ѣ-, -ѣ- stem and in the plural mostly preserving the old inflexions: **къ домѣ** (Is 5. 8), **въ домѣ** (1Kgs 6. 10), **домы** (nom. pl. Lev 25. 32), **домове** (nom. pl. Ex 5. 9), **домы** (acc. pl. Ex 8. 24), **домовѣ** (gen. pl. Lev 25. 33), **домовомѣ** (dat. pl. Acts 4. 34), **домѣхъ** (loc. pl. Jer 19. 13) and similarly **сѣнь** (dat. sg. Ex 13. 8), **сѣнь** (loc. pl. Mk 9. 12), **сѣнове** (nom. pl. Gen 6. 2), **сѣны** (acc. pl. Deut 6. 7) **сѣновѣ** (gen. pl. Ex 12. 26), **сѣномѣ** (dat. pl. Gen 23. 7), **сѣнми** (instr. pl. Ex 10. 9), **сѣнѣхъ** (loc. pl. Prov 8. 31). Dobrovský's paradigm has different inflexions for the two words differing considerably both from the old forms and the tradition of the *Elisabeth Bible*. For example in loc. sg. he has **сѣнь** but **домѣ**, in acc. pl. **сѣнове** but **домы** and all forms of the word **сѣнь** retain a suffix -ов- before the inflexions in dat. instr. and loc. pl. contrary to the practice of the *Elisabeth Bible* but in conformity with Smotryc'kyj who has them as a variant (1619, with the **ѣ** > **е** change).

The above two paradigms represent not the most frequent types according to which the nouns formed their case endings. In the following we shall discuss the nouns of the -ѣ-, -ѣ- stem which outnumbered all other types in Church Slavic documents. Dobrovský illustrates this on the example of the words **раба** (as the representative of the hard) and **царь** (as the representative of the soft declension). As a monosyllabic word denoting a living person **раба** takes the -овѣ inflexion in the *Elisabeth Bible* (EB) in gen. pl.: **рабовѣ** (Ex 8. 51, see also **скотовѣ** Num 31. 30, **враговѣ** Jes Syr 6. 13, **дрѣговѣ** Jes Syr 6. 13, in the

Ostrog Bible without -ѡвѣ). Dobrovský keeps the old zero flexion: **рѡвѣ**. In the soft variant of the same declensional type in dat. sg he prefers the -ю inflexion (**цѡрѣю**) which otherwise correct but not for his monosyllabic example denoting person. The *EB* has both forms: **цѡрѣю** Ex 3. 18 but **цѡрѣви** (Ps 46. 7). In this type he also differs in gen. pl. (**цѡрѣи**) from the practice of the *EB* which, in general, has the -ей inflexion preserving the old ending of the -jǫ- stem: **цѡрѣи** (Hag 2. 23, **кнѡзѣи** Zech 6. 10). The -їи inflexion is a characteristic feature of the Ukrainian Church Slavic used not only with nouns of the former -ї- stem. The *EB*, on the contrary, uses -ей even with nouns of the -ї- stem: **кортѣи** (Esth 5. 30, see also Buliĉ 1893, 166). In the instr. pl. he preserved the old -и inflexion (**цѡри**, **вѡруи**), although in the *EB* we already find innovations of later developments: **цѡрѣми** (Job 3. 14), **бѣиѡми** (1 Kgs 28. 18).

Perhaps the most interesting paradigm to emerge from a comparison of Dobrovský's forms and the practice of the *EB* is the declensional pattern of the word **сѡво** which has almost nothing in common with the standard of the *EB*. While the *EB* still keeps the old consonantal declension (cf. **сѡвѣте** gen. sg. Mt 13. 21, **сѡвѣти** dat. sg. Deut 4.2, **сѡвѣтъ** gen. pl. Ps 119. 161, **сѡвѣтъ** instr. Judg 16. 16, **сѡвѣтъхъ** Ps 119. 162) Dobrovský seems to accept the non-canonical innovations. His inconsistency is manifest, however, in the other examples of the consonantal declension which more or less follow the old tradition.

The phonological changes of the native Slavic languages also had morphological consequences in the Church Slavic. One of these is the changed quality of the phoneme /c/ which became depalatalized in the Russian. As a result, words in the Russian Church Slavic ending in /c/ started to have inflexions according to the changed quality of the consonant. On Ukrainian lands, due to the so-called "second South-Slavic influence", innovations of these type were long resisted and so the old inflexions preserved. The forms used by Dobrovský in his paradigm like **лицѣ** (loc. sg. and instr. pl.) indicate that he prefers the old, traditional way of use.

Another characteristic of Dobrovský's grammar is that he pays special attention to nominal adjectives in the role of modifiers although their use in modern Church Slavic has been reduced considerably (cf. **въ пѡстѣхъ мѣстѣхъ** *OB* → **въ пѡстыхъ мѣстѣхъ** *EB* Mk 1. 45). Although aware of these changes, he gives a paradigm (483–484) and a detailed description of their use (and that of the participles 486–488).

Of interest to us also is the formation of the imperative which in Russian Church Slavic had become simplified, as in all conjugational classes it has the suffix -и-. In the liturgical books printed in Ukrainian presses, however, the suffix -ѣ-, that of the first and second conjugational classes had spread. In the *Institutiones*... we find forms corresponding to the more archaic tradition: **бѣдѣм**, **бѣдѣте** (pl. 1. 2. 534), **лѣжѣм**, **лѣжѣте** (pl. 1. 2. 528). In all probab-

ity he tried to avoid coincidence with the declarative forms **БѢДЕМ**, **БѢДЕТЕ**, **ЛЕЖИМ**, **ЛЕЖИТЕ** (pl. 1. 2.).

The list of instances supporting Dobrovský's adherence to an older type of Church Slavic could be continued. It is, however, interesting to observe that he usually does not give grounds for his choice and does not explain the forms in his paradigms however different they may be from the tradition of the ecclesiastical books he relied on (see for example the paradigm of **ЛОБО**). The data analysed by us suggest that he had drawn heavily on Smotryč'kyj's grammar (in case of several inflexions accepting the first), the *Ostrog Bible* and the early Church Slavic printings which still preserved some archaic features. He never used the expression *Ukrainian redaction* but his remarks ... *in libris recentius in Polonia* (593) and *Polono russica* (435) make clear that he was aware of the characteristic features of this recension. The conclusions reached from these comparisons may shed light on the type of Church Slavic he preferred; they, however, do not explain the rather illogical choice he made. This type of Church Slavic, namely, was losing out in the greatest part of *Slavia Orthodoxa*. At this time even the Cyrillic typography in Vienna and the Glagolitic printings used the Russian redaction of Church Slavic. It is true that some archaic features survived, mostly in books printed by the Basilian typographies, but even they, due to financial reasons, gradually took over the Russian redaction. No wonder that the authorities of the Serbian Orthodox Church looked with disapproval on Dobrovský's grammar as they found in it a different Church Slavic from that used in Serbia (that is from the Russian Church Slavic accepted by the Serbs — see the opinion of Stratimirović the Serbian Orthodox patriarch in Jagić 1910, 131).

The first grammar to be published after Dobrovský's *Institutiones...* was Tirol's **ГЛАВЕНСКА ГРАМАТИКА САД ПРВИ РЕД НА СРПСКОМ ЈЕЗЫКУ ИЗЈАСНѢНА. У Бечу, 1827. У Штампарији јерменскога манастира**. In reality it was only a partial grammar, much more like a *bukvar*', as it gave only an introduction to the pronunciation and reading of Church Slavic texts. It took for granted the knowledge of Church Slavic (its archaic and modern variants), the Serb and Russian languages. In this way it provided help for reading texts in all these languages. The chapters of the book discuss the material with this in view as they start with the phonetic representation of the graphic symbols (letters). As Tirol's work assumes a knowledge of morphology, syntax and lexicon of all the variants mentioned, it has methodological similarity with Vujanovski's grammar (Vujanovski 1793). Thus, the instructions formulated by him could be used for reading texts written in Church Slavic, Serb and Russian as well. For this purpose he printed texts in all these languages in the chrestomathy attached to his book. Tirol's advantage, compared to Vujanovski, is that he had access to Dobrovský's *Institutiones...* (1822). After the appearance of Dobrovský's work,

the new Church Slavic grammars could take into consideration his statements based on recent discoveries and giving the norms of an older variant of Church Slavic. Thus Tirol, while describing the letters and their phonetic values, also pays attention to the early norms. It is, however, understandable that it was impossible to demand something beyond the knowledge of Serbian readers. Therefore, he did not wish them to produce phonemes not existing in their mother tongue while reading Church Slavic texts. He simply advises them how to substitute the extinct and changed phonemes, such as the nasal sounds of the Old Church Slavic, with their modern reflexes /e/, /u/.

To the chapters discussing graphemes, punctuation and the use of signs above the lines, is attached a chrestomathy with texts in four languages (according to him only variants): in Old Church Slavic (11th century), modern Church Slavic of Russian recension (18th century, according to the norms of the *Elisabeth Bible*), in modern Russian (1818) and Serbian (1822). If the reader tried to use his own phonemes for all these variants, he must have come up against difficulties. The instructions given in the book referred to the early variant of Church Slavic and almost nothing was said about the phonetic representation of modern Russian. As for him the graphic forms had priority, there was hardly anything said about the special characters of the Russian phonetic system or prosody, which were sometimes very different from the Serb ones (akanje, the shortening of vowels in unstressed syllables and their change in this position and about the palatalisation of consonants before front vowels). In this way the Russian language could be represented by the phonemes and prosody of the Serbian. Roughly the same method was used by the Slavic Orthodox and Greek Catholic believers while reading Church Slavic liturgical texts.

While giving instructions for reading Early Church Slavic texts, he relies on Dobrovský, according to whom **ѣ** has to be used after sibilants. But as Tirol teaches neither writing nor producing new texts—for this the information given in his book was not sufficient—his comments simply call attention to some characteristic features of Early Church Slavic which, however, due to the phonemes of the Serbian language, were eliminated in pronunciation.

The title (**СЛАВЕНСКА ГРАМАТИКА** = [Church] Slavic Grammar) is justified by the content of the chapters as most of them discuss Church Slavic: the alternation of consonants, the use of signs above the lines etc. (in the same way as Dobrovský does). Considering its content and method this book resembles the **БУКВАРЬ** (primer) type of schoolbooks with the distinction that it starts not with the study of syllables nor continues with the discussion of words and sentences, but it describes the features of written texts (with the exception of the alternation of consonants as it is also part of the written variant of Church Slavic).

His chapters dealing with the early development of Church Slavic undoubtedly are influenced by Dobrovský, but those discussing word formation, the alternation of consonants and the use of signs above the lines, are parts usually

used in all previous grammars (such as Mrazović's 1794, 1800, 1811, 1821 and Vujanovski's 1793).

Zaharijadis's Church Slavic grammar **СЛАВЕНСКА ГРАММАТИКА** was first published (1824) when Mrazović's grammar had already been reprinted three times. This may suggest that Zaharijadis may have wanted to add something new to that contained in Mrazović's grammar which was understandable as he could rely on the results published in Dobrovský's *Institutiones*.... However, under the influence of the opinion of the Serb Orthodox Clergy, he also described the Russian recension of Church Slavic. His decision not to introduce the newest results may have also had phonetical reasons, as almost all the liturgical books in Serbia were of Russian recension. Even if in topic Zaharijadis does not differ from Mrazović's grammar he discusses the Russian recension of Church Slavic in more detail than all previous grammars. This means that he not only describes the language, but where possible, he enters into discussions relying on the newest results in linguistics. Such a theoretical part is the analysis of the syntactic functions of the various cases. To support his argumentation he quotes from the *Elisabeth Bible*. His examples, however, sometimes differ from those given in his paradigms. It is surprising, that despite being a well prepared linguist as seen from his theoretical remarks and whose Greek grammar (1816) was used in Serbian schools, he gives no explanation for these seemingly irregular forms.

In dealing with morphology he differs considerably both from Smotryč'kyj's and Mrazović's grammar. He may have realised that neither of them could describe the preterital system nor could they define the function of the various categories in accordance with the demands of contemporary Slavistics. His endeavour, however, does not mean that he was able to solve all the problems in this respect. The situation was all the more complicated as his metalanguage was Serb (sometimes close to Slavenoserb) and the majority of the examples were from Serbian. Although the preterital system of the Serbian language at the end of the 18th and at the beginning of the 19th century differed not significantly from that of the Church Slavic, his statements, without taking into account the notion of *aspect*, can be accepted only partially.

While discussing the characteristics of the verb he still uses notions typical of the earlier grammars. Thus the title **ВНД** has nothing in common with the *aspect* of the verb but describes the ways of word formations with the help of suffixes (117). The title **НАЧЕРТАНІЕ** describes the formation of compounds. After having discussed the voice (active, passive) and the mood he sets to analysing the tense system and conjugation of the verbs. His examples and the description of the functions reveal that it was not him who did pioneer work in this field but Vuk Karadžić who in his *Pismenica*... published in 1814, established the rules of using the various categories and tenses of the Serb (Slavic)

verb. (It is not our task to find out Karadžić's sources.) Zaharijadis followed this book, changing only the names of some categories.

The descriptive method of Zaharijadis by which he wanted to describe both the Church Slavic and the Serb language (which he calls dialect) at the same time, proved to be not the best means of representing all aspects of the language under investigation. He had difficulties especially with the semantics and the future tense of the verbs.

The structure of the chapters in Zaharijadis's book does not differ much from Smotryc'kyj's grammar. A striking difference is, however, that while Smotryc'kyj's examples are often based on contemporary Ukrainian or Belorussian norm; Zaharijadis gives Church Slavic, sometimes Serbian or Slavenoserb examples. Attached to the book he has an index of difficult Church Slavic words with Serbian explanations.

Analysing his paradigms it is clear that Zaharijadis differs from Dobrovský both in methodology and in his corpus. In the first he is more indebted to Karadžić and Smotryc'kyj and in the second to those who described the Russian Church Slavic. His parallel possible inflexions for the expression of one case indicate that he still looked on the Church Slavic as a polifunctional language.

Lutskay's grammar (*Grammatica slavo-ruthena*, 1830) is the only work in the early 19th century which was really inspired by Dobrovský's *Institutiones*.... This is underlined by the author himself in the introduction (XVI) to his book. The limited space, of course, did not allow him to give a comprehensive comparative-historical view of the Slavic languages. What he undertook was to describe the Church Slavic language and, at the same time, following Dobrovský's method, to compare it with the Russian language and his own Rusyn dialect. Most attention was paid to the Church Slavic as he, according to Kollár's idea, considered it to be the only literary language of the Slavs.

He starts his description with phonological analysis, defining the sound value of the letters. Following Dobrovský's statements he considers the consonants /š/, /ž/, /č/, /šč/ and /c/ soft and consequently nouns, adjectives and participles ending in these consonants should take the inflections of the soft type declension. His theoretical considerations, however, were not always realized in his prescriptive examples. In this way after -ц in nom. sg. he writes sometimes ѣ indicating the soft quality of the consonant, but sometimes he omits it. As he did not use the ѣ at the end of words, the omission of the ѣ signified the soft quality of the consonant. The lexemes used in his paradigms and examples are almost the same as those of Dobrovský's, nevertheless, his inflexions reflect a more regulated usage void of arbitrary forms. As an example of this method can be the soft variant of acc. pl. inflexion of masculine nouns. Instead of the archaic -ѧ used by Dobrovský, Lutskay prefers -и, in accordance with the practice of the *EB*. Following the method of this regularization he corrects the inflexion -ѣхѣ in

loc. pl. in this paradigm: **царехъ**, attested by the *EB* (Jud 8. 26). His task is more complicated when the *EB* has more variants of the same lexeme for one case eg. **камєни** (dat. sg. Jer 2. 27), **камєнєви** (dat. sg. Lk 4. 3), **камєню** (dat. sg. Say Sal 7. 9). There being no parallel flexions in Lutskey's grammar he usually prefers the forms accepted by Dobrovský. In case Dobrovský's form differs from the practice of the *EB*, he corrects it according to the *EB* eg. **сѣиновомъ** → **сѣиномъ** (dat. pl. Gen 23. 7). From the innovations of the *EB* only the latest ones are left outside the framework of his grammar: **сѣинами** (instr. pl. 1 Chr 8. 9). The archaic forms reflecting the soft quality of the sibilants are preserved resulting in an increase of grammatical homoforms: **вола** (nom. sg., gen. sg., nom. pl., acc. pl.). Surprisingly enough he adopts without any change Dobrovský's most controversial paradigm, the declension of the word **слово**. As Dobrovský's forms are modern borrowings from the non-canonical Russian redaction, Lutskey adheres to the practice of the *EB* (**словєте** gen. sg. Mt 13. 21), **словєи** (dat. sg. Deut 4. 2), **словєты** (instr. pl. Judg 16. 16).

Lutskey, like Dobrovský, forms the plural forms of the imperative with the help of the suffix **-ѣ-**, a characteristic of the older variant of Church Slavonic and that of the Ukrainian recension. Erroneously enough he thinks it to be of Polish origin but, nonetheless, uses it in all conjugational classes: **горѣмъ**, **творѣмъ** (imperat. pl. 1) : **горѣте**, **творѣте** (imperat. pl. 2).

The adjectives ending in /k/, /g/, /h/ cause a serious problem for Lutskey as he had already declared that these velars were hard, consequently they could not take inflexions like **-и**. This statement would have demanded that Lutskey go against the tradition of the *EB*. In the paradigm of the adjectival declension (**благъ**) he makes a compromise and accepts the Russian Church Slavonic endings (**-и**), but in the notes repeats his former ideas about the correctness of the connections **-кы**, **-гы**, **-хы**.

If we take into account Lutskey's theoretical remarks and paradigms, it turns out that he tried to synthesize Mrazović's and Dobrovský's views on the Church Slavonic language, in the paradigms standing closer to Mrazović (and so to the Russian reduction) and in the remarks and notes to Dobrovský (and so to an older type of Church Slavonic). But as the paradigms have a stronger prescriptive force, the ideas in his remarks and notes were not treated adequately.

Another Church Slavonic grammar of the mid-century is from the pen of E. Joannovics (*Grammatica...* 1851) which describes the Russian recension of Church Slavonic.

He divided the verbs into ten groups (present tense: one, past tense: five, future tense: four). In the part devoted to the discussion of the past tense, under the title of **преходящее** he deals with the aoristos (**питахъ**—**пита**) and imperfect proper (**питахъ**—**питаше**) without naming them. In spite of this, the aoristos and imperfectum have separate paradigms in his grammar, although they

are for him one and the same category of the verb expressing a past action finished in the past (**преходящее**). He, instead, proposes a different classification of these verbs based on the quality of the action; perfect verbs: **единократные—совершительни**, and continuous verbs: **продолжительни—несовершительни**. From this point of view the imperfect belongs to the continuous verbs (although does not use the word *imperfect*). He thinks that the forms of the imperfect are the remains of the Old Church Slavonic which is called **мимощеющее** by Smotryc'kyj. The confusion met with in the Church Slavic grammars in the first half of the 19th century is due to the fact that the authors could not yet rely on the recently discovered records. These results were summed up only in the grammars published in 1852–1854. One might think that the Church Slavic grammars published after this time, armed with the results of the comparative linguistics, would be free from the errors of the beginning of the century. It is true, that the function and the origin of the aoristos became clear (*-s-* aorist, *-ch-* aorist). The modern Church Slavic grammars, however, had to describe not the ancient forms, but the contemporary Church Slavic, with its various functional variants. This situation changed only when the Church Slavic became solely the language of liturgy and as a result there was no more need to deal with other functional variants. This became possible only at the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century.

From among the books published after Vujanovski, Mrazović and Tirol, Dobrjanskij's Grammar (Przemyśl, 1851) deserves special attention. He discusses the Russian recension (destined for the Greek Catholic believers of Galicia), but his corpus and so his aim must have been more than the liturgical variant of Church Slavic which is emphasized by the several parallel endings in the nominal declension. In the instr. pl. of the lexeme **сынъ**, for example, he has three possible forms: **сыновѣ**, **сынами**, **сыны** (Dobrovský and Lutskey have only **сыны**). Also three parallel forms represent the gen. pl. of the noun **день** all of them reflecting one variant of the Church Slavic: the form **день**—the consonantal declension, **дній**—as used in the Ukrainian recension and **дней**—the practice of the EB.

From the older variant or the Ukrainian recension he preserves only some features e.g. the **-ци** combination in the declension of nouns (**человѣци**), the imperative suffix in pl. **-ѣ** (**глаголюте**), but he does not accept **-а** as the archaic soft ending in nom. and acc. pl. (**цари**).

The Church Slavic grammar of Eumenius Szabó published in 1894 cannot be organically related to those discussed so far. By this time the results of the comparative-historic linguistics and the facts about the Old Church Slavonic language provided different preconditions for a comprehensive grammar of Church Slavonic. In addition to it he could rely on the textbooks used in the

Russian secondary schools at that time. His grammar and Kubek's trilingual dictionary (1906) represented a renewed interest of Hungarian-speaking Greek Catholics to Church Slavonic. The requirements it had to meet were also different as the polyvalency of Church Slavonic had ceased by this time in Subcarpathia. The only function being the ecclesiastical one, Szabó had no need to include in his corpus the administrative or literary variant of Church Slavonic. This resulted in a more uniform system of the language, in a rather small number of double endings in the paradigms. The only complications came from the fact that he took his illustrations from the *Bacsinszky-Bible* (Bačinsky 1804), for the printing of which had served an earlier edition of the EB. As a result of this orientation, many formerly soft consonants were used in velarized forms in the quotations (Ukrainian recension and partly the early norm of the EB). His paradigms and explanations, however, relied on grammars published in Russia at the end of the 19th century, thus reflecting a modernized spelling. Therefore his paradigms and rules sometimes contradict the examples taken from the *Bacsinszky-Bible*.

Although Mrazović's grammar was republished in 1840, it was not corrected or influenced in any way by Dobrovský's *Institutiones*.... The Serbian authors abided by the opinion of the Serbian Orthodox clergy which saw in Dobrovský's grammar features not characteristic of the recension used in Serbia.

The *Institutiones*... have shown contemporary students of Church Slavic the historical formation of this language trying to prescribe a variant which, however, was being ousted by the Russian recension even inside the Habsburg Empire. Grammars of Church Slavic (mostly by Serbian authors) describing this recension, therefore, relied more on Mrazović than Dobrovský. The comparative-historical method of Dobrovský, however, has affected the formation of Slavistics considerably.

References

- Bulič 1893 — Буличъ С. К. Церковнославянские элементы въ современномъ литературномъ и народномъ русскомъ языкѣ. Петербургъ, Nachdruck und Nachwort von Peter Kosta, München 1986.
- Dobrovský 1813 — Joseph DOBROWSKY, Entwurf zu einem allgemeinen Etymologikon der slawischen Sprachen. Prag.
- Dobrovský 1822 — Joseph DOBROWSKY, Institutiones linguae slavicae dialecti veteris quae quum apud Russos, Serbos aliosque ritus graeci tum apud Dalmatas glagolitas ritus latini Slavos in libris sacris obtinet. Vindobonae.
- Dobrjanskij 1851 — Антоній Добрянскій, Грамматика старославянскаго языка. Въ Перемышлѣ.
- DOSTÁL Antonín, Vztah Dobrovského k Vostokovovi a Kopitarovi a jeho podněty pro další studium staroslověnštiny: *Slavia* 23 (1954) 139–143.
- HAVRÁNEK Bohuslav, Význam Jozefa Dobrovského pro slovanskou jazykovědu. In: Jozef Dobrovský 1753–1953. Sborník studií k dvoustému výročí narození. Praha, 1953. 97–116.
- HORBATSCH O. Die vier Ausgaben der kirchenslavischen Grammatik von M. Smotric'kyj. Frankfurter Abhandlungen zur Slavistik. Bd. 7. Wiesbaden 1964.

- Jagić — Ягичъ И. В. Письма Добровскаго и Копитара. Санктпетербургъ 1885.
- Jagić — Ягичъ И. В. Энциклопедія славянской филологіи, Выпускъ 1. Исторія славянской филологіи. Санктпетербургъ
- Joannovics — *Eugenio JOANNOVICS*, Grammatica linguae ecclesiastico-slavicae. Viennae 1851.
- Lutskay — *Michaelis LUTSKAY*, Grammatica slavo-ruthena. Seu vetero-slavicae, et actu in montibus Carpathicis parvo-russicae, ceu dialecti vigentis lingvae. Budae 1830.
- Machovec — *Milan MACHOVEC*, Filosofický význam díla Jozefa Dobrovského. In: Jozef Dobrovský 1753–1953. Sborník studií k dvoustému výročí narození. Praha 1953. 46–89.
- Mrazović — Авраам Мразовић, Рѹководство къ славенстѣй грамматницѣ во оупотрѣбленіе славено-сербскихъ народныхъ училищъ. Въ Вѣннѣ, 1794. (тѣпломъ Стефана Новаковича) — 1800, 1811, 1821, 1840, въ Бѹдинѣ градѣ, письмены Кралевскагѡ Всеѹчилища Пештанскагѡ. 1821.
- NEJEDLÝ Zdeněk, К истории славяноведения до XVIII века: Slavia 22 (1953) 1–28.
- SMOTRYČKYJ Meletij, Grammatiki slavenskija pravilnoje syntagma (Jevje 1619). Herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Olexa Horbartsch (Specimina Philologiae Slavicae, 4). Frankfurt am Main 1974.
- Vujanovski — Стефанъ Вѹановски, Рѹководство ко праволаголанію и правописанію, сочинено во оупотребленіе сербскихъ училищъ. Въ Вѣннѣ, 1793. (тѣпломъ Стефана Новаковича).
- Zaharijadis — Георгъ Захаріадисъ, Славенска грамматика. Швабъ, 1824. Бѹда, 1832. Писмены Кралевскагѡ Всеѹчилища Пештанскагѡ.