

COMPUTER-AIDED INSTRUCTION IN OLD CHURCH SLAVIC AND
THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE

by

Joseph A. Van Campen and Richard Schubach

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 255

June 30, 1975

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION SERIES

Reproduction in Whole or in Part Is Permitted for
Any Purpose of the United States Government

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48106-1000

DATE OF PURCHASE: 1980

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ANN ARBOR

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1000 S. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

TEL: (313) 763-5000 FAX: (313) 763-5001

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

48106-1000

COMPUTER-AIDED INSTRUCTION IN OLD CHURCH SLAVIC AND

THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE

Joseph A. Van Campen and Richard Schupbach

1. Instruction in Old Church Slavic

The computer-based introduction to Old Church Slavic (OCS), as it was originally developed and implemented by Van Campen in the winter quarter of 1973, is described in an earlier technical report (Van Campen, 1973). We are here concerned primarily with the modifications in the computer-based material that were introduced in the summer of 1973 and with an evaluation of the modified course.

Modifications in the Course Material

Content of the computer-based sessions. The 24 sessions of the 1973 course were replaced by a set of 34 sessions covering essentially the same material (see Appendix A). The purpose of this restructuring was to permit even a very slow student to complete any given session in a period not exceeding 40 minutes. (One of the principal complaints raised by students during the winter of 1973 concerned the length of the lessons. The lessons were taken at computer terminals at the Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences (IMSSS), and since students had to spend approximately 20 minutes getting to and from IMSSS from other parts of the Stanford campus, a session that ran longer than 40 minutes tended to disrupt attendance at other classes in the University.)

In reworking the sessions it was almost never necessary to write new material. Restructuring was accomplished either by assigning material covered in the later portion of a given session to the following session or by omitting some of the review material in a given session. The re-writing of individual sections of the material was undertaken only in those relatively rare cases in which it was felt that the presentation of the material in question was poorly formulated. In no case was there a significant modification in the order of presentation, and no new material was added to the course.

Homework assignments. In our earlier report we pointed out that we hoped to add a number of computer-based sessions on the analysis of Old Church Slavic texts. However, in the process of restructuring the material from the 1973 course it soon became obvious that the number of shortened sessions would be too large to permit the inclusion of additional material on text analysis. Therefore it was decided to increase the number and length of the OCS passages included in the homework sheets which accompanied the 1973 course. Beginning with session 12, and in all except three of the other sessions of the course, students were assigned for analysis short passages centering on grammatical material and vocabulary already covered in the computer-based sessions. Although the earliest passages were for the most part artificial creations incorporating only those features of the original OCS models with which our students were familiar, the texts accompanying later sessions were largely or entirely based on passages found in various published editions of OCS manuscripts (see Appendix B). For another approach to this problem, see Section 2 of this report.

Computer-generated drills. Although the drill generator described in our earlier report has been expanded to include the generation of drills utilizing a context in the language being taught and drills calling for the identification of a given form by the student, little or no use has been made of this capability in connection with the OCS course. This is due primarily to the fact that the 34 computer-based sessions, coupled with the homework assignments, would appear to provide so much reinforcement and to occupy so much of the students' time that additional on-line drilling is both unnecessary and, from the students' point of view, undesirable. (This is, of course, in large part attributable to the overall orientation of instruction in OCS at Stanford: most students are specializing in Russian literature and the desired skill is the ability to read and understand texts. Were we dealing with students of Slavic linguistics or with a language which the student was expected to master actively, the situation would in all probability be different.)

The Physical Environment

In 1973-74 conditions remained essentially the same as those described in our earlier report. However, in November of 1974, when the restructured course was being run for the second time, it was necessary to transfer the two Model-35 teletypes from IMSSS to an office in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. Since IMSSS personnel continued to maintain and supply the terminals, the net effect of this change was simply to increase the availability of the terminals to the students.

Student Performance

During the fall quarter of 1973-74, the restructured course was taken by two students under conditions generally paralleling those described in our earlier reports. Both students completed the course with a grade of A-. During the fall quarter of 1974-75, the situation was somewhat different. One student took the course as described. Another student, who had already had a course in OCS at another university, did not wish to take the computer-based lessons or to do the homework. It was therefore decided to provide twice-weekly meetings for this student focusing on the explanation of points of grammar and, in the last six weeks of the course, the reading of texts. The student taking the computer-based instruction (CBI) sessions was also permitted to attend these sessions, so that he in effect received two types of instruction simultaneously. It is interesting to note that this student's performance on the final examination was far superior to that of the individual who received only classroom instruction, particularly in view of the fact that the non-CBI student's background included a course in OCS at another university.

2. Instruction in the History of the Russian Literary Language

The implementation of CBI in the history of the Russian literary language (Slavic 212) was first carried out in the spring quarter of 1973. The programmed material then available, and the course as a whole, is described in an earlier report (Schupbach, 1973); the present report deals only with what has been added to the CBI portion of the course since then.

Modifications in the Course Material

The 11 original programmed lessons have been altered only slightly since their introduction in 1973. The changes made have been largely in response to student comment and have had to do with the rephrasing of lecture material and questions. Since no essentially new material has been added, we will not discuss these lessons further here.

Nine new lessons have been added to the original 11. Of these, 8 concern reading and analysis of Old Russian (OR) texts (see Appendix C); the remaining new lesson concerns the shifts of "e" to "o" in OR (see Appendix D). With the addition of this latter material the major phonological and morphological changes that occurred in OR are now fully programmed. If time permits, I hope to design a lesson on syntax, i.e., on changes in the usages of the cases from OR to contemporary standard Russian (CSR). The addition of this material will result in the complete programming of all the major grammatical (in the broadest sense of the word) changes from OR to CSR.

The major innovation in the CBI portions of Slavic 212 has been the design and implementation of lessons in reading and the analysis of OR texts. Teaching a student to read, analyze, and identify OR texts has always been painful for all those involved. Ability and performance vary widely from student to student. Preparation on the part of the student and instructor is time consuming. Yet these skills must be acquired because no student can be expected to appreciate the effect of historical change on a language with regard to which he is a functional illiterate. Programmed text lessons permit the student to proceed at his own speed; they provide a built-in rigor of analysis which

is difficult to maintain in the classroom--all questions must be answered with 70 percent accuracy or the student is not allowed to proceed; lastly, the student can review the material until it is effectively mastered and all questions have been answered at the teletype or in later consultation with the instructor. I feel that these lessons are responsible for a dramatic improvement in the reading ability of students finishing Slavic 212. I think the effectiveness of these lessons by themselves is worth all the effort that has gone into the programmed portion of the course.

The design of the text lessons is fairly simple (see Appendix E). A brief introduction identifying the text is followed by a few sentences of the material. The student is questioned on his ability to translate the material. Rare or difficult words or combinations thereof are explained beforehand. This is followed by a grammatical analysis and possibly questions on the age and/or style of the piece. Then more text is given and the process continues until a significant portion of the text has been covered. In the case of the Introduction to the Ostromir Gospel, which is short, the entire text is analyzed, whereas only portions of the Chronicles are read.

The text lessons are designed in a sequence such that skills learned in one lesson are applied to the next. In the later sessions the student is expected to be able to handle material of considerable difficulty, i.e., Slovo o polku Igoreve and Russkaja Pravda. The intent is not merely to teach reading and text analysis but also to give the student a grasp of the major documents and genres of OR. To this end, we have three lessons from the Chronicles: two take up the Laurentian Redaction; the third concerns the Novgorod Chronicle, Synodal Copy, which is

introduced for analysis of dialectal features. Russkaja Pravda and Slovo o polku Igoreve are analyzed as reflections of the oral tradition in OR literature. The Lives of SS. Boris and Gleb is read as an example of the heavy influence of OCS on hagiographic literature. The Teachings of Monomax is read for its literary and cultural value as well as for the numerous examples of the usage of the dual in the chosen passage. In addition to these we have, as mentioned above, the Introduction to the Ostromir Gospel, which is read for its early OR linguistic features as well as the mixture of styles of language employed.

I hope to program two lessons on Medieval Russian by next year, in particular portions of Domostroj and Xozenie za tri morja.

Student Performance

Since OCS is a prerequisite course for Slavic 212, the same students whom Van Campen describes in Section 1 have taken, or are presently taking, Slavic 212. The two students who took Slavic 212 in winter 1974 both received A's. The course is presently being taken by the two students, one of whom does not wish to work at the teletype. She has been provided the text of all the lessons and is studying the material on her own. In addition to these four students who are taking or have taken CBI portions of Slavic 212, one other requested to use the CBI portions of Slavic 212 for review toward our Ph.D. written examination in the history of the Russian literary language. This particular person had shown considerable difficulty in reading OR; as a matter of fact, he was taking the examination a second time largely as a result of this particular deficiency. His performance on the make-up examination proved to be an unambiguous "pass." He was able to read a selected passage of OR of approximately

the same level of difficulty that had caused him to fail before. Since then, he has told me that the text lessons helped him in his preparation for the examination.

3. Conclusions

The computer-aided courses in OCS and the history of the Russian literary language have, in our opinion, proved to be a valuable part of the instructional program of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. Over the past three years, students who have utilized these courses as an introduction to the reading of early Slavic texts and the development of Russian have performed as well as or better than those who in previous years (or, in 1974-75, because of individual preference) had only regular classroom instruction. Since the amount of time that the instructor must devote to lectures and drills is significantly smaller when the CBI sessions are employed, there is every reason to retain these courses as an integral component of our Ph.D. program.

References

- Schubach, R. Toward a computer-based course in the history of the Russian literary language (Tech. Rep. 221, Psych. and Educ. Series). Stanford, Calif.: Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences, Stanford University, 1973.
- Van Campen, J. A. A computer-based introduction to the morphology of Old Church Slavonic (Tech. Rep. 205, Psych. and Educ. Series). Stanford, Calif.: Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences, Stanford University, 1973.

Footnote

The research described in this report was supported by the Stanford University Progress Fund and National Science Foundation Grant NSFGJ-443X.

Appendix A: Contents of Old Church Slavonic CBI Sessions

<u>Session</u>	<u>Material</u>
1	Introduction to teletype keyboard, quiz on pp. 1-3 of H. Lunt, <u>Old Church Slavonic Grammar</u> (The Hague, 1959).
2	Continuation of keyboard, quiz on Lunt, pp. 4-5.
3	The letters <u>I</u> and <u>S</u> . The use of <u>I</u> in the digraphs <u>IA</u> , <u>IO</u> , <u>IS</u> , and <u>SI</u> . Approximate phonetic value of S. Spelling of "j + vowel" combinations after vowels and consonants. Nominative singular, dual, and plural of hard two-fold nouns. Nominative of numeral 'two'. Third singular, dual, and plural of present tense. Lunt: Table, p. 44; tables, pp. 48-49; 4.201; 6.11; 6.12.
4	Accusative, genitive, and locative of hard two-fold nouns and of numeral 'two'. Replacement of velars in locative singular and plural, nominative dual, and nominative plural. Lunt: Table, p. 44; tables, pp. 48-49; 4.13; 4.101; table 4.2.
5	Dative, instrumental, and vocative of hard two-fold nouns. Dative and instrumental of numeral 'two'. Replacement of velars in vocative singular. Second singular, dual, and plural of present tense. Lunt: Table, p. 44; tables, pp. 48-49; 4.14; 4.101; table 4.2; 6.11; 6.12.
6	Inflection of soft two-fold nouns in a consonant other than -j-. Lunt: Tables, p. 44; tables, pp. 48-49; 4.11.
7	First dual and plural of present tense. Soft two-fold stems in -j-. Lunt: 6.11; 6.12; tables, p. 44; tables, pp. 48-49; 4.102; 2.51.
8	First person singular of present tense. Substitutive softening of stem-final consonants. Lunt: 6.11; 6.12; 6.221. Review quiz on two-fold declension.
9	Basic stems of OCS verbs. Partial restatement of present-tense inflection in terms of basic-stem approach. Representation of stems in -j-. Lunt: 5.4-5.6; table, p. 73; 6.11; 6.12; 6.213; 6.22; 6.221; 6.23; 6.4.

(Appendix A, continued)

<u>Session</u>	<u>Material</u>
10	Restatement of remainder of present-tense inflection in terms of basic-stem approach. Lunt: 6.211; 6.212; 6.22. Drills on hard two-fold declension.
11	Imperative mood. Lunt: 7.0-7.10211.
12	Two-fold forms of present active and passive participles. Lunt: 8.0-8.13; tables, 4.19; 4.194.
13	Feminine two-fold nouns with nominative singular in -i. Infinitive of verbs. Lunt: 4.18; table, p. 49; 13.1-13.27.
14	Productive aorist of verbs. Review of imperative. Lunt: 10.1-10.4.
15	Supine of verbs. Review of active participles. Lunt: 13.1-13.27.
16	X-aorist and S-aorist. Lunt: 10.602-10.604.
17	Root-aorist, imperfect of stems in labial or dental consonants or in -nq. Lunt: 10.601 (note that the 2.d. is -eta, not -osta); 9.1.
18	Imperfect of all other stem types. Lunt: 9.11-9.23.
19	Past active participle. Lunt: 11.1-11.14.
20	L-participle. Drills on previously covered forms (mog, prosi, žbr, milova). Lunt: 11.2-11.213.
21	Past passive participle. Lunt: 11.30-11.34. Drills on načbn, klbn, česa.
22	Simple nominal declension. Lunt: 4.4-4.403; table, p. 61.

(Appendix A, continued)

<u>Session</u>	<u>Material</u>
23	Hard pronominal declension. Drills on pĕj, rek. Lunt: 4.2-4.202.
24	Soft pronominal declension. Forms of 'he, she, it', etc. Lunt: 4.2-4.202; 4.25.
25	Irregular and 'mixed' pronouns. Drills on bogati, id. Lunt: 4.203-4.24.
26	Singular of anomalous declension. Drills on dělaj, natrov, greb, bod. Lunt: 4.410-4.4113; 4.412; 4.413-4.414.
27	Plural and dual of anomalous declension. Mixture of anomalous and two-fold declensions. Lunt: Table, p. 62; 4.4113-4.4115; 4.52-4.54.
28	Inflection of oko and uxo. Two-fold forms of neuter -es- stems. Personal pronouns and sebe. Drill on trĕpĕ. Lunt: 4.55; 4.551; 4.6-4.65.
29	Hard compound declension of adjectives. Lunt: 4.3-4.301; table, p. 57.
30	Soft compound declension of adjectives. Compound forms of active participles. Productive comparative of adjectives. Lunt: 4.3-4.312; tables, pp. 57-58; 4.70; 4.72; 4.19; 4.31.
31	Compound productive comparative. Nonproductive comparative. Formation of adverbs. Lunt: 4.70; 4.71; tables, pp. 56, 58; 4.82-4.822.
32	2.S. and 3.S. aorist forms in -tĕ. Forms of 'to be' and 'to have'. Lunt: 10.52; 16.1-16.11; 16.24.
33	Athematic verbs, forms of iti. Lunt: 16.2-16.23; 16.3.
34	Foreign nouns with stems in a vowel. Remnants of old 'u-stems'. Strong and weak jers. Tense and lax jers. Lunt: 4.12; 4.141-4.15; 2.520-2.55; 2.51.

Appendix B: Sample Old Church Slavic Homework Assignments

1. Give the n.s. mas. of the pres. pass. part. and the n.s. mas. and n.s. fem. of the pres. act. part.

ТЕП

СТРЪГ

БОД

ДОИ

ДАРОВА

ТРЪПЪ

ГЛАГОЛА

СЛЪША

МЪИ

РИНЪ

КЛЪН

ДАТА

2. OCS had a dative absolute construction (cf. Lunt's section on the uses of the dative case). Translate the following and identify each form.

А. ГЛАГОЛ-ИЮШТОУ РАБОУ СЪ ВОИНЪИ ДЪВЪ ТАИТЕ ЧАДО

Б. ИЮШТАМЪ ЖЕНАМЪ ВЪ ДОМЪ, ВЕДЪТЕ МОЖА КЪ ТЕТРАРХОВИ.

3. Identify. List all possible forms.

МЪНИМЪ

КЪПЦ-ИМЪ

КЪПЦ-ЕМЪ

РЕКОМЪ

МАЖЕМЪ

РЕЧЕМЪ

ДРЪЖА

СЛЪШАШТИ

ПЛАЧЮШТЕ

НЕСЮШТЬ

1. Decline in all numbers and genders **онъ** -- that.
2. Identify and give the n.s. mas. List all possibilities.

ТАЦѸМЪ

ИНОМЪ

ТОА

ОВОЮ

ТѸМЪ

3. Translate and identify all forms.

А. НЕ БОИ СА ЧАДО -- ХРИТОСЪ ПРЕДЪСТОИТЬ ПОМАГАА
ТАЦѸМЪ Л-ЮДѸМЪ.

Б. И ТАКО СЪБЪРАВЪШЕ КОСТИ МОЧЕНИКЪ, ПОЛОЖИША
ВЪ РАКАХЪ. И ТАКО ПОСТРАДАВЪШЕ ВЪНЪЧАНИ БЪША.

Appendix C: The History CBI Lessons and Their Contents

Lesson no.

- 751 Orthography, the differences between the OCS and OR phonologies and the respective writing systems
- 752 Pleophony, the concept of rising sonority and the difference between its effect on so-called 'tort' groups in OR and OCS.
- 753 Syllabic synharmonism, the causes of the various 'palatalizations' and their different effects in OR and OCS.
- 754 The noun, OR noun morphology as opposed to that of OCS.
- 755 The pronoun, OR pronoun morphology as opposed to that of OCS.
- 756 The adjective, OR adjectival and participial morphology as opposed to that of OCS.
- 757 The numeral, OR numeral morphology and syntax as opposed to that of OCS.
- 758 The verb, OR verb morphology as opposed to that of OCS.
- 761 The loss of the 'jers' and the rise of phonemic palatalization.
- 762* The shift from e to o.
- 763 The loss of the dual and changes in numeral morphology and syntax.
- 764 Changes in the declension system.
- 765** Syntax, changes in the use of the cases.
- 771* The Introduction to the Ostromir Gospel.
- 772* The Laurentian Chronicle, the Introduction.
- 773* The Laurentian Chronicle, Olga's Revenge.
- 774* The Novgorod Chronicle, Synodal Copy.
- 775* The Teachings of Monomax.

(Appendix C, continued)

Lesson no.

- 776* Russkaja Pravda.
- 777* Slovo o polku Igoreve.
- 778* The Lives of Ss. Boris and Gleb.
- 779** Domostroj.
- 780** Xoženie za tri morja.

Note. Single asterisk indicates a lesson given for the first time during winter, 1974; double asterisk indicates lessons to be prepared. Lessons 772-780 deal with parts of the indicated texts.

RUS702 RS,LESN

PAGE I

BEG 702
TE THE SHIFT FROM 'E' TO 'O'
AS IN MRUS, HEC, PEC, M40, XEF, ET AL.

FIRST LET'S REVIEW SOME TERMINOLOGY. BEFORE THE
FALL OF THE JERS SIMPLE SOFTENING, I.E., SHARPING OF C'S WAS
A, PHONETIC
E, PHONEMIC

SR _A_
TE AFTER THE FALL OF THE JERS
A, THOSE C'S THAT WERE PHONETICALLY SHARPED BECAME
PHONEMICALLY SHARPED
E, THE STATUS OF PHONETICALLY SHARPED C'S DOES NOT
CHANGE

SR _A_
TE WHICH SERIES CONTAINS ONLY HARD C'S
A, ЛЪИ, БОУ, ТА
E, ПА, ТЪ, СО

SR _E_
TE SAME QUESTION, SHARPED C'S.
A, ПА, БЪ, БЪ
E, МОУ, МІА, ТІО

SR _A_
TE EVEN BEFORE THE FALL OF THE JERS THERE WERE
SOFT C'S WHICH WERE PHONEMES. THEY ARE
A, Т, Д, С, Н BEFORE FRONT V'S
E, Ш, Ж, Ч, Ы, Щ

SR _E_
TE 'E' WENT TO 'O' IN CERTAIN PHONOLOGICALLY PRESCRIBED
ENVIRONMENTS. THEREFORE, THE CHANGE ITSELF WAS
A, PHONETIC
E, PHONEMIC

SR _A_
TE THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE SHIFT FROM 'E' TO 'O',
AFTER PHONEMICALLY SOFT AND, LATER PHONEMICALLY SHARPED C'S,
BEFORE A HARD C OR WORD-END.

NOTE, SOME SCHOLARS MAINTAIN THAT WORD-END DOES NOT CAUSE THE
SHIFT. BE THAT AS IT MAY, THE ABOVE IS AT LEAST A CONVENIENT,
IF NOT COMPLETELY REALISTIC WAY OF LOOKING AT THE PROBLEM.

RST
TE 'E' BEGAN TO SHIFT TO 'O' EVEN BEFORE THE FALL OF THE
JERS. THE ONLY PHONEMICALLY SOFT C'S IN ORUS AT THIS
TIME ARE
A, DENTALS PLUS FRONT V'S
E, THE PALATALS

SR _E_
TE THEREFORE, THIS SO-CALLED 'FIRST SHIFT FROM 'E' TO

'O' OCCURRED ONLY AFTER THE PAL'S.
 MOREOVER, SINCE Ъ HAS NOT AS YET MERGED WITH 'E',
 AND SINCE STRONG Ъ HAS NOT YET GONE TO 'E',
 'SHIFT I' AFFECTS ONLY
 A, THE FRONT V'S
 E, 'ORIGINAL', OLD 'E'

SR
 TE
 TE
 LR
 TE
 LR
 TE

—E—
 THUS THE COMPLETE ENVIRONMENT OF 'SHIFT I' IS
 A SOFT PAL PLUS
 ORIGINAL 'E' PLUS
 A HARD C OR WORD-END.
 COPY THE WORD IN WHICH 'E' GOES TO 'O'
 БЕЛКЪ ЖЕЛТЪ ЖЕЛТЪ
 WHICH THUS COMES TO BE PRN-D AND SOMETIMES SPELLED
 ЖОЛТЪ

'SHIFT I' DOES NOT OCCUR WITH БЕЛКЪ BECAUSE
 A, В IS NOT A PAL
 E, В IS NOT A PAL AND Л IS SOFT

SR
 TE
 LR
 TE

—E—
 COPY THE WORD WHERE 'E' GOES TO 'O'
 ШЕШЕ ШЕСТЬ ШЕШЕ
 'E' DOES NOT GO TO 'O' IN ШЕСТЬ BECAUSE
 A, Ш IS NOT A SOFT PAL
 E, С IS SOFT BEFORE SOFT Т BEFORE FRONT V Ъ

SR
 LR
 LR
 TE

—E—
 ШЕЖЪ ЖЕНЬСКЪ ШЕЛКЪ
 ЖЕЛЪЗНЪ ЕЛКА ЕЛКА
 ЕЛКА BECAUSE IT ACTUALLY BEGINS IN Я WHICH IS A
 SOFT PAL.

LR
 TE

ЕЛЪ ЖЕСТЬКЪ ЖЕСТЬКЪ
 'E' DOES NOT GO TO 'O' IN ЕЛЪ BECAUSE
 A, THERE IS NO INITIAL JOD IN THIS WORD
 E, THE Л IS SOFT

SR
 LR
 TE

—E—
 ВРАНЬЕ ЖЕНЬ ВРАНЬЕ
 ВРАНЬЕ BECAUSE THERE IS AN INTER-VOCALIC JOD BETWEEN
 Ъ AND 'E' AND 'E' IS FOLLOWED BY WORD-END.

SR
 SR
 SR

Т OR F, 'E' GOES TO 'O' IN
 ЖИТЬЕ _Т_
 МОЕ _Т_
 ШЕКЪИ _Т_

RST
 TE

NOTE, IN LITERARY MRUS THE RESULTS OF THE SHIFT ARE EVIDENT
 ONLY UNDER STRESS DUE TO THE REDUCTION OF UNSTRESSED 'O',
 OR АКАНЬЕ. THIS LATTER PHENOMENON DID NOT APPEAR UNTIL
 AFTER 'E' CEASED TO GO TO 'O'. ERGO, THE ORUS NOM PLUR OF
 NOM PLUR OF ЖЕНА MIGHT BE WRITTEN ЖЕНЬИ OR
 ЛR
 ЖОНЬИ

(THE LESSON CONTINUES)

Appendix E: Portions of Lessons 771 and 772, the Introduction to the Ostromir Gospel and the Introduction to the Laurentian Chronicle, respectively.

RUS771 RS, LESN

PAGE I

BEG 771
TE СЛАВА ТЕБѢ Г-И Ч-РИО Н-БСЪМЪИМ

THIS READS
'GLORY TO YOU
A, LORD HEAVENLY GOD
E, LORD HEAVENLY KING

SR
TE E
THE FORM OF ТЕБѢ IS
A, OCS
E, ORUS

SR
TE A
THE ORUS FORM WOULD BE

LR
TE ТОБѢ
IT IS OCS BECAUSE
A, THE 'E' IS UNSTRESSED AND COULD EASILY REPLACE 'O'
E, THIS PHRASE IS A SET FORMULA WHICH WILL NOT EASILY
BE 'PERMEATED' BY ORUS

SR
TE E

TE ИАКО СЪПОДОБИ МА НАПИСАТИ Е-Г/МЕ СЕ.

THIS READS
'BECAUSE
A, IT BEHOOVES ME
E, -HE- MADE ME WORTHY
TO WRITE THIS GOSPEL

SR
LE E
SE THE VERB IS СЪПОДОБИ
SE THE TENSE IS A
SE PERSON 3
TE NUMBER E

IT GOVERNS THE
A, ACC
E, DAT

SR
TE A
MA IS
A, FULL PRN
E, ENCLYTIC

SR
TE E
ITS FORM IS
A, OCS
E, ORUS
O, EITHER

SR
RST O

TE ПОЧАХЪ ЖЕ Е ПИСАТИ ВЪ Л-ТЪ 6564. А ОКОНЬЧАХЪ Е ВЪ Л-ТЪ 6565.

TE THIS READS

RUS771 RS,LESN

^I
A, HAVE BEGUN ... HAVE FINISHED ...
E, BEGAN ... FINISHED ...

SR
SE
SE
TE
SR
LE
LE
TE
E
THE TENSE OF THE VERBS IS _A_
PERSON _I_
NUMBER _E_
T OR F, BOTH ARE OCS

φ
WHICH OF THE TWO IS ORUS? _ЛОЧАХЪ_
IF IT WERE OCS, IT WOULD BE _ЛОЧАХЪ_
THE WORD E IS
A, AN EMPHATIC
E, A PRN

SR
TE
E
WHICH REFERS TO
A, THE GOSPEL
E, BEING WORTHY

SR
TE
A
IT IS
A, ACC PLUR
E, ACC SING

SR
E

TE
BY THE WAY, TO DETERMINE THE YEAR A.D., SUBTRACT 5508
FROM THE YEAR AS GIVEN IN THE ORUS, THUS FOR EXAMPLE,
6564 IS 1056 A.D.

RST
TE
*
НАПИСАХЪ ЖЕ ЕВ-ЛМЕ СЕ. РАБОУ Б-ЖИЮ СЯЮУ ВЪ КР-ШЕНИИ
ИОСИФЪ. А МРЬСКЪИ ОСТРОМИРЪ. БЛИЗКОУ СЯЮУ ИЗАСЛАВОУ
КЪНАЗОУ.

TE
T OR F, РАБОУ ... СЯЮУ IS A DAT ABSOLUTE

SR
TE
φ
THUS IT READS
^I WROTE THIS GOSPEL
A, FOR GOD'S SLAVE ..
E, AS GOD'S SLAVE ..

SR
TE
A
COPY THE CHRISTIAN NAME OF THE MAN FOR WHOM THIS WAS WRITTEN

LR
LE
TE
ИОСИФЪ
HIS SECULAR NAME _ОСТРОМИРЪ_
Б-ЖИЮ IS

A, VOC
E, POSS ADJ IN THE MASC DAT

SR
TE
E
GIVE THE IDEAL FORM OF THIS WORD
SR
TE
Б-Ж_БИО_
СЯЮУ IS

(THE LESSON CONTINUES)

BEG 772
TE THIS AND THE NEXT TWO LESSONS PRESENT READINGS
FROM THE CHRONICLES.

TR СЕ ПОВѢСТИ ВРЕМАНЬНѢИХЪ ЛѢТЪ, ОТКУДУ ЕСТЬ ПОШЛА РУСКАІА
ЗЕМЛІА, КТО В КІЕВѢ НАЧА ПЕРВѢЕ КНАЖИТИ, И ОТКУДУ РУСКАІА
ЗЕМЛІА СТАЛА ЕСТЬ.

TE СЕ MEANS
A, THESE
E, HERE ARE, LO

SR -Е-
TE -Е-СТЬ ПОШЛА
SE TENSE П-
SE NUMB -Е-
SE GEND -Ж-
TE НАЧА
SE TENSE -А-
TE ПЕРВѢЕ IS A COMPARATIVE
A, ADJ
E, ADV

SR -Е-
TE IT MODIFIES THE WORD
LR -КНАЖИТИ-

TE THIS REDACTION DATES FROM
A, BEFORE
E, AFTER
THE FALL OF THE JERS

SR -Е-
TE T OR F, THE FOLLOWING WORDS DEMONSTRATE THAT THE
JERS HAVE FALLEN

SR ВРЕМАНЬНѢИХЪ -Ф-
TE 'F' BECAUSE
A, OF 'E' INSTEAD OF 'B'
E, THE WEAK JERS ARE PRESENT AND ACCOUNTED FOR

SR -Е-
TE ПОШЛА -Т-
TE GIVE THE PRE-FALL FORM OF ПОШЛА

LR -ПОШЛА-
SR РУСКАІА -Т-
TE THE PRE-FALL FORM IS

LR -РУСЬСКАІА-
SR КТО -Т-
TE THE PRE-FALL FORM IS

LR -КЪТО-
TE T OR F, THE FORM КІЕВѢ IS EARLY ORUS

SR -Ф-
TE GIVE THE EARLY ORUS FORM OF КІЕВѢ
LR -КЪІЕВѢ-

TE THUS THIS REDACTION DATES FROM THE
A, XIVTH
E, XIIITH
CENTURY

SR _A_
TE INDEED, IT IS ADAPTED FROM THE 'LAURENTIAN CHRON',
1377, WHICH IS A COPY OF MUCH EARLIER MATERIAL.

RST
TE .
THE FOUNDING OF KIEV

TR ПОЛІАНОМЪ ЖЕ ЖИВШЕМЪ ОСОБЪ И ВОЛОДЪІОШЕМЪ РОДЪІ СВОИМИ,
ИЖЕ И ДО СЕЕ БРАТЬВЪ БАХОУ ПОЛІАНЕ, И ЖИВАХОУ КОЖДО СЪ
СВОИМЪ РОДОМЪ И НА СВОИХЪ МЪСТЪХЪ, ВЛАДЕІОШЕ КОЖДО РОДОМЪ
СВОИМЪ.

TE T OR F, ПОЛІАНОМЪ ЖЕ .. IS A DAT ABS.
SR -T_
TE -ОСОБЪ IS
A, AN ADJ
E, AN ADV

SR -E_
TE THE STEM OF ВОЛОДЪІОШЕМЪ IS
A, OCS
E, ORUS
O, A LITTLE BIT OF BOTH

SR -E_
TE SAME QUESTION, THE SUFFIX
SR -O_
TE THE COMPLETE OCS FORM WOULD BE
LR _ВЛАДЪІАШЕМЪ_
TE THE ORUS
LR _ВОЛОДЪІОЧЕМЪ_
TE MRUS PRESERVES THE
A, OCS
E, ORUS STEM

SR -A_
TE THE MRUS INF IS
LR _ВЛАДЕТЬ_
TE OLD OR NEW, THIS FORM GOVERNS WHAT CASE
SR -T_
TE AS EVIDENCED IN THE FIRST LINE BY WHAT TWO WORDS?
LR _РОДЪІ СВОИМИ_
TE БРАТЬВЪ
SE GEND _Ж_
SE NUMB _E_
SE CASE _P_
TE THIS FORM IS CORRECT FOR, A., OCS, E, ORUS
SR -E_

(THE LESSON CONTINUES)

