

Linguistic Metamorphoses of the Kievan Caves Paterikon

SERGEJUS TEMČINAS

Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore
sergejus.temcinas@flf.vu.lt
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6706-5963>

ANNOTATION. The article presents a general overview of the known linguistic versions of the Kievan Caves Paterikon, and concludes that the chronology of their origin does not correspond to the general line in the development of the linguistic situation in the East Slavic lands of the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth. The information presented below about two unknown Ruthenian translations of the Paterikon significantly changes the overall picture, which, after taking them into account, becomes much more logical and chronologically consistent. Each of the two Ruthenian versions newly introduced into scientific circulation is characterized in terms of its textual volume and the composition of the Paterikon stories contained in it, and the sources used for its creation.

KEYWORDS: Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth; Cyrillic manuscripts; multilingualism; Kievan Caves Paterikon.

The Kievan Caves Paterikon is the earliest original East Slavic literary work of the Paterika genre, the main part of which dates back to the first third of the 13th century¹. This detailed narrative on the most influential Kiev monastery

¹ For more details (including the editions), see: Конявская Елена Леонидовна, Башлыкова Марина Евгеньевна, „Киево-Печерский патерик“, in: Кирилл (ред.), *Православная энциклопедия*, т. 33, Москва: Православная энциклопедия, 2013, с. 91–96; Ісіченко

Received: 19/06/2023. **Accepted:** 07/09/2023.

Copyright © 2023 Sergejus Temčinas. Published by the Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore Press. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

as the main – for centuries – Russian religious and cultural center remained popular during the Middle Ages throughout the entire East Slavic territory: in Kievan, Lithuanian-Polish, and Muscovite Rus.

In its classic 15th-century form, the Paterikon consists of 38 discourses by different authors (some of them anonymous), while only 24 of them constitute the historical core of its text, later supplemented by 14 new discourses (as well as the Life of St Theodosius of Kiev, which also became an integral part of the Paterikon in some of its versions)².

Below, I will first give a survey of different textual and linguistic versions of this Paterikon, and then introduce two neglected Ruthenian versions, with a brief discussion of their importance for the linguistic development of this particular text in the form of conclusions.

1. ALREADY-KNOWN OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC, POLISH, AND RUTHENIAN VERSIONS

All discourses of the Kievan Caves Paterikon were originally written in Old Church Slavonic, which served as the only literary language in both Kievan and Muscovite Rus, while in Lithuanian-Polish Rus it was supplemented by the Ruthenian (Early Ukrainian = Early Belarusian) language in the mid-15th century³. In ecclesiastical writings, Ruthenian was only occasionally used as a language of instruction for the laity (*lingua ad homines*), while Old Church Slavonic continued to function as the only liturgical language (*lingua ad Deum*)⁴.

Igor, *Кієво-Печерський патерик у літературному процесі кінця XVI–початку XVIII ст. в Україні*, 2-е видання, Харків: Акта, 2015.

² For an English translation, see: Heppell Muriel (trans.), *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery with a Preface by Sir Dimitri Obolensky*, (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. English Translations, vol. 1), Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1989.

³ Темчин Сергей Юрьевич, „О времени и условиях становления русской мовы в качестве литературного языка“, in: Сяргей Мікалаевіч Запрудскі, Геннадзь Апанасавіч Цыхун (ред.), *Новае слова ў беларусістыцы. Мовазнаўства: Матэрыялы V Міжнароднага кангрэса беларусістаў (20–21 мая 2010 года)*, (Беларусіка = Albaruthenica, кн. 32), Мінск: Четыре четверти, 2012, с. 47–53.

⁴ Темчин Сергей Юрьевич, „Функционирование русской мовы и иерархия церковных текстов“, in: *Studia Russica*, t. 23, Budapest: ELTE, 2009, p. 226–234.

In contrast to Muscovite Rus, which remained monolingual in its ecclesiastical writings (where Old Church Slavonic continued to be used), the Ruthenian lands of the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth, due to obvious Western influences, gradually switched to a much more complex linguistic system, with four different languages functioning simultaneously in the local Church literature, two of them being endogenous by origin and written in Cyrillic – Old Church Slavonic (liturgical in function) and Ruthenian (secular in function), while the other two – Latin (for a highly educated audience) and Polish (for a more general readership) – being exogenous and written in the Latin script⁵.

According to this, all the linguistic versions of the Kievan Caves Paterikon can be classified into two groups, quite different in terms of their real or potential geographical distribution: East Slavia in general, or only Ruthenia (the East Slavic parts of the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth and the Hungarian Kingdom).

East Slavia: Old Church Slavonic redactions

The rich literary history of the Kievan Caves Paterikon is evidenced by the large number of editorial revisions. I list them below in chronological order, indicating the time, and, when possible, the place of their origin:

*the non-extant 13th-century original (Vladimir on the River Klyazma and Kiev);

Arsenian redaction, 1406 (Tver);

Theodosian redaction, the second quarter of the 15th century;

Main redaction, extant in manuscripts starting from the late 15th to the early 16th century;

First Cassian redaction, 1460 (Kiev);

Second Cassian redaction, 1462 (Kiev);

Joseph Trizna redaction, 1647–1656 (Kiev);

Sophronius redaction, 1655 (Kiev);

Innocent Giesel's printed edition (Kiev, 1661).

⁵ Temčinas Sergejus, „Języki kultury ruskiej w Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej“, in: Marzanna Kuczyńska (ed.), *Między Wschodem a Zachodem: Prawosławie i unia, (Kultura Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej w dialogu z Europą: hermeneutyka wartości, t. 11)*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2017, s. 81–120.

Although the majority of these redactions enjoyed a wide geographical distribution across East Slavia, they were produced in Kiev or by Kievan bookmen elsewhere (the exact places of origin of two of them remain unknown), except the Arsenian redaction, which was compiled in Tver.

Ruthenia: Polish, Ruthenian, and secondary Old Church Slavonic translations

Other linguistic varieties of the same Paterikon are restricted to a single Polish printed version, two or three partial manuscript translations from Polish into Ruthenian, and two secondary manuscript translations from Polish into Old Church Slavonic:

Polish printed edition by Syl'vestr Kosov (Kiev, 1635)⁶;

Two or three Ruthenian translations, made from the Polish printed edition and extant in several manuscripts from the second half of the 17th and the 18th century (only 12 discourses, including the Life of St Theodosius)⁷;

Two secondary Old Church Slavonic translations, the first made from the same Polish edition printed in the 17th century (the place of origin of this translation is unknown), and the second made in Kiev in 1823⁸.

The translations into Polish and Ruthenian undoubtedly appeared as a result of a certain linguistic “nostrification” of the Kievan Caves Paterikon,

⁶ Reproduction of the Polish edition supplemented with a modern Ukrainian translation: Сінкевич Наталія Олександрівна, *“Патерикон” Сильвестра Косова: переклад та дослідження пам'ятки*, Kyiv: Feniks, 2013.

⁷ Перетц Владимир Николаевич, „След украинского перевода Киево-Печерского патерика“, in: Владимир Николаевич Перетц, *Исследования и материалы по истории старинной украинской литературы XVI-XVIII вв.*, вып. 1, (Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности АН СССР, т. 101, вып. 2), Ленинград: Издательство Академии наук СССР, 1926, с. 92–100; Idem, „Киево-Печерский патерик в польском и украинском переводе“, in: *Славянская филология*, вып. 3, Москва: Издательство Академии наук СССР, 1958, с. 174–210.

⁸ Ольшевская Лидия Альфонсовна, „Типолого-текстологический анализ списков и редакций Киево-Печерского патерика“, in: Лидия Альфонсовна Ольшевская, Сергей Николаевич Травников, *Древнерусские патерики: Киево-Печерский патерик. Волоколамский патерик*, Москва: Наука, 1999, с. 298–299.

with the aim of making the text accessible to educated Ruthenians who did not have a sufficient knowledge of the Old Church Slavonic language.

However, the relative chronology of these translations is problematic, since it contradicts the historical development of the local sociolinguistic situation, because Ruthenian remained the main written language among the East Slavs (and Lithuanians) in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth until the mid-16th century, when the Polish language began to take over this function. Why, then, were the Ruthenian translations made not only later than the Polish one, but directly from it (and not from Old Church Slavonic), as was established by V. N. Peretz?

Theoretically, it could be assumed that the Ruthenian manuscript translations of the Polish printed version were made for a broader (democratic) local East Slavic audience, who did not have sufficient knowledge not only of Old Church Slavonic, but also of Polish. In this case, however, a serious problem arises, since before the widespread use of the Polish language among the Ruthenians (and Lithuanians) in the Commonwealth, such people formed an absolute majority among the local East Slavic population. So why did they not produce a Ruthenian version prior to the expansion of Polish in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania?

New manuscript evidence changes the general picture dramatically.

2. PREVIOUSLY UNKNOWN SEMI-COMPLETE RUTHENIAN TRANSLATION OF THE ARSENIAN REDACTION

I recently came across a Cyrillic manuscript from the late 16th century, originating from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It once belonged to the Zhyrovichy Monastery (now in Belarus)⁹ and contains, among other texts, an unknown Ruthenian translation of a significant part of the Kievan Caves Paterikon (St Petersburg, Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Pavel

⁹ Морозова Надежда Афанасьевна, „Предварительный список рукописей, принадлежавших библиотеке Жировичского монастыря“, in: Надежда Афанасьевна Морозова (ред.), *Славянская письменность Великого княжества Литовского. Характерные черты и специфические особенности: сборник статей* (№ 37), Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2014, c. 216.

Dobrokhoto collection [f. 37], No 18, f. 247v–274v)¹⁰. Some other Ruthenian texts (translated from Old Church Slavonic and Czech) of the manuscript have been published¹¹.

The late-16th century codex clearly predates the 1635 Polish edition of the Paterikon. A comparison of the newly discovered Ruthenian version with the Old Church Slavonic redactions of the Kievan Caves Paterikon revealed that its main part goes back to the Arsenian redaction (elaborated in Tver in 1406)¹², which is the earliest of the currently known editions of the text¹³. This gives us the *terminus post quem* for dating the newly identified translation, but it is redundant: the earliest translations of Old Church Slavonic ecclesiastical texts into Ruthenian do not predate the mid-15th century, and there is no reason to assume that this particular case is an exception.

The translation in question must have been completed during the century (from the mid-15th to the mid-16th century) immediately preceding the 1569 Union of Lublin and the corresponding transfer of the vast East Slavic regions from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the Kingdom of Poland. This chronology allows us to associate the considered translation with the East Slavs of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (and not the Kingdom of Poland).

¹⁰ Brief descriptions of the manuscript: Копанев Александр Ильич, Покровская Вера Федоровна, Кукушкина Маргарита Владимировна, *Исторические сборники XV–XVII вв., (Описание Рукописного отдела Библиотеки Академии наук СССР, т. 3, вып. 2)*, (second half of the 16th century), Москва–Ленинград: Наука, 1965, с. 133–137; Ульяновский Василь Иринархович, *Колекція та архів єпископа Павла Доброхотова, (Науково-довідкові видання з історії України, вип. 17)*, (No 35, late 16th century), Київ: Академія наук України–Інститут української археографії, 1992, с. 86; Темчин Сергей Юрьевич, „Неизвестный перевод чешского Луцидария на русскую мову (1563 г.) и его древнейший список конца XVI в.“, in: *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, kn. 51, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2021, p. 185–192.

¹¹ Темчин Сергей Юрьевич, „Руськомовная версия древнерусского толкового канона на Пасху и функционирование русской мовы“, in: *Slavistica Vilnensis*, 2020, vol. 65 (1), p. 131–144; Idem, „Слово о сотворении всего света от початка и до конца“: Руськомовный перевод (1563 г.) чешского Луцидария в списке конца XVI в.“, in: *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, kn. 51, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2021, p. 193–204.

¹² It has been edited: Абрамович Дмитрий Иванович (ред.), *Патерик Киевского Печерского монастыря, (Памятники славяно-русской письменности, кн. 2)*, Санкт-Петербург: Императорская Археографическая комиссия, 1911, с. 137–219.

¹³ For more details concerning this redaction, see: Коняевская Елена Леонидовна, *Очерки по истории тверской литературы XIV–XV вв.*, (Библиотека журнала Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики, кн. 1), Москва: Свой круг, 2007, с. 200–225.

An examination of the spelling and linguistic and textual features of the Ruthenian version of the Paterikon showed that this is a later copy of an earlier (non-extant or still untraced) antigraph and made it possible to determine the “Belarusian” (in contemporary concepts) character at least of the extant manuscript, and, probably, of the translation itself. This is of particular interest, since it testifies to the linguistic “nostrification” of the text (Kievan in both origin and nature) performed by the Ruthenians of the northern (that is, the future Belarusian) region of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Since the main cultural center of this region was Vilnius, the translation in question may be provisionally associated with this capital city.

The study of the textual structure of the newly discovered version revealed its heterogeneity. The main part is a translation of the Arsenian redaction of the Paterikon, and contains 20 discourses in the following order (without any numbering in the manuscript): Nos 1 and 10, 2–3, 4, 5–6, 29, 30, 31, 26, 32, 33, 35, 12, 34, 36, 21–23 according to the generally accepted numbering of the chapters in the Kievan Caves Paterikon. This part is preceded by the epistles of St Theodosius of the Caves to Prince Yaroslav (in fact Iziaslav I, the son of Yaroslav) of Kiev.

These are followed by an additional part, consisting of six texts on the Kievan Caves Monastery (four of them are integral parts of the Paterikon), extracted from the Lengthy version of the Plain Synaxarion¹⁴, sometimes along with an indication of the corresponding calendar dates: May 7, St Anthony of the Caves (discourse No 7); May 3, the Assumption of St Theodosius of the Caves (discourse No 8); undated (in fact May 3), the tale of St Theodosius’ life (the same discourse); May 10, the tale about a monk leaving the monastery (St Theodosius’ Vita); undated (in fact May 26), the tale of how the devil led people out of the church (discourse No 12); May 23, the translation of the relics of St Leontius of Rostov (not a part of the Paterikon, but thematically related to it, since St Leontius was a monk at the Kievan Caves Monastery before becoming a bishop of Rostov and Suzdal).

The Synaxarion contains one more entry in the same cycle (about the monk Isaiah for April 27), but there is no need to include it here, since the

¹⁴ Лосева Ольга Викторовна, *Жития русских святых в составе древнерусских прологов XII-первой трети XV веков*, Москва: Рукописные памятники Древней Руси, 2009, с. 215–224.

corresponding discourse (No 36) is present in the preceding main part, translated directly from the Arsenian redaction of the Paterikon.

It is obvious that the translator into Ruthenian tried to supplement the main part of the Kievan Caves Paterikon at his disposal by adding Synaxarion texts which describe the Kievan Caves Monastery and go back to the Primary Chronicle (under 1051 and 1074), as well as the life of St Theodosius of the Caves.

Thus, the Ruthenian translator must have had access to a manuscript copy of the Kievan Caves Paterikon in its Arsenian redaction, which contained only the 20 discourses listed above, probably in the same order.

3. THE NEGLECTED FRAGMENTARY RUTHENIAN TRANSLATION OF 1660 MADE FROM ONE OF THE TWO CASSIAN REDACTIONS

Another, quite fragmentary, Ruthenian translation from Old Church Slavonic was made from one of the two Cassian redactions by the Ukrainian Orthodox priest Gregory Dmitrievych in Sharhorod (now in the Vinnytsia Oblast of Ukraine) in 1660 (Moscow, Russian State Library, Vukol M. Undolskiy collection [f. 310], No 527, f. 236v–240v; 241v–242v)¹⁵.

The manuscript contains only six discourses from the Kievan Caves Paterikon in a quite unusual textual form: two of them, about Moses the Hungarian (discourse No 30) and Isaac (discourse No 36), are presented in an abridged form, while the other four texts, about the monks Mark (discourse No 32), Spyridon (discourse No 34), Prochorus (discourse No 31) and Agapetus (discourse No 27), are reported in extremely short summaries.

The manuscript is known from at least the second half of the 19th century, but has not yet attracted scholarly attention.

¹⁵ For a brief description of the manuscript: Ундольский Вукол Михайлович, *Славяно-русские рукописи В. М. Ундольского*, Москва: Московский Публичный и Румянцевский музей, 1870, с. 380.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The two newly introduced Ruthenian versions of the Kievan Caves Paterikon change the linguistic history of its text dramatically, and lead us to three main conclusions.

1) Linguistic metamorphoses of the Paterikon started not with the Polish translation published in 1635, but as early as the mid-15th to the late 16th century, when the text was first translated from Old Church Slavonic into Ruthenian. This is completely in line with the general development of the linguistic situation in the East Slavic lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Nevertheless, the printed Polish version contributed substantially to the linguistic history of the Paterikon, giving birth to new translations into both Ruthenian and Old Church Slavonic.

2) The secondary translations into Polish and Old Church Slavonic remained unique or isolated in the linguistic history of the Kievan Caves Paterikon, while translations into Ruthenian (one of them being in fact an adaptation) were made at least four times from different linguistic versions: two Old Church Slavonic (the Arsenian and the Cassian) redactions, and the 1635 Polish translation. The Ruthenian versions were produced from two different – Old Church Slavonic and Polish – versions (which is a unique case in the history of this literary work).

The Ruthenian translations surpass all others both in their number and in the number of linguistic originals used, and thus represent the mainstream in the process of linguistic adaptations of the Paterikon.

3) The Ruthenian versions are incomplete, but the earliest one shows the translator's efforts to make his version as complete as possible by extracting some missing texts from the Old Church Slavonic Synaxarion. The 1660 translation, however, shows the opposite intention, to reduce the number of Paterikon discourses, and to abridge their text as much as possible. This makes the Ruthenian versions the most diverse, and may be a natural sign of the cultural polycentricity of the East Slavic lands of the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth.

All linguistic versions of the Kievan Caves Paterikon show numerous attempts by the East Slavic population to linguistically nostrify its text in the dynamically changing social and linguistic environment, and illustrate the

literary multilingualism of Ruthenian culture. Three out of four of its written languages (Ruthenian, Polish and Old Church Slavonic) were actively involved in the linguistic history of the Paterikon, and only Latin remained separate due to its elitist nature.

CYRILLIC MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

Ruthenian miscellany, late 16th century: St Petersburg, Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Pavel Dobrokhoto collection (f. 37), No 18.

The Small Bible by Gregory Dmitrievych, Sharhorod, 1660: Moscow, Russian State Library, Vukol M. Undolskiy collection (f. 310), No 527.

LITERATURE

Heppell Muriel (trans.), *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery with a Preface by Sir Dimitri Obolensky*, (*Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. English Translations*, vol. 1), Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1989.

Temčinas Sergejus, „Języki kultury ruskiej w Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej“, in: Marzanna Kuczyńska (ed.), *Między Wschodem a Zachodem: Prawosławie i unia, (Kultura Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej w dialogu z Europą: hermeneutyka wartości*, t. 11), Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2017, s. 81–120.

Абрамович Дмитрий Иванович (ред.), *Патерик Киевского Печерского монастыря, (Памятники славяно-русской письменности*, кн. 2), Санкт-Петербург: Императорская Археографическая комиссия, 1911.

Isichenko Igor, *Києво-Печерський патерик у літературному процесі кінця XVI–початку XVIII ст. в Україні*, 2-е видання, Харків: Акта, 2015.

Конявская Елена Леонидовна, *Очерки по истории тверской литературы XIV–XV вв., (Библиотека журнала Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*, кн. 1), Москва: Свой круг, 2007.

Конявская Елена Леонидовна, Башлыкова Марина Евгеньевна, „Києво-Печерський патерик“, in: Кирилл (ред.), *Православная энциклопедия*, т. 33, Москва: Православная энциклопедия, 2013, с. 91–96.

Копанев Александр Ильич, Покровская Вера Федоровна, Кукушкина Маргарита Владимировна, *Исторические сборники XV–XVII вв., (Описание Рукописного отдела Библиотеки Академии наук СССР*, т. 3, вып. 2), Москва–Ленинград: Наука, 1965.

Лосева Ольга Викторовна, *Жития русских святых в составе древнерусских прологов XII-первой трети XV веков*, Москва: Рукописные памятники Древней Руси, 2009.

Морозова Надежда Афанасьевна, „Предварительный список рукописей, принадлежавших библиотеке Жировичского монастыря“, in: Надежда Афанасьевна Морозова (ред.), *Славянская письменность Великого княжества Литовского*.

- Характерные черты и специфические особенности: сборник статей*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2014, с. 205–224.
- Ольшевская Лидия Альфонсовна, „Типолого-текстологический анализ списков и редакций Киево-Печерского патерика“, in: Лидия Альфонсовна Ольшевская, Сергей Николаевич Травников, *Древнерусские патерики: Киево-Печерский патерик. Волоколамский патерик*, Москва: Наука, 1999, с. 253–315.
- Перетц Владимир Николаевич, „След украинского перевода Киево-Печерского патерика“, in: Владимир Николаевич Перетц, *Исследования и материалы по истории старинной украинской литературы XVI–XVIII вв.*, вып. 1, (Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности АН СССР, т. 101, вып. 2), Ленинград: Издательство Академии наук СССР, 1926, с. 92–100.
- Перетц Владимир Николаевич, „Киево-Печерский патерик в польском и украинском переводе“, in: *Славянская филология*, вып. 3, Москва: Издательство Академии наук СССР, 1958, с. 174–210.
- Сінкевич Наталія Олександрівна, „Патерикон“ Сильвестра Косова: переклад та дослідження пам'ятки, Kyiv: Feniks, 2013.
- Темчин Сергей Юрьевич, „Функционирование русской мовы и иерархия церковных текстов“, in: *Studia Russica*, t. 23, Budapest: ELTE, 2009, p. 226–234.
- Темчин Сергей Юрьевич, „О времени и условиях становления русской мовы в качестве литературного языка“, in: Сяргей Мікалаевіч Запрудскі, Геннадзь Апана-савіч Цыхун (ред.), *Новае слова ў беларусістыцы. Мовазнаўства: Матэрыялы V Міжнароднага кангрэса беларусістаў (20–21 мая 2010 года)*, (Беларусіка = Albaruthenica, кн. 32), Мінск: Четыре четверти, 2012, с. 47–53.
- Темчин Сергей Юрьевич, „Руськомовная версия древнерусского толкового канона на Пасху и функционирование русской мовы“, in: *Slavistica Vilnensis*, 2020, vol. 65(1), p. 131–144.
- Темчин Сергей Юрьевич, „Неизвестный перевод чешского Луцидария на руську мову (1563 г.) и его древнейший список конца XVI в.“, in: *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, kn. 51, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2021, p. 185–192.
- Темчин Сергей Юрьевич, „Слово о сотворении всего света от початка и до конца“: Руськомовный перевод (1563 г.) чешского Луцидария в списке конца XVI в.“, in: *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, kn. 51, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2021, p. 193–204.
- Ульяновський Василь Іринархович, *Колекція та архів єпископа Павла Доброхотова*, (Науково-довідкові видання з історії України, вип. 17), Київ: Академія наук України–Інститут української археографії, 1992.
- Ундольский Вукол Михайлович, *Славяно-русские рукописи В.М. Ундольского*, Москва: Московский Публичный и Румянцевский музей, 1870.

Linguistic Metamorphoses of the Kievan Caves Paterikon

Summary

The two newly discovered Ruthenian versions of the manuscript of the Kievan Caves Paterikon change the linguistic history of this text fundamentally and lead to three main conclusions.

1) The linguistic metamorphoses of this work began not with the Polish translation published in Kyiv in 1635, but as early as the middle of the fifteenth century to the end of the sixteenth century, when it was first translated from Old Church Slavonic into Ruthenian. This is fully in line with the overall evolution of the linguistic situation in the Eastern Slavic lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Still, the printed Polish version contributed significantly to the linguistic history of the Paterikon, prompting new translations into both Ruthenian and Church Slavonic.

2) The secondary translations into Polish and Church Slavonic remained unique or isolated in the linguistic history of the Kievan Caves Paterikon, while the translations into Ruthenian (one of which is an adaptation) were made at least four times from different linguistic versions: two Church Slavonic versions (of Arsenii and of Kassian) and the Polish translation of 1635. The Ruthenian versions are thus translated from two different languages, Old Church Slavonic and Polish, and it is a unique case in the history of this literary work.

The Ruthenian translations of Paterikon outnumber all the others both in number and in the linguistic originals used for the translations, and are therefore considered to be the main direction of linguistic adaptation of this work.

3) The Ruthenian versions are not inexhaustive, but the earliest one demonstrates the translator's attempts to make the text as exhaustive as possible, borrowing some missing parts from the ecclesiastical Slavonic Synaxarion. The 1660 translation, however, shows the opposite desire to reduce the number of narratives that make up the Paterikon and to shorten their text as much as possible. This circumstance makes the Ruthenian versions the most diverse and may be a natural manifestation of the cultural polycentricity of the East Slavic lands of the Republic of the Two Nations.

The multiple attempts of the East Slavs to linguistically nostrify the text and adapt it to a dynamically changing socio-linguistic environment are evident in all the linguistic versions of the Kievan Caves Paterikon and illustrate the multilingualism of Ruthenian writing. Three of its four written languages (Ruthenian, Polish, and Church Slavonic) were actively involved in the linguistic history of this work, and Latin alone was left out because of its elitist nature.

KEYWORDS: Republic of the Two Nations; Cyrillic manuscripts; multilingualism; Kievan Caves Paterikon.

Kijevo Olų paterikono kalbinės metamorfozės

Santrauka

Dvi naujai išaiškintos rusėniškos Kijevo Olų Paterikono rankraštinės versijos iš esmės keičia šio teksto kalbinę istoriją ir leidžia daryti tris pagrindines išvadas.

1) Šio kūrinio kalbinės metamorfozės prasidėjo ne nuo 1635 metais Kijeve publikuoto vertimo į lenkų kalbą, o dar XV a. viduryje – XVI a. pabaigoje, kai kūrinyje pirmą kartą buvo išverstas iš senosios bažnytinės slavų kalbos į rusėnų kalbą. Tai visiškai atitinka bendrą kalbinės situacijos raidą LDK rytų slavų žemėse. Vis dėlto spausdinta lenkiška versija labai prisidėjo prie Paterikono kalbinės istorijos, paskatinusi naujų vertimų tiek į rusėnų, tiek į bažnytinę slavų kalbą atsiradimą.

2) Antriniai vertimai į lenkų ir bažnytinę slavų kalbas išliko unikalūs ar izoliuoti Kijevo Olų Paterikono kalbinėje istorijoje, o vertimai į rusėnų kalbą (vienas iš jų yra adaptacija) buvo atlikti mažiausiai keturis kartus iš skirtingų kalbinių versijų: dviejų bažnytinių slavų (Arsenijaus ir Kasijono) redakcijų ir 1635 m. lenkiško vertimo. Taigi rusėniškosios versijos verstos iš dviejų skirtingų – senosios bažnytinės slavų ir lenkų – kalbų (tai unikalūs atvejai šio literatūros kūrinio istorijoje).

Paterikono rusėniški vertimai lenkia visus kitus tiek savo skaičiumi, tiek vertimams naudotų kalbinių originalų skaičiumi, todėl laikytini pagrindine šio kūrinio kalbinės adaptacijos kryptimi.

3) Rusėniškosios versijos yra neišsamios, tačiau ankstyviausioji rodo vertėjo pastangas pateikti kuo išsamesnį tekstą, paėmus kai kurias trūkstamas dalis iš bažnytinio slavų Sinaksario. Tačiau 1660 m. vertimas rodo priešingą norą – sumažinti Paterikoną sudarančių pasakojimų skaičių ir kiek įmanoma labiau sutrumpinti jų tekstą. Ši aplinkybė daro rusėniškas versijas pačiomis įvairiausiomis ir gali būti natūrali Abiejų Tautų Respublikos rytų slavų žemių kultūrinio policentriškumo apraiška.

Visose kalbinėse Kijevo Olų paterikono versijose matomi rytų slavų daugybiniai bandymai lingvistiškai nostrifikuoti jo tekstą ir pritaikyti jį dinamiškai besikeičiančiai socialinei ir kalbinei aplinkai ir iliustruoja rusėnų raštijos daugiakalbiškumą. Trys jos rašomosios kalbos iš keturių (rusėnų, lenkų ir bažnytinę slavų) buvo aktyviai įtrauktos į šio kūrinio kalbinę istoriją, ir vien lotynų kalba liko šio proceso nuošalyje dėl savo elitinio pobūdžio.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: Abiejų Tautų Respublika; kiriliniai rankraščiai; daugiakalbystė; Kijevo olų Paterikonas.