

“Secondary text” as a communicative and cognitive phenomenon in the Old Ukrainian language of the second half of 17th century (in the manuscript “Lives of the Saints”)

J. Oleshko*

Institute of Philology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

*Corresponding author. E-mail: juliaoleshko@gmail.com

Paper received 09.08.15; Accepted for publication 21.08.15.

Abstract. The present paper deals with a “secondary text” as a specific characteristic of manuscripts, in this case, in the “Lives of Saints”. Since the text has traces of work of several scribes, it is relevant to define and differentiate between a “primary” and a “secondary” text, i.e., the basic one and the one with various sorts of “intervention”: omission, addition, and substitution. The changes made by the “secondary author” explicate his “otherness” in consciousness and language. Therefore, the paper analyzes the communicative and cognitive characteristics of the “secondary author” deduced from the text.

Keywords: “secondary text”, “secondary author”, “intervention”, manuscript lives of the saints, Old Ukrainian language of the second half of 17th century

Introduction. Hagiographic literature has been spread in the Slavonic world just after the Christianization. This segment of religious literature has from the very beginning stood out as the syncretism of powerful content and artistic form. First, Bulgarian translations of Byzantine texts, the lives of saints have soon become translated, compiled and produced on the East Slavonic lands. Although the texts were to conform to the main principles of the genre, they were much more free than other confessional texts.

In the 17th century, on the Ukrainian lands the need to enrich the church literature has grown, which was a reaction to the Union of Brest (1596). In order to oppose Greek Catholicism, Orthodox scholars and church officials had to strengthen the authority of Orthodox Christianity. In terms of book publishing, this period has yielded many unique and important texts, which have further greatly contributed to the development of the language and the culture as a whole. However, during the period of 20th century, religious studies was prohibited since the official Soviet ideology was atheistic. Nowadays, the renaissance of scientific study of historical texts, including hagiography, can be traced.

Materials and Methods. This research deals with the manuscript “Lives of the Saints” (second half of the 17th century), which comes from the Mohyliv monastery. It comprises the lives of holy fathers for six months (March-August) – 642 sheets of charter and mostly cursive writing. In the Description of the Manuscript Collections in Kiev, Petrov (1896) suggests this is a translation of “Żywoty Świętych” of the Polish jesuit Piotr Skarga, made by the famous Ukrainian writer Joanicus Haliatovsky, yet this has not been proven. Nevertheless, the contents of the mentioned works are not exactly the same. This means that even if the manuscript’s author used Skarga’s book, it was one of the sources of his creativity. As long as it is not the task of this paper to define the materials which helped the author complete their collection of lives, we can only say the scribes used to filter the texts they were surrounded with, to pick those ideas which they believed to be relevant for their product. This is what van Dijk calls epistemic machine, a mental device which regulates what is epistemically appropriate to the situation (2013).

In addition, from the two modes of hagiography which Rapp (2015) offers to identify, the present manuscript belongs to the second mode, “Text as message”. Both the author and the audience are active. The form of the text is as important as its contents. The text is an embodiment and conveyor of the message. The saint’s life, sufferings and deeds are celebrated due to the speaker’s delivery and the audience’s perception.

Unfortunately, we do not own the information of how many people took part in the creation of this manuscript, yet we can infer from the ink and script that they were two or more. Therefore, we suggest to differentiate between the “primary author” (the one who has written the main text) and the “secondary author” (these could be and evidently are several scribes who have made changes). Accordingly, the text is divided into primary and secondary. The term “secondary text” has been developed by literary theorists to cover such phenomena as a text translation or adaptation, as well as epigonism and fanfiction. However, we will use this term as a specific feature of manuscripts, namely, the collections of religious texts which have been kept in monasteries. This research aims to find out the reasons of appearance of the “secondary text”.

Results. Given the fact that the text has not remained the same, we may assume that this manuscript was actively used. On the margin of the seventh page, one can see the following message: **Отступи сіа листы уставные, ... пиши скорописные** (Skip these charter pages, ... write cursive). Hypothetically, this note demonstrates communication between the abbot (or other church patron) and the compiler. Perhaps, the manuscript (the primary text), or at least its first part, has been copied from another source. We can also conclude that some of the lives have been prepared to be included in another manuscript or a printed book: there are some corrections made purely of graphic nature, such as the corrections of capitalization and punctuation. All this implies that the text was of great significance to its owners; on the other hand, it was not an untouchable entity like the canonical literature. About a third of the texts have been “intervened” into, and, naturally, the degree of “intervention” varies. The question is, how we shall treat these

texts? How did the “secondary author” choose what to change and what leave untouched? Since there are no apparent answers, we may assume that the “secondary text” was rather created by a priest than by an ordinary monk. While preparing his speech for some occasion, the priest used to pick the life of a saint and proofread it. If it did not correspond with the mental model of the life of a saint formed in the speaker’s consciousness, he took responsibility to change the text and became its co-author. The “secondary author” was changing the text as though it was his own product. Thus, it had to match his knowledge and experience as well as adhere to the socio-cultural norms of that time. As a result, the “secondary author” resorted to different means “to tailor an ‘obsolete’ manuscript to the requirements of a new audience” (Snijders, 2014).

Using different criteria, the cases of the “secondary author’s” “intervention” can be divided into several groups:

- Omission, addition, and substitution;
- Marginal notes and in-text corrections;
- Corrections which directly influence the text to be proclaimed, personal notes, and purely graphic editing.

As a result of research, the following are the most demonstrative phenomena of text “intervention” which comprise the “secondary text”:

1. Substitution of Polonizms (Polish language borrowings) with the Ukrainian equivalents. In most cases, the lexemes do not have any difference in connotation; they are the exact translations: *штукү* substituted with *хитрост* (trick, cunning), *звѣтяжити* substituted with *завити* (overcome) (p. 20), *приємност товарнскүю* substituted with *любов братерскүю* (brotherly love) (p. 172). However, this process was not consistent: *злота* substituted with *золота* (gold) (p. 2), but *серебра* (silver) (p. 2) and *зотѣ* (gold) (p. 3) are left with no changing. Returning to the 17th century, when the primary text was created, there was a tendency to borrow polonizms into the Old Ukrainian language. It was as a result of both linguistic and extralinguistic factors: genealogical relationship of languages and their close contacts as well as Reformation movements and political influence (Hontaruk, 2004). Now, evidently in 18th century or later, the Polonizms are becoming archaic; thus, by resorting to substitution, the speaker intends to renovate the text but misses many cases, as Polish lexemes apparently fit his linguistic consciousness.

2. The similar process is the substitution of Church Slavonic lexemes: *рекү* substituted with *мовлю* (say) (p. 35), *исцеленіе* substituted with *вздоровленя* (healing) (p. 40). By doing so, the speaker implies that the bookish language is not what is commonly used by his target audience. Accordingly, he chooses those lexemes which would be easy to understand. This phenomenon indicates the speaker’s intention to expand his audience so that even common people could comprehend what he is talking about.

3. In line with the latter phenomenon, the secondary author decides to substitute old grammatical forms with the new ones. For instance, it can be noticed in the form of participle (*царствүющү* → *царствүючомү* “reigning” (p. 5) – the suffix has been changed) and Perfect verb form (*есмы*

визналѣ → *визналѣ* “have recognized” (p. 601) – the auxiliary verb has been omitted). Such devices are actualizing the text; it becomes up-to-date and, thus, influential.

4. There are also many cases of substitution of lexemes with changing in modality, which implies the difference in the attitude of the speakers to the utterance. Let us compare the pair examples, where (a) is from the “primary text”, and (b) is from the “secondary text”:

(a) **За сего свѣта роскоши... люде... великіе и срогіе мѹки... терпѣти маюут** (p. 5). For this world’s luxuries, people have to suffer a great torment.

(b) **За сего свѣта роскоши... люде... великіе и срогіе мѹки... терпѣти бѹдѹт** (p. 5). For this world’s luxuries, people will suffer a great torment.

The idea of obligation in (a) has been changed to the idea of inevitable future (b).

(a) **(Онѣ) хотѣлѣ мене з ангеловыхъ рѹкъ вырвати, але не посмѣлѣ** (p. 3). (He) wanted to tear me from the angel’s arms but did not dare to.

(b) **(Онѣ) хотѣлѣ мене з ангеловыхъ рѹкъ вырвати, але не моглѣ** (p. 3). (He) wanted to tear me from the angel’s arms but was not able to.

In (a), the Moor does not have enough courage to tear the saint from the angel’s hands, but in (b), he is physically disable to do it.

(a) **Законѣ нашѣ повелѣвает** (p. 5). Our law commands.

(b) **Законѣ нашѣ кажет** (p. 5). Our law says.

Strict imperative in (a) has been changed to the neutral messaging in (b). Moreover, in (a), the focus is on modus while it is on dictum (the information which follows the given utterance) in (b).

(a) **(Я) васѣ жадаю о святүю молитвү** (p. 4). (I) want you to pray.

(b) **(Я) васѣ прошү о святүю молитвү** (p. 4). (I) ask you to pray.

In the utterances, the extent of volition differs: (a) emphasizes the strong desire of the speaker while (b) is rather neutral.

1. Apparently, the speaker tends to be discreet and laconic. He substitutes and omits the expressive lexics.

(a) **Викентій... злый и барзо срогій на христіаны гонитель** (p. 9). Vincentius... an evil and very stern persecutor of Christians.

(b) **Викентій... великій на христіаны гонитель** (p. 9). Vincentius... a great persecutor of Christians.

Remarkably, (a) contains Polonizms (*барзо срогій*), which could be translated in Ukrainian. However, this is one more proof for our suggestion made in the Point 1: the “secondary author” does not draw the line between the Polish and Ukrainian vocabulary, rather he treats Polonizms as archaisms. And in this case, not because the lexics is Polish but because it is expressive, he does not accept it.

(a) **(Я) зъгрѣшилъ къ тебѣ розмовляючи скверными устами нечистыи речи** (p. 5). (I) have sinned by telling you the impious words with my bad mouth.

(b) **(Я) зъгрѣшилъ къ тебѣ мовячи нечистыи речи** (p. 5). (I) have sinned by saying to you the impious words.

In (a), the accent is on the object and instrument of action (**скверными устами нечистыи речи**). This accent works due to the accumulation of attributes with similar negative meaning (impious, bad). In (b), the accent is moved to the action.

(a) **Германъ... втпровадилъ еѣ до монастыря, въ котором през дванадцат мѣсяцей перемешкала** (p. 4). Herman had sent her to the monastery where she lived for twelve months.

(b) **Германъ... втпровадилъ еѣ до монастыря, въ котором през рокъ перемешкала** (p. 4). Herman had sent her to the monastery where she lived for a year.

In (a), the speaker emphasizes the duration (**дванадцат мѣсяцей**) while in (b) he gives a normal name of the time length (**рокъ**).

(a) **(Онъ) вбиблиотеку великую собрал в которон было сто двадцет тысячей книг** (p. 324). (He) had collected a library where there were 120,000 books.

(b) **(Онъ) вбиблиотеку великую собрал в которон было немало книг** (p. 324). (He) had collected a library where there were many books.

Like in the previous example, (a) emphasizes the huge (though maybe exaggerated) amount while (b) mentions an indefinitive quantity, thus removing the focus from it.

2. Avoidance of colloquial language, which is also emotive and, in the opinion of the “secondary author”, does not correspond to the genre requirements.

(a) **Ямъ естемъ с пелюхъ християнин** (p. 601). I am Christian from the cradle.

(b) **Естемъ с дитинства християнин** (p. 601). I am Christian from my childhood.

In addition to the slight difference in the meaning, (a) is more emphatic due to the idiom used.

(a) **... твои ся катовнѣ не бою** (p. 601). I am not afraid of your tortures.

(b) **... твоихъ мѣкъ не бою** (p. 601). I am not afraid of your sorrows.

Again, (a) evokes more vivid images in the recipient’s consciousness.

(a) **чаровникъ або попъ поганскій** (301). Magician or a pagan pope

(b) **жрецъ** (301). Oracle

(a) contains not only the informative component but also the speaker’s attitude to the notion.

3. Besides the rather subjective changes made by the “secondary author”, he tends to clarify and specify and ad-

heres to the ‘ad fontes’ principle. For instance, in the “Life of Paul”, he mentions that this text refers to Isaiah 66 (p. 33). In the “Life of Sophronius”, the saint is names as the Patriarch of Alexandria (p. 53). However, the speaker corrects ‘Alexandria’ to ‘Jerusalem’ and adds the name of the ruler’s wife. The “secondary author” feels free with the in-text citations: he either broadens or shortens them, either adds or deletes at all. This demonstrates his education and the ability to refer to the authoritative sources where necessary.

4. In case the speaker finds the ideas expressed in the text vague and presupposes a misunderstanding may occur, he adds explanations.

(a) **Вбач землю як широка ест и як много мает речий дивныхъ, а еднак то зровнятися з щастям людеи вѣрныхъ не может** (p. 36). Look at the earth: how wide it is and how many wonderful things it has.

(b) **Вбач землю як широка ест и як много мает речий дивныхъ, а еднак то зровнятися з щастям людеи вѣрныхъ не может; бо то все минающе, а то там нигды не ұтавающе** (p. 36). Look at the earth: how wide it is and how many wonderful things it has, yet this cannot be compared to the happiness of believers, since all this is passing, and that is never-melting.

Without doubt, (b) is more extensive and hence more intelligible. Additionally, the priest might have gestured during his proclamation: “All this,” he points near him, “is passing, and that”, he points up, “is never-melting”. Though, such additions are rather rare in the “secondary text”.

5. For the effective proclamation, the “secondary author” has worked on the syntactic structure of the sentences and made some changes. For instance, he changes word order (which is however not connected with inversion in the “primary text”) and phrase order. To illustrate, consider the following example:

(a) **Вный презвитеръ ... показовалъ о роскошахъ и о добрахъ небесныхъ, которыи для справедливыхъ, и теж о мѣкахъ печелныхъ которые для грѣшныхъ людей сѣтъ наготованы** (p. 2). That presbyter ... was speaking about the heavenly luxuries and goods, which are for the fair, and also about the infernal sufferings, which are prepared for the sinners.

(b) **Вный презвитеръ ... показовалъ о мѣкахъ печелныхъ которые для грѣшныхъ людей сѣтъ наготованы, и теж о роскошахъ и о добрахъ небесныхъ, которыи для справедливыхъ** (p. 2). That presbyter ... was speaking about the infernal sufferings, which are prepared for the sinners, and also about the heavenly luxuries and goods, which are for the fair.

The speaker probably uses a psychological trick by putting in the second place that concept which is subconsciously chosen by every person. Furthermore, the negatively valenced concepts are much stronger than the positive ones; consequently, the latter should be put at the end of the phrase in order to keep balance.

6. Naturally, the mistakes (mostly cases of misspelling) are corrected in the manuscript. While preparing for the oral presentation, the priest has marked pauses and intonation so that he could speak comfortably. For his own use as a reader, he has made some notes, such as a short summary of a paragraph or a page written on the margin. This kind of work is intended for another addressee, the priest or monk (scribe) himself. Therefore, some of the marks are not clear to anyone, except them.

Conclusions. The manuscript “Lives of the Saints” has not remained stable during the period of its functioning. Conditionally, its text can be divided into primary and secondary. The latter has been the subject matter of this study. The “secondary text” represents that variant of text which comprises different sorts of “intervention” made in the basic

text. Since it is impossible to define the number of scribes who have worked on this manuscript, we differentiate between the “primary author”, who has written the basic text, and the “secondary author”, the collective supposed person (perhaps, two or three men) who has made changes in the text. As far as this manuscript fixes discrepancies in word choice, sentence structure, word order, etc., it shows discriminate communicative and cognitive characteristics of the authors. Obviously, the socio-cultural context has changed; the secondary author’s epistemic background, intentions, and audience are different. As a result, the secondary text has such characteristics as discreetness, laconicism, inclination for the neutral (neither bookish nor colloquial) literary language, publicism, and the accuracy of in-text citations.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hontaruk, L. (2004). The Character of Language Borrowings from Polish into Ukrainian (16th – First Part of the 17th Century). *Problemy Slovyanoznavstva*, Vol. 54.
- [2] Petrov, N.I. (1896). *The Description of the Manuscript Collections in Kiev*, Issue 2.
- [3] Rapp, C. (2015). Author, Audience, Text and Saint: Two Modes of Early Byzantine Hagiography. *Scandinavian Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, No.1.
- [4] Snijders, T. (2014). *Manuscript Communication: Visual and Textual Mechanics of Communication in Hagiographic Texts from the Southern Low Countries, 900-1200*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- [5] Van Dijk, T. (2013). *Discourse and Knowledge [Lecture]*. Retrieved from EUSPchannel.

MATERIALS

Lives of the Saints. Manuscript of the Second Half of the 17th Century. Vernadsky National Scientific Library of Ukraine. 312, 370 (155).