

Joanna Getka,
habilitated doctor,
head of the Department of Intercultural Studies
Central and Eastern Europe
Faculty of Applied Linguistics
University of Warsaw
ORCID: 0000-0001-5857-7257
j.getka@uw.edu.pl

Viktor Moisiienko,
Doctor of Philology, Professor,
Professor of the Department of Ukrainian
Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University
ORCID: 0000-0002-8420-1947
v.moisiyenko@ukr.net

ORIGINS OF THE UKRAINIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE POLISH HYPOTHESIS ON GENESIS POLISH LITERARY LANGUAGE

The analysis of discussions, regarding the creation of the Polish literary language, has become a powerful stimulus for creating a completely new point of view on the beginnings of the Ukrainian literary language.

This article proposes a new approach to research into Ukrainian literary standard. This term – much better than the somewhat outdated term «literary language», suggesting a certain artistry of the author's utterance – is, however, still used in parallel with the generally accepted term literary language.

The authors start from the theory created by Stanisław Urbańczyk and developed by Bohdan Walczak, according to which one can speak about literary language with the emergence of the first norm.

The norm of the Ukrainian literary language has undoubtedly been created for many centuries and taking into account various cultural influences. However, undoubtedly its origins can be traced back to the period of Kyivian Rus. Similarly to Latin for Polish language, the Church Slavonic language for Ukrainian became an incentive to create one's own literary standard. The process of shaping the Polish and Ukrainian standards, however, was not the same.

Incomprehensible to the ancestors of today's Poles, Latin forced the creation of a completely separate system that only used Latin lexis.

Not completely understood by the ancestors of today's Ukrainians, for some time Church Slavonic language was a sufficient means of literary expression. However, from the very beginning (i.e. from the 11th–11th centuries) there are visible attempts to adapt this language to local pronunciation, which can be treated as the first attempts to create a general language norm.

The oldest texts in the Church Slavonic language reflect the most characteristic features of the Ukrainian language, which today are the norm of the language. In this approach, they should be treated as the oldest monuments of the Ukrainian literary language.

Key words: *polish literary language, Ukrainian literary language, polish standard, Ukrainian standard, language norm, written record, East Slavic languages, Church Slavonic, Ruthenian language.*

Getka Joanna, Mojsijenko Wiktor. Geneza ukraińskiego języka literackiego w kontekście polskiej hipotezy pochodzenia języka literackiego

Analiza dyskusji, dotyczących tworzenia się polskiego języka literackiego, stała się potężnym

bodźcem do stworzenia zupełnie nowego punktu widzenia na początki ukraińskiego języka literackiego.

W niniejszym artykule zaproponowano nowe podejście do badań nad ukraińskim językiem ogólnym. Określenie to – znacznie lepsze, niż nieco już przestarzałe określenie „język literacki”, sugerujący pewien artyzm wypowiedzi autorskiej – będzie jednak stosowane równoległe z przyjętym ogólnie terminem język literacki.

Autorzy wychodzą od stworzonej przez Stanisława Urbańczyka i rozwiniętej przez Bohdana Walczaka teorii, zgodnie z którą o języku literackim można mówić z chwilą pojawienia się pierwszej normy.

Norma ogólnego języka ukraińskiego bez wątpienia tworzyła się wiele wieków i z uwzględnieniem różnych wpływów kulturowych, ale niewątpliwie jej początków można szukać w okresie Rusi Kijowskiej. Podobnie jak dla polszczyzny łacina, tak dla ukraińszczyzny język cerkiewnosłowiański stał się bodźcem do tworzenia własnego języka literackiego. Proces kształtowania się polskiego i ukraińskiego standardu nie był jednak taki sam.

Niezrozumiała dla przodków dzisiejszych Polaków łacina, wymuszała utworzenie zupełnie odrębnego systemu, który wykorzystywał jedynie łacińską leksykę.

Niezupełnie niezrozumiała przez przodków dzisiejszych Ukraińców cerkiewszczyzna stanowiła przez jakiś czas wystarczający środek wypowiedzi autorskiej. Jednak już od samego początku (to jest od X–XI w.) widoczne są próby dostosowania tego języka do miejscowej wymowy, co można traktować jako pierwsze próby tworzenia normy języka ogólnego.

Najstarsze teksty w języku cerkiewnosłowiańskim odzwierciedlają najbardziej charakterystyczne cechy języka ukraińskiego, które dziś stanowią normę tego języka. W tym ujęciu, należy je traktować jako najstarsze zabytki ukraińskiego języka literackiego.

Słowa kluczowe: *polaki język ogólny, ukraiński język ogólny, standard, język literacki, norma językowa, wschodniosłowiańskie języki literackie, język cerkiewnosłowiański, język ruski*

Гетка Йоанна, Мойсієнко Віктор. Генезис української літературної мови в контексті польської гіпотези походження літературної мови

Аналіз дискусій, що стосуються виникнення польської літературної мови, став потужним стимулом до створення цілком нового погляду на виникнення української літературної мови.

У статті запропоновано новий підхід у дослідженні генези українського літературного стандарту. Цей термін хоча і значно кращий, ніж трохи вже застаріла дефініція «літературна мова», яка має риси художності авторського висловлювання, – проте застосовуватиметься паралельно з загально прийнятим терміном «літературна мова». Автори виходять зі створеної Станіславом Урбаньчиком та розвинутої Богданом Варчаком теорії, згідно з якою про літературну мову можна говорити від моменту появи першої норми.

Норма загальної української мови, без сумніву, створювалася багато віків і з врахуванням різних культурних впливів, але її початок можна шукати в періоді Київської Русі. Як для польської мови латина, так для української – церковно-слов'янська мова стала стимулом для творення власної літературної мови. Проте процес формування польського і українського стандарту не був однаковим.

Незрозуміла для предків сьгоднішніх поляків латина, сприяла утворенню цілком особливої системи, яка використовувала лише латинську лексику.

Частково зрозуміла предками сьгоднішніх українців церковнослов'янська мова за деякий час становила достатній ресурс авторського висловлювання. Однак вже від самого початку (тобто X–XI ст.) є видимі спроби пристосування цієї мови до місцевої вимови, що можна трактувати як перші спроби творення норми загальної мови.

Найстаріші тексти в церковнослов'янській мові віддзеркалюють найбільш характерні ознаки української мови, які сьогодні становлять норму цієї мови. Тому їх варто трактувати як найстаріші пам'ятки української літературної мови.

Ключові слова: загальнонародна польська мова, загальнонародна українська мова, стандарт, літературна мова, мовна норма, східнослов'янські літературні мови, церковнослов'янська мова, руська мова.

Introductory remarks. According to the long-established theory of Slavic linguistics, it is still commonly believed that in Ruthenia, at least until the 14th century, the literary Old Ruthenian written language was common for Belarusians, Russians and Ukrainians. In accordance with this theory, supported primarily by the authority of Russian linguists I. Sreznevsky, O. Vostokov, O. Sobolevsky, O. Shakhmatov, V. Vinogradov, F. Filin and others, the history of Eastern Slavic literary languages (at least Belarusian and Ukrainian) began only from the 14th century on. The Russian language literary tradition, on the contrary, by means of terminological conceptual substitution and false synonymy – «Russian language» (for Ruthenian), «Old Russian language» (a modern term denoting the language of ancient scribes, which herewith is aimed at pointing to a direct connection with the term «Russian language – seems to descend from the Rus' times. From this perspective, written records of this time, which contain not only Russian but also inherent Ukrainian and Belarusian language features, are exploited to construct textbooks and dictionaries of the so-called “Russian language of the 11th–14th centuries»¹.

However, since the earliest times local dialectal features of certain East-Slavic languages were penetrating into the texts. Therefore, even Church Slavonic written records can be described as different local versions thereof. Recorded features of a scribe's native dialect (Kyiv Rus', Galician Rus', Volyn Rus', Polotsk Rus', Novhorod Rus') obviously became the impetus for local writing development, and as a consequence – for a separate literary language tradition.

We proceed from the thesis that the dialectic space of Eastern Slavs was differentiated in the most ancient written period (11th–13th centuries). The basis for understanding the linguistic space of the Rus' in this period is Yuri Shevelyov's approach about 5 macrozones, or according to the scientist's terminology «linguistic territorial regional units»: Novgorod – Tver, Polotsk – Smolensk, Murom– Ryazan, Kyiv – Polissya, Halych – Podillya served the basis for the consecutive three Eastern Slavic languages [16, c. 389, 392].

Thus, in a broader context, one of the objectives of the study is to verify the thesis, prevailing in historical linguistics, stating that before the 14th century Old Ruthenian had existed as a common language, unified for all Eastern Slavs. A detailed analysis of the records, which have not yet been described, and the new reading of the monuments previously described, suggests that in this writing we see evident attempts to display scribes' speech features. Inasmuch such attempts/mistakes become increasingly numerous, it is obvious that they are not sporadic, but indicative of the deliberate attempt to introduce a spoken usus into the text, and subsequently to create a new linguistic norm.

It should be emphasized that in reference to the Ukrainian language glotogenesis, the thesis about the historical period of the national language functioning (Old Ukrainian) and prehistoric (proto-Ukrainian) has become obvious [10, c. 5–8], since the appearance of a linguistic feature in the written record is indicative of its much sooner establishment in speech. Spoken norms of each national language are developed gradually, alongside with the formation and development of that

¹ The mentioned fact (the use of Ukrainian and Belarusian records under the joint name «Old Russian» in the textbooks and dictionaries of the «Russian language of the 11th–14th centuries») does not correspond to the actual linguistic reality of the time. In our opinion, the following ethnonyms and glottonyms for naming the Eastern Slavs and their languages in the 11th–14th centuries would be more logical and motivated: Old Ruthenian-Belarusian, Old Ruthenian-Russian, Old Ruthenian-Ukrainian.

language. Initially, they are usually formed as certain «usage» of the dialect which due to certain historical conditions, forms the basis for the national language. Orthoepic and orthographic traditions are closely intertwined. Pronunciation of a particular language native speaker, having got into the written form (into a record), over time influences further spelling tradition. Importantly, this usus can get into the texts of both the (native) language of a certain ethnic group and to the texts written in other (foreign) languages by representatives of that particular ethnic group. Therefore, any written material is important to understand the origins of a particular language structure and such material does not necessarily have to be from the written sources of that language. For example, in order to study the Polish language development, evidence from the 12th century records in Latin is important; for Ukrainian – from Church Slavonic in Ruthenian-Ukrainian version of the 11th century (written by Ruthenian Ukrainians on Rus'-Ukraine territory), etc. Therefore, logically: Church Slavonic texts of the Ruthenian version of the most ancient period, created in Kyiv scriptorium (Reims Gospel of the 11th century, Sviatoslav's Anthologies (Izborniks), 1073, 1076, Archangel Gospel, 1092), can prove the thesis that local Ruthenian scribes left in them (in texts) features of their mother tongue and thus gave reasons for language researchers to draw conclusions about the rise of the language structure.

The rise of literary languages is quite a different matter. For many nations, periodization of the national and literary languages does not coincide (the rise of the national language always precedes that of the literary one). Moreover, many national linguistic literary traditions are based on vernacular language: a particular dialect of a national language that meets the needs of the society at the time. Here new questions arise: what is the convergence / divergence of the next stages of literary language development? How considerable is the continuity tradition for a particular literary written Eastern Slavic language and when does it begin? For example: is the New Ukrainian period of the literary language, starting with Kotlyarevskyi's «Aeneid» an actual new tradition in the Ukrainian literary language development or it also continues the previous one, which was initiated during the period of Kyiv Rus', the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth? [17] Basically, does modern Ukrainian literary language have an Old Ruthenian (11th–13th c.) period in its development history? Yes or No?

Hence, there is another crucial problem for understanding a Ukrainian any other literary language origin: how shall a literary language be described? Does the current definition of «literary language» fit different stages of its formation?

By coming closer to answering these questions, we can get closer to developing a new perspective on the development of Ukrainian literary language.

Language – norm – literary language.

As a starting point for studying the literary norm development for the Ukrainian and other languages, one can use cultural studies of identity categories as well as those, which allocate distinctions between the «my» and «foreign» system lies in *self*-awareness through the carriers of this ethnolect, the fact of their separate language functioning. The final stage of this process is – with obvious opportunities that ensure the existence of a power cell, that alongside with it is a culture cell – the desire to adopt a certain orthography, which will confirm the separation of this language. Extralingual aspects herewith become especially important, namely separation issue for a language is primarily a social and political matter (Max Weinreich's citation: «language is a dialect which has an army and a navy»).

Orthography implementation itself is a long-term process: language norm and literary tradition can be undergoing adjustments for centuries, since the interaction between language oral and written speeches is the subject of ongoing discussions among scientific and educated society layers: *język literacki to nieco już przestarzała nazwa języka ogólnego, inaczej – standardowego (dawniej jego nośnikiem była literatura (stąd jego nazwa), dziś przede wszystkim prasa i inne media). Główna odmiana języka narodowego, ukształtowana w toku rozwoju kultury, nauki i piśmiennictwa, użyciem słownictwa i gramatyki rządzą w języku literackim normy ustalone przez tradycję* [18, c. 68; 20, c. 208].

Similar definitions of the standard language (with various additions) can be made in the analyzes of scholars representing other scientific traditions: *Основная наддиалектная форма существования языка, характеризующаяся большей или меньшей обработанностью, полифункциональностью, стилистической дифференциацией и тенденции к регламентации* [3, с. 270]; *Літературна мова – апрацьована упорядкована і нормалізована форма агульнанаціональної мови, призначення якої – абслуґоуваць різноманітні сфери громадської діяльності чалавека* [2, с. 312]; *Język literacki... charakteryzuje się formalną kodyfikacją w wydawnictwach normatywnych oraz poważaniem jako kanoniczny, ogólnonarodowy wzorzec językowy, o szerszym zasięgu geograficznym niż dialekty obiegowe i większym stopniu wypracowania funkcjonalnego* [21, с. 83]; or: *унормована мова суспільного спілкування, загальноприйнята в писемній та усній практиці* [6, с. 318].

The above mentioned speculations lead to the conclusion that a norm is the key concept of a literary language. The concept of a «norm» at the initial stage of its formation is of particular importance, therefore it (the norm) is subject to studies in the field of literary languages genesis.

In general, most approaches, interpretations, and visions of a literary language origin and understanding the essence of the expression «ancient functioning period» of any literary language can be reduced to different and sometimes contradictory provisions:

Only high (sermons, religious literature) and medium (chronicles, fiction) register samples should be included into the scope of a literary language.

When analysing the processes of norm formation, as well as literary language formation, any written implementation where such a norm is detected, can be used.

Only the written form, displaying elementary features of local language usage (which must be carefully identified, counted and noted) can be attributed to a literary language: whether there are certain tendencies among scribes to introduce local vernacular usus (but without grammars and dictionaries).

Only the written form, which is already fixed in grammars, literary books and lexicons, can be attributed to a literary language.

Not only written but also oral forms of supra-dialectal speech, reflected in folklore can be attributed to a literary language².

Consideration of the expressed approaches testifies to the need to develop a unified approach, which would standardize the specifics of a literary languages development (in our case – of Ukrainian) at its different functioning stages.

We consider Bohdan Walczak's «minimalist» approach, regarding the discussion on the Polish literary language formation to be the most logical and reasonable.

According to his «maximalist» concept, the existence of a literary language can be acknowledged when it has three features: 1) this language is normalized; 2) highly artistic samples

² *Rozwój polskiego języka literackiego należy rozpatrywać zatem od początków polskiego piśmiennictwa, w szczególności zaś od czasu powstania większych tekstów ciągłych, z uwagą na stopniowe urabianie się ogólnopolskiej normy graficznej i gramatycznej, także słownikowej i frazeologicznej, na tle orozycji do właściwości lokalnych, gwarowych czy indywidualnych* [19, с. 129]; *Традиционный подход к русизмам, встречающихся в древнеболгарских рукописях, списанных на Руси, определил, что русизмы в них появлялись прежде всего «по недосмотру», по «ошибке» писцов, причем некоторые «ошибки», «недосмотры», «описки» отражены рукописями более консеквентно, тогда как другие даже и таким образом не попадают в рукописи, хотя ошибаться могли все писцы. Выходом из этого положения является предположение некоторыми учеными (А. А. Шахматов, Н. Дурново, Н. И. Толстой, Б. А. Успенский) определенной нормы, которая исходя из функции древнеболгарских рукописей, открыла доступ проникновения в рукописи определенных русизмов. Те русизмы, которые с течением времени входили в нормы церковно-книжного языка, более или менее выдержано и консеквентно отражаются в рукописях. Те же русизмы, которые не составляют постоянно распространяющуюся норму древнерусских рукописей, попадают в них действительно «по недосмотру». Конечно, наличие норм стало характерно для русской редакции только после определенного периода бытования и пользования древнеболгарскими рукописями на Руси* [14, с. 331–332].

of belles-lettres writing have been created in this language; 3) this language is an instrument of the entire spiritual culture for the people.

The researcher, however, suggests rejecting the artistic element (that is, the great artistic value in the literary works) as a subjective opinion [23, с. 39], as well as the fact of the language existence as the only spiritual communication means for the people (e.g.: equivalent functioning of Polish and Latin on the territory of the Commonwealth, as well as ancient Greek was not comprehensible on the vast territory of ancient Greece) [23, с. 40], and following Stanisław Urbanchyk, claimed that *jedynym (a więc zarazem koniecznym i wystarczającym) warunkiem istnienia języka literackiego jest norma językowa. Pytanie o czas powstania języka literackiego jest więc pytaniem o czas pojawienia się normy językowej* [23, с. 41; 22, с. 97–109].

The fact that the emergence of a literary language must be linked to the emergence of the first linguistic norm [22, с. 97–10] shall be the base for the further study of the Ukrainian literary language rise.

Church Slavonic Texts as a Source for Studying the Rise of the Ukrainian Literary Language.

Many scholars still do not see the importance of the most ancient Church Slavonic texts for the study of Eastern Slavic literary languages. They primarily study phonetic, morphologic, lexical, or syntactic features that are interpreted within the scope of research aimed at tracing pronunciation of the ancestors of modern Belarusians, Russians, or Ukrainians. Of course, we do not question the role and importance of such research. Regarding functioning of the Church Slavonic language in Ruthenia, it is worth emphasizing other factors related to cultural and social life of Kyiv Rus' and, in a wider context, to Central and Eastern Europe of the 10th–14th centuries.

The language situation in Slavic countries of *Latin* culture (Poland, Czech Republic) and the *orthodox* culture (Ukraine, Belarus) differed, since Latin and Church Slavonic occupied different positions in the minds of their users. Latin was completely unclear to the Western Slavs (and was perceived as completely foreign); Church Slavonic language was relatively clear and generally not perceived as completely alien.

That is, the Church Slavonic was not as alien and unacceptable to educated Ruthenian Ukrainians, Belarusians, and Russians, as, for example, Latin for Poles and Czechs.

It is this «relative clarity» of the Church Slavonic that led to its penetration into almost all life spheres of Ruthenians.

It is now a disputable question, whether the scribes of the oldest Church Slavonic texts were randomly mistaken, thus injecting vernacular Ukrainian peculiarities, or they deliberately introduced Ukrainian vernacular features into the text. From the 14th century on, especially in the 15th century, we have Church Slavonic written records, where the scribes introduced not only certain phonetic or morphological features into the text, but even created whole fragments (several pages) now not in Church Slavonic, but in Ruthenian. Undoubtedly, in such a situation, one can say about the conscious activity of a scribe who introduced his Ruthenian Ukrainian norm throughout the structure of a different language for his understanding – Church Slavonic.

For example Menology of 1489 illustrates entire sheets of text in Ruthenian Ukrainian (not Church Slavonic), written by a Ruthenian scribe, as shown in the following fragment:

“Сл(в)о на рож(с)тво пресѣтя. вл(д)чца наша бца приснодѣвы мѣрія” (с. 13 зв.– 19 зв.), «ставши по(д) дрѣвомъ дяфиною. начала плачуши молити(с)... оузрѣла на дрѣве гнездо птичєє. и почала силно плакатисѣ. а рекучи. оувы мнѣ бѣднои... охъ мнѣ бѣднои. кому сѣ могу ровнати. птица(м) ли. но и тыи гнѣзда выють. и дѣтки плодятъ. о бѣда мнѣ ѡканной грѣшнои”; “а какъ исполнилосѣ .Ѹ. м(с)цеи. родила айна. оуспытала бабы. рекучи. што єсми родила. и она рекла. жѣньскийи поль. и повивши баба. сѣю преч(с)тѣю дѣвицю. положила оу легалници. и ка(к) исполнилисѣ дєниє // очистиласѣ айна. дала сєсєць свои(т) персеи сѣои дѣвици. и нарекли имѣ. єє сѣои мл(с)ти мѣрія. и почала сѣя девица рости дѣня ѡто дѣна.”(Німчук 2015: 27).

The question when such an awareness and understanding of the own language differentness from the Church Slavonic appeared, currently remains unanswered. The answer may lie in the analysis of the detected dialectal phenomena (especially their quantitative registration). Since in church text copies, we find from several hundred to thousands of «mistakes», so apparently, the scribes were deliberately creating the local Ruthenian Ukrainian norm.

Proceeding from what has been mentioned, we suggest the thesis about the existence of not only three separate linguistic structures in the Rus' period – Ukrainian, Belarusian and Russian, but also of the corresponding literary languages.

We conduct the search for the origins of Eastern Slavs' literary languages on the basis of certified linguistic phenomena, which at the time of writing were a local usus, and subsequently became the norm and revealed in written records, created in specific territories, where their ancestors mostly lived: for Ukrainian – Kyiv – Polissya and Galicia – Podillya lands, for Belarusian – Smolensk – Polotsk and partly Polissya, for Russian – Novgorod – Tver and Murom – Ryazan. For some regions, there was obviously no direct perspective on this or that language. At the borders of Polissya and Smolensk (Ukrainian – Belarusian contacts), Polotsk and Novgorod (Belarusian – Russian contacts) dialects, interpenetration of language systems occurred. The native speakers of the Kyiv – Polissya and Galicia – Podillya regions during the whole starting period of original features formation in the Ukrainian and Russian languages never interacted with the native speakers of Novgorod – Tver and Murom – Ryazan regions. Everything created (spoken and written) in the 11th–14th centuries in Murom, Ryazan, Rostov, Novgorod is the heritage of the Russian written language tradition, and in Kyiv, Halych, Volodymyr, Chernihiv – the Ukrainian written language tradition³.

Usus/norm establishment in the Ruthenian Ukrainian language of the earliest period on the basis of analyzing lingual phenomena that have penetrated from dialectal speech in course of rewriting 11th century Church Slavonic texts, which had been preserved in the original, means extraction of language features from selected analysis sources (The Reims Gospel of the first half of the 11th century; Ostromyrov Gospel, 1056; Sviatoslav's Anthologies (Izborniks), 1073 and 1076; Archangel Gospel, 1092; as well as the original graffiti inscriptions on the Saint Sophia Cathedral in Kyiv) and the comparison of the former with modern Ukrainian (normative and dialectal) features, which may be the basis for highlighting the most ancient period of functioning of Ruthenian Ukrainian literary and written language well from the 11th century and on. This approach will enable tracing the rise (first fixations) and growth (quantitative manifestations) of the Ukrainian language norm.

We take into consideration the fact that those features that had been used in a certain area for several centuries could penetrate into the Church Slavonic texts. Therefore, even the earliest texts written in the Church Slavonic language are the study source of the linguistic norm for a particular East Slavic language in the outlined area of Kyiv Rus'. In this regard, we note that the texts chosen for the analysis, although, add to a certain extent to the common contribution to the culture of Ruthenians – Ukrainians, Belarusians and Russians, but at the same time they reflect certain linguistic peculiarities that later remained in the language practice of a specific East Slavic people.

The objective thus will bring us closer to the main purpose of the study: to establish to what extent the analysed written sources are relevant for tracing the earliest history of the Ukrainian literary language

³ That is, the Ukrainian language was formed in the process of interaction, interpenetration of the tribal dialectal features of Polans, Drevlyans, Dregovichs, Severians, Dulebes (Volyn), Ulichs, Tivertsy, White Croats, but in no way of Polochans, Krivichs, Radimichs [11, c. 16].

The article will contain examples from the 11th century written records in order to demonstrate the emergence of the Ukrainian language norm, and consequently – the literary language.

We trace and register dialectal features in two stages.

1) finding phonetic (vocal, consonantal) and morphological (word-alternating), and, where possible, word-forming and lexical features, which were included in the text under the influence of local spoken language and contrasted with the corresponding features of possible ancient Bulgarian and Old Macedonian protographs;

2) Comparison of distinctive features with modern grammar and orthography Ukrainian literary norm (according to the СУЛМ – Сучасна українська літературна мова / Modern Ukrainian Literary Language) and dialectal features (according to the АУМ – Атлас української мови / Atlas of the Ukrainian language).

The chart below contains examples both well known in the literature and new ones that we have distinguished for the first time from the 11th century records.

Table 1.

Distinguished dialect features of the Ukrainian language in the records of the 11th century.

Item No	Language feature	Written record, style	Countersamples in the Ukrainian dialect (according to АУМ)	Conformity with СУЛМ (orthography, academic grammar, dictionary)
phonetic level				
1.	a) Pattern *Yat → e (after j)	<p><i>на ученикы свое 2 rev.а, грѣхы свое 10а, еды пржгы 10b (РС). ѣсти 5б, ѣиа 119зв. (Ізб. 1073/.</i></p> <p><i>ѣда 227. (Ізб. 1076/.</i></p> <p><i>явьшееса звѣды 145, ѣмь и пью 68, пси ѣдаль 71, от нее (АрС) [15, с. 257],</i></p> <p>All examples from ChSlav records of Ruthenian (Ukr) version;</p> <p><i>несть брев., въ вѣре 8 rev., веруж 21 rev., гнѣзь 26 rev., въсѣаль (Ізб. 1073); къ темь 14 (Ізб. 1076);</i></p> <p>All examples from ChSlav records of Ruthenian (Ukr) version; <i>лета, неделѣ (Kyiv St.Sophia inscr., 11th c.) [7, с. 239]; розъгръмел(са) (Kyiv St.Sophia inscr., 1052) [5, с. 134]</i></p> <p>Secular graffiti inscriptions on St.Sophia walls;</p>	<p>The phenomenon is common in the northern dialects of the Ukrainian language [1, к. 3–10]</p> <p>The phenomenon is common in the northern dialects of the Ukrainian language [1, к. 3–10; III, ч. III, к. 6]</p>	<p>Is a usus for the North Ukrainian dialect</p> <p>Is a usus for the North Ukrainian dialect</p>
	Pattern *Yat → e (other positions)			

Item No	Language feature	Written record, style	Countersamples in the Ukrainian dialect (according to АУМ)	Conformity with СУЛМ (orthography, academic grammar, dictionary)
	б) Pattern *Yat → i	<p><i>нициї</i> 5, <i>въ вѣри</i> 17rev., <i>нимая</i> 142, <i>видыи</i> 149, <i>исцили</i> 162 (Ізб. 1073).</p> <p><i>въ мироу</i> ‘помірно’ 237rev. (Ізб. 1076)</p> <p><i>двѣризи</i> (АрЄ) (4, с. 8);</p> <p><i>съ стины</i> 6 (XIII Слів Григорія Богослова XI ст.) [7, с. 239];</p> <p>All examples from ChSlav records of Ruthenian (Ukr) version;</p>	<p>The phenomenon is common in the southern dialects of the Ukrainian language [1, k. 3–10; III, ч. III, k. 6]</p>	<p>In Pd Ukrainian, such pattern is the norm. [13, с. 49; 8, с. 87]</p>
2.	<p>Mixing old *i (i) *y ()</p>	<p><i>мужь єа правьдывь си</i> 4b, <i>члкъ сы правьдъни</i> 6a, <i>ныже</i> 8a (РЄ); <i>неправди</i> 104rev., <i>ти ли съмѣши</i> 87, <i>плѣтолюбья</i> 135, <i>выны</i> 154rev., <i>землямѣрыи</i> 203rev., <i>псалтира</i> 253rev., <i>прикриває</i> 185 (Ізб. 1073); <i>осырѣж</i> 112rev., <i>пронирливи</i> 249 (Ізб. 1076); <i>постыдыть</i> сА 80rev., <i>години</i> 111, <i>рызы</i> 118, <i>рибы</i> 163 (АрЄ).</p> <p>All examples from ChSlav records of Ruthenian (Ukr) version;</p>	<p>The phenomenon is common in the majority of dialects in the Ukrainian language [1, т. I, k. 41–44; III, ч. III, k. 5]</p>	<p>In Pd Ukrainian, such pattern is the norm [8, с. 90]</p>
3	<p>Proximation of unstressed e, u</p>	<p><i>наричѣши</i> 112 (Ізб. 1073), <i>на кристѣ</i> 157, <i>властилинъ</i> 130 rev. (Ізб. 1076)</p>	<p>The phenomenon is common in all dialects in the Ukrainian language [1, I, k. 41–44)</p>	<p>In Pd Ukrainian, such pattern is the orphoepic norm.</p>
4.	<p>ь, ъ graphic form before j [i], [u]</p>	<p><i>повиты и</i> 5a, <i>полаты и</i> 12б, <i>прилаты и руку</i> 15a <i>нарежуги имА</i> (РЄ); <i>попалы и, приимы и оставимы и</i> 30a, <i>приведы и</i> 77б (Ізб. 1073); <i>попаты и</i> 154, <i>прилаты и на руку</i> 156rev. (АрЄ), And Yu. Shevelyov’s examples from (Ізб. 1073): <i>отъ плодовы ихъ, вы имА</i>; з (АрЄ) <i>вы истину</i> [15, с. 354].</p> <p>All examples from ChSlav records of Ruthenian (Ukr) version;</p>	<p>In Ruthenian records of 11th–13th c. the phenomenon is common in Kyiv and Galicia–Volyn written register</p>	
5.	<p>e > o shift after fricatives</p>	<p><i>чоловѣка</i> 179rev. (Ізб. 1073); <i>жона</i> 181rev. (Ізб. 1076), <i>шѣпѣтьникъ</i> ‘gossipper’ (Ізб. 1076) [15, с. 201].</p> <p>All examples from ChSlav records of Ruthenian (Ukr) version;</p>	<p>The phenomenon is common in the majority of dialects in the Ukrainian language</p>	<p>In Pd Ukrainian, such pattern is the norm. [13, с. 50]</p>

Item No	Language feature	Written record, style	Countersamples in the Ukrainian dialect (according to АУМ)	Conformity with СУЛМ (orthography, academic grammar, dictionary)
morphological level				
1.	<i>Reduced verbal forms in 3rd person</i>	<i>напише</i> 294rev. (ОС 1056) <i>свьршає</i> 12rev., <i>быває</i> 15, <i>бжде</i> 17 (Ізб. 1073). All examples from ChSlav records of Ruthenian (Ukr) version;	The phenomenon is common in all dialects of the Ukrainian language.	
2.	<i>flexion -ѣ in Gen. sing. and в Nom.-Acc. pl. of nouns jā-stem.</i>	<i>стѣла недѣлѣ</i> 1rev.b, <i>ни едино пользѣ</i> 2a, <i>творите стѣзѣ</i> его 9rev.b, 10rev.b (РС)		
3.	Pronominal forms Dat. and Loc. case тобѣ, собѣ	<i>тобѣ, собѣ</i> – this spelling is testified in all ChSlav records of 11 th c. Ruthenian (Ukr) version, rewritten in Kyiv	The phenomenon is common in all dialects of the Ukrainian language.	

Conclusions. In accordance with the hypothesis, accepted in this study, the selected ancient Church Slavonic and Ruthenian records display more or less conversational features, which are preserved as normative in modern Ukrainian (or as a *usus* in Ukrainian dialects). We are well aware that some of the attested features may have been common for other Eastern Slavic languages, for example, the writing *e* instead of **ě* (*yat*) is common in both Belarusian and Russian. But the localization of the manuscripts and the wider context of other identified features give reason to speak of a local (in this case, Kyiv) pronunciation *usus*. Additionally, the presence of exclusively Ukrainian features alongside with the common ones may serve the proof that these are the first examples of the Ukrainian norm. The number of such features rose from single manifestations in the most ancient texts of the 11th century, gradually increased to hundreds in the late 13th – early 14th centuries. Undoubtedly, in these cases it is possible to speak of a scribes' (who were the ancestors of modern Ukrainians) attempt to create a certain writing standard for their language.

The above mentioned examples make it possible to thuswise trace to a certain extent, the emergence of the Ukrainian language norm. Although there are very few original Ruthenian Ukrainian texts of the ancient written age, there is still reason to qualify attested features (repeated over several decades in the 11th century) as a reflection of the local Ruthenian vernacular element. Hence – the introduction of this dialectal *usus* element in writing and, accordingly, the establishment of the Ukrainian literary norm from the 11th century on took place.

Eventually, the suggested research can be an impetus for a broader study of the Ukrainian literary language emergence. Due to the new understanding and thorough linguistic analysis of Church Slavonic texts and the isolation of a considerable number of spoken Ruthenian (Ukrainian) features well in the records of the 11th century (Rheims Gospel, Svyatoslav's Anthologies, Archangel Gospel), which later become an unwritten *usus* / norm, the conclusions in the article may change the Slavists' approach to the process of creating Eastern Slavonic literary languages.

In the broadest context, the project effects and conclusions will be generic for studying the literary norm of Slavic languages, which developed on a Cyrillic graphic tradition. According to the thesis adopted in the project, the Church Slavonic language, which was not completely

incomprehensible to the speakers, was not a fossilized system, but still fell within the influence of the vernacular Ruthenian elements. We assume that the introduction of local spoken features into the Church Slavonic language could be an impetus for the creation of certain Slavic literary languages. The texts studied, in which we find an obvious tendency: from the quantity (frequency) of a detected feature – to the establishment of the linguistic usus (norm), and hence – to the literary language, can serve a confirmation of the above mentioned assumption. The method for systematic study of spoken features in the written records, suggested in the project will open a new perspective on the rise of the literary Slavic languages on the Cyrillic basis.

Список скорочених джерел

- АрЄ: Архангельское Евангелие 1092 года. Исследования, древнерусский текст, словоуказатели / изд. подгот. Л. П. Жуковская, Т. Л. Миронова. Москва : Скрипторий, 1997. 668 с.
- Изб. 1073: Изборник Святослава 1073 года. Факсимильное издание. Москва : Книга, 1983. 360 с.
- Изб. 1076: Изборник 1076 года / изд. подгот. В. С. Гольщенко, Е. Ф. Дубровина, В. Г. Демьянов, Г. Ф. Нефедов. Москва, 1965.
- ОЄ: Остромирово Євангеліє 1056–1057 г. Фотолитографическое издание. Санкт-Петербург, 1889.
- РЄ: Реймське Євангеліє. Видання факсимільного типу : у 2 т. Київ : Горобець, 2019. 120 с.

References (translated & transliterated)

- ArYe: *Archangel'skoe Yewangeliie 1092 goda. Issledovaniia, drevnerusskii tekst, slovoukazateli [Archangel Gospel 1092. Research, Old Russian text, word indexes]*. (1997). L. Zhukovskaia & T. Mironova (izd. podg.). Moskow: Skriptorii [in Russian].
- Isb. 1073: *Izbornir Sviatoslava 1073 goda. Faksimilnoe izdanie [A compilation of Svyatoslav 1073. Facsimile Edition]* (1983). Moskow: Kniga [in Russian].
- Isb. 1076: *Izbornir Sviatoslava 1073 goda [A compilation of Svyatoslav 1076]* (1965). V. Golyshenko, E. Dubrovina, V. Demyanov & G. Nefedov (izd. podg.). Moskow [in Russian].
- OYe: *Ostromirovo Yevangeliie 1056–1057 g. Fotolitograficheskoe izdanie [Ostromyr Gospel 1056–1057. Photolitograficheskoe izdanie]*. (1889). St. Petersburg [in Russian].
- RYe: *Rejmske Yevanhelie. Vydannia faksymilnoho typu [The Reims Gospel. Facsimile edition. Research. In II volumes]*. (2019). Kyiv: Horobets [In Ukrainian].

Список використаних джерел та літератури

1. Атлас української мови : в 3 т. Київ : Наукова думка, 1984–2001.
2. Бандарэнка Т. П. Літаратурная мова. *Беларуская мова. Энцыклапедыя*. Мінск : Беларуская энцыклапедыя, 1994. С. 312.
3. Гухман М. М. Литературный язык. *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь* / гл. ред. Н. В. Ярцева. Москва : Советская энциклопедия, 1990. С. 270.
4. Бузук П. О. Про мову найдавнішої української євангелії. *Записки історико-філологічного відділу УАН*. Кн. 12. Київ, 1927. С. 4–25.
5. Висоцький С. О. Київська писемна школа X–XII ст. (До питання української писемності). Львів – Київ – Нью-Йорк : Вид-во М. П. Коця, 1998. 248 с.
6. Єрмоленко С. Я. Літературна мова. *Українська мова. Енциклопедія* / редкол. : В. М. Русанівський та ін. 2-е вид. випр. і доп. Київ : Українська енциклопедія, 2004. С. 318.
7. Жовтобрюх М. А. Фонетика. *Жовтобрюх М. А., Русанівський В. М., Скляренко В. Г. Історія української мови. Фонетика*. Київ : Наукова думка, 1979. С. 65–329.
8. Жовтобрюх М. А., Волох О. Т., Самійленко С. П., Слинко І. І. Історична граматики української мови. Київ : Вища школа, 1980. 320 с.

9. Бевзенко С. П., Грищенко А. П., Лукінова Т. Б., Німчук В. В., Русанівський В. М., Самійленко С. П. Історія української мови. Морфологія. Київ : Наукова думка, 1978. 539 с.
10. Мозер М. Історія української мови. Київ, 2018. 27 с.
11. Мойсієнко В. М. Історична діалектологія української мови. Північне (поліське) наріччя. Київ : ВЦ «Академія», 2016. 284 с.
12. Німчук В. Українська Четя 1489 року. Житомир, 2015. 102 с.
13. Сучасна українська літературна мова / ред. А. П. Грищенка. Київ : Вища школа. 1997. 493 с.
14. Тот И. Русская редакция древнеболгарского языка в конце XI – начале XII вв. София : Болгарская академия наук, 1985. 358 с.
15. Шевельов Ю. Історична фонологія української мови. Харків : Акта, 2002. 1054 с.
16. Шевельов Ю. Чому общерусский язык, а не віборуська мова? // Ю. Шевельов. Вибрані праці. Мовознавство. Кн. 1. Київ, 2009. С. 382–411.
17. Getka J. Białoruski i ukraiński wariant prostej mowy XVIII wieku czy białoruska i ukraińska prosta mowa XVIII wieku? (na materiale ruskojęzycznych teologii moralnych z Supraśla, Uniowa i Poczajowa). *Języki ruskie w rozwoju historycznym i kontaktach z polszczyzną*. Białystok, 2018. S. 99–125.
18. Jaworski S. Terminy literackie. WSiP, 1990.
19. Kuraskiewicz W. Tło społeczne rozwoju polskiego języka literackiego *W. Kuraskiewicz. Polski język literacki*. Warszawa – Poznań, 1986. S. 129–179.
20. Słownik terminów literackich / red. J. Sławiński. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź : Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, 1988.
21. Toporišič J. Enciklopedija slovenskega jezika / red. K. Dolinar. Lublana : Cankarjeva založba, 1992.
22. Urbańczyk S. W sprawie polskiego języka literackiego. 1. O dawności dialektu kulturalnego. *Język Polski*. XXX. 1950. Z. 3. S. 97–109.
23. Walczak B. Geneza polskiego języka literackiego. *Teksty Drugie: teoria literatury, krytyka, interpretacja*. № 3 (27). 1994. S. 35–47.

References (translated & transliterated)

1. *Atlas ukraïnskoi movy [Atlas of Ukrainian Language]* (Vols. 1–3). Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1984–2001 [In Ukrainian].
2. Bandarenka, T. (1994). Litaraturnaia mova [Literature Language]. *Belaruskaiia mova. Entsyklapedyia – Belorussian Language. Encyclopedia*. Minsk: Belaruskaiia entsyklapedyia, 312 [In Belarusian].
3. Guchman, M. M. (1990). Literaturnyi yazyk [Literature Language]. *Lingvisticheskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar – Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary*. N. V. Yartseva (Ed.). Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 270 [In Russian].
4. Buzuk, P. O. (1927). Pro movu naidavnishoi ukraïnskoi yevanhelii [About a Language of the most Ancient Ukrainian Gospel]. *Zapysky istoryko-filolohichnoho viddilu UAN – Notes of historic-philological department of UA of Sciences*, 12, 4–25 [In Ukrainian].
5. Vysotzkyi S. O. (1998). *Kyivska pysemna shkola XI–XII st. (Do pytannia ukraïnskoi pysemnosti) [Kyiv Writing School in X–XII c. (On the issue of Ukrainian writing)]*. Lviv – Kyiv – New York: Vyd-vo M. P. Kotsia [In Ukrainian].
6. Yermolenko S. Ya. (2004). Literaturna mova [Literary Language]. *Ukraińska mova. Entsyklopediia – Ukrainian. Encyclopedia*. M. V. Rusanivsky (Ed.). Kyiv: Ukraińska entsyklopediia, 318 [In Ukrainian].
7. Zhovtobryuch, M. A., Rusanivsky, V.M. & Sklyarenko, V. G. (1979). Fonetyka [Phonetics]. *Istoriia ukraïnskoi movy. Fonetyka – History of the Ukrainian Language. Phonetics*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 65–329 [In Ukrainian].
8. Zhovtobryukh, M. A., Voloch, O. T., Samiilenko, S. P. & Slynko, I. I (1980). *Istorychna hramatyka ukraïnskoi movy [The Historical Grammar of the Ukrainian Language]*. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola [In Ukrainian].
9. Bevzenko, S. P., Hryshenko, A. P., Lukinova, T. B., Nimchuk, V. V., Rusanivskyi, V. M. & Samiilenko S. P. (1979). *Istoriia ukraïnskoi movy. Morfolohia [History of the Ukrainian Language. Morphology]*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka [In Ukrainian].
10. Moser, M. (2018). *Istoriia ukraïnskoi movy [History of the Ukrainian Language]*. Kyiv [In Ukrainian].
11. Moisiienko, V. M. (2016). *Istorychna dialektolohia ukraïnskoi movy. Pivnichne (poliske) narichchia [Historical Dialectology of the Ukrainian Language. Northern (Polissya) dialect]*. Kyiv: VTs «Akademiiia» [In Ukrainian].
12. Nimchuk, V. (2015). *Ukraińska Chetia 1489 roku [Ukrainian Chetah of 1489]*. Zhytomyr [In Ukrainian].
13. Hryshenko A. P. (Eds.). (1993). *Suchasna ukraińska literaturna mova [Contemporary Ukrainian Literary Language]*. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola [In Ukrainian].

14. Tot, I. (1985). *Ruskaia redaktsiia drevnebolgarskogo yazyka v kontse XI – nachale XII wieka [Ruthenian edition of the Old Bulgarian language in the late XI – early XII centuries]*. Sofia: Bolgarskaia akademiia nauk [In Russian].
15. Sheveliov, Yu. (2002). *Istorychna fonologia ukrainskoi movy [Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language]*. Kharkiv: Akta [In Ukrainian].
16. Shevelyov, Yu. (2009). Chomu obshcheruskii yazyk, a ne vibchoruska mova? [Why the All-Russian language, not the Vibtscho-Russian language?]. *Yu. Shevelov. Vybrani pratsi. Movoznavstvo. Kn. 1 – Shevelov Yu. Selected works. Linguistics. Book. 1*. Kyiv, 382–411. [In Ukrainian].
17. Getka, J. (2018). Białoruski i ukraiński wariant prostej mowy XVIII wieku czy białoruska i ukraińska prosta mowa XVIII wieku? (na materiale ruskojęzycznych teologii moralnych z Supraśla, Uniowa i Poczajowa) [Belarussian and Ukrainian variant of simple speech of the 18th century or Belarussian and Ukrainian simple speech of the 18th century? (on the material of Russian-language moral theologies from Supraśl, Uniów and Poczajów)]. *Języki ruskie w rozwoju historycznym i kontaktach z polszczyzną – Ruthenian languages in historical development and contacts with the Polish language*. Białystok, 99–125 [In Polish].
18. Jaworski, S. (1990). *Terminy literackie [Literary terms]*. WSiP [In Polish].
19. Kuraszkiewicz, W. (1986). Tło społeczne rozwoju polskiego języka literackiego [Social background of the development of the Polish literary language] *W. Kuraszkiewicz. Polski język literacki – W. Kuraszkiewicz. Polish literary language*. Warsaw – Poznan, 129–179 [In Polish].
20. Sławiński, J. (Eds). (1988). *Słownik terminów literackich [Dictionary of literary terms]*. Wrocław – Warsaw – Krakow – Gdansk – Lodz: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolinskich [In Polish].
21. Toporishich, J (1992). *Enciklopedija slovenskega jezika [Encyclopedia of the Slovene Language]*. K. Dolinar (Ed.). Lublana: Cankarjeva založba [In Slovene].
22. Urbanczyk, S. (1950). W sprawie polskiego języka literackiego. 1. O dawności dialektu kulturalnego [On the Polish literary language. 1. On antiquity of a cultural dialect]. *Język Polski – Polish Language*. XXX, Vol. 3, 97–109 [In Polish].
23. Walczak, B. (1994). Geneza polskiego języka literackiego [The genesis of the Polish literary language]. *Teksty Drugie: teoria literatury, krytyka, interpretacja – Second Texts: theory of literature, criticism, interpretation*, 3 (27), 35–47 [In Polish].

Статтю отримано 20.10.2019 року
Прийнято до друку 10.12.2019 року