

Lukovenko T. O.,
Candidate of Science (Linguistics),
Associate Professor at the Ukrainian Language and Literature Department
of the Donbas State Teachers' Training University

Roman V. V.,
Candidate of Science (Linguistics), Senior Lecturer
at the Department of Germanic and Slavonic Linguistics
of the Donbas State Teachers' Training University

Riabinina I. M.,
Candidate of Science (Linguistics),
Associate Professor at the Ukrainian Language and Literature Department
of the Donbas State Teachers' Training University

SOURCES OF STUDYING HISTORY OF EAST SLAVONIC LANGUAGES IN YU. SHEVELIOV'S SCHOOLS

Summary. The article outlines the approach of the outstanding scientist in the field of Comparative Linguistics of the second half of the 20th century Yu. Sheveliov to the sources of studying the history of the Ukrainian language. The specific character of methods of the scientist's work along with the contemporary dialectal records, the material of the old written documents and the other documents have been revealed. The article is grounded on the material of the book by Yu. Sheveliov "A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language". It has been shown the novelty contributed by the linguist to the investigation of the problem of the sources of studying the language history; the primary theories have been defined to be valuable for modern linguistics.

Key words: sources of studying language history, priority source, material of old written documents, modern dialectal records.

Introduction. The problem of sources of studying language history for present-day Comparative and Historical Linguistics is considered a topical question: a great number of works have been published and their authors employ the material of such sources of studying language history for their research as the contemporary dialectal facts and the material of old written documents and others.

The decision on certain questions about the priority given to this or that source of studying language history depends on the character of explanation for historical and language material and its interpretation.

The article outlines the peculiarities of approaches to studying the history of Eastern Slavonic languages in Linguistics in the 70-s of the 19th c. – the 30-s of the 20th c.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Giving reasons for the priority to the contemporary dialectal facts as the source of studying language history, the Neogrammarians in the practice of their research studied predominantly the material of old written documents. The scientists of Kharkiv, Moscow and Kazan schools as Ye.K. Tymchenko, O.B. Kurylo, A.M. Selishchev proved the importance of the contemporary dialectal facts taking into account the theoretical and practical research. They considered the material of old written documents as the most fundamental background among subsidiary sources.

Old written documents determine the priority significance to the source of studying language history in the works by A.I. Sobolevskiy, N.M. Karinskiy and A.Yu. Krymskiy, I.I. Ohienko [6], the second source of primary importance is modern dialectal records which have a stating meaning. For such linguists as L.L. Vasiliev, P.O. Buzuk, O.M. Kolessa, K.T. Nemchynov, V.M. Hantsov both sources were equipollent [1, p. 49–51, 109–121; 7, p. 9, 14]. In Linguistics of the second half in the 20th century such approach is successively revealed in the works by Yu.V. Sheveliov and V.V. Kolesov [2, p. 10].

The article contains a number of new observations in comparison with the article by I.M. Riabinina [8] mentioned what has become possible due to using new material.

The paper **aims** to reveal the essence of approach to the sources of studying language history of such prominent scholar of Comparative Linguistics in the second half of the 20th century as Yu. Sheveliov.

Presentation of the main research material. The article is based on the material of the book by Yu. Sheveliov "A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language" [11].

In his work Yu. Sheveliov wrote about Ukrainian changing $\check{e} > i$ and a greater part of his observation was done grounding on the material of old written documents. The scientist mentioned that in early and middle Ukrainian documents \check{e} advancement forward was recorded by blending letters **h** and **u** (sometimes **u** is used instead of **h**). Old authentic data bearing records about this change can be found in Moldavian charters: **внт#зю** (Dative case, singular) alongside with **внт#узѡва** (possessive adjective, feminine) (1392), **внрѡ** «вера» (in the Russian language) (1400); **дудѣ** «дед» (in the Russian language) (1452) and others [11, p. 541].

It was concluded from the observations according to which the same tendency was noticed in Galicia and Podillia; however less quantity of examples was used in old written documents. The linguist grounded that phenomenon by strong influence of spelling norms. A little bit later there appeared changing **u** from \check{e} in Volyn (a historic region in Central and Eastern Europe, situated between south-eastern Poland, south-western Belarus and western Ukraine): **вѡлли** «велели», **вудив** «видя» (Russian) (1434, Lutsk

(a city on the Styr river in northwestern Ukraine)), *синожѣтми* (Ukrainian) (1440, Vladimir (city and the administrative center of Vladimir Oblast, Russia, located on the Kliazma river) and others [ibid, p. 541].

Yu. Sheveliov emphasized that single spelling of such type penetrated even into the Polissian old documents however as the author stated (he referred to the records of modern Polissian dialects) that phenomenon was the reflection of southern sample; consequently the registered spelling norms do not reflect local pronunciation, if we compare examples, *снубаюци, снѣтѣли* (1496) [ibid, p. 542].

A special attention should be paid to the fact that in modern Polissian dialects there is no *u* instead of *ѣ*, but in old Polissian documents blending of letters *h* and *u* can be observed. Hence the linguists made a conclusion that it was a peculiarity of southern influence although (Polissian) dialect pronunciation had not been registered in old written documents [ibid].

Yu. Sheveliov compared changes *ѣ* into *u* and *u* into *y* and drew his own conclusion after he had considered the facts about their relative chronology and gave absolute chronology of these two phenomena. The scholar thoroughly studied the documents of definite territories and correlated the records of the documents with the data of modern dialects. Analyzing the modern dialectal records, Yu. Sheveliov also described written documents in details [11, p. 545–547]. Consequently, the linguist considered these two sources interchangeable.

The ideas of using transcription of personal and common names in the language (languages) of eastern Slavs with the help of graphic means of other languages laid by A.A. Shakhmatov, M.M. Durnovo, A.Yu. Krymskiy were dynamically developed in the second half of the 20th century and improved on the same language material. At the same time of the given period another kind of material was engaged into research, the linguists in the 70-s of the 19th c. – 30-s of the 20th c. had nothing similar at their disposal. The demonstrative example of such approach is considered a comprehensive investigation by Yu. Sheveliov.

Characterizing the changes *ѣ* into *u*, Yu. Sheveliov recorded Ukrainian names and words in foreign sources [11, p. 542]. These facts are proved by the records of Ukrainian documents although they are registered primarily in late period, for example, *вигозмит* (from Armenian) (1559), *иминѣ* (imenja can be possible) «ИМЕНИЕ» (from Russian) (1562), *терпит* (1563) and others from Kami-anets-Podilskiy (a city in western Ukraine) where the Armenian diaspora have ancient origins; some examples from Yiddish can be observed: *Bilsk, Bilkamin* (the Jewish community was registered from the beginning of the 16th c. and from the middle of the 18th c. [ibid, p. 542].

To illustrate the facts having been mentioned above, let us consider one more source of history of East and Slavonic languages, the lexical borrowings from other languages into Slavonic, mostly East Slavonic languages. M.M. Durnovo did not mention this source though as the analysis given by us of “An essay of ancient period of Russian language” is clearly demonstrated [10] by A.A. Shakhmatov. The scholar paid a great attention to this source which was interpreted at a sufficient level as a consequence; he marked such phonetic phenomenon as pleophony in some words of East Slavonic languages which were originated from the words borrowed by Old Slavonic from other languages. In particular we would like to give examples of forms *коромола* (A.A. Shakhmatov understood it as Old Russian) and *коромѣлы* (the scientist docu-

mented them in the Ukrainian language). According to the linguist’s opinion the given forms originated from Old Slavonic form **kormola*. A.A. Shakhmatov derived the last one from Middle Latin form *carmula* (“insurrection”) and correlated with an Old Slavonic word «крамола», Czech *kramola* [10, p. 152].

Later investigations of the etymologists proved the non-pleophony character of two last words, opposed to plephony itself which is typical in particular Ukrainian obsolete word *коромѣли* (plot, deception). In accordance with M. Vasmer’s opinion and other editors of “An etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language”, non-pleophonic variants of the analyzed word which are registered in the Slavonic languages originated from Old High German *karmala* (rebellion), related to Old Low German *karm* (complaint, plaint), Old English *curm* (*cearm*) (noise) [7, p. 40; 8, p. 365–366]. M. Vasmer supposed that Middle Latin form of *carmula* was a borrowing from Old High German (*karmala*) [9, p. 365].

Yu. Sheveliov had another view on the origin of the word *коромола* (rebellion) than A.A. Shakhmatov: *коромола* is “a simple substitution” of relevant Old Slavonic non-pleophonic «крамола»; Yu. Sheveliov studied also other toponymic names which are considered borrowed words and represent the phenomenon of pleophony.

These are such hydronyms as *Sliporid* (a river in Ukraine), the second element of which is derived from Old Iranian **pord-* (confluence), and Korol (a tributary) from Old Iranian **horv-*. These two examples illustrate that the phenomenon of pleophony appeared after interference of the Slavs and the Iranians on the basis stated above [11, p. 130].

According to A.A. Shakhmatov’s interpretation, the demonstrative example represented the history of the Russian word *король* (king) characterized as eastern Slavonic phenomenon of pleophony. The name of Frankish king Charles the Great which was known to the Slavs in the 8th – 9th cc. was changed into a common noun, and underwent all the variations peculiar to the original words with such combinations as **tort* : cf. eastern Slavonic *король*, Old Slavonic *кралъ*, Polish *król*, Czech *král*. A. A. Shakhmatov assumed that the word penetrated into the Old Russian language from one of the West Slavonic languages (Czech or Polish) to the metathesis of vowel and consonant sounds [10, p. 152].

A.A. Shakhmatov’s interpretation established the traditional norms. V.V. Ivanov and M.A. Zhovtobriukh followed his ideas in their investigations [5, p. 128–129; 4, p. 160]. Yu. Sheveliov understood the origin of the word «*король*» in another way: Ukrainian word *король* turned out to be an adaptation in Pre-Ukrainian dialects of Czech word *král* and Bulgarian *краль* [11, p. 131]. The scholar considered the word *мороморь* one of the latest borrowings which originated from Old Slavonic **mormorъ*; A.A. Shakhmatov interpreted the reconstructed word **mormorъ* as borrowed from the Greek language [11, c. 152].

M. Vasmer supported A.A. Shakhmatov’s version of the etymological analysis who admitted Latin influence of the word *мармор* [9, v. 3, p. 668]. V.V. Ivanov did not take into account A.A. Shakhmatov’s concepts and gave the etymology of the word *мрамор* as an example illustrating the process of borrowing from other languages [5, p. 24].

Yu. Sheveliov suggested another interpretation. He explained the etymology of the word *моромор* as “simple substitution” of Old Slavonic *мраморъ* [11, p. 131]. He involved other phonetic significant examples in his research and took them into consideration.

Conclusions. The investigation of a definite group of documents, which are combined in accordance with their attributing character to different periods, can give the possibility to reconstruct the language system and the dialect reflected at definite phases and the realization of language system in speech at different synchronic levels as well as in the dynamics.

The analysis of the works by the linguists of the second half in the 20th century revealed that the research of a group of documents linked together in keeping with the indication of synchronism but territorially different can contribute to the reconstruction of the language system in its dialectal variations at the same synchronic level. However it should be given emphasis to the investigation of written documents which belong to different but adjacent territories taking into account contemporary dialectal division.

The research of a group of documents which belong to different territories and different periods of history using both the records of dialectology and linguistic geography will give an opportunity to describe comprehensively the dialects of East Slavonic languages.

Further investigation of works by Yu. Sheveliov will give the opportunity to reveal in a profound and comprehensive way, the methods of research by Yu. Sheveliov along with modern dialectal records, the material of old written documents and other sources of studying language history.

References:

1. Глушенко В.А. Принципи порівняльно-історичного дослідження в українському і російському мовознавстві (70-і рр. XIX ст. – 20-і рр. XX ст.): монографія / НАН України, Ін-т мовознавства ім. О.О. Потебні; відп. ред. О.Б. Ткаченко. Донецьк, 1998. 222 с.
2. Дурново Н.Н. Введение в историю русского языка : монография. Москва : Наука, 1969. 295 с.
3. Етимологічний словник української мови : в 7 т. / гол. ред. О.С. Мельничук. Т. 3. Київ : Наукова думка, 1989. 551 с.
4. Жовтобрюх М.А. Історія української мови : фонетика. Київ : Наукова думка, 1979. 367 с.
5. Иванов В.В. Историческая грамматика русского языка : учеб. для студентов пед. ин-тов по спец. «Русс. яз. и лит». 3-е изд. Москва : Просвещение, 1990. 400 с.
6. Роман В.В. Адаптація лексичних запозичень у концепції І.І. Огієнка: загальнолінгвістичний аспект. *Нова філологія*. Запоріжжя, 2013. № 53. С. 149–153.
7. Рябініна І.М. Джерела вивчення історії мови в українському та російському мовознавстві XIX ст. – 30-х рр. XX ст. : автореф.

дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.15 Донецький нац. ун-т. Донецьк, 2007. 20 с.

8. Рябініна І.М. Джерела вивчення історії східнослов'янських мов у студіях В.В. Колесова та Ю.В. Шевельова. *Східнослов'янська філологія*. Горлівка, 2006. С. 152–159.
9. Фасмер М. Этимологический словарь русского языка : в 4-х т. Т. 2. 2-е изд. Москва : Прогресс, 1986. 672 с.
10. Шахматов А.А. Очерк древнейшего периода истории русского языка. Репринтное изд. Москва : Индрик, 2002. XXVIII, II, L, 369 с.
11. Шевельов Ю.В. Історична фонологія української мови. Харків : Акта, 2002. 1054 с.

Луковенко Т. О., Роман В. В., Рябініна І. М. До питання про джерела вивчення історії східнослов'янських мов у студіях Ю. Шевельова

Анотація. У статті розглянуто підхід видатного українського компаративіста другої половини XX ст. Ю. Шевельова до джерел вивчення історії української мови, розкрито специфіку прийомів роботи вченого із сучасними діалектними даними, матеріалом давніх писемних пам'яток, іншими джерелами. Статтю виконано на матеріалі книги Ю. Шевельова «Історична фонологія української мови». Показано новизну, внесену лінгвістом у дослідження проблеми джерел вивчення історії мови, викладено твердження, що зберігають цінність для сучасного мовознавства.

Ключові слова: джерела вивчення історії мови, пріоритетне джерело, матеріал давніх писемних пам'яток, сучасні діалектні дані.

Луковенко Т. А., Роман В. В., Рябініна І. Н. К вопросу об источниках изучения истории восточнославянских языков в студиях Ю. Шевелёва

Аннотация. В статье рассмотрен подход выдающегося украинского компаративиста второй половины XX в. Ю. Шевелёва к источникам изучения истории украинского языка, раскрыта специфика приемов работы ученого с современными диалектными данными, материалом древних письменных памятников, другими источниками. Статья выполнена на материале книги Ю. Шевелёва «Историческая фонология украинского языка». Показана новизна, внесенная лингвистом в исследование проблемы источников изучения истории языка, изложены положения, сохраняющие ценность для современного языкознания.

Ключевые слова: источники изучения истории языка, приоритетный источник, материал древних письменных памятников, современные диалектные данные.