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Abstract

The Sinaiskij Paterik, one of the oldest written documents in Old Russian literature, was translated from a 7th century Greek original. Scholars are divided on the topic of the place and time of translation of this document into Old East Slavic. The majority of linguists postulate that it was translated in Bulgaria in the 10th century while others believe that the Sinaiskij Paterik was translated in the 9th century by Saint Methodius, and yet others think that the translation took place in Old Rus' in the 11th century. The original text is known as Λειμωνάριον 'meadow', and represents a series of didactic stories about lives of monks.

The fact that this is a translation does not mean an absence of variation in the Old Russian text. Indeed, the document contains different kinds of variation.

One instance of such variation is the presence in the manuscript of both uncontracted and contracted imperfect forms. It is a very interesting phenomenon as the majority of the imperfects used in Old Russian documents represent a contracted variety, reflecting a process evident already in Old Church Slavonic. The objective of my research was to investigate the factors which might have possibly influenced the use of uncontracted forms in the document and to determine which factors, if any, had conditioned such use. My exhaustive analysis of all conceivable factors led me to conclude that only individual preferences of scribes and the length of words might have influenced the choice of uncontracted forms, whether in the translation or the copying process.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1. Preliminary Remarks

The Sinaiskij Paterik is one of the oldest written documents in Russian literature. It was translated from the Greek original written in the beginning of the 7th century by the Byzantine monk John Moschus. The original text is known as Λειμωνάριον 'meadow', from λειμών 'meadow, flower garden', Lat. Pratum spirituale 'Spiritual meadow', and represents a series of didactic stories about lives of monks, collected by Moschus while traveling in Egypt, Syria, Palestine and other Middle East countries with his friend and disciple Sophronius. The place and time of translation of this document into Old East Slavic are controversial but the majority of scholars postulate that it was translated in Bulgaria in the 10th century (Slovar' knižnikov i knižnosti Drevnej Rusi, 1987). However some linguists believe that the Sinaiskij Paterik was translated in the 9th century by Saint Methodius (Ivanova, 1965), while others think that the translation took place in Old Rus' in the 11th century (L'vov, 1967). The last 36 chapters of the book were added later by the Slavic translators (Žukovskaja, 1984).

The manuscript was published by V.S. Golyšenko and V.F.Dubrovina in Moscow in 1967. My analysis is based on this text.
The manuscript was written mainly by the same scribe. However, Golyšenko and Dubrovina identified at least 7 other distinct handwritings in the document.

The Sinaiskij Paterik represents great opportunities for linguistic analysis as it reflects various linguistic changes characteristic of Old East Slavic. It is possible that some of the variation may stem from the antegraphs as it was highly characteristic of the younger Old Church Slavonic (OCS) texts (Collins, personal communication). Being one of the oldest texts in Russian literature, the Sinaiskij Paterik may represent either the first copy of its Old Church Slavonic protograph, or it may be distant from its protograph by one or two copies. As such, its linguistic system has to render a combination of the linguistic features of OCS supplemented by the linguistic skills of scribes, which were formed under the influence of their general cultural surroundings and specifically the scriptorium in which the work had been done (Mironova 2001, 172). However, neither the protograph nor the antegraph copies are available to us, and therefore we cannot make definitive conclusions regarding the origins of each case of variation in the document.

One type of variation in the manuscript is the presence of uncontracted imperfect verbs alongside with their contracted forms. The focus of this study is to identify whether there were certain factors which might have conditioned contraction of the imperfects in some situations while preserving uncontracted forms in other environments. I assume that even if contraction or noncontraction of imperfects in general were carried over from the antegraphs, there could be some factors which had an influence on their use in the
specific situations. However, I also concede the possibility of random distribution of the uncontracted imperfects throughout the text.

2. The imperfect tense in Old Russian

The imperfect was one of two simple past tenses in Russian and other Slavic languages (the other was the aorist), which at some time was actively used for communication but was lost relatively early from the most of Slavic languages including Russian during the gradual reshaping of their verbal systems. The loss of the imperfect in Old Russian preceded that of the aorist, and its beginning is dated by scholars to no later than the 12th century (Kuznecov 1959, 215).

The oldest Old Russian manuscripts of the 11-12th centuries, both original and translated from the Old Church Slavonic versions, contain numerous examples of the imperfect in texts of different genres.

The imperfect was formed by using the suffixes -ɛax/-aax/-aax and the root aorist endings and denoted continuous, habitual, repeated action without reference to its temporal restrictions or completion: несъкахъ 'carried.1Sg', можааше 'was able.2,3Sg', биваашете '.beat.2Pl'. However, the old manuscripts also contain numerous examples of imperfects based on perfective stems and representing repeated, but completed, actions (Kuznecov 1959, 197): оумраше 'died.2,3Sg', сожъкаху 'burned.3Pl'.

Most of the imperfects used in the Old Russian documents represent a contracted variety, thus reflecting a process which is evident already in Old Church Slavonic. In
contracted imperfects the suffix -ѣах/-ѧх/-ѧх is reduced to -ѧх/-ѧх/-ѧх depending on the type of the stem: несѧхъ 'carried.1Sg', речѧше 'said.2,3Sg', чѹчаѧше 'sensed.2Pl'. Nonetheless, the oldest manuscripts of the 11-12\textsuperscript{th} century still use a number of uncontracted imperfects, probably under the influence of OCS (Borkovskij 1963, 257).

3. Types of the imperfect in the Sinaiskij Paterik

Both the contracted and uncontracted types of the imperfect are found in the Sinaiskij Paterik. Out of 761 tokens of the imperfect in the document 121 are uncontracted, which makes 15.9% of all imperfects. This fact raises the question of whether it is possible to determine the factors which defined the use of contracted imperfects in some situations but uncontracted forms in others. Therefore the objective of this research is to investigate the factors which might have influenced the usage of uncontracted forms in the document and to determine which factors, if any, had conditioned such usage.

4. Factors analyzed

I recognize that some factors are more likely than others to make a difference in the choice of the form. However, it is important to look into as many factors as possible, even the unlikely ones, in order to be able to eliminate the possibility of their impact. The factors which in my opinion are more likely to influence the choice of contraction are the personal preferences of the scribes, the position of the word in the line and in the sentence, and the length of the word. Nonetheless, I have also examined other factors
which seem to have a very low likelihood of making an impact, i.e., factors based on semantic characteristics and orthographic features.

All of the factors analyzed can be also divided into linguistic and non-linguistic. Among linguistic factors, I examined syllabic structure of verbs, aspectual type of stems, the kind of graphemes in the line, and the semantic typology of words and sentences. For non-linguistic factors I considered the above mentioned preferences of the scribes, the position of the word in the line and in the sentence, the number of syllables per line and in the word, and the number of graphemes in the line.

Each of these parameters seems to be potentially influential for its own reasons in the process of translation or copying the document. Aspect could have been a contributing factor if scribes associated contraction either with perfective or imperfective verbs. Hypothetically, markedness of perfective verbs, which denote finished action limited in time, might have resulted in the marked contracted forms of the imperfect. Such factors as the kind of graphemes, word position, or number of syllables or graphemes per line might have been influential from the point of view of economy as scribes had to be very rational in their usage of valuable manuscript space. It is recognized that in cases in which scribes had a choice, they would prefer to use the narrower graphemes towards the end of the line. In the introductory paleographic description of the Sinaiskij Paterik V.S. Golyšenko and V.F.Dubrovina mention that the graphemes ȋ and ȷ were used in the manuscript mainly at the end of lines (Golyšenko and Dubrovina, 24) while their wider counterparts H and O elsewhere. For the same reason,
scribes might have preferred contracted imperfects towards the end of the line, or in lines with a greater number of syllables or graphemes, and especially, with the wider graphemes.

Another factor I analyzed is the length of a word. The longer forms of the imperfect in the Sinaiskij Paterik are represented by verbs with roots longer than two syllables, by composite derivatives, and by the 1st person plural and 1st person dual verbs. I posit that the longer forms of the imperfect in the document should be represented mainly by contracted forms as a way to compensate for their extension in length.

Finally, scribes themselves might have been influenced by the group norms if they worked in a scriptorium, or they could also have their own preferences based on their educational background, age, or other factors. The scribes could also be partially implementing their own patterns on top of earlier patterns found in the antegraphs (Collins, personal communication). However, there is no way to analyze their working environments as well as their personal characteristics. There is also no information available to us about other manuscripts copied by the same scribes who worked on the Sinaiskij Paterik, which would allow one to discern grammatical peculiarities in their writing. Therefore the term 'personal preference' used in my analysis simply reflects statistical data which indicates whether the scribe uses mainly contracted or uncontracted forms of the imperfect in the absence of other relevant factors playing a role.

Another factor, semantic typology of a word, sentence or context in general, might also have played some role in preserving the older uncontracted imperfects due to their
stylistic nuances but this should be regarded as the lowest in the hierarchy of the likelihood. Presumably, the older uncontracted imperfects might have been associated with the meanings of state and process, which denote a static or slow developing action in progress, rather than with meanings of achievement or accomplishment, which express dynamism and completion.

Carefully assessing each of these factors in all the individual cases when imperfect verbs were used in the document, I tried to come up with the system that would explain why contraction of imperfects takes place in some contexts while in others it does not. I started my analysis by comparing verbs represented by both contracted and uncontracted forms. However, in regard to these verbs, my research has not allowed me to make a particular case for the majority of the above mentioned factors, except for the individual choice of the scribes and the length of the word. The next step was to put to the test verbs represented only in one group, either contracted or uncontracted. Besides previously mentioned factors, I have also examined their verb class based on the type of infinitive and present tense stems. An exhaustive analysis of these verbs returned the same results as for the verbal pairs represented in the manuscript in both forms. This allowed me to infer that in the case of such verbs the type of the imperfect may simply be an idiosyncratic lexical property of the verb itself and is not conditioned by other factors.
Chapter 2: Data analysis

1. General overview of the imperfects in the Sinaiskij Paterik

In the Sinaiskij Paterik I found 761 tokens of the imperfect tense in both contracted and uncontracted forms, representing 230 distinct verbs. Most of these imperfects, 175 verbs, are contracted and were formed using the imperfect suffixes -ах (-аш)/-ах (-аш)/-ах (-аш): e.g., бесѣдоваховѣ 'talked, conversed.1Du', възлежаше 'laid.3Sg', въпихахоу 'drank.1Pl', въпрашаше 'asked.3Sg', имахоу 'had.3Pl', жалаше 'felt sorry.3Sg'.

However, the document also contains 121 token of uncontracted imperfects representing 55 verbs with the suffixes -аах (-ааш)/-аах (-ааш)/-аах(-ааш): e.g., бѣжаахоу 'ran.3Pl', въсхожаше 'ascended.3Sg', хоташе 'wanted.3Sg', вѣдѣаше 'knew.3Sg'.

Thirty out of these verbs (37 tokens) are used only in uncontracted form while the rest of them are also found as contracted.
2. Overview of grammatical forms of the imperfects in the Sinaiskij Paterik

2.1. 3rd Person Singular

Within each of these groups the imperfect was most often used to denote the 3rd person singular (41 uncontracted and 129 contracted verb types, or 95 uncontracted and 679 contracted tokens).

(1) онъ же не хот1аше въ синаискую

he (part.) not wanted.Uncontr.Imperf.3Sg said.Pres.Act.Part to Sinai.Dat.Sg

гору хохъ ити.

Mountain.Dat.Sg want.1Sg.Pres to go.Infin.

'He didn't want, saying: I want to go to the Sinai mountain.' (Sinaiskii Paterik, 3 r line 6)

(2) архиепискупъ же. Ножкаше

archbishop (part.) insisted.Contr.Imperf.3Sg

'archbishop was insisting' (Sinaiskij Paterik, 3 r line 8)

2.2. 3rd Person Plural

The 3rd person plural imperfects make the next largest group in the document (11 uncontracted and 28 contracted verb types, or 23 uncontracted and 52 contracted tokens). Among these verbs the document contains orthographic variants. Most of verbs are
written with the digraph -oy (9 uncontracted and 31 contracted tokens), but some verbs still use the older ending – ž (4 uncontracted and 2 contracted tokens).

(3) тъ же мазаше и кръщаше.

He (part.) annointed.Contr.Imperf.3Sg and baptized.Contr.Imperf.3Sg

иже о семь прихожаху.

those who for that came.Contr.Imperf.3Pl

'He was anointing and baptizing those who were coming to him for that purpose.'

(4) и половырьна оставиааше охождааш.

And half-dead having left walked away-Uncontr.Imperf.3Pl

'And having left (him) half-dead, they walked away.'

2.3. 1st Person Singular, 1st Person Plural, and 1st Person Dual

The Sinaiskij Paterik also contains a few verbs expressing the 1st person singular (1 uncontracted and 12 contracted verb types/1 uncontracted and 22 contracted tokens), the 1st person plural (1 uncontracted and 5 contracted verbs/1 uncontracted and 7 contracted tokens), and the 1st person dual (1 uncontracted and 1 contracted verb types/tokens).
Then said him elder not this (part.) pain for was praying. Contr. Imperf. 1Sg you. Acc. Sg

'Then the elder said to him: is it not for this pain that I was praying for you?' (Sinaiskij Paterik, 30 v line 15)

and on every Saturday was going. Uncontr. Imperf. 1Sg to him

'And on every Saturday I was going to him'. (Sinaiskij Paterik, 37 v line 4)

were. Uncontr. Imperf. 1Pl because we in sorrow

'Because we were in sorrow' (Sinaiskij Paterik, 12 v line 7)

in sorrow were. Contr. Imperf. 1Pl great

'We were in great sorrow' (Sinaiskij Paterik, 121 r line 19)

we two (part.) and both. Dat. Sg had. Uncontr. Imperf. 1Du information
'We two had information for both'. (Sinaiskij Paterik, 117 v line 11)

(10) 

\[
\text{\textit{беседовашь же съ нимь}}
\]

\textit{talked.Contr.Imperf.1Du} (part.) with him

'We two were talking with him' (Sinaiskij Paterik, 114 v line 8)

As can be seen here, all grammatical forms are represented by both contracted and uncontracted imperfects, but the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person singular and plural verbs show a greater tendency to preserve uncontracted forms (3Sg - 28.9\% uncontracted imperfects, 3Pl - 28.3\%, 1Pl – 13\%). However, the number of imperfects represented by other than 3\textsuperscript{rd} person grammatical categories is too small to allow one to infer that grammatical form played a role in the choice of contraction.

3. Long vs. short grammatical forms

The longer forms of the imperfect in the Sinaiskij Paterik include complex derivatives as opposed to simplex verbs, verbs with longer roots consisting of a few syllables, and the forms which are paradigmatically longer such as the 1\textsuperscript{st} person plural and the 1\textsuperscript{st} person dual verbs as opposed to the 1\textsuperscript{st} person singular.

My hypothesis is that the longer forms of the imperfects might have undergone the compensatory contraction.

The difference in numbers between simplex and composite imperfect verb types in the document is rather small, 131 of the former versus 99 of the latter. There are 33
distinct simplex uncontracted and 98 simplex contracted imperfect verb types in the document in addition to 22 composite uncontracted and 77 composite contracted verbs. However, the number of tokens of simplex imperfects is almost twice as large as the number of tokens of composite derivatives: 87 uncontracted and 443 contracted simplex imperfects (530 total) as opposed to 34 uncontracted and 197 contracted composite imperfects (231 total), which indicates that in general simplex verbs are used more often in the imperfect tense than composite verbs.

The weight of simplex uncontracted and composite uncontracted imperfects within the groups of simplex and composite imperfects in general do not differ appreciably. As shown in the Table 1, the ratio of simplex uncontracted imperfect verb types among all simplex imperfect verb types in the document to the corresponding verb tokens is 25.19% to 16.41%, which is very close to the ratio of types of composite uncontracted imperfects among all composite imperfects in the document to their tokens, 22.22% to 14.72%. This data contradicts my hypothesis that composite forms should have undergone contraction more often than simplex forms of the imperfect.
The document contains three composite derivatives of particular interest for my research. Each of them has two prefixes, which makes them syllabically longer than other imperfects in the Sinaiskij Paterik: въс-при-имаше 'received.3Sg' (used 1 time), ик-по-вѣдаше 'confessed.3Sg' (used 2 times), and про-по-вѣдаше 'preached.3Sg' (used 1 times). All of these verbs are used only in the contracted form, which might have been defined by their morphological structure. However, the number of such verbs and their frequency in the document are too low to infer that double prefixation triggers contraction of the imperfects in the document.

Another category of longer grammatical forms in the document is a small group of imperfect verbs with roots consisting of more than one syllable. There are only few such verbs and all of them are contracted: бесѣд-овашь/бесѣд-оваше
'conversed.1Du/conversed.3Sg' (each used once), комък-аваше 'received communion.3Sg' (used 1 time), не-береж-ахоу 'didn't care.3Pl' (used 1 time), об-лыгъч-ахоу 'relieved.3Pl' (used 1 time), оупражн-аше 'practiced.3Sg' (used 3 times), and хвальств-овахоу 'bragged.3Pl' (used 1 time). The fact that these verbs are represented only in the contracted forms provides a suggestive argument in support of the assumption that the longer grammatical forms in the document usually undergo contraction in the imperfect tense.

The third group of longer forms of the imperfect is represented by the 1st person plural and the 1st person dual which are paradigmatically longer (by one syllable) than the rest of the imperfect's forms. There are only two cases of the 1st person dual imperfect in the entire document: one is contracted and the other is uncontracted. Such an even distribution of forms within dual does not indicate any inclination towards preference of either form. Besides, the data is too limited to allow for a meaningful conclusion based on the usage of dual imperfects in the manuscript.

However, the 1st person plural imperfects are more numerous than dual imperfects and the majority of them are contracted. As seen in the Table 2, the weight of types of contracted 1st person plural imperfects within the group of the 1st person plural imperfects in general is 83.33% and the weight of their tokens within the same group is 87.5%. Thus length may be a factor favoring contraction in the imperfects.
As can be seen here, analysis of the longer grammatical forms of the imperfect in the document has returned mixed results. The imperfects with double prefixes and verbs with roots consisting of two or more syllables are represented only by contracted forms. The same applies to the 1st person plural imperfects. This usage is consistent with the hypothesis proposed above that the longer grammatical forms should trigger contraction, compensating for their extension in length.

However, the fact that uncontracted composite imperfects are used more often than their simplex counterparts, contradicts this hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of types in document</th>
<th>Number of tokens in document</th>
<th>Weight of types of uncontracted imperfects grammatical category (%)</th>
<th>Weight of tokens of uncontracted imperfects within their grammatical category (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1P Sg uncontr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P Pl uncontr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P Du uncontr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P Sg contr.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92.31</td>
<td>95.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P Pl contr.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P Du contr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Ratio of the longer grammatical forms to the shorter grammatical forms
4. Scribal preference

Often linguistic peculiarities of ancient manuscripts depend on individual preferences of the scribes engaged in the process of copying or translating, which in turn reflect the scribes pronunciation or a system of rules they are familiar with (Lunt, 1949). At least 8 scribes contributed to the writing of this document. The following chart illustrates distribution of the handwritings throughout the manuscript. The scribes are given a unique number from I to VIII. Since most of pages were written by the same scribe (I), the list of the pages copied by this scribe has been omitted from the chart below.

Based on the data presented in the Table 3, all scribes who worked on the Sinaiskij Paterik, used the imperfect verbs in their writing, and most of them, with the exception of the scribes III and VIII, used a certain number of uncontracted forms. The greatest contribution of the uncontracted imperfects to the document was made by scribe I (115 tokens, which makes 15.8% of all imperfects contributed by this scribe).
However, the rest of the scribes contributed only very limited number of uncontracted imperfects, 1 or 2, thus showing an obvious preference towards contracted forms. It is especially evident in regards to the scribes IV, VI, and VIII, whose contribution of contracted imperfects is above 80% for each. Only scribe VII uses no contracted imperfects, but the total number of imperfects used by this scribe is very small cant (1 token) which does not allow us for firm conclusions about his linguistic preferences.

Table 3. Distribution of the writing among the scribes

| Handwriting | Number of pages | Contribution of pages into document (%) | Imperfects total | Contribution of imperfects to the document (%) | Uncontracted imperfects by the scribe | Contribution of uncontracted imperfects by the scribe (%) | Contracted forms to the total number of imperfects by scribe (%) | Uncontracted forms to the total number of imperfects by scribe (%) | Pages contributed by the scribe |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| I           | 315            | 87.99                                  | 728             | 95.66                                     | 115                                 | 95.04                                                    | 84.2                                                     | 15.8                                                     | L. 15 R, 16 R (line 12) – 17 (line 4)                     |
| II          | 3              | 0.84                                   | 2               | 0.26                                      | 1                                   | 0.83                                                     | 50                                                       | 50                                                       | L. 21 R (line 16) – 23 (line 3)                           |
| III         | 4              | 1.12                                   | 2               | 0.26                                      | 0                                   | 0                                                        | 100                                                      | 0                                                        | L. 24 (line 8) – 28(line 7)                               |
| IV          | 9              | 2.51                                   | 7               | 0.92                                      | 1                                   | 0.83                                                     | 50                                                       | 50                                                       | L. 38 R (lines 1-2), 39 R (lines 3-12), 40 (line 15-16) - 40 R (line 1), 52 R (lines 16-20), 58 R (lines 15-20), 65 (lines 16-20), 69 (lines 5-20), 70 (line 12) – 71, 78 (lines 7-10) |
| V           | 13             | 3.61                                   | 4               | 0.53                                      | 2                                   | 1.65                                                     | 50                                                       | 50                                                       | L. 42 R, 72 (lines 1-12), 106 R (lines 15-16), 107 R (lines 1-11), 122 R, 153 (lines 4-12), 157, 166 R (lines 9-20), 169 (lines 1-4) |
| VI          | 9              | 2.51                                   | 9               | 1.19                                      | 1                                   | 0.83                                                     | 88.89                                                    | 11.18                                                    | L. 60 R                                                  |
| VII         | 1              | 0.28                                   | 1               | 0.13                                      | 1                                   | 0.82                                                     | 0                                                        | 100                                                      | L. 173 R – 174 (lines 1-5)                               |
| VIII        | 2              | 0.56                                   | 8               | 1.05                                      | 0                                   | 0                                                        | 100                                                      | 0                                                        |                                                          |

Total count: 761 100 121 100
Unfortunately, there is no information available about the scribes' regions and the exact times when each of them was working on the document, information which would help determine to what extent each of them might have been influenced by such external factors in the replacement of uncontracted imperfects with their contracted forms. Nor can we make connection between individual characteristics of scribes such as their education, age, physical traits, etc., and their linguistic preferences. However, my analysis shows that there was an obvious preference by the majority of the scribes working on the manuscript towards contracted forms of the imperfect.

5. Word position in the line and in the sentence

Another factor I investigated is the word's position in the line and in the sentence. For analysis I randomly selected every fifth verb from the list of imperfects sorted alphabetically, which yielded 35 contracted and 11 uncontracted verbs. While the use of some verbs is seemingly restricted to a certain position, most of imperfects are found in all positions of the sentence or the line, i.e., initial, non-initial, and final. Based on this fact, I infer that neither position in the line nor in the sentence influenced scribes decisions regarding the use of a specific form. For example, the verb сѣдѧше/сѣдѧше 'was sitting.3Sg', which is quite common in the manuscript and was used 21 times in contracted form and 6 times in uncontracted form, is consistently found in non-initial position both in the line and in the sentence except for one instance when the contracted form of this verb is used in initial position in the line and one instance when it was used...
in the initial position in the sentence. However, most other imperfects found in the manuscript are used in any of these positions, thus eliminating the factor of positioning as decisive.

6. Syllabic structure of the word

Another factor which presumably could have influenced a choice of using uncontracted imperfects instead of contracted ones is the syllabic structure of verbs. Presumably, developing closed syllables might have resulted in preserving noncontraction of imperfects as a way to compensate for the loss of jers thus preventing a verb from becoming too short, perhaps. However, my research shows that the majority of imperfect verbs in the document both contracted and uncontracted are constituted of the open/light syllables with a few exceptions of the verbs which contain either closed syllables or consonant clusters: въСКЛепааше 'accused.3Sg', поГРоужааше 'immersed.3Sg', съХРанѧаше 'protected.3Sg', СТРадахоу 'suffered.3Pl', съБЛажнаше 'tempted.3Sg'. Nonetheless, while such clusters make syllables heavier, they do not close syllables and, therefore, do not contradict the above rule.

7. Number of syllables per line

In order to investigate whether the number of syllables had any effect on the choice of contraction, I counted syllables in lines with every tenth contracted imperfect and every fifth uncontracted imperfect sorted alphabetically. The count resulted in 23
contracted and 14 uncontracted imperfects. Based on this analysis, throughout the entire document the length of lines where either type of the imperfect was used fluctuates from 13 to 19 syllables (see Appendices 1 and 2).

For selected contracted imperfects, 1 line had 14 syllables, 1 line – 15 syllables, 12 lines – 16 syllables, 5 lines – 17 syllables, and 3 lines – 18 syllables. One of the analyzed lines was shorter due to concluding a chapter and consisted of 11 syllables.

For selected uncontracted imperfects, 1 line had 14 syllables, 3 lines – 15 syllables, 3 lines – 16 syllables, 2 lines – 17 syllables, 2 lines - 18 syllables, 1 line – 19 syllables, and 1 line – 20 syllables.

(11) (въ сеи старыць мнкън про) звутеръ

(in this elder some clergyman

сѣдаше великъ же вѣ зѣло ста(рыцъ и доброравны)

was sitting,Uncontr.Imperf.3Sg great (part.) was very elder and virtuous.

'In this (church) some great elder was sitting who was very old and virtuous.' (Sinaiskij Paterik, 15 v 16; 15 syllables)

(12) Гѣлалшо мнцени в оць. авва георги ошьльци.ако

said.Uncontr.Imperf.3Pl some from father avva Georgy hermits which
“Certain hermits from among the fathers of Abba George said...” (Sinaiskij Paterik, 62 v 15; 20 syllables)

(13) (смѣ)хь же на вѣдущѣ вѣдомъ многъ бѣше

laugh in the air devil.Dat.Pl many was.Contr.Imperf.3Sg

'There was much laughter at devils in the air' (Sinaiskij Paterik, 174 r, line 5; 14 syllables)

(14) (вельблудьникъ) же иже бѣ осьла поалѣ.

driver of camel (part.) which was donkey caught

идѣше пакѣ пышеница (продавать въ сѣм градѣ.)

Walked.Contr.Imperf.3Sg again wheat sell in holy city

'The camel-driver which had caught the donkey was walking again to the holy city to sell some wheat' (Sinaiskii Paterik, 75 line3; 19 syllables)

The above examples (11)-(14) were selected randomly based only on the difference in the length of lines. They clearly demonstrate that both contracted and uncontracted imperfects are used in the shorter and in the longer lines and therefore the length of line cannot be considered a defining factor for choosing contraction.
8. Aspectual type of stem

Most imperfect verbs in Old Russian were traditionally formed from imperfective stems. In the 11th century, at the time of the manuscript, the imperfect was still a living form of preterite, used to denote an action unlimited in time, repeated or continued in its development (Kuznecov, 196). However, sometimes an imperfect could be also created from perfective stems. In such cases the imperfect reflected an action which was repeated in the past but every time was completed. The preference of one aspectual type of imperfect over another in Old Russian depended on the semantic goals of the text (Bunina, 110).

Most of uncontracted and contracted imperfect verbs in the Sinaiskij Paterik are formed on the basis of imperfective stems and express the traditional meaning of the imperfect. However, there are very few verbs in each group of imperfects which are created from the perfective stems, i.e., contracted "стояш" 'was distant.3Sg', "подьахъ'lifted up.1Sg; and uncontracted "повелахоу'commanded.3Pl', "иставше'exhausted.3Sg', "придахой'approached, brought closer.3Pl', "сеончааш" 'finished.3Sg'. The distribution of imperfects based on perfective stems is completely random in both groups and constitutes about 10% of all contracted and 4% of the uncontracted imperfects in the document. The number of contracted imperfects created from the perfective stem is slightly higher than the number of those within the uncontracted group, but the overall numbers are too small to allow for a meaningful comparison.
9. Number and kind of graphemes in the line

In my opinion, it is reasonable to investigate whether the kind and number of graphemes in the line define usage of a particular form of the imperfect in the document. Traditionally, scribes had to start counting spaces towards the end of lines to make sure that they would be able to fit all text designed for that line (Gribble, personal communication). Such an economy-driven approach might have led scribes to choose contracted forms over uncontracted if verbs were to be used at the end of lines.

However, analysis of randomly selected lines with either contracted or uncontracted imperfects leads me to the observation that neither of these factors affected scribes' choice of the particular form of the imperfect. I sampled in total 30 lines from different pages, written by different scribes: 20 lines with contracted imperfects and 10 lines with uncontracted forms. The number of graphemes per line with either type of the imperfect varies from 27 to 36. Evidently, there is no reason to believe that the number of graphemes defines usage of the particular form of the imperfect. Another evidence that economy of space in the document was not the decisive factor in the choice of contraction is the fact that pages have ragged edges and many lines have spaces at the end which were available to fit another syllable but which were not used by scribes.

I also performed random analysis of the kind of graphemes constituting lines with different forms of the imperfect, assuming that presence of the wider digraphs such asiotated vowels ɪə, ɪɛ, ɪɛ, ɪɛ, ɪɛ, vowels ɨ or ɤ, ligature ʊ, or fricative consonants ɥ
or might have triggered usage of contracted forms in order for scribes to be able to compensate the line space. I analyzed lines with the highest number of graphemes (36-37) and the lowest numbers of graphemes (27-30). All analyzed lines contain a variety of graphemes both narrow and wide, and it is evident, that distribution of uncontracted forms of the imperfect does not depend on the number of the wide graphemes.

10. Semantic typology of the word and the sentence

It seems reasonable to me to investigate into semantic classes of verbs and sentences with the intention to discern whether there is any correlation between the semantic type and morphological form of the imperfect. My analysis of semantic typology is based on the classification by Eva Eckert (1985) who, in turn, drew on the categories from Vendler and other authors, by which verbal actions are divided into seven types that are expressed by a verb in combination with its sentential context (Eckert, 169): state, activity, process, iterative action, accomplishment, achievement, and event. Below I reproduce definitions of these verbal actions given by Eckert (1985, 170):

- **State** – situation homogeneous throughout its existence;
- **Activity** – a dynamic state: an action involving no change throughout its existence, but (unlike true states) requiring input of energy;
- **Process** – dynamic situation leading toward a goal;
- **Iterative action** – situation implying repetition of action;
- **Accomplishment** – result of a state or an activity;
- Achievement – final goal or a process;
- Event – one of the actions that create an iterative action.

I speculated that uncontracted forms of the, due to their older nature, might have survived longer within restricted lexical contexts which required specific means of expression, i.e., certain semantic types of verbal action. However, random analysis of imperfect verbs throughout the document has shown that different types of verbal action are equally represented in both contracted and uncontracted groups. Most commonly, imperfect verbs based on imperfective stems render the meaning of state or activity, with a few imperfects denoting process. The document also contains some examples of accomplishment and achievement rendered either by contracted or uncontracted imperfects formed from perfective stems.

Some examples illustrated these findings:

1. Activity – гънаахоу 'drove away,hunted.3Pl' uncontracted; хожааше 'walked.3Sg', uncontracted; бесѣдоваховѣ – 'conversed.1Du' contracted; въкоушаше 'ate.3Sg' contracted; мазаше 'anointed.3Sg' contracted; почиаше 'rested.3Sg' contracted.

2. State - сѣдѧаше 'sat.3Sg' uncontracted; владѧаше 'possessed.3Sg' uncontracted. блахомъ 'was.1Pl' uncontracted; баши 'was.3Sg' contracted.

3. Process – въсхожааше 'ascended.3Sg' uncontracted; възношааше 'lifted/praised.3Sg' contracted.
4. Accomplishment/achievement – исказь 'exhausted.3Sg' uncontracted; сваранье 'cooked.3Sg' contracted; повелахо 'commanded.3Pl' uncontracted.

As can be seen, distribution of different verbal types throughout the document does not indicate that either contracted or uncontracted imperfects were semantically restricted within the contexts.

Analysis of a broader contextual unit, the sentence, also shows that there is no isomorphism between lexical type of the context and the morphological implementation of the imperfect. Random selection of sentences with imperfects illustrates that both contracted and uncontracted forms are always used in contexts of the narrative style, which eliminates the factor of a semantic type of the context as defining contraction of the imperfect.

11. Verbs represented only in contracted or uncontracted form of imperfect

Some imperfect verbs in the Sinaiskij Paterik are used only in contracted or uncontracted form. The document contains 30 such unpaired uncontracted and 184 such unpaired contracted imperfects. I have already included these verbs into above analyses and examined them for any evidence of conformity to general tendencies of the document concerning a choice of contraction. The only distinctive factor for these verbs, which has not been analyzed so far, is their verb class based on the type of the stem.
Verbs of Old Russian are traditionally classified by the type of a stem of either the infinitive or the 3rd person plural present (Lunt 1974). As Lunt points out, in the majority of cases, the basic stem of a verb was the longer one out of two. In cases when two stems are the same length, the basic stem is chosen on the grounds of providing more information (Lunt, 71).

I analyzed stem type for all unpaired imperfects and came to the conclusion that most of the imperfect verbs in both groups are based either on the infinitive vowel-stem/present j-stem, or infinitive vowel-stem/present consonant-stem. The following imperfect verbs, used in the manuscript only in the uncontracted or contracted form, are based on the infinitive vowel-stem/present consonant-stem: бъжаху 'ran.3PL' (uncontr.), мылаше 'thought.3SG' (uncontr.), хождахъ 'walked.1SG' (uncontr.), чьждаше 'rejected.3SG' (uncontr.), бораху 'took.3PL' (contr.), вараше 'cooked.3SG.' (contr.), възлежаше 'went up.3SG' (contr.), дръжаше 'held.3SG.' (contr.).

The subsequent examples represent imperfect verbs based on the infinitive vowel-stem/present j-stem. This group by far makes the majority of imperfect verbs used in the document exclusively either in the contracted or the uncontracted form: владаше 'possessed.3SG' (uncontr.), даваше 'gave.3SG.' (uncontr.), истадше 'exhausted.3SG.' (uncontr.), начинаху 'began.3PL.' (uncontr.), поставлаху 'supplied.3PL.' (uncontr.), блахаше 'hurt, tempted.3SG' (contr.), възврашаше 'returned.3SG.' (contr.), въжаше 'ate.3SG.' (contr.), вараше 'named.3SG.' (contr.), обръташе 'gained.3SG.' (contr.).
The above analysis shows that verb class did not play a role in the scribes choice of contraction in the verbs used only in contracted or uncontracted forms. Therefore the only plausible explanation to this phenomena is that the tendency towards either contraction or noncontraction is idiosyncratically built into the properties of these verbs itself and can be regarded as a lexical idiosyncrasy of theirs that is stored in the lexical entries for these verbs in the mental dictionaries of speakers.

However, these verbs are not very numerous in the document. Most of them are used only once or twice with the exception of a few contracted imperfects: Творѧше 'created.3Sg' (used 13 times), Видѧше 'saw.3Sg' (used 7 times), Дѣлаше 'did.3Sg' (used 4 times),Ѣдѧше 'ate.3Sg' (used 6 times), Искаше 'searched.3Sg' (used 4 times), Можаше 'was able.3Sg' (used 4 times), Молѧше 'besieched.3Sg' (used 5 times), Обрѧщаше 'converted.3Sg' (used 4 times), and Плакаше 'cried.3Sg' (used 4 times). The fact that frequency of each of these verbs in the document is very low does not allow us to make definitive conclusion regarding special properties of such verbs.
Chapter 3. Conclusions

The goal of my analysis was to examine distribution of uncontracted and contracted imperfect verbs in the 11\textsuperscript{th} century Old Russian manuscript of the Sinaiskij Paterik and to define conditioning factors which might have influenced scribes choice of contraction. I investigated such factors as the syllabic structure of imperfect verbs, the length of the lines in which imperfect verbs are encountered, the number of syllables per word, semantic typology of imperfect verbs and of the sentences in which these verbs occur; aspectual type of stems, scribes' individual preferences, etc. My detailed analysis showed that most of above mentioned factors did not have any influence on the choice of contraction in imperfects. However, such factors as individual preferences of scribes and the length of grammatical forms might have affected this choice.

Nonetheless, many unanswered questions still remain. More research needs to be done to investigate working conditions of scribes in Russian scriptoria which would allow one to say convincingly how strictly scribes were required to follow group norms. Also it would be very helpful to know more about the scribes themselves and other documents they translated or copied. Knowledge of the exact place and time when this manuscript was
created would also help us to gain a better understanding of the choice of contraction of imperfect verbs.
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### Appendix A: Number of syllables per line for contracted imperfects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contracted imperfect</th>
<th>Occurrence in the text</th>
<th>Number of syllables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Бесѣдоваховѣ</td>
<td>114 v 8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Борѣхоу</td>
<td>177 v 16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Возвраацаше</td>
<td>178 r 1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Въкжаше</td>
<td>108 v 10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Въхожаше</td>
<td>72 v 6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Дръжаще</td>
<td>61 r 1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Зъраше</td>
<td>177 r 4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Исповѣдаше</td>
<td>33 r 17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Крѣмлаше</td>
<td>115 v 6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>мольахь</td>
<td>30 v 16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Намакаше</td>
<td>128 v 17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Недожаше</td>
<td>104 v 20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Обрѣташе</td>
<td>126 r 19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Оуповааше</td>
<td>176 v 19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Повѣдоваще</td>
<td>154 v 18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Положаше</td>
<td>116 v 14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Прѣбонуахь</td>
<td>90 r 1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Прилежаше</td>
<td>99 r 6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Приѣхомѣ</td>
<td>109 r 15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Речаше</td>
<td>92 r 8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Слыашаше</td>
<td>92 r 14</td>
<td>16 (end of chapter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Сълѣжахоу</td>
<td>101 r 10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Хвальствовахоу</td>
<td>56 r 19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Number of syllables per line for uncontracted imperfects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Uncontracted imperfects</th>
<th>Occurencies in text</th>
<th>Number of syllables per line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Бѣжаахоу</td>
<td>178 7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Владѧаше</td>
<td>164 v 19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Въкоушаахоу</td>
<td>136 12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Вѣсхожааше</td>
<td>13 r 14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Дааше</td>
<td>13 v 7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Имѧаховѣ</td>
<td>117 v 11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Живааше</td>
<td>142 v 9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Мыплааше</td>
<td>177 r 5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Оставлааше</td>
<td>40 r 12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Повѣлааше</td>
<td>67 v 10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Пребѣвааѣѣ</td>
<td>166 r 12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Прихожааше</td>
<td>36 v 14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Сѣдааше</td>
<td>10 v 5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Хотлааше</td>
<td>3 r 6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>