

'Diastratic diglossia' in 18th-century Russia, or: When did Church Slavonic become a foreign language?

Boris Uspenskij assumes that the "Third South Slavic Influence", which began in the 1640s, resulted in the speedy decline of diglossia in Russia and its replacement with bilingualism. This brought about a change of status of Church Slavonic: While in diglossia H and L serve as varieties of one language, in bilingualism Church Slavonic is a foreign language for Russian speakers. This paper, however, provides proof of the fact that Church Slavonic remained a variety of the Russian language with high prestige until the 1760s or 1780s. Among other things, this follows from Lomonosov's inclusion of Church Slavonic into his Theory of the Three Styles. Consequently, the second half of the 17th and the first half of the 18th century have to be regarded as a transitional period, during which the essential features of diglossia were preserved, but the distribution of H and L gradually turned from a strictly diaphasic model into a predominantly diastratic one. We call this kind of situation 'diastratic diglossia'.

Translated from "'Diastratische Diglossie' im Russland des 18. Jahrhunderts, oder: Wann wurde Kirchenslavisch zur Fremdsprache?" in Dieser, Elena (ed.), *Linguistische Beiträge zur Slavistik: XX. JungslavistInnen-Treffen in Würzburg, 22.-24. September 2011*, 29–45. München: BiblionMedia 2015. DOI: 10.18716/bun/digl.

DOI: 10.18716/omp.64.8

1. Introduction

This paper was originally written as part of my postdoctoral thesis on biscriptality. Since biscriptality is defined as the simultaneous use of two writing systems, script variants, or orthographies for the same language (or varieties of the same language), the linguistic situation in 18th-century Russia poses a problem. It is well known that Tsar Peter I introduced the so-called *graždanskij šrift* 'civil type' in 1708, without completely replacing the traditional Old Cyrillic script. The latter remained in use as a typeface for ecclesiastical texts—and even to this day for certain church books used in Orthodox worship (cf., e.g., the acolouthia for the martyrs of the Soviet era, published in 1992, excerpts of which are printed in Trunte 2014 [1998]: §30.7c). From today's perspective, however, some will argue that this cannot be considered biscriptality in the sense of the above definition because the Old Cyrillic script has only been used for Church Slavonic since the alphabet reform, while texts in the Russian language have since been printed ex-

clusively in *graždanskij šrift*. Thus, the two script variants would be used for different languages, so that both Russian and Church Slavonic would be monoscriptal.

Although closer examination shows that the distribution of scripts among the language forms in the 18th century was by no means so clear-cut, the question arises: Were Russian and Church Slavonic actually already different languages at the beginning of the 18th century? Since when have they been different languages, and how can this be determined? This paper addresses this complex of questions.

2. Questions of distance

□30 How can we determine whether two varieties belong to the same language or to different ones? The first approach is, of course, to determine the linguistic distance, i.e. the degree of similarity and difference between the varieties. It is intuitively clear that two varieties with only minimal differences (e.g. British and American English) can hardly be considered different languages, while completely different varieties (e.g. English and Hungarian) can under no circumstances be regarded as varieties of one language. There is extensive specialist literature on the question of how this distance can be measured (e.g. Ammon 1989, Casad 1992). The fundamental problem is to weigh up the facts of different language levels (e.g. phonetics, grammar, vocabulary) against each other and thereby obtain a measure that reflects as accurately as possible what is commonly described as “intelligibility”. In contrast to distance, which, at least in theory, can actually be expressed in objective numbers, intelligibility is *a priori* a subjective variable that depends to a large extent on the individuals involved, their experience with texts in the respective language, their basic motivation to understand these texts, and, last but not least, the topics of the texts used. Furthermore, intelligibility is not symmetrical, as it is possible that speakers of one language find it easier to understand speakers of another language than vice versa (a well-known example is that Danes apparently understand Swedish more easily than Swedes tend to understand Danish). Therefore, if the answer to the question of the linguistic status of a variety is to reflect more than just the attitudes of the speakers concerned, there is no way around measuring the distance.

Ammon (1995: 6) proposes a simple test which, although it does not provide a concrete figure for the distance between two languages, allows a distinction to be made between high, medium, and low similarity—which is entirely sufficient for our purposes—and, because it is based on the comparison of texts, largely eliminates the need to weigh up different language levels.¹ For this test, “texts

¹ The question of how to weigh up graphic/orthographic and phonetic/phonological differences, however, is not entirely clear. Since written texts are usually compared with each other, one is sometimes confronted with orthographic differences that have no effect

with the same meaning, translated □31 as literally as possible” (“sinngleiche, möglichst wörtlich übersetzte Texte”, *ibid.*) are compared. A high degree of similarity (i.e. a small distance) between the varieties can be said to exist if more than half of the words are completely identical, and a low degree of similarity (i.e. a large distance) if more than half of the words are completely different.

„Bei mittlerer Ähnlichkeit zwischen zwei Varietäten ist [...] die Zahl der divergierenden Wörter zwar größer als die Zahl der übereinstimmenden Wörter; bei der Mehrzahl der paarweise verglichenen Wörter ist jedoch die Ähnlichkeit so groß, daß sie leicht als einander entsprechend erkannt werden können.“ (Ammon 1995: 6)

“In the case of medium similarity between two varieties, [...] the number of diverging words is greater than the number of identical words, but for the majority of the words, when compared in pairs, the similarity is so great that they can easily be recognized as corresponding to each other.”

This test does not require the evaluation of massive parallel corpora; even with very short texts, it is usually quickly clear which category a pair of varieties belongs to. With respect to historical language states, however, we encounter the additional problem that it is no longer possible to ask a native speaker to produce a translation “as literally as possible”. However, existing parallel texts can be used as a work-around and adapted slightly if necessary. To illustrate this, here is a small excerpt from an exercise book by Mixail Ivanov from 1726–1728, quoted by Uspenskij (2002: 509, §19.2):

Russian: Я видѣлъ малчика, которои стоячи в' цркви осудил члка, немного погода и сам осудился от нихъ [sic! — Б. У.] людей. Я ето смотрячи молвил ему: вот ежели бы ты не осудил то бы и сам не осужденъ былъ.

Church Slavonic: Азъ видѣхъ отрока, иже в' цркви осуди члка. Послѣди и сам осужденъ бысть от иных члкъ. Аз сѣ зрящи рекъ ему: аще бы ты не осудилъ еси не бы и сам осужденъ бысть [sic! — D. B.].

All deviations are underlined. For comparison, let us look at the Russian translation of the Gospels from 1818, which was not completed until the beginning of the 19th century but is characterized by a very literal and yet modern translation (here Matthew 7:24–25 is quoted from the third edition: Rossijskoe Biblejskoe Obščestvo 1820: 21):² □32

on pronunciation, or with orthographically identical words that are pronounced very differently. However, these problems are unlikely to be of any significance for Church Slavonic and 18th-century Russian.

² The facsimile comes from *Google Books* (<http://books.google.de/books?id=pTs7AAAAcAAJ&pg=PA21>, accessed 24 April 2012).

Ѣд. Всаки ѹбо, ѡже слы-
шитъ словеса моѡ сѡа, и
творитъ ѡ, уподоблю егѡ
мѡжѡ мѡдрѡ, ѡже созда хра-
минѡ свою на камени:

Ѣе. И снѡде дождь, и при-
дѡша рѡки, и возвѡаша
вѡтри, и нападѡша на хра-
минѡ тѡ, и не падѡса:

24. И паякъ всякаго, кто слу-
шаетъ сѡи Мои слова, и испол-
няетъ ихъ, уподоблю мужу
благоразумному, который по-
строилъ свой домъ на камнѡ:

25. И пошелъ дождь, и раз-
лились рѡки, и подули вѡ-
птры, и устремились на домъ
топъ, и онъ не упалъ;

As can be seen, between about one-third (13 out of 38 words in the Russian Bible text) and just under half of the words (in the exercise book) match exactly, and for the vast majority of words the correspondence is obvious. The test therefore shows a *medium* degree of similarity between Church Slavonic and the Russian vernacular.

While a high degree of similarity between two varieties means that they automatically belong to the same language, and a low degree of similarity means that they are different (abstand) languages *per se*, the classification in cases of medium similarity depends on sociolinguistic criteria such as standardization: It is precisely this medium distance that allows a dialect to become a standard language through standardization (for a graphical representation of this relationship, see Bunčić 2008: 91 [English translation: p. 41 in this volume—D. B. 2026]). For our question about the status of Church Slavonic, this means that its medium distance from the Russian vernacular allows for both answers. Therefore, what is decisive is the sociolinguistic function of Church Slavonic and its relationship to Russian.

3. Diglossia vs. bilingualism

Uspenskij (1987, 2002) describes the sociolinguistic situation of the East Slavs in the Middle Ages (or, in Western terminology, also in the early modern period) as *diglossia* in the sense of Ferguson (1959; on the history of the transfer of this concept to the East Slavic language situation, see Rehder 1995: 362–367). According to this, the East Slavic—and later Russian—variety of Church Slavonic (traditionally called *recension*, *redaction* or, in Russian, *izvod*) functioned as the H variety and the East Slavic ‘vernacular’ as the L variety.³ In Russia, according to Uspenskij

³ Uspenskij (2002: 24–26, §2.2) calls H *knižnyj jazyk* ‘bookish language’ or *literaturnyj jazyk* ‘literary language, standard language’ and L *neknížnyj jazyk* ‘non-bookish language’ or *razgovornyj jazyk* ‘colloquial language’, which is not always appropriate when one considers, for example, that books such as *Russkaja pravda* were also written in Old East Slavic and that Ferguson’s concept is fundamentally open to different distributions of functions. I will therefore use the more neutral terms *H* and *L* here.

▣33 (2002: 418, §16.3), the so-called Third South Slavic Influence,⁴ which began in the 1640s, led to the dissolution of diglossia and its replacement with bilingualism. Gradually, Russian took over almost all the functions of the H variety, while at the same time Church Slavonic now also came to be used for secular purposes that had previously been reserved for the L variety, e.g. for everyday conversations or private letters (Uspenskij 2002: 477–485, §18.2; in the Ruthenian, i.e. modern-day Ukrainian and Belarusian, areas, diglossia had already been terminated before that, cf. *ibid.* 386–408, §15). This change led to competition between the varieties within both ‘high’ and ‘low’ text types, which is best illustrated by the emergence of parallel texts in both varieties (Uspenskij 2002: 474, §18.1). However, this does not mean that Church Slavonic lost its high prestige:

«[П]рименение языка определяется при этом не отношением к предмету речи (как это имело бы место ранее), но исключительно уровнем образования пишущего — владение церковнославянским языком демонстрирует ученость, принадлежность к элитарной культуре.» (Uspenskij 2002: 482, §18.2)

“In this, the choice of language is not determined with respect to the subject of the text (as would have been the case previously) but exclusively by the writer’s level of education; mastery of the Church Slavonic language demonstrates erudition and belonging to the elite culture.”

After 1640, Church Slavonic and the Russian vernacular did not lose their status as ‘high’ and ‘low’ varieties. It was not at all the case at this point in time that the two varieties “function more or less in parallel” (“функционируют более или менее параллельно”), as Uspenskij (2002: 24, §2.2) describes ▣34 their relation in bilingualism. All that changed were the factors determining the choice of these varieties. In Gregory’s (1967) terminology, the previous model can be described as purely *use-oriented* and the subsequent one as partially *user-oriented*, while in Coseriu’s (1992: 280–292) terminology, the distribution of varieties had previously been *diaphasic*⁵ and now became mainly *diastratic*. Ferguson (1959), however, does

⁴ This widely used term emphasizes similarities between the orthographic symptoms of this development and those of the Second South Slavic Influence in the 14th century. However, the “Third South Slavic Influence” had nothing to do with the South Slavs but was in fact an influence of Ruthenian language practice on Russian language usage (cf. Uspenskij 2002: 411–412, §16.1).

⁵ Unfortunately, the term *diaphasic* is used with different meanings. When Coseriu introduced it into linguistic usage, he used it to refer to different stylistic levels, which fits the basic meaning of Greek *φάσις* ‘expression’ (Coseriu 1992: 283). In later works, however, other authors also include factors relating to the overall communication situation (cf. Ammon 2000). Still others use the term with reference to the current meaning of the word *phase*, so that it either becomes very similar to *diachronic* (cf. *ibid.*) or refers to differences between different age cohorts (e.g. Goossens 1977: 9–10). In this paper, the term is used

not envisage *user-oriented diglossia*. Both his four model cases and his description refer exclusively to diaphasic, and sometimes also to medial and diamesic⁶ differences, which can be summarized as *use-oriented*. In the ideal case of diglossia, H and L not only apply to an entire language community, but each individual also masters both varieties, so that they can use them depending on the communication situation.⁷ Therefore, Uspenskij concludes from the change in the Russian language situation described above that diglossia had been abolished and calls the new situation *bilingualism*.

□35 In addition, Uspenskij repeatedly compares the new sociolinguistic situation in Russia with the language situation in Western Europe:

«Соответственно, церковнославянский язык предстает как язык ученого со-словия, т. е. приобретает функции, свойственные латыни на Западе, и становится вообще функциональным эквивалентом латыни.» (Uspenskij 2002: 479, §18.2)

“Accordingly, Church Slavonic appears as the language of the educated class, i.e. it acquires functions characteristic of Latin in the West and, in general, becomes a functional equivalent of Latin.”

It is precisely this situation in Western Europe, in which Latin, as the language of education and, in some cases, the official language, roofed various vernacular languages that were not closely related to it, that Auer (2005: 9–12) describes as *exoglossic diglossia*, because Latin functionally assumes exactly the role that the H variety plays in diglossia and the situation differs from Ferguson’s diglossia only in that the H variety is not closely related (endoglossic) to the respective L variety.

Putting this information together, the following picture emerges: in the second half of the 17th century, the linguistic situation in Russia changed from endoglossic diglossia to a kind of bilingualism that is functionally comparable to exoglossic diglossia—but without abandoning the endoglossic H variety, Church Slavonic. Obviously, this does not add up.

exclusively in Coseriu’s original meaning, i.e. in relation to language styles and the text types in which they are realized.

⁶ This practical term, coined in Italian linguistics (cf. Kabatek 2000: 313f.), is used here to describe the difference between the *language of proximity* and the *language of distance* as defined by Koch & Oesterreicher (1985).

⁷ Ferguson does not address the fact that the school education necessary for acquiring active competence in the H variety is not accessible to all sections of society and that, as a result, even in his four model cases, some speakers are/were unable to produce acceptable Standard German, Standard French, High Arabic, or Katharevousa. However, this is not specific to diglossia: Even in a ‘normal’ standard-dialect continuum (in a *diaglossia*, cf. Auer 2005: 22–23), there are always speakers who do not have a sufficient command of the standard language and need help, for example, when writing job applications, so as not to be rejected from the outset because of dialect features and poor spelling.

The central problem with this description is, once again, that Uspenskij (2002: 24, §2.2) assumes that the decisive criterion for distinguishing between diglossia and bilingualism is that “in the case of diglossia, the functions of the two coexisting languages are in complementary distribution” («В случае диглоссии функции двух сосуществующих языков находятся в дополнительном распределении»). However, as Rehder (1989: 368) rightly points out, a strict complementary distribution is not part of Ferguson’s diglossia at all. Ferguson (1959: 328, 329) himself put it this way:

“In one set of situations only H is appropriate and in another only L, with the two sets overlapping only very slightly. [...] In all the defining languages some poetry is composed in L, and a small handful of poets compose in both, but the status of the two kinds of poetry is very different [...]”

▮36 Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that a slight overlap, a few texts in the ‘wrong’ variety, a handful of translations from the H variety into the L variety and vice versa, which Uspenskij (2002: 472–512, §§18–19) describes for the situation after the Third South Slavic Influence, would not have led Ferguson to assume a complete dissolution of diglossia. Moreover, Church Slavonic never lost its high prestige compared to the East Slavic vernacular, and language teaching in schools remained limited to Church Slavonic for a long time. The first Russian grammar book aimed at native speakers and therefore written in Russian, Adodurov’s “detailed grammar” (“пространная грамматика”), was probably written between 1738 and 1741 (cf. Uspenskij 1975: 44, 49), but it was not printed and was probably only known to a small circle of people (ibid. 91; cf. also Keipert 2002: 119). The first Russian grammar for Russians that was also printed, Lomonosov’s *Rossijskaja grammatika*, did not appear until 1755, more than a century after the beginning of the Third South Slavic Influence.

Overall, therefore, the sociolinguistic shift from diglossia to bilingualism does not seem to have taken place as quickly as Uspenskij assumes. We may assume a transitional phase that lasted until the mid-18th century, during which the main characteristics of diglossia continued to apply, but the distribution of the varieties gradually changed from *use-oriented* to *user-oriented*, or in other words: the formerly diaphasic diglossia increasingly took on diastratic elements. This phenomenon could be described as *diastratic diglossia*.

The actual emancipation of Russian from Church Slavonic only began gradually as a result of Peter I’s reforms. By granting secular texts a higher status than before, by creating secular educational institutions such as the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, and by establishing printing houses that were not under ecclesiastical authority, the foundation was laid for Russian to compete with Church Slavonic as an H variety, and for the latter to eventually become unnecessary outside the religious sphere.

4. Native variety vs. foreign language

All of this is relevant to our initial question of when Church Slavonic came to be regarded as a foreign language, because there is a mutual dependence between the **▯37** sociolinguistic relationship of two varieties used and their linguistic status in relation to each other:

«Соответственно, в условиях двуязычия оба языка [...] осознаются именно как два разных самостоятельных языка. Между тем, в условиях диглоссии сосуществующие языки не противопоставляются, а отождествляются.» (Uspenskij 2002: 26, §2.2.1)

“Accordingly, under the circumstances of bilingualism, both languages [...] are perceived as two different independent languages. Meanwhile, under the condition of diglossia, the coexisting languages are not opposed to but identified with each other.”

Elsewhere, I have already shown that traditionally Church Slavonic was not regarded as a foreign language by its users: Ivan Uževyč wrote a single *Grammatica Sclavonica* in 1643–1645, in which he only occasionally distinguished between *lingua sacra* (i.e. Church Slavonic) and *lingua popularis* (i.e. Ruthenian; cf. Bunčić 2006: 144). In a 17th-century manuscript preserved in Copenhagen, the Russian translator of Noël de Berlaimont’s popular phrasebook (Sørensen 1962; cf. Keipert 1993) did the same, referring to Church Slavonic alternatives to the vernacular form in only 19 places, e.g. *ѣ топерѣ пришолѣ нз школы / пришолѣ нз училница* ‘I have just come from school’ (fol. 8; cf. Bunčić 2006: 143). For decades, there has been debate as to whether the language of the Bible translations printed by Francysk Skaryna between 1517 and 1522 is Church Slavonic or ‘Old Belarusian’ (i.e. Ruthenian) or even a mixture of both (cf. Barkoŭski 1977: 4), and to this day there is no consensus on the matter (cf. Žuraŭski 2002: 71). Lunt (1990: 8) states unequivocally for the earliest period of East Slavic literature: “‘Old Russian’ and OCS [Old Church Slavonic] are mere variants of one language.”⁸

By contrast, Uspenskij (2002: 25, §2.2) remains rather vague about the actual linguistic status of the speech forms involved in a situation of diglossia: **▯38**

«[...] в языковом сознании при диглоссии книжный и некнижный языки воспринимаются как один язык [...]. Между тем, для внешнего наблюдателя (включая сюда и исследователя-

“[...] in a situation of diglossia, the literary and non-literary languages are perceived as one language in linguistic consciousness [...]. Meanwhile, for an outside observer (including a linguistic re-

⁸ One consequence of this interpretation, mentioned in Bunčić (2006: 146–147) and, to my knowledge, not yet fully explored elsewhere, is that the recensions of Church Slavonic must be regarded as belonging to two languages at the same time: For example, Russian Church Slavonic is then both a variety of Church Slavonic alongside Croatian Church Slavonic, Serbian Church Slavonic, etc., and a variety of Russian alongside the Russian dialects.

лингвиста) естественно в этой ситуации видеть два разных языка. Таким образом, [...] диглоссию можно определить как такую языковую ситуацию, когда два разных языка воспринимаются (в языковом коллективе) и функционируют как один язык.»

searcher), it is natural in this situation to see two different languages. Thus, [...] diglossia can be defined as a linguistic situation in which two different languages are perceived (by the linguistic community) and function as one language.”

The question is: Who is right—the linguist Uspenskij or the Russian language community in the 18th century? Even an “outside observer” such as the early linguist Johann Werner Paus called the language of his grammar “Slavonic-Russian language” (“Slavonisch-Russische Sprache”) in 1729 and spoke out in favor of the unity of the two varieties: “after all, two *jazyki* can become brothers and 2 languages, sisters” (“zwey языки können jawohl brüder u[nd] 2. Sprachen Schwester[n] werden”, quoted from Živov 2004: 214). Ferguson (1959: 325) leaves no doubt about the status of the language forms in diglossia: he clearly defines diglossia as a relationship between “two or more varieties of the same language”. His definition of diglossia expressly excludes “the analogous situation where two distinct (related or unrelated) languages are used side by side throughout a speech community, each with a clearly defined role”. Conversely, this means that Church Slavonic and the Russian vernacular were not separate languages as long as they were in a situation of diglossia.

This view is also held by Demidov (2006: 42). Regarding the mid-18th century, he uses the expression *cerkovno-slavjanskij ‘jazyk’* ‘Church Slavonic “language”’—with *jazyk* ‘language’ in quotation marks!—and explains this as follows:

«Термин “язык” здесь понимается как норма и, шире, функциональная разновидность русского литературного языка.»

“The term ‘language’ is understood here as a norm and, more broadly, as a functional variety of the Russian literary language.”

☐39 This stance is based on his observation that many Church Slavonic features introduced in the 1751 Elisabeth Bible “also have a certain usage as variants in the secular literary norm” (“имеют некоторое вариантное хождение и в светской литературной норме”, Demidov 2006: 42).

5. Lomonosov's Theory of the Three Styles

Even Lomonosov, who is rightly regarded as one of the pioneers of modern Standard Russian, proves in a way that Church Slavonic was not yet a foreign language in his time: In his *Predislovie o pol'ze knig cerkovnyx v rossijskom jazyke* (*Preface on the utility of church books in the Russian language*) from 1758, he includes Church Slavonic in his influential version of the Theory of the Three Styles. The highest style of the Russian language, as he imagines it, consists exclusively of Church Slavonic

words, albeit preferably those that are “comprehensible for Russians and not too antiquated” (“россиянам вразумительных и не весьма обетшалых”). Summarizing his thoughts on the high style, Lomonosov remarks: “Through this *štil'*,⁹ Russian surpasses many contemporary European languages, making use of the Slavonic language from the church books” («Сим штилем преимуществует российский язык перед многими нынешними европейскими, пользуясь языком славенским из книг церковных», Lomonosov 1952 [1758]: 589). In this context it is remarkable that Lomonosov’s (1755: 199, §467) *Rossijskaja grammatika* even includes such specific Church Slavonic grammatical forms as the dative absolute and expressly recommends its use in the high style (cf. Vomperskij 1970: 164).

The title of the *Predislovie* should probably also be taken seriously: the author considers *church books in the Russian language* (as the syntactically ambiguous title can also be understood) to be part of the Russian language. Keipert (1994: 26–27) points out that Lomonosov’s (1952 [1758]: 590) ideas on the alleged comprehensibility of the “Russian language since the reign of Vladimir” (“российский язык от владения Владимирова”) primarily refer to the Church Slavonic translation of the Bible (and not to more □ 40 vernacular texts such as the *Russkaja pravda* or the Primary Chronicle, as one might assume). Only in this way is the statement understandable, since the Church Slavonic text of the Gospels has indeed changed little over the centuries, and an 18th-century Russian would therefore have been able to read a text from, for example, the Ostromir Gospels with almost the same ease as—or rather, with hardly any greater difficulty than—the Elizabeth Bible. This comprehensibility clearly does not apply to secular texts in Old East Slavic, considering how extensively 20th-century scholars have debated how the individual provisions of the *Russkaja Pravda* ought to be understood.

Vomperskij (1970: 139) interprets Lomonosov’s view to mean that Church Slavonic was historically a language distinct from Russian (which modern linguistics would of course not dispute), but that “the Russian and ‘Slavonic’ elements ceased to be separate languages and, in the course of a complex interaction, formed functional varieties of a unified literary language on a Common Russian [i.e. East Slavic—D. B.] vernacular basis, which he calls *štil'*” (“русская и «славянская» стихии перестали быть отдельными языками и в результате сложного взаимодействия создали функциональные разновидности единого литературного языка на общерусской [т. е. восточнославянской — Д. Б.] народной основе, которые он называет «штилями»”).

It quickly became apparent that Lomonosov’s Theory of the Three Styles was not, in fact, a suitable model for the new Russian standard language. However, the great advantage of this theory was the fact that the previous two varieties, Church

⁹ Instead of the modern Russian form *stil'*, Lomonosov uses the now obsolete form *štil'*, which I convey here in its original because some of the research literature on Lomonosov distinguishes between *štil'* in the sense he describes it and *stil'* in the modern sense.

Slavonic and the Russian vernacular, were regrouped into three styles. As a result, the middle style had to be composed of both Church Slavonic and vernacular elements. Only after the high and low styles were abandoned, i.e. no longer considered parts of the literary language, did the Russian standard language become completely independent of Church Slavonic, which from that point on can really be considered a foreign language. This development took place mainly during the second half of the 18th century. Vomperskij (1970: 180) dates the dissolution of the three styles to the mid-1770s and the early 1780s:

«Начиная с этого времени становятся наглядными процессы смешения и разрушения между языковыми стилями и выработки в недрах старой системы «штилей» функционально-речевых стилей, когда сближение норм разговорной и □41 письменной речи создаст единую национально-языковую норму, которая нашла свое выражение в творчестве А. С. Пушкина.»

“Starting from this time, the processes of mixing and destruction between linguistic styles and the development of functional styles of speech within the old system of *štily* become apparent, when the convergence of the norms of spoken and written speech creates a single national language norm, which found its expression in the works of A. S. Puškin.”

6. ‘Ecclesiastical’ vs. ‘civil’ script variants

Interestingly, it is at the same period that the Old Cyrillic type was tied to the Church Slavonic language (cf. Bunčić & Kislova & Rabus 2016 for more details): until the 1760s, the ‘civil’ and ‘ecclesiastical’ script variants were used independently of the language form for secular and religious texts, respectively. The interpretation of a text as secular or religious depended not only on the subject matter within the text but also on the context in which the text was placed. For example, a sermon on a current political topic could be interpreted as religious in a church context, but as secular in a political context. One of many examples of this is Simon Todorskij’s sermon *Božie osobennoe blagoslovenie* (*God’s Special Blessing*), which he gave in 1745 at the wedding of the heir to the throne, the future Tsar Peter III, to the future Tsarina Catherine the Great. The Synodal Printing House in Moscow printed the sermon in Old Cyrillic type (Zernova & Kameneva 1968: № 359; Guseva 2010: № 1356), whereas the Printing House of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg published the same text, virtually unchanged in terms of language, as a political contribution in civil type (Kondakov 1963–1967: № 6476). The last such text printed in two scripts that I have been able to find so far is *Učreždenie Imperatorskago vospitatel’nago doma* (*The Establishment of the Imperial Orphanage*) by Ivan Beckoj (or Beckij), which was printed in 1763 in civil type (Kondakov 1963–1967: № 561) and in 1764 in Old Cyrillic type (Zernova & Kameneva 1968: № 659; Guseva 2010: № 101). Only after that did the Old Cyrillic script variant remain restricted to texts in Church Slavonic, while vernacular Rus-

sian texts were from then on printed exclusively in civil type. This strict separation of script variants according to language basically still applies today.

7. Conclusion

▮42 Drastically simplified and reduced to a few key protagonists, the development could be described as follows: Peter the Great's 'Enlightenment from above' initiated the separation of Russian language norms from Church Slavonic, Lomonosov and others (e.g. Karamzin) promoted it, and Puškin put the finishing touches to the now finally emancipated modern Russian standard language. The third South Slavic influence, in any case, was not the immediate reason for the transition to bilingualism—let alone the period of turmoil around 1600, as Uspenskij (2002: 472, § 18.1) suggests. The phenomena in the 17th and first half of the 18th century that he describes (translations, parallel texts, etc.) merely characterize a transitional situation, in which Church Slavonic and the Russian vernacular continued to function as H and L varieties of a unified 'Slavonic-Russian' language. However, their distribution was no longer exclusively use-oriented but increasingly user-oriented, which also facilitated the appearance of parallel texts. If one wanted to find a label for this sociolinguistic situation, *diastratic diglossia* would probably be the most appropriate description. It was not until the second half of the 18th century, namely during the 1760s–1780s, that Russian emancipated itself from Church Slavonic, so that from then on Russians can legitimately regard the latter as a foreign language.

References

- Ammon, Ulrich. 1989. Towards a descriptive framework for the status/function (social position) of a language within a country. In idem (ed.), *Status and function of languages and language varieties*, 21–106. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Ammon, Ulrich. 1995. *Die deutsche Sprache in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz: Das Problem der nationalen Varietäten*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Ammon, Ulrich. 2000. Diaphasisch. In Glück, Helmut (ed.), *Metzler Lexikon Sprache*, 2nd edn., 157. Stuttgart, Weimar: Metzler.
- Auer, Peter. 2005. Europe's sociolinguistic unity, or: A typology of European dialect/standard constellations. In Delbecq, Nicole (ed.), *Perspectives on variation: Sociolinguistic, historical, comparative*, 7–42. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Barkoŭski, Viktor I. 1977. Ad rědaktara. In Aničenk, Uladzimir V. (ed.), *Sloŭnik movy Skaryny*, vol. 1, 3–6. Minsk: Vyšėjšaja škola.
- Bunčić, Daniel. 2006. *Die ruthenische Schriftsprache bei Ivan Uževyč: unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seines Gesprächsbuchs Rozmova/Besěda, mit Wörterverzeichnis und Indizes zu seinem ruthenischen und kirchenslavischen Gesamtwerk*. München: Sagner.
- Bunčić, Daniel. 2008. Die (Re-)Nationalisierung der serbokroatischen Standards. In Kempgen, Sebastian et al. (eds.), *Deutsche Beiträge zum Internationalen Slavistenkongress, Ohrid 2008*, 89–102. München: Sagner. [English version in this volume, pp. 38–54.]

- Bunčić, Daniel & Kislova, Ekaterina & Rabus, Achim. 2016. In Bunčić, Daniel et al., *Biscriptality: A sociolinguistic typology*, 102–121. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Casad, Eugene H. (ed.). 1992. *Windows on bilingualism*. Dallas: SIL.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1992. *Einführung in die Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*. 2nd edn. Tübingen: Francke. [1st edn. 1988, based on a Spanish manuscript from 1981.]
- Demidov, Dmitrij G. 2006. Rol' knig cerkovnoj pečati v istorii ruskogo literaturnogo jazyka. In Kornilov, Gennadij E. (ed.), *Čtenija, posvjaščennye dnjam slavjanskoj pis'mennosti i kul'tury: K 70-letiju so dnja roždenija doktora filologičeskix nauk, profesora G. E. Kornilova: Sbornik statej meždunarodnoj konferencii*, 31–43. Čeboksary: Čuvaškij gosudarstvennyj universitet imeni I. N. Ul'janova.
- Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15. 325–340.
- Goossens, Jan. 1977. *Deutsche Dialektologie*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Gregory, Michael. 1967. Aspects of varieties differentiation. *Journal of Linguistics* 3(2). 177–197.
- Guseva, Aleksandra A. 2010. *Svod ruskix knig kirillovskej pečati XVIII veka tipografij Moskvy i Sankt-Peterburga i universal'naja metodika ich identifikacii*. Moskva: Indrik.
- Kabatek, Johannes. 2000. L'oral et l'écrit — quelques aspects théoriques d'un « nouveau » paradigme dans le canon de la linguistique romane. In Dahmen, Wolfgang et al. (eds.), *Kanonbildung in der Romanistik und in den Nachbardisziplinen: Romanistisches Kolloquium XIV*, 305–320. Tübingen: Narr.
- Keipert, Helmut. 1993. Nochmals zur Kopenhagener Handschrift russischer Gespräche aus dem 17. Jahrhundert. *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 53(2). 285–303.
- Keipert, Helmut. 1994. Die *knigi cerkovnye* in Lomonosovs "Predislovie o pol'ze knig cerkovnyh v rossijskom jazyke". *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 54(1). 21–37.
- Keipert, Helmut. 2002. Einleitung. In Keipert, Helmut & Huterer, Andrea (eds.), *Compendium Grammaticae Russicae (1731): Die erste Akademie-Grammatik der russischen Sprache*, 7–127. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Koch, Peter & Wulf Oesterreicher. 1985. Sprache der Nähe – Sprache der Distanz: Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 36. 15–43.
- Kondakov, Ivan P. (ed.). 1963–1967. *Svodnyj katalog russkoj knigi graždanskoj pečati XVIII veka: 1725–1800*. 5 vols. Moskva: Gosudarstvennaja biblioteka SSSR imeni V. I. Lenina.
- Lomonosov, Mixajlo. 1755. *Rossijskaja grammatika*. Sanktpeterburg: Pri Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk. [Reprint: Leipzig 1972.]
- Lomonosov, Mixail V. 1952 [1758]. Predislovie o pol'ze knig cerkovnyh v rossijskom jazyke. In idem, *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij* (ed. by V. V. Vinogradov, S. G. Barxudarov, and G. P. Blok), vol. 7, 585–592. Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Lunt, Horace G. 1990. History, nationalism, and the written language of Early Rus'. *Slavic and East European Journal* 34(1). 1–29.
- Rehder, Peter. 1989. Diglossie in der Rus'? Anmerkungen zu B. A. Uspenskijs Diglossie-Konzeption. *Die Welt der Slaven* 34(2). 362–382.
- Rossijskoe Biblejskoe Obščestvo. 1820. *Gospoda našego Īisusa Christa Svjatao Evangelie, ot Matfeja, Marka, Luki i Īoanna, i Dėjanija Svjatyx Apostolov, na Slavjanskom i Russkom narečii*. Sanktpeterburg: Greč.

- Schweier, Ulrich. 2001. Die "kirchenslavisch-ostslavische Diglossie" und ihre Auflösung als Kategorisierungswandel: Vom aristotelischen zum prototypischen Modell. *Die Welt der Slaven* 46(1). 27–42.
- Sørensen, Hans Christian. 1962. *Ein russisches handschriftliches Gesprächsbuch aus dem 17. Jahrhundert*. København: Munksgaard.
- Trunte, Nicolina. 2014. *Slavenskij jazyk: Ein praktisches Lehrbuch des Kirchenslavischen in 30 Lektionen, zugleich eine Einführung in die slavische Philologie*. Vol. 2. 2nd edn. München: Sagner. [1st edn. 1998.]
- Uspenskij, Boris A. 1975. *Pervaja russkaja grammatika na rodnom jazyke: Dolomonosovskij period otečestvennoj rusistiki*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Uspenskij, Boris A. 1987. *Istorija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (XI–XVII vv.)*. München: Sagner. [3rd edn. Moskva: Aspekt Press 2002.]
- Vomperskij, Valentin P. 1970. *Stilističeskoe učenie M. V. Lomonosova i teorija trex stilej*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.
- Zernova, Antonina S. & Kameneva, Tat'jana N. 1968. *Svodnyj katalog russkoj knigi kirillovskoj pečati XVIII veka*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennaja ordena Lenina Biblioteka SSSR imeni V. I. Lenina.
- Živov, Viktor M. 2004. *Očerki istoričeskoj morfologii russkogo jazyka XVII–XVIII vekov*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- Žuraŭski, Arkadzij. 2002. Die Sprache der Übersetzungen. In Rothe, Hans & Scholz, Friedrich (eds.), *Biblija ruska: vyložena doktorom Franciskom Skorinoju, Prag 1517–1519. Kommentare, Apostol* (Biblia Slavica, III.1), 69–103. Paderborn: Schöningh.