

Motoki Nomachi (Sapporo)

ON THE LANGUAGE
OF THE SECOND EDITION OF IOANN RAJIĆ'S
HISTORY OF VARIOUS SLAVIC PEOPLES (1823)

MULTIGLOSSIA IN THE 18TH CENTURY'S SERBIA
AND THE PLACE OF RUSSIAN

It is well-known that three linguistic registers (or three languages or “sublanguages”) coexisted as literary varieties in the 18th and 19th centuries in Serbia: the Russian recension of Church Slavonic, the Russian literary language of the 18th century, and a mixture of Russian Church Slavonic and Serbian vernacular, known as Slaveno-Serbian (Tolstoj 1998: 243). These registers were used differently depending on the literary genre, while the proportion of the coexisting registers changed as time went by. Among these registers, Literary Russian, which is the target of our analysis, was used in secular literature, particularly, in historiographical works (Ivić 2001: 179), but only a few members of the educated class could comprehend this language (Milanović 2004: 90).

According to the standard periodization of the history of the Serbian language advanced by B. Unbegaun (1935) and accepted by N. Tolstoj (1998) and others, the 18th century can be roughly divided into three periods: (1) from 1690 to 1740, (2) from 1740 to 1780, (3) from the last 20 years of the 18th century to the beginning of the 19th century. Literary Russian was used particularly heavily in the last two periods.

Among Serbian writers who used literary Russian in the above-mentioned last two periods, Ioann Rajić (1726–1801) was one of the the most eminent ones. Rajić's monumental *History of Various Slavic Peoples* (1794–1795) was practically the only rigorous and reliable historiographical work at that time and remained an influential piece of scholarship for decades —

not only as a fundamental work in the field of Serbian historiography, but also as a source of motifs for Serbian literary works (Deretić 2007: 448)¹.

Since the following three decades did not produce any other work that would come close to Rajić's book in quality and scope, it is not surprising that there appeared an idea to publish his *History* again, which was indeed realized in 1823. However, as was pointed out by N. Tolstoj (1988: 179), the pace of literary development in Serbia was much faster than in Russia or other European countries, which in effect meant that the linguistic circumstances were quite different between two editions, and that Rajić's language must have been perceived differently in the changed linguistic trend. To be more specific, the size of educated readership had become bigger and more sophisticated in the 1820s as compared to the 1790s, whereas literary Russian had become much less comprehensible to the readership. There was a strong inclination toward a wider usage of Slaveno-Serbian as a vehicle of literature in Serbia and beyond, and the educational system did not provide training in literary Russian. All this made the publisher update the language of Rajić's text, but without Rajić himself as the second edition of *History* was published after 20 years since his death.

RAJIĆ'S IDIOLECT AND THE UNSOLVED QUESTION OF A SECOND EDITION IN IT

There are various views on Rajić's language as represented in his *History*. According to P. Kulakovskij (1882: 9), it is "Slaveno-Serbian" or "Russian Slavonic"² with a modest admixture of Serbian lexemes and expressions. A. Belić (1935: 9) argues that Rajić wrote his *History* in Russian Church Slavonic, a view J. Skerlić (1967: 70) endorses. J. Deretić (2007: 448) points out that it is an artificial language, which is neither Serbian nor Russian nor (Church) Slavonic. B. Unbegaun (1935: 47), A. Mladenović (1988: 46), P. Ivić (1998: 127), and N. Tolstoj (1998: 274) are of the opinion that it is literary Russian for the historiographical style. Indeed, there is no rigid line between literary the Russian historiographical style and Russian Church Slavonic and his idiolect can be said to contain ample Church Slavonic elements, more so than the idiolects of other contemporary writers who used

¹ It should be noted that the first manuscript was ready in 1768. However, according to K. Georgijević (1946: 11), Rajić seemed to continue correcting and editing his text until 1790.

² It means Russian Church Slavonic.

Russian, such as, e.g., Zaharija Orfelin (Gudkov 2007: 58). Rajić's idiolect, as represented in his *History*, still had room for more Slavicization, which means that the language is rather Russian than Russian Church Slavonic.

With regard to the second edition of *History*, it is important to note that the proportion of Church Slavonic elements changed significantly. To the best of my knowledge, it is V. Gudkov (2007: 97) who pointed out for the first time that the second edition of *History* is heavily Slavicized compared to the first edition. V. Gudkov (*ibid.*) illustrates this phenomenon by providing such Church Slavonic lexemes and forms as *jako*, *ašče*, *obače*, *trudmi* instead of Russian *čto*, *estli*, *no*, *trudami*, respectively. It goes without saying that this short list of Slavicized items is not enough to show the extent of Slavicization of the text simply because Slavicization took place not only on the lexical and morphological levels, but also on the phonological and syntactic levels as well, which should be thoroughly analyzed. In addition, it is not clear why the editor of the second edition of *History* had to Slavicize the text against the visible tendency presented at that time to make the written language closer to the spoken vernacular(s).

HOW DID THE EDITOR SLAVICIZE THE SECOND EDITION OF *HISTORY*?

It is worth mentioning that Rajić's command of Russian was almost impeccable. This can be confirmed by the fact that the first volume of his *History* was published in St. Petersburg in 1795 immediately after the publication in Vienne in 1794 and the corrections made for the Russian edition were only very minor. They are particularly visible in orthography, and the mistakes in the original may be due to errors on the part of the publisher. Thus, the changes in the second edition made by the publisher, in most cases do not represent a correction of his Russian. Secondly, Slavicization of Rajić's text is observed primarily, in the Introduction, while the changes in the main body of *History* were not significant.

Slavicization of Rajić's text can be found particularly in the following areas: on the phonetic/phonological level, the reflection of *tj, *ktj, *dj, the second palatalization of velars; on the morphological level, it affects case endings, especially, the dative, locative, instrumental in the masculine-plural, while the verbal morphology can be characterized by the fact that some past tense forms with the *l*-participle are replaced with the aorist and imperfect, and the present-tense form of the auxiliary *byti* very often appears in the past tense as if it functioned as the perfect, which is not the case of the first

edition. On the syntactic level, subordinate clauses very often take *jako*, *i/e/ jaže*, *egda* and *ideže* in the second edition, while such words as *čto*, *kogda*, *gde*, etc., are used in the first edition. Slavicization of the lexicon is most visible. Borrowings from Ukrainian and West European languages are often replaced with Old Church Slavonic words.

WHY DID THE EDITOR CHANGE RAJIĆ'S TEXT?

Rajić's text was not an easy read (except for the members of the educated elites) even when the first edition came out. One may wonder, then, whether the Slavicization was the best strategy to make Rajić's publication accessible to the readership. In my presentation, I am going to analyze the publisher's strategy of editing Rajić's text for adapting his language to the newer linguistic circumstances in Serbia at the beginning of the 19th century, considering the competing (linguistic) ideologies at the time.

REFERENCES

- Belić 1935 — *Белић А.* Борба око нашег књижевног језика и правописа. Београд: Библиотека Коларчевог народног универзитета, 1935.
- Georgijević 1946 — *Георгијевић К.* Када је Јован Рајић завршио своју историју // Глас српске академије наука СХС. Други разред. 95 (1946). С. 5–12.
- Gudkov 2007 — *Гудков В. П.* Исследование частных вопросов истории славянских языков. Москва: Издательство Московского университета, 2007.
- Deretić 2007 — *Деретић Ј.* Историја српске књижевности. Београд: Sezam Book, 2007.
- Ivić 1998 — *Ивић П.* Преглед историје српског језика. Сремски Карловци: Издавачка књижара Зорана Стојановића, 1998.
- Kulakovskij 1882 — *Кулаковский П. А.* Вук Караджич. Его деятельность и значение в сербской литературе. Москва: Типография быв. Ф. Б. Миллера, 1882.
- Milanović 2004 — *Милановић А.* Кратка историја српског књижевног језика. Београд: Завод за уџбенике, 2004.
- Mladenović 1989 — *Младеновић А.* Славеносрпски језик. Нови Сад: Књижевна заједница Новог Сада, 1989.
- Skerlić 1967 — *Скерлић Ј.* Историја нове српске књижевности. Београд: Просвета, 1967.
- Tolstoj 1998 — *Толстой Н. И.* Избранные труды том II. Славянская литературно-языковая ситуация. Москва: Языки русской культуры, 1998.
- Unbegaun 1935 — *Unbegaun В.* Les débuts de la langue littéraire chez les serbes. Paris: Champion, 1935.