

SOUTH SLAVIC-UKRAINIAN PHONETIC AND GRAPHIC VARIABILITY IN RELIGIOUS MONUMENTS OF THE 14TH – 15TH CENTURIES

Inna Tsaralunga

Khmelnytsky National University (Ukraine)

Abstract. As a result of the analysis of liturgical texts of the 14th–15th centuries created in the territory of Ukraine, expressive signs of interaction between the Old Bulgarian graphic and spelling system and the Ukrainian folk speech are recorded. Manifestations of the phonetic and graphic South Slavic-Ukrainian variability are associated with the following linguistic phenomena in the vocalism and consonantism of religious monuments: continuity of the former **ǣ*, **ʼa* and **Q*; change of the initial **je* into *o*; transition of *e* into *o* after hushings and *y*; reduction of *u* > *ʊ* before iotated vowels; confusion of unstressed *u* and *e*; development of sound combinations **tort*, **tolt*, **tert*, **telt*; reflexes of sound combinations *ʊp*, *ʊl*, *ʊp*, *ʊl*; hardening of *p*'; hardness/softness of hushing consonants; dissimilation and simplification of consonants; change of sound combinations **dj*, **z dj* and **tj*, **kt*.

In the phonetic system of the studied monuments, the interaction of the traditional writing of that time and the local vernacular is observed, in particular, the phonetic features of the North Ukrainian and the South-West Ukrainian dialects are revealed. The study of the language of religious monuments taking into account the results of other research in the field of philology, paleography, theology has undeniable prospects for linguistic interpretation of church books with the definition of local language traditions of the time, their localization as elements of the Slavic written culture, resolving debatable issues regarding the formation, chronology and systematization of the church-written corpus.

Keywords: religious monument; variability; phonetic system; the Old Bulgarian language, the Ukrainian dialect influence

Topicality

The period of the 14th–15th centuries was marked by the active spread of liturgical literature in the territory of Ukraine. The idea of the Church Slavonic basis of religious texts of that time is traditional in the Slavic studies. According to the theory of diglossia common in the Ukrainian scientific studies, two literary and written languages functioned in parallel in Kyivan Rus: The Old Slavonic, which acquired

the local Ukrainian phonetic, grammatical, and lexical features under the influence of living language, and the Old Ukrainian, which was based on the vernacular (Uspenskij, 1994, p. 4 – 8; Skab, 2014, p. 45 – 46). The statement about the Old Bulgarian origin of the religious monuments distributed on the territory of Ukraine of this time was quite reasonably expressed by A. Stamenova: “In other Slavic and non-Slavic countries, lists of liturgical and related texts, translated or created in the Old Bulgarian language, are distributed. This is how its editions (derivations, local types) are formed, for example, Moravian, Croatian, Serbian,... Ukrainian, Belarusian, Vlach-Moldavian. They are connected by the common Old Bulgarian language basis, but differ in secondary ethnic local layers as a result of functioning in a foreign language environment” (Stamenova, 2017: 29).

Research sources

There are few religious monuments of the 14th century, marked by the consequences of the military attacks of Batu Khan, the widespread destruction of cultural artifacts in the Ukrainian and adjacent territories. As L. Zhukovska emphasized: “The vast majority of them are written in the Galician-Volyn, Novgorod, Pskov, Rostov-Suzdal, Smolensk-Polotsk language regions... The relatively small number of ancient lists of the Gospels from the southern and eastern regions of Russia, including from Kyiv land is due to the fact that a large number of manuscripts in these areas were lost during the Mongol-Tatar invasion” (Zhukovskaya, 1976). These are primarily such liturgical manuscripts of the 14th century: The Putna Gospel of the 13th– 14th centuries, the Gospel of Verkovich of the 13th– 14th centuries, the Bybel'skyi Apostle of the 14th century, the Lutsk Gospel of the 14th century, the Lavryshiv Gospel of the 14th century, the Pandects of Antioch of 1307, the Lutsk Psalter of 1384, the Kyiv Psalter of 1397, the Polycarp's Gospel of 1307, the Panteleimon's Gospel of 1317.

Due to the economic and socio-political development of the Ukrainian lands, the 15th century was characterized by the active formation of centers of book writing. The transition from parchment to a more convenient and cheaper material - paper - contributed to the increase of written literature, its wider penetration into the popular environment. Rich linguistic material is presented in the following written records: Ismaragd of the 15th century, the Kamyanka-Strumyliv Gospel of 1411, the Chetia-Mineya of 1489, the Teachings of Ephraim the Syryn of 1492, the Apostle of the 15th century from the village of Antonivtsi in Kremenets region, the Korolevo Gospel of 1401, the Uzhhorod Half-Uncial of the beginning of the 15th century, the Mukachevo Psalter of the 15th century.

Analysis of research on a scientific problem

These liturgical monuments are an invaluable source for studying the history of language, as the language system is realized in a set of linguistic facts recorded at the same time, in the same place. As a result, they have become the subject of research by many linguists, both in the context of general linguistic reviews – V. An-

ichenko (Anichjenka, 1966), L. Bulakhovskyi (Bulakhovskyi, 1977), L. Zhukovska (Zhukovskaya, 1959), A. Stamenova (Stamenova, 2017), J. Stradomski (Stradomski, 2014), S. Temchin (Temchin, 2009) and others; and works on individual linguistic monuments – K. Verdiani (Verdiani, 1954), P. Kopko (Kopko, 1912), V. Nimchuk (Nimchuk, 1997), C. McRobert (McRobert, 2010), P. Popesku (Popesku, 1962), M. Smoraġ-Różycka (Smoraġ-Różycka, 1999), V. Jagic (Jagic, 1894) and others. However, special attention should be paid to the issue of the South Slavic-Ukrainian phonetic and graphic variability in these books, which is a significant gap in historical and linguistic studies.

The purpose of our scientific work – based on a thorough analysis of preserved and accessible texts of religious monuments of the 14th–15th centuries from the territory of Ukraine to identify examples of the phonetic and graphic South Slavic-Ukrainian variability, to clarify linguistic phenomena attested in parallel linguistic elements, to analyze linguistic interactions as possible causes of variability.

Presentation of the main material and justification of the research results

Analysis of the problem of the relationship between spelling and pronunciation in religious manuscripts of the 14th–15th centuries showed that the history of the transmission of vowels and consonants is complex and contradictory, which is due to the variability of graphemes, phonetic oscillations due to the influence of local speech.

Vocalism

Variable spellings due to irregular use of *A* i *Ж*, transition of the ancient **e* and **Q* in pure vowels. In the liturgical texts of the 14th century we find a consistent interchange of the letters *A* – *Ж*, *Ж* – *ЛЖ* in the Gospel of Verkovich, typical of the Old Bulgarian monuments: *алчАЦи* ЄВ, 160 а, *въсплАчАт(ь)сА* ЄВ, 87 а, *иМАЩАГО* ЄВ, 41 а, *въ сАботоу* ЄВ, 46 а – *възЖиЖ* ЄВ, 92 б, (comp. *възиЖ* ЄВ, 92 б), *ЖЖждеть* ЄВ, 19 а, *поклонишЖСА* ЄВ, 3 б, *прозЖбе* ЄВ, 163 а, *слышЖть* ЄВ, 53 б; *ЛЖзыкомь* ЄВ, 66 а, *ЛЖсте* ЄВ, 84 б, *силы нбснЫЛЖ* 66 а – *въпиАЩАГО* ЄВ, 176 б, *оуноваАТЬ* ЄВ, 168 а etc. The confusion of the yus is represented in the Mukachevo Psalter: *наЖчина* МП, 38 – *паАчина* МП, 89, even compared to: *бАрАщіймсА* МП, 34, *внАтрь* МП, 44, *каплАщА* МП, 71, *празноуАщАГО* МП, 41, *призывАщійхъ* МП, 98, на *пРА* моА МП, 34, *оузРА* МП, 5, въ главЖ *Аглоу* МП, 117 and others. This phenomenon is even more widely represented in the Kamyanka-Strumyliv Gospel: *воЛА* (Possessive case, singular) КСЄ, 33, 181, *вънАтрь* КСЄ, 52 зв., *гласАт* КСЄ, 12, на *земЛА* (Possessive case, singular) КСЄ, 132 зв., *иМАт* КСЄ, 24 зв., *иМАЦи* КСЄ, 82, *истинствоАт* КСЄ, 12, *сидѣшиедидА* КСЄ, 76, *негодѣАце* КСЄ, 93, за *некоДА* крамолод *бышиоДА* КСЄ, 154, в геенѣ *огньнѣДА* КСЄ, 43, 85, не *требоДАть* КСЄ, 36 зв. and many others.

Reflection of the former **e* and *'*a*. The language of the church at that time reflected the North Ukrainian dialects, in particular in the varied spell-

ings caused by the reflection of the former **ę* and **'a*. For example, in the texts of the Kyiv Psalter: *оуглебохъ* КП, 90 зв. – *оуглабноу* КП, 91 зв.; *ефиоплене* КП, 97, *засецьмь* КП, 144, *кленАхоусА* КП, 139 зв., *прозебаи* КП, 143 зв., *прозебаюцѣя* КП, 224 зв., *прокленоуть* КП, 158 зв. and the like, but: *памать* КП, 10 зв., *сѣмА* КП, 122, *тысАць* КП, 117, *кляхсА* КП, 122 etc. According to the conclusions of V. Nimchuk, "...the strengthening of the northern element in Kyiv region began in the twelfth century and apparently increased after the Tatar-Mongol invasion", therefore, the native language of the scribe was Ukrainian in its northern form. (Nimchuk, 1997, p. 21). Many examples of the change of **ę* and **'a* into *e* in the unstressed position can be found in the Gospel of Verkovich, first of all in the verb affix *-сА*: *не боитъсе* ЄВ, 146 б, *възрадоуютсе* 16 б, *кланѣиесе* ЄВ, 23 б, *наоучитесе* ЄВ, 26 а, *оставлѣтсе* ЄВ, 40 а, *прославитсе* ЄВ, 16 а, *родисе* ЄВ, 16 б, *чюдисе* ЄВ, 47 б and others; in the endings of nouns: *въ име мое* ЄВ, 21 а; in the middle of the words: *ѡ кнезы* ЄВ, 29 б, *двою на десете* ЄВ, 50 б, *ѣзыкь* ЄВ, 47 а; as well as in the stressed position: *иночедь* ЄВ, 45 б, *начело* ЄВ, 38 б, *проклети* ЄВ, 19 б, *свезано* ЄВ, 20 б, *чедо* ЄВ, 48 а etc.

The spellings in the Lutsk Psalter and the Lutsk Gospel related to the transmission of the former **ę* and **'a* may testify to more noticeable spelling tendencies, the skill of the scribes of that time: *имА* ЛП, 8 зв., *кнази*, *ѣзыци* ЛП, 2, *любАцимъ* его ЛП, 30 зв., *памать* ЛП, 10 зв., *прѣпоюсая* ЛП, 22, *смагеса* ЛП, 5 зв., *сѣмА* ЛП, 28 and others; *грядоуца*, *єдинога на десАть* ЛЄ, 3 зв., *истАзаюцимасА* ЛЄ, 2 зв., *поманеши* ЛЄ, 44, *свАза* ЛЄ, 69, *сѣяноѣ* ЛЄ, 61 etc. Therefore, we did not find in these manuscripts any use of *e* in the place **ę* and **'a* in the unstressed position, attested in other monuments of Polissya. This may be due to the fact that the scribe consistently used the graphemes *А* (*ѣ*) to convey the vowel *e* under the strong influence of spelling traditions.

In Hagiography of 1489, the grapheme *e* was recorded in accordance with the Proto-Slavic *ę* in an unstressed position: *хто жедаеть – жаж(д)жицхъ*, and: *колодезь*, *паметайте*, *жены плесание* Четья, 39. The grapheme *e* instead of *я* is used in the Apostle of Kremenets region: *клатвою – кленѣтеса*, *неуведаемый*, *светилища*, *ѡ страстех* Ап, 70, 72; in Ismaragd: *продлѣжєю(т)* Изм. №488, 7, *развращєть* Изм. №489, 60, but: *кнагинА* Изм. №489, 33 зв., *мАтжцєсА* Изм. №488, 90, *тысАццѣ* Изм. №488, 44. Isolated cases of substituting *А* (*ѣ*) through *e* occur in the texts created in the south-western territories of Ukraine: in the Mukachevo Psalter: *блжде(т)* (3rd person plural) *ср(д)цємь* МП, 94, *крѡтцїи же наслѣде(т)* (3rd person plural) *землА* МП, 36, *тежцѣ ѣ(х)* МП, 34, we also compare the inverse confusion: *чАлюсти* МП, 31; in the Kamyanka-Strumyliv Gospel: *стєзатисА – стАзатисА* КСЄ, 43 зв., *тежателем – ѡ(т) тАжател* КСЄ, 89, *бѣахѣ отєгчени* КСЄ, 124, *болецѣА* КСЄ, 37 зв., *свєзавше* КСЄ, 50 зв., *плАцєницю* КСЄ, 95 зв.

The oscillations caused by the transition of the initial *je* into *o*. Some signs of change of the initial *je* into *o* are found in numerals

and derived words: *ѣдинъ* ЛЄ, 2 зв., *едины* ПЄ, 3, *единого* КП, 5 зв. – *одинъ* ЛЄ, 2 зв., however, the Church Slavonic forms predominate: *единъ* ЛП, 8 зв., *ѣдиного* БА, 3 зв., *единомышлениемъ* КП, 74, *единою* КП, 82, *единачадаго* ПЄ, 2, *ѣдиночадыи* ЛЄ, 1 зв., *ѣдиночадъ* ЛП, 32, *ѣдинъмь* Лавр Є, 54 зв. etc. We also observe the oscillation in other parts of speech: *елеемъ* КП, 62 – *олъемъ* ЛП, 28 зв., *олъи* ЄВ, 92 б, *Олена* Лавр Є, 78 зв., *Олены* ПЄ, 251, *Єсифови* ПЄ, 192 – *Осифови* ПЄ, 16, *Јсифъ* – *Осифъ* Лавр Є, 14-14 зв., but: *езера* КП, 162, *ѣзеро* Лавр Є, 46, *при езеръ* ПЄ, 89, *елень* КП, 57, *сѣве ефремови* КП, 106 and the like. Most traditional spellings are due to the specifics of the religious style, but in the monuments of official and business writing of that time, the cases of spelling *o*, which has become established in the modern East Slavic literary languages, significantly prevail (Tsaralunga, 2017, p. 67-68).

The oscillations caused by the transition of *e* into *o* after the hushing sound and *ц*. Cases of traditional spelling are combined with the specific Ukrainian phonetic feature – the transition of *e* > *o* in variable spellings: *бчолa* – *бчелы*, *вже* – *вжо*, *сцо* – *сце*, *жолчь* – *желчи*, *жона* – *жену*, *предотече* – *пр(д)тчо* Четья, 37-38; we also compare: *говоречо*, *жовтый*, *радоуючосa*, *старцо(м)*, *черницюю*, *чого*, *чоловѣкъ* and the like Четья, 37-38.

There are vowel oscillations in the adjective forms of the Uzhhorod Half-Uncial: *давишомоу*, *изведшомоу*, *оубившомоу*, *оутвердшомоу* УП, 93 а-93 б – *отрасшомоу*, *створшомоу*, *поразившомоу* УП, 93 а-93 б and the like; in the Mukachevo Psalter: *благодѣавшому* МП, 12, 56, *веселашому* МП, 42, *вѣшешому*, *нищому* МП, 67, *градѣшому* МП, 70, *живѣшому* МП, 122, *ω(т)емлашомѣ* МП, 75 – *живуще(м)* МП, 30 etc; in the texts of the Kamyanka-Strumyliv Gospel: *чотыромъ* КСЄ, 8 зв. – *четыри* КСЄ, 10 зв., *чотыродесатницю* КСЄ, 1 зв., *чотыроличныи* КСЄ, 66 зв., as well as: *каѣшомсa* КСЄ, 137, *чоловѣк* КСЄ, 138 зв. The Apostle from Kremenets region: *ничого*, *чому*, but: *лицемиріе* Ап, 70, 73; Ismaragd: *вѣставшои* Изм. №489, 172 зв., *прѣходашю* Изм. №488, 15 зв., *ничого* Изм. №488, 5, 11 зв., 17 зв., *чого* Изм. №488, 14 зв. etc.

Reduction of *u* > *ь* before iotated vowels. Yu. Shevelyov drew attention to the optionality of writing *u* and *ь* before *j* in church monuments (Shevelov, 2002, p. 352). Many similar parallel ancient East Slavic inscriptions with *ь* before iotated ones, which reflect living speech, in accordance with the Old Slavic *u*, inscriptions, are found in the Lutsk Psalter: *дѣянъя* ЛП, 19, *любовью* ЛП, 30, *оружье* ЛП, 18, *покапънъемъ* ЛП, 20, *посѣченья* ЛП, 18 зв., *селенья* ЛП, 23 зв., *оугльє* ЛП, 21 and others, comp.: *безаконіе* ЛП, 15 зв., *достояніе* ЛП, 16 зв., *каменика* ЛП, 24, *прошеніе* ЛП, 19, *радостью* 25 зв., *оуглиє* 20 зв., *оумленія* ЛП, 20, *оупованіе* 16 зв. etc. Word forms with *ь* instead of *u* dominate in the Lutsk Gospel of the 14th century: *Бѣѣя* ЛЄ, 4 зв., *змью* ЛЄ, 5 зв., *знаменья* ЛЄ, 11, *Марья* ЛЄ, 12 зв., *оу преломленьи* ЛЄ, 3 зв., *радостью* ЛЄ, 6 зв., *подъ сѣмоковью* ЛЄ, 4 зв., *оупьютьска* ЛЄ, 8 зв. and many similar; in the endings of

nouns in the Lavryshiv Gospel: *писаньѣ* Лавр Є, 49 зв., *подножью* Лавр Є, 80 зв., *рождьѣ* Лавр Є, 39 зв., *свят ѣнья* Лавр Є, 12 зв., *оуздыханья* Лавр Є, 14 зв. etc. It should be noted that the Kyiv Psalter also represents the spelling with *ь* in accordance with the ancient with *u* before the iotated ones: *безѡмья* КП, 51 зв., *бл(ѣ)вньѣ* КП, 4 зв., *званьѣ* КП, 5 зв., *моленьѣ* КП, 7 зв., *повелѣньѣ(м)* КП, 8 зв., *сѣньѣ* КП, 44 зв., *блѣговоленія* КП, 7 зв., *веселия* КП, 17 зв. and others. In the Pandects of Antioch we do not observe variability, as vernacular forms prevail: *въ безмолвьѣ* ПА, 5 а, *въздержаньѣ* ПА, 22 б, *житьѣ* ПА, 18 б, с *лестью* ПА, 154 б, с *напастью* ПА, 74 б, бес *прѣтыканья* ПА, 50 а, без *роптання* ПА, 82 а, ко *смѣрѣнью* ПА, 160 б and the like. Variable spellings related to the reduction of *u* > *ь* before iotated vowels are contained in the Uzhhorod Half-Uncial: *братья* – *братіа* УП, 9 б, *весельѣ* УП, 194 а – *веселиѣ* УП, 193 б, в *кѣльѣ* УП, 16 б – в *кѣльѣи* УП, 10 а, *пью* УП, 192 а – *пю* УП, 187 б and many others. Similar changes are represented in the Teachings of Ephraim the Syryн: *братьи* ЄС, 77 зв. – *братія* ЄС, 298, во *житьи* ЄС, 32 зв. – у *житии* ЄС, 48, *многословѣсью* ЄС, 22 зв. – *многословѣсию* ЄС, 208 зв. and many similar.

Confusion of unstressed *u* and *e*. Cases of oscillations of the unstressed *u* and *e* in liturgical texts of the 14th century are rare: не *прегрѣша(м)* – *пригрѣша(м)* КП, 44 зв., *призри* ЛП, 27 зв. – *презри* ЛП, 9 зв., *преидоша* ЛП, 21 – *придѣте* ЛП, 31, *прелагаютсѣ* КП, 63, *преидоша* КП, 98 зв., *преплывають* КП, 144 зв., в *зимли* КП, 109, *исправляюще* Полікарп Є, 112, *прибывает* ПЄ, 21, *прикратилисѣ* – *прѣкратять сѣ* ПЄ, 143, сѣ *прикратили* ЄВ, 86 б etc. In general, the process of converging the unstressed *u* and *e* is very vaguely represented by the religious monuments of the 14th century. Note: researchers believe that this feature, which belongs to the characteristic Ukrainian language features and is widely used today in many Ukrainian dialects, appeared in writing around the middle of the 15th century (Bulakhovskyi, 1977, p. 250; Shevelov, 2002, p. 665 – 666).

In the religious monuments of the 15th century: *придадѣт* – *предадѣт* КСЄ, 53 зв., *прѣбывашь* – *прѣбываѣ(м)*, *претерпѣль* – *притерпѣль* Четья, 47; in the Apostle of the 15th century from Kremenets region: *въ время послѣднѣе*, не *раздражайтѣ*, *помазавиѣ* Ап, 70, 73; in the Teachings of Ephraim the Syryн: *негыблѣмаго* ЄС, 16, *немоцинь*, *пишитѣ* ЄС, 170 зв., *суитѣнаго* ЄС, 9, 10, 14 зв. and others, *суитѣ* ЄС, 25 зв.; in the Uzhhorod Half-Uncial: *прічасникъ* – *прегрѣиіхъ* УП, 2 б-2 а, *прегрѣшатъ* УП, 67 б, *пречюдныи* УП, 131 б, *кернїци* УП, 76 а and others. The spelling of *u* instead of *e* is typical of the Kamyanka-Strumyliv Gospel: *пять талантъ еси придадѣ* КСЄ, 56, *прикратилисѣ* КСЄ, 54, *прѣпосавсѣ* КСЄ, 188 зв., *сторицїю* КСЄ, 119 зв., *хировими* КСЄ, 8 зв.; Ismaragd: *Василеи* Изм. № 488, 15 зв., *Деонисья* Изм. № 489, 3, *живущѣ(х)* Изм. № 489, 15 зв., *жениитисѣ* Изм. № 488, 49, *помянитѣ* Изм. № 488, 37, *седѣть* Изм. № 488, 9, *сотворете* Изм. № 488, 37, *ходите* Изм. № 488, 55.

Variability associated with **tort*, **tolt*, **tert*, **telt* sound combinations reflexes. Significant influence of the South Slavic written

traditions affected the spelling of continuations of **tort*, **tolt*, **tert*, **telt* sound combinations. Since the examples of the development of the pleophony in the studied texts are rare, – *березезоль* ПЄ, 249, *нагородьства* ЛП, 10, *Ѡгородника* ПЄ, 246, – it is possible to state consistent observance of the traditions of book-writing operating at that time. This is consistently confirmed by examples of word forms in the Lutsk Gospel: *брашно* ЛЄ, 12, *възвратистасА* ЛЄ, 3 зв., *гла(с)* ЛЄ, 2, *Ѡ(т) града* ЛЄ, 4, *здравь* ЛЄ, 16, *въ средоу* ЛЄ, 14, *посрѣдѣ* ЛЄ, 3 etc; in the Lutsk Psalter: *враждоующа* ЛП, 3 зв., *грады* ЛП, 10 зв., *дрѣво* ЛП, 18 зв., *младенець* ЛП, 7 зв., *посрѣдѣ чрѣва* ЛП, 27, *прахъ* ЛП, 23, *прѣвыше* ЛП, 7 зв., *оуслади* ЛП, 19 зв. and many others; in the Kyiv Psalter: *влась*, *главы*, *посраматсА* КП, 55 зв., *гла(с)* КП, 5 зв., *масло кравье* КП, 209 зв., *плѣниль* КП, 89, *позлащена(х)* КП, 62, *посреде* КП, 65 etc. In the Pandects of Antioch the nonpleophonic forms prevail: *из града* ПА, 165 б, *дѣрага* ПА, 291 а, *многозраченъ* ПА, 108 а, *прѣд* лицемъ ПА, 38 б, *схранить* ПА, 179 б, however, it is also witnessed: *ворожьнья* ПА, 193 б, *въ деревѣ* ПА, 48 б, *сволокъ сА* ПА, 32 а.

The traditional spelling in the transmission of the former sound combinations **tort*, **tert* is reflected in the Lavryshiv Gospel: *бранить* Лавр Є, 94 зв., *жрѣба* Лавр Є, 117, *мрѣжа* Лавр Є, 59, *посрѣдѣ* Лавр Є, 45 зв., *срѣду* Лавр Є, 165 зв., *стрѣгуше* Лавр Є, 153 and many similar. The traditional spelling in the Putna Gospel is quite consistently followed: *по брѣгоу* ПЄ, 64, *врага* ПЄ, 55, *враты* ПЄ, 217, *нѣ възбраните* ПЄ, 230, *срѣдѣ* васъ ПЄ, 2, *схранити* ПЄ, 40, *оузвратиста сА* ПЄ, 4, *въ чрѣвѣ* ПЄ, 229 and others; in the Vybelskyi Apostle: *власы* БА, 6 зв., *глава* БА, 6, *младъ* БА, 8 зв., *млѣка* БА, 17, *сладѣѣ* БА, 24, *Ѡ(т) срѣды* БА, 31, *сѣграждають* БА, 3 зв., *чрѣсѣ* БА, 5 etc; in the Gospel of Verkovich: *силж вражиж* ЄВ, 166 б, *жскым(и) враты* ЄВ, 159 а, с. 6, *посрѣдѣ* ЄВ, 163 а, *прѣ(д) Ѡ(т)цемъ* ЄВ, 21 б and the like.

In the 15th century, consistent traditional writings became the part of most religious monuments: *град*, *Ѡбратит*, *пред* бѣгом, *сребро* Ап, 72-73; *вразі* УП, 10 б, *власья* УП, 151 а, *врата* УП, 182 а, *древа* УП, 70 б, *младенець* УП, 95 б, *предними* дверми УП, 68 б, *сладкья* УП, 20 б, *срамень* УП, 120 а, *чрево* УП, 65 а, but: *березо(л)* УП, 154 а; the Teachings of Ephraim the Syrun: *злато* ЄС, 103 зв., *небрѣжьньи* ЄС, 4, *прѣдложеньє* ЄС, 241 зв., *прѣксловѣсьници* ЄС, 121, *срамлямося* ЄС, 75 зв.; the Mukachevo Psalter: *враждоужижА* (!) МП, 2, *гла(с)* МП, 28, *меташа жрѣбїА* МП, 21, *въ риза(х) позлащена(х)* МП, 44, *посрамлатсА* МП, 82, *прѣполовненїе* МП, 101, *из чрѣва* МП, 70; the Kamyanka-Strumyliv Gospel: *по брегоѣ* КСЄ, 25, 75 зв., *гласѣат* КСЄ, 12, *златницю* КСЄ, 50 зв., *пред* събою КСЄ, 20, *страны* тирскїа КСЄ, 38 зв., *ис чрева* КСЄ, 45; Is-тагагд: *вранове* Изм. № 488, 227 зв., *гласове* Изм. № 488, 235, *града* Изм. № 488, 55, *два древа* Изм. № 488, 27 зв., *наслаженїа* Изм. № 488, 24 зв., *небреженїе* Изм. № 488, 39, *Ѡбраоеит* Изм. № 488, 30 зв., *чрес* повелїи Изм. № 489, 15 зв. and others.

However, the language of Ismaragd also reflects the pleophony forms: *вередиши* Изм. № 488, 118, *головою* Изм. № 488, 5 зв., *голо(д)* Изм. № 488, 235, *голодень, пере(ж)* Изм. № 488, 6 зв., *золотомъ* Изм. № 489, 90, не *отеребле(н)*, не *соромоти* Изм. № 488, 4-4 зв., *полонъ* Изм. № 488, 11, *оухоронити* Изм. № 488, 9 etc. Obviously, the language of the church became more and more close to the vernacular, so the liturgical books include expressions of pleophony.

Variability of reflexes of combinations *ѣр, ѣл, ѣр, ѣл*. Signs of change are witnessed in the monuments of religious style *ѣр > ер; ѣл > ол: дерзъноу* Лавр Є, 134 зв., *долженъ* Лавр Є, 103, *жертвоу* ЛП, 24 зв., *зерно* Лавр Є, 11 зв., *наверхъ* ЛП, 7, *наполн(ите)* Лавр Є, 10, *столтъ* Лавр Є, 113 зв., *торжникомъ* Лавр Є, 3, *торжъникомъ* Поликарп Є, 32, *оумолькни* Лавр Є, 66, *червь* ЛП, 26 зв. and the like. In the Gospel of Verkovich there is a spelling *ѣ, ѣ* after the smooth: *длъжьнь* ЄВ, 34 а, *дръжитсе* ЄВ, 24 а, *ѡ(т)врѣжетсе* ЄВ, 21 б, *тлъцате* ЄВ, 54 а, *въ четврѣтъ жѣа* ЄВ, 30 б etc, caused, apparently, by the Old Bulgarian influence and peculiarities of spelling of that time.

Newer constructions with vowels of full creation in the Uzhhorod Half-Uncial often correspond to the ancient combination of *ѣр, ѣл, ѣр, ѣл* between consonants: *волна, сполниса* УП, 11 а, *держави* УП, 18 б, *державенъ, скорбѣти* УП, 120 а, *дерзновеніе* УП, 196 а, *долготрѣпѣнью* УП, 196 б, *испроверже* УП, 30 а, *кормацихъ* УП, 10 а, *одержа* УП, 27 а, *ѡ(т)верзи* УП, 36 а, *персть, привержень, оутвержение* УП, 208 а, *скорби* УП, 5 а, *скорблю* УП, 78 а, *скорбъ* УП, 9 а, *холмъ* УП, 91 б etc. Older constructions with reduced vowels are less common: *дръжава* УП, 121 а, *дръжавоу* УП, 17 а, *істръженья* УП, 121 б, *одръжашеся, ѡдръжа* УП, 120 а, *скръбъ* УП, 208 and others.

The words reduced in the middle are very consistently used in the texts of the Mukachevo Psalter: *вльнь* МП, 94, на *врѣби* МП, 190, *врѣхъ* МП, 39, *въспоплъзновеніа* 55, *грѣлица* МП, 83, *длъготрѣпѣливъ* МП, 7, *жрътвж, скръби, тажкосрѣди* МП, 4, *мрътвь* МП, 30, *одръжаніе, растрѣнѣ(м)* МП, 2, *плѣкъ* МП, 26, *прѣвья* МП, 43, *прѣсть* МП, 6, 8, *сѣврѣшилъ* МП, 39, *сѣмрътъ* МП, 17, *чръвь* МП, 21, *чрътога* МП, 18 and others; the Kamyanka-Strumyliv Gospel: *влѣхвы* КСЄ, 14 зв., *длъгы* КСЄ, 20 зв., *ѡ(т)врѣзше* КСЄ, 14 зв., *тлъцѣте* КСЄ, 22 and the like.

Consonantism

Hardening of *p'*. Signs of depalatalization of *p'* before vowels *a* and *y* are represented by a small number of spellings, so, given the specifics of religious writing of that time, it is possible to state the predominance of traditional spelling in liturgical texts. There are some exceptions, apparently caused by vernacular influence: *ѣзеро гороуцѣ* Лавр Є, 111; *кесарѣ* ЄВ, 87 б, 119 б, *Лазару* КП 67, *Лазара* ЄВ, 48 а, *мора* ЄВ, 30 б, *назаранине* ЄВ, 42 б, *прамо* Лавр Є, 117; *рибара* ЄВ, 23 а, *ѣроу* ЄВ, 33 б and the like, but: *боура* КП, 67 зв., *вечерю* БА, 6

зв., *вечера* ЄВ, 55 а, *горю* (дієсл.) ПЄ, 96, *градьи* ЛП, 28 зв., *драхла* ЛЄ, 2 зв., *зара* (!) и сїнце КП, 101 зв., *мора* КП, 97, *напраже* ЛП, 7, *напраже* КП, 9, *олтарю* КП, 59, *польмор* ЛЄ, 11, *радника* БА, 10, *расны* КП, 62 зв., *Сухарь* ПЄ, 27, *творю* БА, 33 зв., *творю* ПЄ, 26, *творацимь* КП, 40 зв., and, obviously, *hyperic*, *трапезоу* ЛП, 28 зв., *трапеза* КП, 92 зв.

Signs of the hardening of *p'*, inherent in the Ukrainian dialects, are recorded in the Apostle of Kremenets region: *сотворѣ*, *гра(д)ущих* Ап, 70; the Kamyanka-Strumyliv Gospel: *ко морю* КСЄ, 72 – *ко морѣ* КСЄ, 70, *сътворю* КСЄ, 86 зв. – *сътворѣ* КСЄ, 191; in Ismaragd lists: *борж(т)* Изм. № 488, 21, *по морж* Изм. № 488, 41, *обращеши* Изм. № 488, 30 зв., *сотворѣ* Изм. № 489, 56 etc.

Signs of hushing sounds' hardening/softening. Often linguistic parallelism in religious texts is associated with the processes of hardening of hushins: *конч ѿетьса* ЄВ, 99 а – *скончатиса* ЄВ, 11 б, *обращи* – *обращѣ* КП, 89 зв., *притьча* ЄВ, 61 а – *прича* ЄВ, 46 б, *чюдеса* КП, 152 зв. – *чѣдеса* КП, 150 etc. But along with the traditional spellings: *несоущю* КП, 8, *кожю* КП, 143, *нашю* КП, 61, *постыжюса* КП, 39 зв., *въ притчю* КП, 66, *оутвержю* КП, 41 зв., *чюдно* КП, 9, *чюжемоу* КП, 60 зв. and others, we record word forms that may indicate the depalatalization of consonants: *величатиса* КП, 13, *лжа*, КП, 5, *моужа* КП, 6, *одеръжащяка*, *приближатса* КП, 41, *плача* КП, 7 зв., *въ притьчахъ* КП, 105 зв. etc.

The softness of the hushings is reflected in most examples from the Lutsk Gospel: *не вижю* ЛЄ, 7 зв., *дышющю* ЛЄ, 11 зв., *межю* собою ЛЄ, 14 зв., *недосташию* ЛЄ, 8, *одежю* ЛЄ, 13, *помажють* ЛЄ, 12 зв., *оуложю* ЛЄ, 7 зв. and others, but there are examples of the hardening of hushings: *градаоуща* ЛЄ, 3 зв., *отроча* ЛЄ, 13 зв., *плащаницю* ЛЄ, 12 зв., *пребывающаго* ЛЄ, 10 зв., *оуслышатъ* ЛЄ, 10 etc. We find parallelism in the graphic transmission of hushing consonants in the Lutsk Psalter: *насыщюса* ЛП, 18 зв., *Ѡмочю* ЛП, 5 зв., *оуврачю* ЛП, 19, *поглажю* ЛП, 23, *не постыжюса* ЛП, 32 зв., *чюдно* ЛП, 7, *чюжши* ЛП, 23, *съ шюмомь* ЛП, 10 зв. and the like, but there are cases of another implementation of hushing: *вѣнчалъ* ЛП, 7 зв., *державно* ЛП, 16 зв., *издалеча* ЛП, 24, *наоуча* ЛП, 22, *Ѡбнищавшиа* ЛП, 8-8 зв., *подвижатъса* ЛП, 17 зв., *плача* ЛП, 6-6 зв., *шаташиаса* ЛП, 2 etc; in the texts of the Pandects of Antioch: *бывъшию* ПА, 7 б, *въздвигють* ПА, 18 б, *чюгѣмь* ПА, 106 б, *надежю* ПА, 14, *плачюще* ПА, 223 а, *свѣщю* ПА, 61 а, *не хошю* ПА, 214 а, *чювествьѣ* ПА, 61 б and the like., but: *дѣя* ПА, 3 б, *изъвѣщати* ПА, 153 б, *лѣжа* ПА, 106 б, *о начатъѣ* ПА, 9 б, *осълоушалъ* ПА, 99 б, *пища* ПА, 18 а, *повѣчатиса* ПА, 43 б, *рѣжа* ПА, 29 а, *чають* ПА, 41 а and others.

We record similar changes in the monuments of the south-west, namely – in the Vybelskyi Apostle: *ваши* БА, 33 зв., *възложю* БА, 3, *наоучю* БА, 10 зв., *плачющеса* БА, 2 зв., *положю* БА, 4 зв., *не пощажю* БА, 26, *прохожю* БА, 12 зв., *въ чюжѣхъ* БА, 23 and others, but: *ваша* БА, 35 зв., *причастници* БА, 13 зв.,

троужаюцемоуса БА, 24 зв., чаши БА, 5 etc.; in the Putna Gospel: *вложю* ПЄ, 9, *жѣжджита* ПЄ, 212, *слышю* ПЄ, 13, *притчю* ПЄ, 33, *стражю* ПЄ, 107, *оузвращюса* ПЄ, 103, *чашию* ПЄ, 66, *чловѣчю* ПЄ, 152, but: *възвѣщаи* ПЄ, 104, *жатва* ПЄ, 30, *лежаща* ПЄ, 3, *начаша* ПЄ, 107, *отъгъчаютъ* ПЄ, 121, *въ прѣтчахъ* ПЄ, 94 and the like; in the Gospel of Verkovich: *быша* ЄВ, 11 а, *въпросиша* ЄВ, 7 б, *плачѣшася* ЄВ, 80 б, *праведнича* ЄВ, 28 а, *притьча* ЄВ, 61 а, but: *имащяго* ЄВ, 41 а, *имащюу* ЄВ, 33 б, *ѡ(т)вѣщаишж* ЄВ, 2 б8, *печалнѣ* ЄВ, 16 а etc.

Note that *y* in conjunction with *ж*, *ч*, *ш*, is always used as *ю* in the texts of the Uzhhorod Half-Uncial: *возвожю* УП, 120 а, *доушю* УП, 12 а, *иццюцихъ* УП, 182 а, *кожю* УП, 20 а, *межю* собою УП, 68 б, *надежю* УП, 19 б, *насыщюса* УП, 204 б, *наоучю* васъ УП, 67 б, *нашю* УП, 10 б, *пищю* УП, 11 а, *препокашютъса* УП, 11 б, *притчю* УП, 14 б, *пришедшю* УП, 156 б, *солжютъ*, в *соушю* УП, 10 б, *оуврачюета* УП, 166 б, *честнѣшю* УП, 7 б, *всѣми чювьствы* УП, 9 б, в *чюдесѣхъ* УП, 3 а, *шюма* волны УП, 11 а etc, but in conjunction with *a* the forms are non-palatal: *дѣа* УП, 67 а, *единочадаго*, *чадомъ* УП, 64 а, *начало* УП, 16 б, *ѡ(т) печали(х) (!)* УП, 67 б, *радошамы* УП, 95 б, да *оуслышати* УП, 67 а, *часы* УП, 181 а and the like. Similar spelling features we found in the Teachings of Ephraim the Syryun: *вѣльможа* ЄС, 303 зв., *печали* ЄС, 62 зв., *одежю* ЄС, 23, *почюдьмыся* ЄС, 148, *прикљючютъся* ЄС, 16, *чюжѣмъ* ЄС, 86 зв. and others. It is noteworthy that in religious monuments of the previous century, this trend is also present.

In the texts of the Mukachevo Psalter such a pattern is not observed, although there are confusions: *ицзаеать* МП, 67, 118, *лъцаахж* МП, 5, *подвижася* МП, 96, 113, *подрѣжаніе* МП, 43, *порѣницж(т)* МП, 58, *сѣгорацж* МП, 7, *шоумомъ* МП, 9 – *велерѣчюлицеи* МП, 34, *въжжжда* МП, 41, *въшоумѣша* МП, 45, *ицезоша* МП, 36, 63, 101, *постидѣшася* МП, 52, *раздрѣшиша* МП, 10, *смжтишася* МП, 17, *чюдеса* МП, 25, *чѣлюсти* МП, 31 etc.

In the Kamyanka-Strumyliv Gospel we observe parallel spellings: *дѣю* КСЄ, 41 – *дѣюѡ* КСЄ, 87, *крѣщюса* – *крѣщѣса* КСЄ, 87, *плачѣщюи* КСЄ, 18 – *плачюци* КСЄ, 200 зв., *притча* КСЄ, 89 зв. – *притчю* КСЄ, 34 зв., 35, 38 зв., *чѡдеса* КСЄ, 48 – *чюдесе* КСЄ, 203 зв. So along with depatalized forms: *безначалнаго* КСЄ, 8, *болащана* КСЄ, 27, *начат* КСЄ, 146, *прелцаетеса* КСЄ, 51, *оѡбокашася* КСЄ, 75 зв., *аще хоцѡѡ* КСЄ, 110 зв. etc., – the softness of the consonants is reflected: *бывшю* КСЄ, 60 зв., *врачю* КСЄ, 111, *ѣщю* КСЄ, 41 зв., *отроча* КСЄ, 168 зв., *праведничю* КСЄ, 29, *оѡмльча* КСЄ, 50 зв., *чюждаго* КСЄ, 181, *чада* КСЄ, 28 and others.

The confusion of hushings is quite consistently evidenced in the lists of Ismaragd: *вашию* Изм. № 488, 43, *жатели* Изм. № 488, 227, *моужю* Изм. № 488, 8 зв., *плачю* Изм. № 488, 53 зв., *причастники* Изм. № 488, 226 зв., *сходашю* Изм. № 488, 13, *творяшю* Изм. № 488, 19 зв., *тѡжю* Изм. № 488, 55 зв. – *венчаеать* Изм. № 488, 22, *възбоужаите* Изм. № 488, 40, *жадаи* Изм. № 488, 4 зв., не *ѡ(т)чаи-*

мо Изм. № 488, 3 зв., *ω(т)ча* Изм. № 488, 47 зв., *почали* Изм. № 488, 8 зв., *чаровь* Изм. № 488, 55, *не шепчы* Изм. № 489, 48 зв. etc.

Cases of *dissimilation* in pronoun forms are not recorded in the liturgical books of the 14th century, which may indicate the stability of traditional spelling: *кто* ПА, 116 а, *кто* ЛЄ, 2, *кто* КП, 5 зв., *кто* БА, 3 зв., 14, *кто* ПЄ, 2, *кто* ЄВ, 2 а, 8 а, *нікто* ЛЄ, 14 зв., *нікто* ЛП, 9 зв., *нікто же* БА, 33 зв., *нікто же* ПЄ, 3, *нікто же* ЄВ, 4 а, *ньктоже* Лавр Є, 80 зв., *нкто* ПЄ, 100, *что* ПА, 110 б, *чьто* ЛЄ, 14, *что* ЛП, 13 зв., *что* КП, 9 зв., *что* ПЄ, 2, *что* ЄВ, 118 б, *ничто же* ЛЄ, 6 зв., *ничто же* КП, 103, *ничто же* БА, 3 зв., *почто* БА, 1 and many similar. However, at the end of the 15th century, new forms of such words appeared: *хто* Изм. № 488, 3 зв., 7 зв., *нихто* Изм. № 489, 26, 77 зв., *што* Изм. № 488, 6, *штобы* Изм. № 488, 7 зв., *што(ж)* Изм. № 488, 10, *штоль* Изм. № 488, 3 зв., *ништо* Изм. № 488, 5, *нѣшто* Изм. № 488, 9 зв., *пошто* Изм. № 488, 14 зв. and others.

Occasionally we record examples of *simplification of sounds in groups of consonants*: *празника* КП, 101 зв – *праздъноующаго* КП, 57 зв., *лестному* БА, 36, *местьника* ЛП, 7 зв., *мѣсопоустнага* ПЄ, 121, *непричастъна* ЛП, 8 зв., *праздника* ПЄ, 22, *праздноуѣте* БА, 1 зв., *распоустъныга* ПЄ, 74, *сердцемь* КП, 10, *сыропоустнага* ПЄ, 124, *срдцмь* Лавр Є, 93 зв., *срдчаго* ПЄ, 68, *въ слнци* ЛП, 23 зв., *оустъны* ЛП, 14 etc.; *сѣцю* УП, 118 б – *слнци* УП, 123 б, *сѣце* трезвѣща УП, 87 а – *срдцю* УП, 191 б, and also: *празникы* МП, 73, *празноуѣщаго* МП, 41, *прѣчасникъ* УП, 2 а, *оупразнитеса* МП, 45, *празнуйте*, *but бога(т)ство*, *че(с)тный* Ап, 70, 72 and others.

Reflection of the Proto-Slavic sound combination *dj attracts attention by spelling the vernacular ж in accordance with the Old Bulgarian жед: *гражане – граждѣне* Лавр Є, 104.

In the texts of the Pandects of Antiochus, the Lutsk and the Kyiv Psalters, the Bybelskyi Apostle, the Lavryshiv Gospel, the Putna Gospel, the Gospels and the Gospel of Verkovich, the sound combinations *dj, *zдж were continued by the following continuants:

*dj > ж: in nouns: *гражане* ПЄ, 117, *гражаны* ПА, 42 б, *исхоженъе* КП, 180, *надежа* Лавр Є, 14 зв., *надеже* ЛП, 9 зв., *надежю* БА, 4, *въ наслаженъи* ЛП, 8 зв., *ноужю же* имѣше ПЄ, 195, *одежа* ПА, 207 б, *въ одежахъ* ПЄ, 116, *одежею* Лавр Є, 78 зв., *оружьѣ* ЛП, 18, *осужьѣнъѣ* Лавр Є, 7 зв., *оутверженъѣ* ЛП, 20, *оутвержение* КП, 97 зв. and others;

in adjectives: *слажьша* ЛП, 27, *хоужьшеѣ* БА, 6 зв. etc;

in verb forms: *вижь* (imperative mood) ЛП, 11, *въгажяюще* ПА, 109 б, *въсажь же* (imperative mood) ПЄ, 103, *дажь* (imperative mood) ЛП, 10, *зблужьшяга* Лавр Є, 44, *жажюще* КП, 152 зв., *обижю* ПА, 83 а, *поцжяю* БА, 26, *прихожю* Лавр Є, 27, *роженое* ПЄ, 6, *дрѣво саженоѣ* ЛП, 1 зв., *свобожатѣмъ* ПА, 25 а, *стыжюся* ЛП, 31, *соужю* Лавр Є, 12, *троужающагося* Поликарп Є, 112 and many others;

in adverbs: *прѣже* ЛП, 18 зв., *пърѣже* ПА, 61 а, *прѣже* БА, 33 etc.

**dj*, **zdj* > *жд*: in nouns: *дождь* КП, 96 зв., *дождь* ПС, 56, *дъжда* ПА, 123 б, *дрож(д)ьна* 102 зв., *жажду* ПС, 191, *рождьнѣ* Лавр С, 39 зв. and others;

in adjectives: *чюждихъ* СВ, 31 б etc.;

in verb forms: *въждельныи* ЛП, 24, *жсѣжджита* ПС, 122, *ѡсѡжд(д)ень* КП, 7 зв., *повѣждъ* СВ, 88 б, *пригвожденѣи* ЛП, 19 зв. *раждъ же ма* ЛП, 17 зв., *раждежеса* КП, 150, *рождени* СВ, 183 а, *страждеши* ПС, 96, *троужда ѣжт са* ПС, 60 and the like;

in adverbs: *прѣжде* ПС, 192 and others;

**dj* > *ждъж* (*ждеж*): *раждьжено* ЛП, 14 зв., *раждежена* ЛП, 22, *раждежено* КП, 14 зв. and the like;

**zdj* > *жч*: *дождь* Лавр С, 51 зв, 52, 82 and others, *ѡдъжчи* Лавр С, 104 etc.

The dominant continuum of the Proto-Slavic **sound combination** **dj* in the religious monuments of the 15th century was the Old Bulgarian combination *жд*: *дождь*, *зabloждения*, *злостраждеть*, *не ѡдождити по земли*, *ѡсѡждаеши*, *постраждите* Ап, 72-73; in the Mukachevo Psalter: *въжсѣжда* МП, 41, *ѡдъждити* МП, 10, *да не постижджса* МП, 70, *съсиж(д)еть* МП, 126, *оутверждени* МП, 150, *хождаа(х)* МП, 141, but: *инорожь* МП, 28; in the Kamyanka-Strumyliv Gospel: *бездождіе* КСЄ, 208 зв., *виждъ* КСЄ, 91 зв., *дождь* КСЄ, 23, *междѡ* събою КСЄ, 43 зв., *новжда* КСЄ, 146 зв., *прежде* КСЄ, 195 зв., *чюждаго* КСЄ, 181, but: *межи* црковію КСЄ, 53. Linguistic fluctuations in the Uzhorod Half-Uncial, associated with the continuum of **dj*, are represented in the spelling of *жд*, *ж*, *жж* *оутверждены* УП, 87 а – *оутвержение* УП, 208 а, *рожешию* УП, 90 б – ѡ(т) *ражже(н)на* УП, 198 б etc. In Ismaragd lists under the influence of live speech appear *жс*, *зжд*: *преже* Изм. № 489, 19, *гражано(м)* Изм. № 488, 32 зв., *межи* Изм. № 488, 18 зв., *одежа* Изм. № 488, 42 зв., *побѣжаемъ* Изм. № 489, 15 зв., *повѣжь* Изм. № 488, 20 зв., *прироженіа* Изм. № 488, 4 зв., *разждаетса* (!) Изм. № 488, 41 зв., *разсоужаа* Изм. № 488, 58, *оутверженіе* Изм. № 488, 15 зв., *яжъ* (imperative mood) Изм. № 488, 16 зв. etc.

The combination *жч* is used in the Teachings of Ephraim the Syryn: *дъжчевнаго*, СС, 14, *изможчалая* СС, 95, *изможчаньѣмъ* СС, 123, *ражченеши* СС, 179 зв., *ражчетъ*, *ражчѣньнѣ* СС, 125-125 зв., *ражчъжетъ* СС, 61 зв.

Reflexes of **sound combinations** **tj*, **kt* are represented by the traditional spelling of *щ* (*шт*, *щ*): in nouns: *нощъ* ЛП 38 зв., *нощи* СС, 154 зв., *до ноши* КП, 17, *нощью* ПС, 6, ѡ(т) *пещи* КП, 223 зв., *пещера* ПС, 136, *пещь* ѡгньоу ЛП, 26, *пещь* МП, 20, *полоунощи* ПС, 86, *полоунощница* УП, 10 б, *оу пѣщъ* ПС, 223, *пѣщъ* СС, 159 зв., *пѣщъ* Изм. №488, 124, *свѣщю* ПА, 61 а and the like; in adjectives: *нощнаго* УП, 86 б, *нощънаа* КП, 126 зв., *пѣщънаго* ПА, 26 б, *пѣщъноѣ* СС, 103 зв. etc.; in verb forms: *посѣщю* 124 зв., *свѣщаша* ЛП, 37 зв. and others; in adverbs: *внощи* КП, 120 and many others, but: *печерскаго* УП, 156 б.

Conclusions. Thus, as a result of the analysis of the texts of religious monuments of the 14th – 15th centuries, clear signs of the interaction of the Old Bulgarian graphic and orthographic system and the Ukrainian folk speech were recorded. Manifestations of the phonetic and graphic South Slavic-Ukrainian variability are associated with the following linguistic phenomena: continuity of the former **ę*, **'a* and **Q*; change of the initial **je* into *o*; transition of *e* into *o* after hushings and *u*; reduction of *u* > *o* before iotated vowels; confusion of unstressed *u* and *e*; development of sound combinations **tort*, **tolt*, **tert*, **telt*; reflexes of sound combinations *ѡp*, *ѡл*, *ѡp*, *ѡл*; hardening of *p'*; hardness/softness of hushing consonants; dissimilation and simplification of consonants; change of sound combinations **dj*, **zdj* and **tj*, **kt* .

In the phonetic system of the studied monuments, the interaction of the traditional writing of that time and the local vernacular is traced, in particular, the phonetic features of the North Ukrainian and the South-West Ukrainian dialects are revealed. Due to the fact that the sacred books were transcribed by local residents (Ukrainians), the newly created manuscripts contained many different spellings from the original, which reflected the peculiarities of oral regional speech of scribes. Ancient dialectal features of the living language penetrated into the orthoepy of the sacred language, which led to a gradual departure from the Old Slavic written *usus* and the emergence of variants of liturgical orthoepy. Dialectal phonetic features are reflected in the liturgical manuscripts created in the Ukrainian lands, graphically not to the same extent. In certain cases, it is reasonable to assume that some phonetic features were quite strongly developed in the scribe's language, but he could not reproduce them due to the orthographic traditions of religious book-writing of that time, which were based on the Old Bulgarian language basis. In general, we can conclude that the process of approaching the church language to the living vernacular acquired an organic understanding and a certain dynamic.

Prospects of the study

The study of the language of religious monuments taking into account the results of other research in the field of philology, paleography, theology has undeniable prospects for linguistic interpretation of church books with the definition of local language traditions of the time, their localization as elements of the Slavic written culture, resolving debatable issues regarding the formation, chronology and systematization of the church-written corpus.

Conditional symbols

АП – Karpinskij, M. (1888). Yuzhno-russkij Apostol XV veka. [The South Russian Apostle of the 15th century]. *Russkij filologicheskij vestnik*, 19, 68 – 73. Varshava.

БА – Kopko, P. (1912). Apostolus Bybliensis saec. XIV. Grammatisch-kritisch Analysiert. *Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Denkschriften*, 55 (1), 1 – 103. Wien.

ЄВ – Kulbakin, S.M. (1901). Evangelie Verkovicha XIII – XIV v. Otchet o zanyatiyah v knigohranilishah Moskvyy i Peterburga. [The Gospel of Verkovich of the 13th – 14th centuries. Report on the lessons in the book depositories of Moscow and St. Petersburg]. *Sbornik Otdeleniya russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk*, 59 (3), 2 – 20.

ЄС – Sobolevskij, A.I. (1884) Poucheniya Efrema Sirina 1492 goda. [The teachings of Ephraim the Syryn of 1492]. *Trudy po istorii russkogo yazyka*, 1. *Ocherki po istorii russkogo yazyka*, 50 – 58. Kiev.

ІЗМ. № 488, ІЗМ. № 489 – Trebin, O. (1910). Materialy do istorii ukrainskoj movy z rukopysiv XV viku kyivskykh bibliotek. [Materials on the history of the Ukrainian language from the 15th century manuscripts of Kyiv libraries]. *Zapysky Ukrainskoho naukovoho tovarystva v Kyievi*, 7, 1-16.

КЄ – Sopko, O.I. (2015). *Korolevske Yevanheliie 1401 r.* [The Korolevo Gospel of 1401]. Uzhhorod: Grazhda.

КП – Kievskaya Psaltir 1397 goda iz Gosudarstvennoj Publichnoj biblioteki imeni M. E. Saltykova-Shedrina v Leningrade. (1978). [The Kyiv Psalter of 1397 from the State Public Library named after M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin in Leningrad]. Moskva.

КСЄ – Kryzhanovskij, G. (1886). Kamenec-Stromilovskoe tetraevangelie 1411 goda i volynskoe narechie v XIV – XV vv. [The Kamenets-Stromilov tetra-Gospel of 1411 and the Volyn dialect in the 14th–15th centuries]. *Volynskie Eparhialnye vedomosti*, 17, 502 – 509; 18, 531 – 540.

Лавр Є – Svencickij, I.S. (1913). Lavrashevskoe Evangelie nachala XIV veka (Paleograficheskij-grammaticheskoe opisanie). [The Lauryshev Gospel of the beginning of the 14th century (Paleographic and grammatical description)]. *Izvestiya otdeleniya russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk*, XVIII (1), 206 – 229. Sankt-Peterburg.

ЛЄ – *Lutske Yevanheliie XIV stolittia. Faksymilne vydannia.* (2011). [The Lutsk Gospel of the 14th century. Facsimile edition]. Kyiv.

ЛП – *Lutskyi Psaltr 1384 roku. Faksymilne vydannia.* (2013). [The Lutsk Psalter of 1384. Facsimile edition]. Kyiv.

МП – Sokolov, I.I. (1883). Mukachevskaya psaltr XV veka. [The Mukachevo Psalter of the 15th century]. *Sbornik statej po slavyanovedeniyu, sostavlennyj i izdannyy uchenikami V. I. Lamanskogo po sluchayu 25-letiya ego uchenoj i professorskoj deyatel'nosti*, 450 – 468. Sankt-Peterburg.

ПА – *Pandekty Antiokha 1307 r. Natsionalnyi muzei u Lvovi imeni Andreia Sheptytskoho. Rukopys 48/257.* [The Pandects of Antioch of 1307. Andrei Sheptytsky National Museum in Lviv. Manuscript 48/257].

ПЄ – Kaľuzniacki, Aem. (1888). Evangeliarium Putnanum. *Monumenta linguae palaeoslovenicae*, 1, 1 – 270. Wien-Teschen.

Поликарп Є – Kalajdovich, K.F. (1824). *Ioann, ekzarh Bolgarskij: Issledovanie, obyasnuyushee istoriyu slavyanskogo yazyka i literatury IX i X stoletij.* [John, Ex-

arch of Bulgaria: Study explaining the history of the Slavic language and literature in the 9th and 10th centuries]. Moskva.

УП – Kolessa, O. (1925). „Uzhhorodskiyi Poluustav” u pergaminovii rukopysi XIV v. [The Uzhhorodskiyi Poluustav in a parchment manuscript of the 14th century]. *Zapysky NTSh*, 141 – 143, 1 – 59. Lviv.

Четья – Nimchuk, V. (2015). Ukrainska Chetia 1489 roku. [The Ukrainian hagiography of 1489]. Zhytomyr.

REFERENCES

Jagic, V. (1894). „Ismaragd” ein altrussisches Literaturdenkmal. [Review of “To the literary history of the Old Russian collections” of V.A. Yakovlev]. *Archiv fur slavische philologie*, 16, 240 – 242. Berlin.

Kopko, P. (1912). Apostolus Bybliensis saec. XIV. Grammaticisch-kritisch Analysiert. *Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Denkschriften*, 55 (1), 1 – 103. Wien.

McRobert, C.M. (2010). The textual peculiarities of the Luck Psalter of 1384 (Acquisti e Doni MS 360, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Florence). *Ricerche slavistiche*, 8 (54), New Series, 101 – 125.

Nandriş, Gr. (1924). Aspectele verbale in Evangheliarul slav de la Putna (sec. XIII – XIV). *Codrul Cosminului. Analele Stiintifice ale Universitatii “Stefan cel Mare” din Suceava*, 1, 9 – 18.

Popesku, P. (1962). Manuscrisele slavone din mănăstirea Putna. *Biserica Ortodoxă Romină*, 1 – 2, 105 – 145.

Smorağ-Różycka, M. (1999). *Ewangeliarz Ławryszewski*. Kraków.

Stradomski, J. (2014). Rękopisy i teksty. Studia nad cerkiewnosłowiańską kulturą literacką Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego i Korony Polskiej do końca XVI wieku. *Krakowsko-wileńskie studia slawistyczne*, 10. Kraków.

Verdiani, C. (1954). Il Salterio Laurenziano-Voliniense: Codice paleoslavo del 1384. *Ricerche slavistiche*, III, 1 – 29.

Anichjenka, W.V. (1966). Knizhna-carkownaslavjanskija tradycyi v ukrainskaj i belaruskaj perekladnoj pismennasci XVI – XVII st. [The Book-Church Slavonic traditions in the Ukrainian and Belarusian translated writing of the 16th – 17th centuries]. *Slavia*, 1, 68 – 70.

Bulakhovskiyi, L.A. (1977). *Vybrani pratsi: v 5 t. T. 2*. [Selected works: in 5 volumes. V. 2]. Kyiv, Ukraine.

Nimchuk, V. (1997). Kyivskiyi Psaltyr 1397 roku – pamiatka pivnichnoho dialektu ukrainskoi movy. [The Kyiv Psalter of 1397 – the monument of the northern dialect of the Ukrainian language]. *Ukrainskyi dialektolohichnyi zbirnyk*, 3, 218 – 231. Kyiv, Ukraine: Naukova dumka.

Shevelov, Yu. (2002). *Istorychna fonolohiia ukrainskoi movy*. [Historical phonology of the Ukrainian language]. Kharkiv, Ukraine: Akta.

- Skab, M.V. (2014). *Tserkovnoslovianska mova ukrainskoi redaktsii: istoriia vynyknennia ta funktsionuvannia, hrafika, orfohrafia, fonetyka, leksyka*. [The Church Slavonic language of the Ukrainian edition: history of origin and functioning, graphics, spelling, phonetics, vocabulary]. Chernivtsi, Ukraine.
- Stamenova, A. (2017). *Istoriya leksicheskikh drevnebolgarizmov v ukrainskom literaturnom yazyke*. [History of lexical Old Bolgarisms in the Ukrainian literary language]. Sofia, Bulgaria: Paradox.
- Temchin, S.Yu. (2009). Funkcionirovanie ruskoj movy i ierarhiya cerkovnyh tekstov. [The functioning of the Russian language and the hierarchy of church texts]. *Studia Russica*, XXIII, 226 – 234. Budapest, Hungary.
- Tsaralunga, I. (2017). Pivdenoslovianski movni elementy v ukrainsko-moldavskykh hramotakh XIV – XV st. [The South Slavic language elements in the Ukrainian-Moldavian letters of the 14th – 15th centuries]. In: *Multikulturalizm i mnohgoezichie. Sbornik s dokladi ot Trinadesetite mezhdunarodni slavistichni cheteniya. Sofia, 21 – 23 april 2016 g. T. 1. Lingvistika*. Veliko Trnovo, Bulgaria.
- Uspenskij, B.A. (1994). *Kratkij ocherk istorii russkogo literaturnogo yazyka (XI – XIX vv.)*. [A brief outline of the history of the Russian literary language (11th – 19th centuries)]. Moskva, Russia: Gnozis.
- Zhukovskaya, L. P. (1959). O perevodah evangeliya na slavyanskij yazyk i o “drevnerusskoj redakcii” slavyanskogo evangeliya. [About translations of the Gospel into the Slavic language and about “the Old Russian edition” of the Slavic Gospel]. *Slavyanskoe yazykoznanie. Sb. statej*, 86 – 97. Moskva, Russia.
- Zhukovskaya, L.P. (1976). *Tekstologiya i yazyk drevnejshih slavyanskikh pamyatnikov*. [Textology and language of the oldest Slavic monuments]. Moskva, Russia.

✉ **Prof. Inna Tsaralunga**

Scopus Author ID: 57193385975

Web of Science Researcher ID: AAE-4150-2020

ORCID iD: 0000-0002-7937-8529

Department of Ukrainian Philology

Khmelnytsky National University

Khmelnytsky, Ukraine

E-mail: tsaralungainna@ukr.net