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Notes on Transliteration

The present investigation contains many examples from printed and handwritten eighteenth-century documents. All examples from eighteenth-century sources will be presented in their original orthography, as far as this is technically possible.

In the transliteration of handwritten documents, a slash “/” indicates a line break; a double slash “//” indicates a page break. Square brackets “[…]” indicate an illegible passage with the number of dots indicating the assumed number of illegible characters. Curly brackets {...} indicate parentheses in the original text.

Superscript characters are brought down into the line and italicized, thus identifying them as superscripts in the original: ⟨воен҇ную⟩ → ⟨воен҇ную⟩.

Texts will be separated into words. Thus, cases where additional words, such as conjunctions, prepositions, or negations are attached to the following word, this will be broken up: ⟨иѕакричал҇⟩ → ⟨и ѕакричал҇⟩, ⟨ѿꙋчрежденнагѡ⟩ → ⟨ѿ ꙋritelnагѡ⟩. The principles applied in this investigation are thus in accordance with the established scholarly tradition.¹

In the Bibliography, the spelling of all pre-1918 titles has been modernized. Transliterations of Cyrillic are made according to the Library of Congress System (without diacritics).

Spelling of Names

Names are treated according to the Library of Congress System standard. However, if a historical person has a well-established name in English, that form will be used. Thus, Peter the Great will be named by this traditional epithet, not as Pëtr Alekseevich. His daughter will be called Elizabeth, not “Elizabet, Elisabet” or “Elizaveta Petrovna.” For persons of German, Irish and other,
non-Russian origin, for example, von Bühren (Biron), Lacy (Lassi), and others, the original forms and Russian alternatives of their names will be presented.

The Old Style Calendar

In Russia prior to 1700, years were counted “from the Creation of the World.” This was changed by Peter the Great to conform with the rest of Europe. However, the Russian Empire retained the Julian calendar, which is now referred to as the Old Style (O.S.), throughout the period covered by the present investigation and until 1917.

In the 1700s, the Julian calendar was eleven days behind the Gregorian one. Thus, January 1, 1740 Old Style (O.S.) was January 12, 1740 New Style (N.S.). In this book, dates found in eighteenth-century documents are all in the Old Style, thus reflecting the Julian calendar.

Translation of Quotations

Quotations originally written in languages other than English have been translated into English. All translations are made by the author, unless indicated otherwise. Translations of longer excerpts are found in the footnotes, in parentheses.

---

This book was long in the making. The idea for it came to me ten years ago at the Uppsala branch of the Swedish national archives, when I stumbled across some letters in Russian from the 1740s while looking for something else. At that point, having been trained as a philologist, I was vaguely familiar with seventeenth-century Russian, but this was something else. As I actively started assembling documents from the 1740s, I became fascinated by them and the language of their (often anonymous) authors. Since then, the writing of this book has been the educational journey of my life.

Many people have contributed to making this book possible. I want thank Irina Lysén for commenting on drafts of the investigation, and Kathleen Anderson de Miranda for reviewing my English. Furthermore, I owe my thanks to many colleagues at the universities of Uppsala and Gothenburg who have, through the years, patiently listened to me by coffee machines and in corridors. Sometimes my tale has been one of woe and despair, sometimes one of bubbling enthusiasm.

At Academic Studies Press, I am indebted to my editor, Ekaterina Yanduganova, for her encouragement and advice. I am also indebted to the anonymous reviewers who read an earlier version of this book, and whose comments have improved the investigation in significant ways. Any remaining errors or inconsistencies are entirely my own.

Finally, I am forever grateful to my wife, Lina, for her love, unwavering patience and willingness to support a project that many times, I am sure, must have seemed like a pushy and obnoxious acquaintance, constantly demanding her husband’s attention.

Thomas Rosén
Gothenburg, November 2021
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Having won the Great Northern War against Sweden (1700–1721), the Russian Empire emerged as one of the great powers of Europe during the second quarter of the eighteenth century. Although the empire was highly diverse ethnically and linguistically, the scope of this study concerns a single language during a single decade: Russian in the 1740s.

Today, speakers of Russian are universally literate, and an overwhelming majority have access to information at the touch of a screen or a button. In the 1740s, the situation was entirely different. The vast majority of Russian speakers did not know how to read or write. In all probability, a majority of the population had seen writing and knew of its existence from an early age, but few were given the opportunity to learn such skills. The educational system catered to a small fraction of the population. For the majority, Russia was an oral society. People communicated in native dialects as they always had, and changes in people’s language were likely slow and gradual, with pronunciations or grammatical forms competing for generations. As K. Anipa concludes, “[a]t any given time, a language overwhelmingly represents continuity.”

The empire’s new status as a great power and the proximity of its new capital, St. Petersburg, to Western Europe, inevitably brought the Russian language into close contact with other languages and idioms. For example, the Danish theologian, Peder von Haven, spent several years in Russia at the beginning of the 1740s and picked up the following example of codeswitching that he found remarkable:

---

Monsieur, Paschalusta, wil ju nicht en Schalken Vodka trinken, Isvollet, Badusca. Hvilket skal hede så meget: Monsieur, kjære, vil De ikke drikke et glass brendevin, værsågod eller behager De, lille fader.²

Strangely enough, however, the traditional image of the Russian language during the eighteenth century is one where the element of continuity is lacking entirely. Everything is focused on sudden change and renewal: “[i]n the Middle ages, the Russian language was dozing. It was aroused by the reign of Peter the Great.”³ The reign of the Great Reformer allegedly witnessed a “cultural revolution.”⁴ Even Viktor Zhivov, one of the world’s foremost authorities on eighteenth-century Russian, assessed the period’s linguistic situation with the following words: “[t]he eighteenth century witnessed a radical transformation of the Russian linguistic situation that encompassed all levels of the Russian language and all of the spheres in which it functioned.”⁵

Looking at existing research, one quickly encounters voices that disagree with Zhivov. Was there, in fact, a “revolution” or was there gradual change? If there was a gradual change, what was changing, and whom did the changes affect? Zhivov’s argument has been opposed by the hypothesis that Russian language experienced a succession of “synchronies” rather than a “revolution.” Synchrony, in the words of another prominent linguist, Vitalii Kostomarov, “... represents a virtual period in which the diachrony is hidden or reveals itself by means of variation, irritating ‘errors’ and other witnesses of linguistic dynamic.”⁶

---

² Alf Grannes, Vsjakaja vsjatjina: Om folk og språk i “Sovjetunionen”, Russland og Bulgarja (Bergen: Universitetet i Bergen, Russisk institutt, 1992), 3 (Monsieur, pozhaluista, wil ju nicht en Schalken Vodka trinken, izvol’te, batiushka. Which amounts to: Monsieur, my dear, will you not drink a glass of vodka, please little father).
³ V. G. Kostomarov, Iazyk tekushchego momenta: poniatie pravil’nosti (s. l.: Zlatoust, 2014), 152.
1.1 Aim and Purpose of the Investigation

This investigation examines the functions of language in society. It is thus a sociolinguistic investigation, “[а] задача социолингвистического исследования состоит как раз в том, чтобы получить представление о реальной языковой жизни людей.”7 In the words of sociolinguist J. V. Neustupný, “[l]anguage is reactive to other socioeconomic phenomena and is thus continuously adapting to changes in other spheres.”8 Finding out about “people’s real linguistic life” therefore includes studying developments in society in conjunction with the linguistic evidence.

Despite brilliant research carried out on Russian eighteenth-century language by generations of scholars, our knowledge of this period remains incomplete. The principal reason is that certain spheres of the language have been investigated in detail, while others have attracted less attention (cf. chapter 2). As a result, we are left with a biased image of eighteenth-century Russian.

This investigation aims to expand this image, reveal this bias, and provide contrasting examples. It has three principal goals. First, to offer a sociolinguistic analysis of the Russian language during the 1740s, based on a broad selection of sources (the reasons for my choice of this period are detailed in section 1.4). Second, to study what forces may have caused linguistic change, or lack thereof, in the 1740s. Third, to determine how the usage observed in the textual material corresponds to the linguistic registers, varieties of a language associated with a particular situation of use, of the Russian language prevalent in the eighteenth century.9

---

1.2 Language and Society in Eighteenth-Century Russia

The transformation of the linguistic situation in Russia may have been quite radical for a limited group of speakers, but far less so for others. This argument is based on considerations of the nature of language management, explained below.

The ways in which people think about the functions of language in their society, and the steps taken to influence or modify these functions are known collectively as language policy. A language policy, in the words of Bernard Spolsky,

... operates within a speech community, of whatever size. The domain of language policy may be any defined or definable social or political or religious group or community, ranging from a family through a sports team or neighborhood or village or workplace or organization or city or nation state or regional alliance.

Language policy, in the Spolskyan sense, has three components: language practices, ideology, and management. Language practices are described as “the linguistic features chosen, the variety of language used. They constitute policy to the extent that they are regular and predictable.” Ideology consists of “the values, or statuses assigned to named languages, varieties and features.” Language management, previously known as language planning, is “the explicit and observable effort by someone or some group that has or claims authority over the participants in the domain to modify their practices or beliefs.”

Spolsky’s use of the term language management differs from that suggested by Jiří V. Neustupný and Björn H. Jernudd, who define language management in the following way:

The term language management covers what has often been referred to as language planning but its boundaries are wider. It comprises all behaviour that has language as its target, including language policy, the cultivation of language, language teaching

12 Ibid., 5.
14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
and language acquisition, interpreting/translation, speaker’s correction of language in discourse and speech therapy. One could also say metalinguistic behaviour, especially as linguistics is also one of the genres of language management.\textsuperscript{16}

While recognizing the differences between the definitions of language management described above, this investigation draws on both. The term language management is used here in the sense of explicit and observable efforts to modify linguistic practices or beliefs. For these functions, Neustupný uses the term organized management.\textsuperscript{17} The term language planning will not be used in this investigation.

Having reserved the term language management for the explicit and observable efforts to modify linguistic practices or beliefs, we must also consider the implicit and non-observable activities by which people have wielded authority over language. Where no policy or planning can be discerned, the term simple or discourse-based management can be used. An example of simple management is when a speaker corrects his or her own speech “here and now.”\textsuperscript{18} For a diachronic investigation such as this, the discourse-based management remains beyond reach.

Neustupný offers a typology for language management based on modernity, for which not all features need to be present simultaneously. The typology has four stages: premodern, early modern, modern, and postmodern. Although it is never explained what exactly characterizes the premodern period, this can be defined as the stage when the conditions characteristic of the next stage, the early modern, have not yet been reached. The latter are: a) the beginning of machine-assisted production; b) the emergence of new social structures; c) the appearance of modern national societies; d) the limitation of the power of the aristocracy, and e) the birth of the modern ideology of nationalism.\textsuperscript{19}

It becomes immediately apparent that language management activities in mid-eighteenth-century Russia belonged to the premodern stage when evaluated

\textsuperscript{17} Neustupný, “Sociolinguistic Aspects,” 2210.
\textsuperscript{18} Nekvapil, “From Language Planning to Language Management,” 96.
\textsuperscript{19} Neustupný, “Sociolinguistic Aspects,” 2210–2211.
according to Neustupný’s typology. None of the criteria suggested for early modern societies were as yet fulfilled. Indeed, when historian Simon Dixon wrote about Russia in 1825, he concluded that it was by no means a modern state:

Nowhere in Europe was popular participation in politics so severely discouraged; nowhere was subsistence agriculture so widely practised; nowhere did the workings of the world remain so mysterious to so many. Behind the façade of its rationally ordered bureaucratic hierarchy, and beneath the level of the cosmopolitan nobility, the Russian empire remained a peasant society ruled by autocrats who never relinquished their personal grip on the impersonal state authority they were so anxious to develop.20

Russia must have been even less modern seventy-five years earlier. However, there is only a partial overlap between the characteristics listed by Neustupný and Dixon. Sue Wright finds that

although formal language policy making and language planning is a relatively recent development in terms of human history, as an informal activity it is as old as language itself, plays a crucial role in the distribution of power and resources in all societies. ...21

In accordance with Wright’s argument, I regard the study of language management in eighteenth-century Russia as a possible endeavor—at least as available sources allow—despite the fact that it chronologically belongs to the premodern period.

It is reasonable to question whether the eighteenth-century Russian state and its institutions possessed the means by which they could influence the majority—let alone all—of their subjects. On the whole, the majority of Russian speakers had very limited access to education during the eighteenth century. A transformation of the linguistic situation powerful enough to permeate all of

society would require the force behind it to have vast resources of information and education. Modern hi-tech societies have this in the form of mass media and universal public education. The eighteenth-century Russian state, however, had far fewer and weaker resources at its disposal.

The Imperial Academy of Sciences was, in effect, the only institution that had such resources. Viktor Zhivov often returns to its role in linguistic matters. He finds that, for as long as its monopoly on civil printing lasted, this organization was the only institution in Russia to actively engage in attempts to normalize the language. Although only a limited group of people read the academy’s publications and adhered to its norms, the monopoly of the academy existed until the 1750s, when it began to deteriorate. This deterioration occurred in conjunction with the rapid development of literary culture during this period. Also during the 1750s, “расхождение между реальным узусом и конструируемой Академией стандартом остается скрытым, существующим вне публичной сферы.” Therefore, in order to get a more accurate picture of the real linguistic landscape, it is crucial to look beyond the public sphere and consult a broad selection of relevant documents that have survived from the eighteenth century.

1.3 Historical Sociolinguistics?

Many aspects of “people’s real linguistic life” in the distant past cannot be studied because tangible evidence is no longer available. In contrast to sociolinguists concerned with contemporary language, the linguist who wishes to carry out a diachronic investigation has no way of interacting with a statistically representative group of speakers in order to request additional information. Instead, he or she must observe and draw conclusions based exclusively on written evidence that has survived, sometimes by pure chance. This uneven preservation of data led William Labov to describe historical linguistics as “the art of making the best use of bad data.”

Notwithstanding this “bad data problem,” as it is universally known, the desire to widen our knowledge of language in past societies has resulted in the gradual

---

23 Zhivov, Ocherki, 552 (the divergence between real usage and the standard constructed by the academy remains hidden, existing beyond the public sphere).
evolution of a discipline known as *historical sociolinguistics*. It developed during the last four decades, and its theoretical aspects lend themselves well to the investigation of eighteenth-century Russian language material.

### 1.4 Chronological Delimitations

Analyzing the entire eighteenth century would be a gigantic undertaking. Rather than maintaining a wide perspective, this study narrows in on a single decade in order to investigate the details and learn what new information they provide. But why the 1740s? Why not the 1720s or 1780s?

One reason to examine the 1740s is that this decade has long been neglected in the study of the Russian language in the eighteenth century. The decade tends to be overshadowed by expositions on the Petrine reforms and the times of Lomonosov and Catherine the Great.

The 1740s are also chronologically situated halfway between the reforms of the Petrine period and the publication of M. V. Lomonosov’s *Rossiiskaia grammatika* in 1757. Since Lomonosov’s work was the first Russian grammar book aimed at domestic consumption, the 1740s represent the last period in history when no such grammatical instruction was available to the general public.

---

1.5 Was Post-Petrine Russian in Disarray?

Pursuing an investigation of the Russian language in the 1740s is important for many reasons. First, it provides a deeper understanding of the Russian linguistic situation in the 1740s, since it is understudied. Secondly, we must correct, whenever possible, erroneous images of the past that have may have arisen. Such misunderstandings are not uncommon and may have various causes: biased or insufficient source information, ideological notions, and so forth. A few examples may help to illustrate this point. One author has the impression that all official business in Russia before 1750 was conducted in Church Slavic, not Russian:

Obviously, Muscovian merchants did business in the vernacular, not Church Slavonic, which they used passively in church. The official switch to the vernacular as a written language began only with the linguistic works authored by Mikhail Vasilevich Lomonosov (1711–65). ... 29

Another specialist suggests that post-Petrine Russian was somehow in a state of imbalance:

Church Slavonic was losing its function as a language of literature and culture and vernacular Russian was in disarray, struggling to absorb the influx of foreign words and adapt itself to the needs of the emerging high society and the growing bureaucracy, of science and literature. 30

1.6 Research Questions

The objectives of this investigation outlined in section 1.1 give rise to individual research questions. These questions can be further divided into two groups: 1) a group of extralinguistic issues about how Russian society was organized

---

and how this organization impacted language, and 2) a group of purely linguistic questions.

1.6.1 Extralinguistic Questions

a) What was the societal structure of the Russian Empire during the 1740s, and what events and processes in that society may have impacted the language?
b) How was the educational system organized? What can be said concerning the levels of literacy?
c) What concrete measures did organizations and authorities take relating to linguistic matters?

1.6.2 Linguistic Questions

a) How do printed and handwritten documents in Russian from the 1740s differ significantly from each other?
b) If significant differences between printed and handwritten documents exist, how can they be interpreted from a sociolinguistic perspective?
c) Are efforts of linguistic standardization visible in printed texts from the 1740s?
d) Do handwritten documents contain evidence of linguistic standardization?
e) Is there evidence of linguistic change in the 1740s?

1.7 Outline of the Investigation

In order to meet the objectives of this investigation and to answer the research questions, this monograph is organized as follows. Chapter 1 introduces the study and its objectives. Chapter 2 outlines the current state of research on Russian in the first half of the eighteenth century, particularly the language of the 1740s. It also contains a section on sociolinguistic studies of eighteenth-century Russian language. Chapter 3 examines how Russian eighteenth-century society impacted the language. Chapter 4 presents the textual sources available for research on Russian in the 1740s. Chapter 5 discusses research methods. As a result of the methodological choices made in chapter 5, chapters 6, 7, and 8 contain respectively a situational, a linguistic and a functional analysis. Chapter 9 summarizes the conclusions of this study.
Survey of Existing Research

Bibliographic searches reveal that linguists have given little attention to the Russian language of the 1740s. This decade constitutes the tail end of a period that was disparagingly labelled a “literary and linguistic wasteland” by a past generation of scholars. For example, the author of a well-known handbook from the 1980s chose to dismiss the period in a few words: “French achieved undisputed pre-eminence in literature and the intellectual field (thought, criticism, history) from the accession of Elizabeth (1740). Everything French was worthy of imitation.”

In order to properly contextualize research about the Russian language during the 1740s, this discussion will present relevant issues within a wider chronological and thematic framework. This will be achieved by surveying the entire first half of the eighteenth century.

This chapter begins with a survey of research on the 1740s and then situates this decade within the overall eighteenth-century context. Because various aspects of the functions of language in society is the focus of this study, this survey of existing research will also include an assessment of research relevant to Russian historical sociolinguists.

2.1 Russian Language from the 1740s as a Field of Study

Research on Russian language from the 1740s has mostly revolved around religious language and business language (ру. деловой язык). Ekaterina Kislova

---

3 For a general introduction to the study of business language with a rich bibliography of Soviet and Russian literature, cf. O. V. Nikitin, Delovaia pis’mennost’ v istorii russkogo iazyka (XI–XVIII vv.): lingvisticheskie ocherki, 3rd ed. (Moscow: Flinta, 2017). Nikitin does, however, not discuss the 1740s.
has investigated the language of sermons from the 1740s, a topic previously touched on by V. M. Zhivov. Kislova finds that, despite the frequent occurrence of Russianisms in sermons, their language

[ч]етко противопоставлен русскому языку светской литературы, в которой только отдельные грамматические церковнославянизмы допустимы как «поэтические вольности», но наиболее яркие формы (аорист, имперфект, плюсквамперфект) маркированы как чужеродные. Язык проповеди не осознается, очевидно, как русский, т. к. яркие грамматические церковнославянизмы из него не изгоняются.

Research suggests that in 1750, the majority of literate people read texts that were largely similar to those read a century earlier. Given the crucial importance of religion for the vast majority of people during the eighteenth century, literate Orthodox Christian Russians most likely considered texts with a significant admixture of Church Slavic as natural. The secular language had not yet incorporated the domain of religion. V. M. Zhivov writes:


5 Kislova, “Propoved’ 1740-x godov,” 52 (... is clearly opposed to the Russian language of secular literature, in which only individual grammatical Slavonisms were allowed as “poetic licenses,” whereas the most conspicuous forms [aorist, imperfect, pluperfect] were marked as alien. The language of the sermon is, obviously, not recognized as Russian since the glaring grammatical slavonisms are not banished from it.).

Survey of Existing Research

Следует иметь в виду при этом, что духовная литература XVIII в. имела никак не меньшую читательскую аудиторию, чем литература светская. Жития святых пользовались неизмеримо большим читательским спросом, чем сочинения Ломоносова. Это обстоятельство не могло не сказываться на социальных параметрах усвоения светского языкового стандарта.7

Research is scarce when it comes to other varieties of the language, although studies of regional business documents from the 1740s have been undertaken by Nikolai Chugaev and Larisa Belova.8 Individual texts from the 1740s occur in academic editions.9

Studies that claim to deal with the history of the eighteenth-century language are very similar to descriptions of the history of Russian literature. This becomes evident when the former is compared with the latter, as has been pointed out by Helmut Keipert.10

Genres of imaginative literature were a recent phenomenon in the 1740s. They had very limited distribution in Russian society and “occupied an insignificant

7 Zhivov, Ocherki, 553–554 (Here one must not forget that, in the eighteenth century, spiritual literature enjoyed a readership much larger than that of secular literature. Saints’ lives were vastly more popular than the writings of Lomonosov. This condition could not help but influence the social parameters of the adoption of the secular linguistic standard.)
9 Cf., for example, Sumkina and Kotkov, Pamiatniki.
place in publishing schedules.” Between 1725 and 1755, belles-lettres and odes constituted fifteen percent of all titles published. During the same period, religious content accounted for forty-one percent of published titles and laws, manifestos and official information represented eighteen percent.

### 2.2 General Studies of Eighteenth-Century Russian

In the scholarly literature on the history of Russian, the eighteenth century constitutes a watershed, separating the traditions of seventeenth-century Muscovy from those of the Russian Empire. There is universal agreement about the importance of the period, as one prominent researcher described:

> … и сегодня еще наши знания о языке этой эпохи, за которой традицией закреплен статус переходного этапа между т.н. древнерусским периодом и современным русским литературным языком (понятия и феномены, до сих пор не имеющие дефиниции в строгом смысле слова), в значительной степени фрагментарны.

The main research focus of eighteenth-century Russian has concentrated on the creation and development of what is known today as the Russian literary language (русский литературный язык), or contemporary standard Russian. In

---


13 Anna Kretschmer, review of V. K. Trediakovskijs “Gespräch zwischen einem Fremden und einem Russen über die alte und neue Orthographie und alles, was zu dieser Materie gehört”: eine philologisch-kritische Darstellung by Marianne Müller, *Russian Linguistics* 21, no. 3 (1997): 327 (... even today, our knowledge of the language of this period, to which tradition has fixed a status of transitional phase between the so-called Old Russian period and the modern Russian literary language (concepts and phenomena that are still lacking definitions in the strict meaning of the word), to a considerable degree, remains fragmentary).

modern scholarly literature, the emerging idiom is referred to as a *new type of Russian literary language* (русский литературный язык нового типа) or *new Russian literary language* (новый русский литературный язык).15

“Codification of this new literary language began in the 1730s,” writes V. M. Zhivov, who dates the earliest beginnings of standardization activities by the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences to the middle of 1728.16 By the 1740s, the new literary language had lost some of its novelty, and writing in it was no longer considered as “беспредцедентная смелость.”17 Certain syntactical, lexical and morphological elements that were previously separated, were now being integrated in the new written Russian.18 In printed texts from the period, scholars have identified evidence suggesting that a process of standardization had begun. However, due to lack of research, little can be said about the extent to which the standardization had actually advanced in printed texts. Even less can be said about the varieties of the language used in texts that were never printed.

In 1984, Helmut Keipert published a survey, which has since become an important key to the understanding of research on eighteenth-century Russian.19 In the 1999 revised version, he examines the ways in which the Russian literary language has been studied and identifies four basic models, or “main foci of interest” (Germ. Interessenschwerpunkte):

1. als Geschichte der Sprache von Texten, vorzüglich der von Originalwerken [история литературового языка = история языка литературы/письменности = история текстов]; oder 2. als Geschichte der (литератур)прескриптивной норм; oder 3. als Geschichte der

Keipert concludes that a strong emphasis has been placed on the first two areas of interest, but not the third and fourth. One reason suggested by Keipert is that few meta-linguistic statements by Russian have been preserved from the past.

It has long been acknowledged within the scholarly community that the general scope of eighteenth-century research has been rather narrow. Already in the 1960s, Iurii Sorokin, a Soviet specialist in historical lexicography, wrote:

Итак, исследование языка XVIII в. до сих пор было в известной степени односторонне привлечено к памятникам собственно литературным. Но и здесь оно было сосредоточено по преимуществу на произведениях нескольких писателей (Кантемира, Ломоносова, Сумарокова, Фонвизина, Радищева, Карамзина, Дмитриева, Державина, отчасти Тредиаковского, комедий второй половины XVIII и начала XIX в., в частности Плавильщиков и некоторых других),— на произведениях очень симптоматичных и важных, но не создающих полной картины.21

In the West, Keipert also criticized higher education courses on the history of the Russian literary language of their “shameful neglect” of the socio-historical aspects of their subject.22 However, equating Russian linguistic history with that

---


21 Iurii S. Sorokin, ed., Protesssy formirovaniia leksiki russkogo iazyka (ot Kantemira do Karamzina) (Moscow and Leningrad: Nauka, 1966), 13 (Thus far, the investigation of the eighteenth-century language has, to a certain extent, focused only on the great works of literature in the narrow sense. And even here it concentrated on the works of a few writers (Kantemir, Lomonosov, Sumarokov, Fonvizin, Radishchev, Karamzin, Дмитриев, Державин, Tредиаковский, the comedies of the second half of the 18th and early 19th centuries, particularly Plavil’shched and a few others), on works that are indicative and important, but that do not provide the full picture).

of imaginative literature has endured in practice, if not in theory. Keipert concludes that the image of the eighteenth-century language does contain certain “notorische Lücken.”

In 2015, Irina Podtergera published an article that has proven valuable for explaining the causes underlying the situation described above by Keipert. According to her, the term literary language has been interpreted in two different ways by scholars working in different historical periods, resulting in a confusion of the concepts. The first definition of literary language was employed by A. I. Sobolevskii and other scholars in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: “литературный язык 1—письменный язык, язык литературных произведений и документов.” The second definition, used during the twentieth century by representatives of the Prague linguistic circle, reads: “литературный язык 2—стандартный язык, который в том числе может функционировать как язык литературных произведений.” Podtergera continues:

На самом же деле мы имеем дело со смещением, возникшим в результате наложения друг на друга двух омонимичных терминов и двух стоящих за ними традиций. Чтобы ликвидировать это досадное смещение, нужно прежде всего признать наличие первой, более ранней традиции в отечественном языкознании как полноценной и завершенной в себе. Отдав дань уважения Соболевскому как одному из крупнейших ученых своего времени и признав его вклад в мировую лингвистику, нам, вероятно, следует прекратить попытки во что бы то ни стало вписать его линию в актуальный научный опыт.

25 Podtergera, “Chto takoe istoriia iazyka?,” 420–421 (literary language 1—written language, the language of literary works and documents; … literary language 2—a standard language that, among other things, can function as the language of literary works).
26 Ibid., 424 (In fact we are dealing with a confusion that occurred as a result of an imposition one on top of the other of two homonymous terms and of the two traditions behind them. In order to liquidate this annoying confusion, it is first necessary to recognize the existence of the first, earlier tradition in linguistics in Russia as valuable and complete in itself. Having paid tribute to Sobolevskii as one of the greatest scholars of his time and having recognized his contribution to world linguistics, we probably should discontinue the efforts to insert his line in the current scholarly experience).
Podtergera finds that the position according to which *literary language* is understood as the language of literature maintains a strong position in the syllabi of higher education (presumably in the Russian Federation, although this is not stated—T.R.), thus reducing the history of the literary language to historical stylistics.

During the last decade of the twentieth century, however, something started to shift in the diachronic research on Russian. In their review of Keipert’s 1999 survey article, V. M. Zhivov, Elena Zemskaia and Leonid Krysin conclude that

Историю литературного языка нового времени невозможно написать, не представляя себе, каков был круг пользователей этого языка, как и когда он начал утрачивать свою элитарность, как воспринимался этот язык большинством населения, остававшимся к этому языку во многом непричастным.27

By the late 1990s, a steady flow of works had begun to contribute to a more complete picture of the eighteenth-century language, as desired by Iurii Sorokin in the 1960s (see above). Important contributions made during the 1990s and 2000s include work by Gerta Hüttl-Folter, Anna Kretschmer, V. M. Kruglov, B. A. Uspenskii, V. M. Zhivov, and many others.28

The latest comprehensive treatment of the eighteenth century is V. M. Zhivov’s monumental two-volume *Istoriia iazyka russkoi pis’mennosti*. It was published posthumously in 2017 and is likely to remain influential for the foreseeable future. Concerning the first half of the eighteenth century Zhivov writes:

27 V. M. Zhivov, E. A. Zemskaia, and L. P. Krysin, review of Geschichte der russischen Literatursprache by H. Keipert, Voprosy iazykoznaniia 5 (2000): 127 ([t]he history of the literary language of the modern period cannot be written without imagining what the circle of users of this language was like, how and when it began to lose its elite status, and how this language was received by the majority of the population who, generally, did not contribute to it).

Языковая ситуация радикально меняется в эпоху Петра Великого: культурная революция, устроенная царем-преобразователем, сопровождается и лингвистической революцией. Она состоит прежде всего в отказе от старой регистровой организации языковой деятельности. На смену языку, фрагментированному по регистрам, приходит — по крайней мере, в виде, в идеале — единый полифункциональный письменный язык, парадоксальным образом являющийся в то же время «гражданским наречием».  

However, until the end of the 1750s, 

[н]овый языковой стандарт остается достоянием небольшой части образованной элиты, а возникшие за этот период образовательные институции (Академическая гимназия, Шляхетный корпус, Московский университет) существенной экспансии нового идиома пока еще не дают.  

In addition, during the mid 1740s, Zhivov identifies signs of a new cultural-historical situation affecting the literary language. The new idiom had acquired additional features characteristic of literary language. This process, however, came to fruition after the 1740s, and thus lie beyond the scope of this investigation.  

Is it then reasonable to talk of a linguistic “revolution” during the first half of the eighteenth century? Yes, but only from the position of elite culture, as Aleksandra Pletnëva has pointed out.  

29 Zhivov, Istoriiia, vol. 1, 73–74 (The linguistic situation changes radically in the time of Peter the Great: the cultural revolution organized by the Tsar-reformer, is accompanied by a linguistic revolution. This means, in the first place, the renunciation of the old, register-based organization of linguistic activity. A language fragmented into registers is supplanted — at least conceptually — by a unified polyfunctional written language, which is, paradoxically, at the same time the “civil dialect”).  

30 Zhivov, Istoriiia, vol. 2, 1060 ([t]he new linguistic standard remains the property of a small portion of the educated elite, whereas the educational institutions that appeared during this period [the Academy Grammar School, the Cadet Corps, the Moscow University] do not yet result in any significant expansion of the new idiom). The English renderings of the names of these institutions are taken from Geoffrey Hosking’s Russia and the Russians. A History, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011), 207–208.  


Where does the lasting value of Zhivov’s *Istoriia iazyka russkoi pis’mennosti* lie? Partly, the answer is found in its title. Zhivov explains:

Существенно лишь иметь в виду, что ситуация с письменным языком в эпоху до появления языкового стандарта (литературного языка) была принципиально иной, чем та, к которой мы привыкли. … Такая ситуация во всех европейских обществах возникла сравнительно недавно.33

### 2.3 Sociolinguistically Oriented Studies of Eighteenth-Century Russian

Historical sociolinguistics is an important part of our current understanding of language history.34 As previously mentioned, eighteenth-century Russian was often studied on the basis of literary and other printed texts. Another traditional focus has been on the language use of individual members of the elite of Russian society. An example is the following recommendation, taken from a historical grammar published in the early 1960s: “[t]he phonology of eighteenth-century Russian may be studied at the beginning of this period in the private correspondence and official papers of Peter the Great and in the middle of it in the data pertaining to the three styles recommended by Lomonosov.”35

The 1960s saw a broadening of the base for diachronic investigations when S. I. Kotkov and his fellow scholars began to prepare editions and studies of private letters, business and administrative documents, providing researchers with a larger variety of texts than had previously been available.36 Today, business

---

33 Zhivov, *Istoriia*, vol. 1, 35 ([i]t is essential to keep in mind that the written language situation during the period preceding the emergence of the linguistic standard (the literary language) was fundamentally different from what we are used to. … Such a situation appeared relatively recently in all European societies).
34 Podtergera, “*Chto takoe istoriia iazyka?*,” 427.
documents are attracting increasing scholarly interest, including those from Russia’s regions.37

**Historical sociolinguistics** is a term used in the Soviet Union/Russia since the early 1980s. In the West, historical sociolinguistics has established itself as a discipline within diachronic linguistics during the last half-century or so.38 Thanks to this discipline, we now understand that Russian language history was more heterogeneous than was previously assumed, and the interest in historical sociolinguistics is growing.39

In 1983, the historian V. B. Kobrin read a paper at a conference in Dnepropetrovsk, the theme of which translates into English as “The Fourth All-Union Conference ‘Current Problems of Source Criticism and Special Historical Disciplines.’” Kobrin contributed a paper entitled “Historical Sociolinguistics as a Special Historical Discipline.”40 In it, he suggests that new information could be gained from studying changes in the “social codes” of languages:

> Коротко можно сказать, что крестьянин XVII в., переодевшийся боярином, вряд ли был бы разоблачен по языку, а крестьянин XVIII не имел шансов не выдать себя, если бы вздумал вырядиться генералом.41

---

37 See, for example, L. A. Glinkina and E. A. Sivkova, eds., Delovoi iazyk XVIII–nachala XIX vekov na luzhnom Urale i v Zaural’ë (Cheliabinsk: Poligraf-Master, 2006); T. P. Rogozhnikova, ed., Istoriia russkogo literaturnogo iazyka: regional’nyi aspekt (Moscow: Flinta, 2016).


41 Ibid., 249 (In short, one could say that a seventeenth-century peasant dressed up as a boyar would hardly be exposed on linguistic grounds, whereas an eighteenth-century peasant would certainly betray himself if he tried to pass himself off as a general).
Kobrin briefly describes the status of sociolinguistics in the Soviet Union and how it had begun to be used synchronically, and scholars such as Iu. D. Desheriev had written about how “retrospective sociolinguistics” still lacked a conceptual apparatus, but no development had as yet taken place in the field.42

According to Kobrin, the Soviet Union is the birthplace of sociolinguistics, and its father was E. D. Polivanov.43 Sociolinguistic studies were halted during Stalinism, and later Soviet linguists paid less attention to the social factors in linguistic development. However, after the fall of the Soviet Union, interest in historical sociolinguistics surfaced once again.44

Today, approximately three decades later, the importance of certain types of texts for our understanding of Russian linguistic developments during the eighteenth century is becoming increasingly apparent. These texts include business texts, private correspondence, and other kinds of domestic (бытовые) texts.45 However, leading scholars conclude that methods suitable for investigation of the Russian material require design and development.46 The present investigation represents one such development.

42 Ibid., 247.
46 Nikitin, Problemy etnolingvisticheskogo izuchenia, 77–78.
2.4 Language and Politics in the 1740s

Language management (cf. above, section 1.2) is the conscious and explicit effort to control peoples’ choices in linguistic matters, whether done by members of the family, communities or the state. Even though the Russian Empire lacked a state language agency in the modern sense of the word during the 1740s, state organized language management activities did take place.

In the 2009 preface to the English translation of Language and Culture in Eighteenth-Century Russia, V. M. Zhivov comments on what he considers a weakness in his original investigation. He finds that it is lacking “an institutional component”. The “institutional component” he is referring to is the role of the Academy of Sciences in the codification of the language, on which he elaborates in later publications. Today, most scholars will agree that the Academy of Sciences was a crucial component in the development of the Russian literary language during the eighteenth century.

Throughout the 1740s, the Russian state was uncontested in institutional language management. Through its various administrative branches and its effective control of Russia’s printing presses, the state exercised power over both religious and secular language. Until the end of the 1750s, the academy was the sole body responsible for printing texts in the civil typeface, which was used for printing secular texts.

The developments in the Academy of Sciences during the 1740s deserve to be investigated, as do other forms of language management in Russia during this period. Much has been written about the initiative to form a translators’ conference, known as the Russian Conference (Российское собрание) in 1735. Less is known about its real impact, and the impact of the work of individuals such as V. K. Trediakovskii, and the “linguistic programs” ascribed to him and other persons associated with the academy.

47 Zhivov, Language and Culture, xiii.
48 Zhivov, “Literaturnyi iazyk”; idem, Ocherki; idem, Istoriia.
50 Zhivov, Language and Culture, xiii.
2.5 Assessing the Situation

Whether it is the result of how the term *literary language* has been interpreted, or through some combination of other reasons, the situation concerning Russian is strongly reminiscent of the *funnel view* of language history.\(^{53}\) Heavily summarized, the theory can be described in the following manner: at the wide end of the funnel (that is, at an early stage in the development), a number of coexisting varieties of a language are “poured into” the funnel, and at the narrow end of the funnel (a later stage), a *standard language* emerges: “[t]he fate of the original varieties poured in at the top and others that may have arisen at a later stage are generally not taken into consideration.”\(^{54}\)

The funnel view results in a norm-oriented perception of language history. This brings to mind the “sanitized language history,” which has earlier characterized the studies of the development of the French language: “Until recent years, histories of the French language were based primarily on literary texts. This has resulted in a sanitized version that makes the language history appear more homogeneous than it surely was.”\(^{55}\) A situation similar to this can be said to exist also in the historiography of the Russian language, likely a result of reverence for the standard language throughout the modern period:

В отечественной культуре авторитет литературного языка весьма высок. Отклонения от литературной нормы оцениваются обществом негативно как показатель низкого культурного уровня говорящих. Это связано с тем, что в отечественной культуре литературный язык ассоциируется, прежде всего, не социальным положением говорящего, но с его культурно-образовательным уровнем. Более того, учению о русском литературном языке нередко придается политико-патриотическая окраска.\(^{56}\)

---

56 Germanova, *Teoriia i istoriia*, 200 (In domestic culture, the authority of the literary language is very high. Deviations from the literary norm are judged negatively by society as an indicator of a low cultural level on the part of the speakers. This is linked to the association, in domestic culture, of the literary language not with the social position of the speaker, but with his level of culture and education. Furthermore, the doctrine of the Russian literary language is often coloured by politics and patriotism).
Nationalism can thus be a consideration in the analysis of the ways in which language history has been written during the past century. Anna Kretschmer finds this to be one of the defining characteristics of diachronic Slavic studies:

Zu dem Erbe der Romantik gehört auch die Überbetonung des Nationalen, des Autochtonen, die bis zum heutigen Tag gerade für die diachrone Slavistik so prägend ist. Dabei wird nur zu häufig vergessen, daß die Grenze zwischen dem Autochtonen und dem Autarken, dem zum Prinzip erhobenen Anspruch, auch im Hinblick auf die Schrift- bzw. Standardsprache sich selbst zu genügen, fließend ist und leicht überschritten werden kann. Die Ausrichtung auf das Eigene birgt immer die Gefahr eines xenophoben Purismus in sich. In der diachronen Slavistik hat sie u. a. dazu geführt, daß über die Grenzen der nationalen Schulen hinweg so gut wie keine Koordinierung der Forschung stattfindet.\(^{57}\)

### 2.6 Conclusions

As this survey of existing research illustrates, the linguistic situation in Russia during the 1740s has never been subject to detailed investigation. There are investigations of individual genres, notably sermons, and some information can be extracted from general treatments of the eighteenth century. However, it remains difficult to understand the various forms of written Russian and how they differed from one another.

Many scholars have reacted against the bias towards imaginative literature, which prevails in the existing research on Russian in the eighteenth century. In the 2000s, these critical opinions resulted in a growing research interest related to previously neglected linguistic domains, such as regional business texts.

However, despite much new research, the image of the second quarter of the eighteenth century remains unclear. This is partially due to the fact that certain

---

\(^{57}\) Kretschmer, *Zur Geschichte des Schriftrussischen*, 5–6 (The legacy of Romanticism also includes an overemphasis on the national, the autochthonous, which to date has been so characteristic of diachronic Slavic studies. It is all too often forgotten that the boundary between the autochthonous and the autarchic can escape the claim, made into a principle, that it is also self-sufficient with regard to the written and standard language, and can easily be crossed. The focus on one’s own always carries with it a risk of xenophobic purism. In diachronic Slavic studies, this has, among other things, resulted in the almost complete absence of research coordination across the boundaries of national schools).
functional spheres of the language remain understudied. To put it simply: several pieces of the puzzle are missing.

In order to remedy the current situation, several issues need to be addressed. First of all, an improved understanding of the linguistic situation calls for broadening the textual base to include greater variety. This can be achieved by analyzing text from a greater number of genres.

Secondly, several remaining problems deserve renewed scrutiny: What was the literate culture like in the eighteenth century for the majority of the population of the Russian Empire? Who could read and write? What can be said about the literacy rates for men and women, and for people from diverse social backgrounds? How did literate people use their skills? How is the literacy level of the period reflected (or revealed) in preserved documents?

Thirdly, with the broadening of the field of vision comes a need to consider how “new” areas of research have been perceived intellectually in Russia and other countries. Although the subject does not strictly belong to linguistics, an investigation of Russian in the 1740s would be incomplete if it did not take into account the ideological considerations at the base of current perceptions of history.

The remaining chapters of this book are dedicated to answering these questions and finding solutions to these problems.
In chapters 6 to 8 of the present investigation, a number of texts in Russian from the 1740s will be subject to analysis. However, before determining the significance of the linguistic information found in these texts, it seems logical first to examine the sociocultural context of Russian in the 1740s. This will be done in the form of a brief survey of extralinguistic evidence.

In order to make the exposition as accessible as possible, a very brief introduction to Russian society in the 1740s is provided below. Such an introduction must, by necessity, draw on work done by others—mainly the work of historians—and there is an evident risk of reiterating facts already familiar to many readers. For this reason, the introductory remarks below are kept to a minimum.

### 3.1 Introductory Remarks

After a reform promulgated in 1727, the Russian Empire consisted of 14 provinces (губерния) and approximately 250 counties (уезд). The territorial expansion during the 1740s was modest. Following the Peace of Turku in 1743, a portion of Eastern Finland was annexed. In 1744, a reform of the gubernii led to the addition of two new provinces: Vyborg and Orenburg.¹

---

3.1.1 Peoples and Languages

Between 1719 and 1857, Russian authorities levied ten tax revisions (ревизия).\(^2\) The second revision was undertaken in 1744 and 1745. According to its findings, the male population comprised a little over nine million individuals.\(^3\) Multiplied by 1.02—since there were slightly more females than males—the grand total amounted to almost nineteen million individuals, that is, slightly less than France of the same period.\(^4\) Between the second and third revisions (1744–1762), the population of the Russian Empire increased by some sixteen percent.\(^5\) While the majority of the population of Russia in the 1740s was ethnically Russian (over sixty-nine percent), the empire was characterized by great ethnic diversity.\(^6\) While questions about the empire’s ethnic composition are fascinating, they are not immediately relevant to the present investigation, which focuses on the language of the majority: Russian.

This investigation is concerned with varieties of Russian in the first half of the eighteenth century. However, in order to avoid unwanted repetition, detailed discussions of these varieties will be presented in the chapters below. At this stage, a general observation must suffice: contemporary standard Russian is closely related to the varieties of spoken and written language employed during the 1740s, the spheres of existence of these varieties differed from what we can observe today (cf. below, section 5.2.2). The Russian-speaking population communicated amongst themselves in their local dialects. The development of the latter is the object of historical dialectology.\(^7\) The distribution of Russian dialects during the early modern period is of great interest for the research on regional business language (cf. above, section 2.3).

---

5 V. M. Kabuzan, Narody Rossi v XVIII veke: chislennost’ i etnicheskii sostav (Moscow: Nauka, 1990), 116.
7 K. V. Gorshkova, Istoricheskaia dialektologiia russkogo iazyka (Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1972).
3.1.2 Social Stratification

The social stratification of Russian society increased during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, resulting in the development of society based on the soslovie (сословие [plural soslovia, сословия], a term often rendered in English as “estate”—T.R.). While as a term soslovie is well established, certain aspects of the concept itself are not. Alison K. Smith points out that the use of the term soslovie is slightly anachronistic for the eighteenth century prior to the reforms launched by Catherine the Great in 1767. A recent volume by historians N. A. Ivanova and V. P. Zheltova presents a number of key issues of soslovie society that remain unresolved. One such issue concerns the chronology of formation. While some researchers favor the beginning of the eighteenth century, others claim that the formation process of the soslovia reached its culmination as late as the 1830s. Another discussion has as its goal to define the relationship between the Russian state and the soslovia, whether or not this relationship should be considered “serflike” for all social categories. While the outcome of such discussions are of great interest, further treatment of them clearly lies beyond the framework of the present investigation. Instead, focus will be shifted to the distribution of the soslovia in the population.

The second revision reports that, of the approximately nineteen million Russians, about ninety percent were peasants (крестьяне). The peasants were not a homogeneous group, but rather belonged to various categories with different judicial status: state serfs, estate serfs, monastery serfs, and others. Their economic conditions also varied. While the overwhelming majority worked in agriculture, a few—like the serf Kondratii, who began his career as a

---

9 For a discussion of this term and its possible translations (estate, caste, class, and so forth), see Alison K. Smith, For the Common Good and Their Own Well-Being: Social Estates in Imperial Russia (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 5.
10 Ivanova and Zheltova, Soslovnoe obshchestvo, 7–8.
12 Figures pertaining specifically to social stratification during the 1740s are unavailable. However, since figures reported by Ia. E. Vedernikov, Naselenie Rossii v kontse XVII–nachale XVIII veka (chislennost’, soslovno-klassovyi sostav, razmeshchenie) (Moscow: Nauka, 1977), 56 for the years 1719 and 1795 are identical, we may assume that they are valid also for the years 1740–1749. Mironov concludes that the social composition of the empire changed at a very slow pace. Peasants made up 89.1% of the population in 1719, falling slowly to 80.1% in 1913, cf. Mironov, Rossiiskaia imperiia: Ot traditsii k modernu, 476.
13 Mironov, Rossiiskaia imperiia: Ot traditsii k modernu, 398.
cottage-industry weaver on the estates of the nobleman Bibikov—became successful industrialists.\textsuperscript{14}

The remainder of the population fell into a number of groups. Approximately 3–4\% were counted as town dwellers (городское сословие), another 1.5–2\% belonged to the clergy, and between 1 and 1.5\% were made up of the service personnel of the army and navy.\textsuperscript{15}

The most influential group in Russian eighteenth-century society was the nobility. During the reign of Empress Elizabeth, this soslovie was often referred to as the shliakhetstvo (шляхетство), or dvorianstvo (дворянство).\textsuperscript{16} During the initial decades of the eighteenth century, the nobility doubled in number. In 1700, it had counted “little more than 15,000 men.”\textsuperscript{17} According to the second revision, the nobility constituted 0.5\% of the population.\textsuperscript{18} In absolute numbers this amounted to 37,326 males.\textsuperscript{19}

3.1.3 Politics and Administration

Historian Aleksandr Kamenskii characterizes the reign of Elizabeth (1741–1761) as a period of stabilization of the political and social life compared to the preceding decades. The leading figures of the era belonged to a generation that had grown up in the midst of the Petrine transformations.\textsuperscript{20}

Following a peace treaty with the Ottoman Empire in 1739, Russia enjoyed a comparatively peaceful decade as far as external military engagements were concerned. A minor war with Sweden between 1741 and 1744 was merely

\begin{itemize}
  \item B. P. Gorshkov, \textit{Peasants in Russia from Serfdom to Stalin: Accomodation, Survival, Resistance} (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018), 73.
  \item Ivanova and Zheltova, \textit{Soslovnoe obschestvo}, 79.
  \item Kabuzan, \textit{Narodonaselenie}, 154.
\end{itemize}
“peripherally important.”21 Also, the Russian Empire took little part in the great European military conflict of the period, the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–1748).22

Real power in Russia, during the eighteenth century, fluctuated among three groups of institutions: (1) the visible state: Senate, Holy Synod, kollegii;23 (2) the monarch’s advisory council (under various names); and (3) the monarch’s personal favorites.24 Towards the middle of the century, a clearer understanding emerged between the sovereign (государь) and the state (государство). The state was no longer perceived as the fiefdom of the sovereign.25 Nonetheless, the empire’s center of power was the sovereign, who was aided by small groups of advisers.26 No constitutional assembly or other popular representation existed, rather “the Russian monarchy consulted representatives of social groups, local communities, and central institutions on an ad hoc basis”27 The monarch remained the sole formal legislative authority until the introduction of the State Duma in 1906, that is, far beyond the period chosen for the present investigation.28

23 Kollegia (коллегия) was the term used for an agency of the central administration, that is, a ministry, such as the Kollegia of Foreign Affairs (Иностранная коллегия or Коллегия иностранных дел) or the Kollegia of War (Военная коллегия), cf. Erik Amburger, *Geschichte der Behördenorganisation Russlands von Peter dem Großen bis 1917* (Leiden: Brill, 1966), 118–120.
Russia was administered by a bureaucratic apparatus that had received its basic structure through the reforms of Peter the Great. By European standards, the educated and ruling cadres remained small throughout the 1740s. The administrators were mostly Russians, but there was also a significant contingent of non-Russians. Thus, in 1730, the percentage of non-Russian administrators was thirty percent.

3.2 Education and Literacy in Eighteenth-Century Russia

As was seen in the Introduction (cf. above, section 1.2.1), Neustupný lists a number of criteria linked to modernity, which require fulfilment in order to facilitate early modern language management. The criteria include, among other, the emergence of new social structures, the appearance of modern national societies, and the limitation of the power of the aristocracy. Based on these criteria, it was concluded that Russia in the 1740s clearly belonged to the premodern type of society as far as language management was concerned. However, in order to understand the linguistic situation on Russia, and how decisions were made that were relevant to its development, one other criterion is important: the development of the system of education.

Intended as a base for further discussion, the current section will provide an overview of education in Russian society during the 1740s.

3.2.1 Education

In the 1740s, like other European states, Russia did not possess a ministry of education. Such institutions and their legal foundations were not created until a couple of decades later. Laws on public schools began to appear in the 1760s, with Prussia’s General Regulation on Rural Schools (General-Landschulreglement) from 1763 as an early example. Europe’s first state agency charged with public

31 Mironov, *Sotsial’naia istoriia*, vol. 1, 32.
education was set up in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1773. In Russia, the Main Commission for Public Schools (Главная комиссия училищ) was established in 1782 and the Ministry of National Education (Министерство народного просвещения) about twenty years after that. The state educational initiatives took a long time to develop, and the number of state high schools remained low throughout the century. In the absence of a unified educational system, three principal forms of education were available in Russia: ecclesiastical, private, and state-organized.

The educational establishments of the church were organized according to four levels: parish schools, district schools, seminaries, and academies. Basic literacy education, the main focus of parish schools, was the basis for much of the further education. This continued according to well-established traditions:

At least during the first two-thirds of the eighteenth century elementary language learning preserved the traditional pattern, that is, it consisted of studying the Slavonic primer, prayer book and Psalter, to which might be added Feofan Prokopovich’s *Russian Catechism* (*Pervoe uchenie otrokom*) ...; attempts to introduce books in the civil script into primary education were not successful.

In traditional Muscovite society, formal education had not been a general requirement, even for priests. To cope with the lack of educated people, institutions of higher learning began to be introduced in Russia during the second half of the seventeenth century. Leading representatives of the Great Moscow Synod (Большой московский собор) of 1666–1667 concluded that the great schism in the Russian Orthodox Church in the mid-1600s had come about due to the

---
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absence of schools in the country.\textsuperscript{38} Most famous among the new institutions is the Moscow Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy.\textsuperscript{39} Later, during the reforms of Peter the Great, the state sponsored the creation of several educational facilities.\textsuperscript{40} However, these did not gain immediate popularity. E. K. Sysoeva, the author of a recent handbook on the history of Russian education, points out that coercive measures were often recommended to force people into education.\textsuperscript{41} One explanation for the need of compulsion is that students were not well treated. Disciplinary measures included flogging and pressing into naval service.\textsuperscript{42}

In the highest-level institutions the curriculum included theology, philosophy, literature, church history, arithmetic, geography, Greek, Latin, and modern languages, such as French and German.\textsuperscript{43} This caused an evident inequality in terms of access to education: “While the clergy and the higher estates could be taught all manner of subjects, local parishioners (that is, the peasants) would learn, at most, their ABCs.”\textsuperscript{44} There were notable exceptions to this in Russia of the 1740s, for instance, serf children sometimes received good education to prepare for future service as estate administrators.\textsuperscript{45}

Towards the very end of his life, in 1724, Peter signed the charter creating the Academy of Sciences. From the outset, this institution also had a “university” attached to it:

Университетъ есть собраніе ученыхъ людей, которые наукамъ высокимъ, яко теологія и ѳеодозъ пруденція (правъ искусству), медицины и филозофіи, сирѣчь до какого состоянія оныя нынѣ дошли, младыхъ людей обучаютъ.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{38} B. L. Fonkich, Greko-slavianskie shkoly v Moskve v XVII veke (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul’tur, 2009), 65.
\textsuperscript{40} Cracraft, The Petrine Revolution, 132–133; E. K. Sysoeva, Shkola v Rossii XVIII–nachalo XX vv.: vlast’ i obschestvo (Moscow: Novyi khronograf, 2015), 31–41.
\textsuperscript{41} Sysoeva, Shkola v Rossii, 47.
\textsuperscript{42} D. A. Tolstoi, “Vzgliad na uchebnuui chast’ v Rossii v XVIII stoletii do 1782 goda,” Sbornik otdeleinia russkogo izuyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi akademii nauk 38, no. 4 (1885): 12.
\textsuperscript{43} S. F. Egorov, ed., Rossiiskoe obrazovanie: istoriia i sovremennost’ (Moscow: ITPIMIO, 1994), 59–60.
\textsuperscript{45} Dowler, A History of Education, 19.
\textsuperscript{46} M. I. Sukhomlinov, ed., Materialy dlia istorii Imperatorskoi akademii nauk, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia akademiia nauk, 1885–1900), 14 (A university is an assembly of learned
The major Russian educational institutions were staffed by foreigners, and foreign teachers remained in majority at major Russian educational institutions throughout the first half of the eighteenth century. When new *Statutes* (*Регламент*) were issued in 1747 for the Academy of Sciences—and for the Gymnasium, a secondary school attached to the academy— they stated that the language of instruction should be Russian. However, despite some efforts, it proved impossible to find suitable teaching staff, and it was therefore decided that instruction should continue as before, that is, not in Russian, but rather in French, German, and Latin. Among the large institutions, only the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy, which had Russians on its staff, was an exception in this respect because of its Orthodox character.49

Some general handbooks on the history of Russian education give the impression that the University of the Academy of Sciences was fully functional from the beginning. This, in fact, was not the case. In its early stages, higher education in Russia was riddled with start-up problems and enrollment was negligible. The first class of the university had eight students and during some of the subsequent years, none were recruited. Since there were scarcely any Russians with secondary education, the first students had to be invited from abroad.51

Other difficulties originated within the faculty: at one point, in 1736, the professors could not be persuaded to give lectures. In the 1740s, with the university again practically dormant, the academicians were ordered to read public lectures, and posters were printed to this effect, but the expected audience failed to show up.52 As D. A. Tolstoi, a late nineteenth-century scholar, wrote: “И так, people who teach young people the high sciences, such as theology, and jurisprudence [the art of law], medicine and philosophy, that is, to such an extent as they have now reached.

47 About the Gymnasium, see L. V. Moskovkin, *Iazykovoe obrazovanie v Akademicheskom universitete i gimnazii v XVIII veke* (Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel’stvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta, 2019), 40.


50 For example, S. F. Egorov, ed. *Khrestomatiia po istorii shkoly i pedagogiki v Rossii (do Velikoi Oktiabrskoi Sotsialisticheskoi Revoliutsii)*, 2nd rev. ed. (Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1986), 42.
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The Academy University was finally brought to a standstill in 1743. Subsequent efforts to revive it during the late 1740s and 1750s by the new president of the academy, Count Kirill Razumovskii (from 1746), V. E. Trediakovskii, and M. V. Lomonosov did not result in expansion. For a time in 1746, however, Lomonosov did lecture publicly on experimental physics in Russian.  

A later endeavor, which proved lasting, was the foundation of Moscow University in 1755. However, at its opening, it too had a very modest body of students: 100, dropping to 82 thirty years later.  

The third component of the educational system in early eighteenth-century Russia was privately organized educational endeavors. Private tutors were used in all ranks of society, from peasant literacy tutors (мастера грамоты) to imported French and German tutors for the children of the more privileged. Examples of peasants creating their own literacy schools exist as early as the seventeenth century.  

Advertisements for foreign teachers began appearing in the _Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti_ in the 1740s, and the first description of a private school run by foreigners in Russia appeared at the end of that decade. In 1746, eight French tutors were working in Moscow. As for the basic schooling of their own children, foreign nationals set up their own schools in close connection with their religious communities.  

Finally, besides the education available within Russia, a possibility of traveling abroad also existed. Among others, this was an option for some of the graduates from the Academy University, who, upon completion of the course, were
promoted to adjunct professors and sent abroad for further training. Groups of students were dispatched to Leiden in the Netherlands to study law, mathematics, and medicine. Others were dispatched to Germany, especially to Halle, Leipzig, Jena, and Wittenberg. Students who were sent abroad were selected among the most talented graduates of schools such as the Moscow Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy.

Summing up this presentation of the system of education in Russia, it is clear that around the middle of the eighteenth century the church stood out as the main educational provider. In this respect, Russia did not differ from other European countries. Despite the fact that the reforms of Peter the Great and his successors added many new schools to Russia’s educational system, it still catered to a fraction of the population and took a long time to develop. The design of the educational system, largely influenced by the religious institutions, also affected its ability to teach Russian as a mother tongue. Such instruction started no earlier than the second half of the 1730s.

3.2.2 Literacy

An eyewitness account of the literacy situation in Russia during the first half of the eighteenth-century is found in I. T. Pososhkov’s Book on Poverty and Wealth. The narrative refers to the 1720s:

Паки немалая пакость крестьянам чинитца и от того, что грамотных людей у них нет. Аще в коей деревне дворов дватцать ии и тритцать, а грамотнаго человека ни единаго у

60 Tolstoi, “Vzgliad na uchebnuiu chast,” 11.
63 Liubzhin, Istoriia russkoi shkoly, 563.
64 Marker, Publishing, Printing, 72.
ниих нет, и какой человек к ним ни приедет с каким указом или и без указу, да скажет, что указ у него есть, то тому и верят … И ради охранения от таковых напрасных убытков, видитца, не худо б крестьян и поневолить, чтоб они детей своих, кои десяти лет и ниже, отдавали дьячкам в науление грамоты и, науча грамоте, научили бы их писать. И чала, не худо бы так учинить, чтобы не было и в малой деревне без грамотнаго человека.68

Viewed in a larger context, Pososhkov’s account clearly does not represent the whole story. As stated in the previous section, there were schools where peasants learned to read and write, so not all peasants were analphabets. On the contrary, it is sometimes claimed that leading members of Russia’s eighteenth-century elite in fact were. One name that comes up in such discussions is that of the powerful A. D. Menshikov (1673–1729); however, this is a dubious example, because Menshikov was born among the lower ranks of society and did not receive an education that would have been expected of a nobleman.69 Claims about the analphabetism of various historical figures cannot be proven either way, and there is a strong possibility that rumors of illiteracy have been exaggerated by political enemies or a disrespectful posterity.70 In any case, the allegations in themselves are interesting since they suggest that literacy was not to be assumed in the eighteenth century, even among members of the ruling elite.

Setting out to examine the literacy situation in eighteenth-century Russia, one soon discovers that there are no reliable statistics on literacy rates. Instead, knowledge about literacy must be gained in other ways. Historian B. N. Mironov has done much work on the issue of literacy in the Russian Empire. In 1985, he suggested a method for calculating literacy levels in the past based on

68 I. T. Pososhkov, *Kniga o skudosti i bogatstve i drugie sochineniia*, ed. B. B. Kafengauz (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1951), 171; the English translation is quoted from Iván Pososhkóv, *The Book of Poverty and Wealth*, ed. and transl. A. P. Vlasto and L. R. Lewitter (London: Athlone Press, 1987), 313 (The peasants also suffer no little hardship from a lack of literate men among them. A village of twenty or thirty families may not have a single literate man, so a stranger has but to flourish a written order before them, or even merely to state that he has such an order without producing it, and they will surely believe him. … To guard against this it would clearly be advisable to oblige peasants to send their children under the age of ten to the sacristan to be taught to read and, that learnt, also to write. It seems to me that it would be no bad thing to ensure that even in the smallest village all are able to read).


retrospective prognoses. For the present investigation, one of his estimates is interesting. He calculates that, in 1757, literacy in the statistical cohort of ten- to nineteen-year-olds was 19.3% for urban males and 5.1% for urban females, while for rural males and females they were 3.3% and 3.1% respectively.

It was not until a century or so after the 1740s that literacy statistics began to appear. I. M. Bogdanov reports figures collected by N. P. Luppov from the marriage registry of a rural community in Viatka province for the years 1839–1848. According to these statistics, eleven percent of males were literate, while none of the females could read or write.

What methods, then, are at our disposal for determining how many speakers of Russian in earlier centuries actually knew how to read, and how many knew how to write? These and related questions have been addressed by a number of scholars starting with A. I. Sobolevskii in the nineteenth century.

For estimates of literacy rates during the late seventeenth century, specialists have largely relied on the analysis of signatures. Using this method, combined with data from examinations of witnesses during legal proceedings, Mironov has concluded that literacy among adult townspeople did not exceed thirteen percent, and among peasants, two to four percent.

Among scholars who have dealt with the topic of literacy, estimates vary from the high percentages of literacy calculated by Sobolevskii for mid-seventeenth century Muscovy—seventy-five percent or more for landlords, fifty percent for urban dwellers, and fifteen percent for the peasantry—to Gary Marker’s more skeptical view that “Muscovy was characterized by a near absence of literacy and
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73 I. M. Bogdanov, Gramotnost’ i obrazovanie v dorevolutionnoi Rossii i v SSSR (istoriko-statisticheskie ocherki) (Moscow: Statistika, 1964), 57.
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Russian in the 1740s

Marker suggests that rudimentary literacy levels may have been from three to ten percent of the population, while intermediate literacy levels were as low as one or two percent in the late seventeenth century.

In the first third of the eighteenth century, Mironov suggests that literacy among the most prosperous townspeople reached forty-two percent. Other traders and manufacturers show percentages between four and ten percent. Peasants in northern Russia, judged by signatures on collective supplications, appear to have reached literacy rates of about nine percent. He points out that literacy rates were subject to variation between, as well as within, social groups. There was also geographic variation. Estimates suggest that literacy among peasants of northern Russia was five to ten times higher than in the central regions.

The figures presented by Marker correspond fairly well to those published by Mironov. According to the latter, male literacy among peasants varied between one and twelve percent towards the end of the eighteenth century. One-fifth to one quarter of the town dwellers were literate while more than three-quarters of the clergy knew how to read and write. The highest rate of literacy in eighteenth century Russia was found among male representatives of the nobility: eighty-four to eighty-seven percent.

A rare exception to the scarcity of information about the 1740s, again reported by Mironov, is the data comprising 4,306 observations of soldiers recruited to the army between the years 1732 and 1756. His results suggest a literacy rate among recruits of around 0.5%.

Among officers, the situation was different. A small study conducted by the author of the present investigation on material from two regiments, the Kozlovskii Garrison Infantry Regiment and the Pavlovskii Garrison Infantry Regiment, shows that in 1740, the majority of commissioned officers knew how to read and write. The information was deemed important enough to deserve its own column in the mustering rolls: "грамоте писать умеет ли кто не умеет" (knows how to write or not). Out of a total of six lieutenants enrolled in the Pavlovskii Regiment, two individuals—Zakharei Alymov and Iakov Iviakov—are reported as being illiterate. Similarly, from a total of seven ensigns, one Stepan Chepelëv did not know how to read or write. In all three cases, this
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was grounds for denial of promotion. This, in turn, was noted in a separate column: “Са неуменниемъ грамоте удостоит невозможно” (promotion denied due to illiteracy).\(^81\) The three men were older than their colleagues, and they had all been in the service from twenty five to thirty years, Iviakov since 1707.

In comparing the findings by Marker and Mironov, it is reasonable to assume that the overall literacy rates for adult males in the 1740s lay somewhere slightly below five percent.

As illustrated above, Marker differentiates between rudimentary and intermediate literacy. This differentiation is important since there is an obvious difference of ability between being able to sign your name and being able to decode and/or produce structurally complicated texts. There are well-founded reasons to suggest that, in order to participate in a literate culture, one must master intermediate literacy. This immediately raises a new question: How large was the “reading public” in the 1740s? Calculations suggest that the reading public in Russia a century later, in the middle of the nineteenth century, comprised between 600,000 and 1 million people, which means between 1% and 1.5% of the population.\(^82\) What situation was in the 1740s, we cannot say with certainty. However, given the calculated literacy rates, it is not unreasonable to imagine that the figure was considerably lower.

What about women and literacy? Mironov concludes that female literacy rates were probably significantly lower than those reported for males, but they cannot be determined due to lack of data.\(^83\) His conclusion is supported by statistics from the second half of the nineteenth century.\(^84\) Research on female literacy conducted after Mironov’s investigation provides some insights. Calculations by Michelle Marrese suggest that literacy among provincial noblewomen varied between four and twenty-six percent at the middle of the eighteenth century, that is, a mere fraction of the percentage reported for males of this social stratum.\(^85\) Is this the whole story? Maybe not. A different view on the issue of literacy is offered by Aleksandra Pletnêva and Aleksandr Kravetskii. In their investigation of literacy in Church Slavic in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, they find that
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существенная часть населения страны, в первую очередь крестьяне, могли читать церковнославянские тексты, но не владели русским литературным языком. Уровень церковнославянской грамотности в процентном отношении был более высоким, чем уровень русской грамотности. Однако в господствующей культурной парадигме умение читать по-славянски рассматривалось не как элемент образованности, а как часть «нецивилизованной», «народной» культуры.86

Since the claims made by Kravetskii and Pletnëva apply to a much later period—the twentieth century—they lack immediate relevance for the eighteenth century. They do, however, undeniably offer food for thought. The existing literature supports the idea that the reading and writing skills taught by a minor church official would be in Church Slavic, and thus a considerable portion of the population who were peasants, could read Church Slavic but not Russian. So, the question to consider is: how should literacy in eighteenth-century Russia be classified? Were there different kinds of literacy?

Throughout the eighteenth century people learned to read using the Cyrillic alphabet and reading by rote (по складам). The Civil alphabet was “supplementary and only learned by small social groups,” such as those who came into contact with printed, secular texts.87 In all likelihood, therefore, literacy in the Civil script was limited during the first half of the eighteenth century.

Since, as was seen above, Russia did not possess a unified educational system during the 1740s, it is likely that much literacy training took place in informal circumstances, such as in people’s homes.88 Since literacy training was not

86 A. G. Kravetskii and A. A. Pletnëva, Istoriia tserkovnoslavianskogo iazyka v Rossii: konets XIX–XX vv. (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul’tury, 2001), 41 (… a considerable portion of the country’s population, predominantly peasants, were able to read Church Slavic texts but did not master the Russian literary language. The level of literacy in Church Slavic was percentually higher than literacy in Russian. However, in the predominant cultural paradigm, the ability to read in Slavic was viewed not as an element of education, but as a part of an “uncivilized,” “popular” culture). Cf. also A. A. Pletnëva, “K kharakteristike iazykovoi situatsii v Rossii XVIII–XIX vv.,” Russkii iazyk v nauchnom osveshchenii 2 (12) (2006): 213–229.


centrally organized, there is a high likelihood that it varied in content and depth. Any general conclusions concerning literacy in mid-eighteenth-century Russia must therefore be circumspect.

A serious problem is that so much of the research is based on signatures. Mironov recognizes the risks associated with overestimations of literacy data based exclusively on signatures.\(^8^9\) He sees three principal drawbacks: the number of signatures is low; signatures do not provide stable and exact data on the level of literacy; and the use of the signature method tends to raise the level of literacy, since there was a tendency to invite literate people as signatories when possible. His work clearly demonstrates that no single type of source can provide trustworthy data about the literacy situation in eighteenth-century Russia. Instead, a clear picture may be found using a combination of data from multiple sources. This is the case also in other countries, where scholars have gathered information from a variety of sources in order to assess literacy rates: in Sweden it has been church registers; in France, marriage and military records; in Britain, marriage and census records; and in North America, manuscript census records.\(^9^0\)

### 3.3 Language Management

Above, in section 1.2, the term *language management* was introduced, and a brief comparison was made of its uses by different scholars. This term was chosen for the present investigation to describe observable efforts to control and influence language. The opposite of this was termed *discourse, simple or discourse-based management*, that is, implicit language management activities.

Language management takes place today all around us and we can safely assume that the same was true during the 1740s. People influence each other’s language within the family, the community, and in interactions with people from the outside. We must also assume that language management, especially of the discourse-based variety, took place in all languages spoken across the Russian Empire during the eighteenth century. For the purposes of the present investigation, however, the latter topic must be left unaddressed. The evidence of discourse-based management when speaking of Russia in the 1740s, is, if not irretrievably lost, then scant to the point of near-nonexistence. In other words, we must focus on traces of language management that are observable in texts from the examined period.

---
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The present investigation is concerned with Russian. While maintaining a strictly Russian-centric perspective, however, one other culturally important language deserves mentioning: Church Slavic. Texts in Church Slavic were being composed in Russia during the 1740s, enjoyed prestige in the society of the period, and are preserved in great numbers. Foremost among them is the Bible. The Russian state, through the offices of the Holy Synod, carried out a revision of the Bible during the 1740s, a task of great relevance to many people, and with an effect that lasts up to the present day. The revision, which resulted in a “reasonably accurate rendering of the Septuagint text,” is known in Russian as the Елизаветинское издание Библии and in English as the Elizabethan Bible. The history of Church Slavic in eighteenth-century Russia is, however, the subject of an entirely different investigation.

3.3.1 Examining Language Management in Handwritten Documents from the 1740s

Texts were produced in every corner of the Russian Empire and language produced in the provinces developed slightly differently compared to the center. One explanation of this is that old administrative structures remained longer in the provinces, continuing to influence administrative usage. Oleg V. Nikitin finds that

Даже во второй половине XVIII столетия, когда система государственного судебного производства функционировала в ее гражданских формах самостоятельно, монастырь оставался одним из главных «действующих лиц», поддерживающих старые приказные традиции в глубинке.

91 A. A. Guseva, Svod russkikh knig kirillovskoi pechati XVIII veka tipografii Moskvy i Sankt-Peterburga i universal’naia metodika ikh identifikatsii (Moscow: Indrik, 2010).
93 Nikitin, Delovaia pis’mennost’, 177 (Even in the second half of the eighteenth century, when the state judicial system functioned independently in its secular forms, the monastery remained one of the principal “actors,” supporting the old administrative [prikaz—T.R.] traditions in remote places).
Nikolai Chugaev’s investigation of administrative documents, stemming from the early 1740s, from the Prikam’e region of the western Urals support Nikitin’s conclusions. Chugaev finds that the texts in his investigation display a greater number of archaisms than texts produced in the center. 94

One way of studying the effects of language management in eighteenth-century Russia is thus to examine texts from a certain period, looking for features of the language (in vocabulary, morphology, syntax, formulas, and so forth), known from existing research to be typical. Another way is to observe how closely the language in a document adheres to codified norms. As far as the 1740s are concerned, this presents considerable difficulties due to the fact that the number of such codified norms was very small indeed. While grammars of Church Slavic and Russian had been published in far away places, such as England, no normative grammar was widely available for Russian domestic use. 95 The discussion of доломоносовские (pre-Lomonosov) grammars ran high in the 1970s–1990s (for some of the most important contributions, cf. above, section 1.4). In short, the only reasonably contemporary printed grammar of Russian—written in German—was the one found in Ehrenreich Weismann’s German-Latin-Russian dictionary from 1731. 96 The Anfangs-Gründe, as the grammar is known, was compiled by the then student at the Academy University, Vasilii Evdokimovich Adodurov, apparently from a variety of sources. 97 Other codified norms, concerning the use of certain characters in print, had been issued by the Academy of Sciences. 98

96 E. Weissmann, Teutsch-lateinisich- und russisches Lexicon, samt denen Anfangs-Gründen der russischen Sprache / Nemetsko-latinskii i russkii leksikon kapno s pervymi nachalami ruskago iazyka (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia akademia nauk, 1731). A facsimile edition is available in Filippov, Kareva, and Volkov, Vasilii Evdokimovich Adodurov, 45–90.
3.3.2  The Imperial Academy of Sciences, a Language Management Agency

In the modern world, many countries have official or semi-official language management agencies, known variously as academies, boards, councils, or commissions. Such language agencies began appearing in Europe between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries: the Accademia della Crusca in Florence, Italy, in 1583, the Académie française in Paris, France, in 1635, and the Real Academia Española in Madrid, Spain, in 1713.\(^9\) Russia received its own national language academy in 1783 through the establishment of the Императорская российская академия (Imperial Russian Academy) headed by Princess Ekaterina Vorontsova-Dashkova.\(^10\) Thus, strictly speaking, Russia did not have its own language academy during the 1740s. However, this did not mean that centrally organized language management activities did not take place.

The Императорская академия наук (Imperial Academy of Sciences) was founded by Peter the Great on January 22, 1724. It consisted of three sections, known as “classes”: (1) a mathematical class including theoretical mathematics, astronomy, geography, navigation, and mechanics; (2) a physics class that included theoretical and experimental physics, anatomy, chemistry, and botany; (3) a humanities class with three departments (rhetoric and antiquities, ancient and modern history and law, and politics and ethics).\(^11\) In addition, a fourth, administrative branch with a secretary and a librarian is sometimes also referred to as a “class.”\(^12\) None of these was formally charged with the task of managing the Russian language, however. The St. Petersburg academy was intended to be similar to learned institutions abroad:

И понеже сие учреждение такой академии, которая въ Париже обрѣтается, подобна есть (кромѣ сего различія и авантажа, что сіѧ академія и то чинить, которое университету или

\(^9\) Spolsky, *Language Management*, 235. Spolsky reports that the Accademia della Crusca was founded in 1584. The Accademia itself gives 1583 as “the year of its stable constitution” (*anno della sua stabile costituzione*), see its website, accessed 17 May, 2021, https://accademiadellacrusca.it/it/contenuti/storia/6981


The Paris academy to which reference is made in the quotation was in all likelihood the Académie royale des sciences. The Tsar had paid a visit to this institution in 1717. He may also have been familiar with another French academy—the Académie française—then and now responsible for the cultivation of the French language.

The newly established St. Petersburg academy was not given a role similar to that of the Académie française, but its founders did not ignore the issue of language. They did realize the importance of having books translated into Russian:

И понеже российскому народу не токмо въ велику пользу, но и во славу служитъ будьть, когда такія книги на российскомъ языкѣ печатаны будууть, того ради надлежить при каждомъ классѣ акаDEMическомъ одного переводчика, и при секретарѣ—одного жѣ, и тако во всѣхъ четырехъ классахъ, определить.

The academy’s first president, Laurentius Blumentrost (1692–1755), whose father had been physician to Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, was the exception. Despite his German-sounding name he was born in Russia, while the other academicians had been invited to Russia for the specific purpose of working in the new institution. During the first decade of its existence, the St. Petersburg academy was staffed by non-Russians. Despite being non-Russian, however, they tried to address the Russian society.

---

103 Sukhomlinov, Materialy, I, 16 (Since this institution is to be an academy like that found in Paris [except for this difference and avantazh, that this academy is also to do what is appropriate to a university or college], therefore I hope that this institution would most conveniently be called an academy). The English translation is quoted from Cracraft, The Petrine Revolution, 246–247.


106 Sukhomlinov, Materialy, vol. 1, 19 (And since it will be not only to a great benefit, but also to the glory of the Russian people when such books [courses written by the individual members of the academy, each in his particular subject—T.R.] are printed in the Russian language, therefore one translator shall be appointed in each of the three academic classes, and one also with the secretary, thus in all four classes).

107 Zhivov, Istoriiia, 999.
Since, during the first decade of the academy’s existence, native Russians took little part in its activities, business was conducted in Latin, German, and French. Some evidence even shows that the foreign members were reluctant to recognize the real or potential worth of Russian as an academic language.\(^{108}\)

For language management in Russia during the first half of the eighteenth century, one of the academy’s presidents—or commander-in-chief, as he was called—stands out: Baron Johann Albrecht von Korff (1697–1766). Born in Courland and of German ethnicity, Korff was educated in Germany and returned to the Russian Empire after graduating from the university of Jena in Thuringia “съ блѣстящимъ успѣхомъ” (with brilliant success). In 1728, he was employed as a chamber-page in the service of the future Empress Anna Ioannovna.\(^{109}\) His great-nephew, and biographer, describes Korff as being endowed with “глãн-зende Geistesgaben” (brilliant intellectual gifts).\(^{110}\)

Hermann Carl von Keyserlingk (1695/96–1764), Korff’s predecessor as head of the academy, had spent most of his tenure abroad on diplomatic missions.\(^{111}\) So, when Korff was appointed head of the St. Petersburg academy, some members welcomed the appointment.\(^{112}\)

The Public was notified of Korff’s promotion through the *Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti*: 

18 дня сего мѣсяца изволила Ея Імператорское Величество по всевысочайшеи своєи милости и особливому попеченїю о здѣшнеи Імператорскои Академїи Наукъ управлѣніе оныя своему дѣиствительному Каммергеру Фонъ Корфу всемилостивѣише поручить, и при томъ ему обыкновенное Презїдентское жалованїе по 3000 рублеи въ годъ опредѣлить. Отъ сеи перемѣны можно заключать, что высочаишее намѣренїе Ея Імператорскаго Величества, то есть чтобь


\(^{111}\) “Baron Iogann Albert Korf, 1697–1766,” 78.

From the very beginning of his term in office, Korff threw himself into his work with great energy and attention to detail:

Онъ обращалъ внимание даже на мелочныя подробности и давалъ приказынія: какъ вести протоколъ; какъ содержать въ порядкѣ архивъ; какъ подписывать статьи, снимать копіи и пр. Вообще онъ обращался съ академиками, какъ начальникъ съ подчиненными.114

Despite his great talent, Korff does not seem to have communicated officially in Russian. An example is the letter from Korff to the academy librarian, Johann Daniel Schumacher, dated January 9, 1735.115 In this letter, Korff orders V. E. Adodurov to translate a text from Russian into German. The letter suggests that Korff’s command of Russian was insignificant. His handwriting is very untidy, yet a detailed analysis shows that he was not familiar with the spelling of the translator’s name. Instead he renders Adodurov’s name as ⟨Atjadurf⟩. Pekarskii, in his history of the Academy of Sciences, reports that Korff did not know Russian.116

The first native Russian scholar employed by the academy was the already mentioned V. E. Adodurov who served as adjunct professor of mathematics from 1733.117 The first senior appointments of ethnic Russians were V. K. Trediakovskii

---

113 Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti, September 23, 1734, accessed May 18, 2021, https://www. vedomosti1728.ru/pdf.cgi?r=99&key_pdf=XiV9nHpekSrW25MW (On the 18th day of this month, Her Imperial Majesty, by her supreme grace and special care for the Imperial Academy of Sciences in this city, condescended to bestow its leadership upon Her High Chamberlain von Korff, and to fix for him the usual Presidential salary at 3,000 roubles annually. From this change one may conclude that the supreme intention of Her Imperial Majesty will be fulfilled, that is, to improve the condition of the Academy of Sciences as much as possible).

114 Pekarskii, Istoriia, vol. 1, 522 (He paid attention even to petty details and gave orders: how to keep a protocol, how to keep the archive in order, how to sign articles, make copies etc. On the whole, he treated the academicians like a boss treats his subordinates).

115 SPbFARAN, F. 121, op. 2, no. 84.


(1703–1768), appointed professor of Latin and Russian Eloquence, and M. V. Lomonosov (1711–1765), professor of Chemistry, both in 1745.118 Whereas Lomonosov is undoubtedly better known to posterity than Trediakovskii, the latter was more prominent during the 1730s and 1740s. Lomonosov’s star rose slightly later, in 1745, after he received his professorship, and following his appointment as editor of the newspaper Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti in 1748 (cf. below, section 4.2.2). Trediakovskii had spent four years in the Netherlands and France during the late 1720s and returned to Russia in 1730.119 Soon upon arrival in his country of origin, Trediakovskii published a translation of Abbé Tallemant’s Voyages de l’île d’amour (Voyage to the Isle of Love).120 To the translation, Trediakovskii attached a preface in which he expressed his views on the Russian language. The main feature of this pioneering work is its focus on the usus loquendi and its denial of Church Slavicisms.121 It has been proposed that the young Trediakovskii’s thinking was influenced by the ideas of the French pedagogue and historian Charles Rollin (1661–1741), who stated that French was equal to the ancient languages.122

The preface to the Voyage to the Isle of Love has secured Trediakovskii’s place in the history of the Russian language. It has also led to a widely entertained view that Trediakovskii held a leading position among the academy’s translators. This idea is rejected in recent work by E. G. Pivovarov who presents evidence suggesting that the other translators were, in fact, no less prominent.123 Trediakovskii’s work on the Russian language has been researched in great detail by B. A. Uspenskii.124

In addition to the preface mentioned above, a few other documents involving Trediakovskii are important in the context of Russian language management: first
among these is his employment contract with the Academy of Sciences from 1733, second, his inaugural speech at the Russian Conference in 1735 (cf. below, section 3.3.4), and third, his treatise on orthography from 1748. By the time of the latter, Trediakovskii had radically changed his views on language, compared with the opinions expressed in the preface. He was now in favor of Church Slavic.

Trediakovskii's employment contract was drawn up in French and signed by Hermann Keyserling, then President of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, on October 14, 1733. The contract clearly demonstrates that he was employed in order to carry out tasks that fell within the realm of language management:

1. Le dit Trediakoffski s'oblige de faire tout son possible pour l'interêt de Sa Majesté Impériale, et l'honneur de l'académie.
2. De perfectioner la langue russienne, soit par la prose, ou par les vers.
3. D'y donner des leçons, en cas qu'on le demandera.
4. D'achever la grammaire qu'il a commencée, et travailler conjointement avec d'autres sur le dictionnaire russien.
5. De traduire du françois et du latin en russe, tout ce qu'on lui en donnera.

Pekarskii located a Russian translation, in Trediakovskii's own handwriting:

1. Помянутой Тредіаковскій обязывается чинить, по всей своей возможности, все то, въ чемъ состоить інтересъ Ея Императорского Величества, и честь Академіи.
2. Вычищать язык рѣской пишучи какъ стіхами, такъ и не стіхами.
3. Давать лекціи, ежели отъ него потребовано будетъ.
4. Єкончить Грамматікъ, котъръ онъ началъ, і трѣдится совокупно съ прочими надъ Дікціонаріемъ рѣскимъ.
5. Переводить съ французскаго на рѣской языкъ все что емъ дастся.

127 Pekarskii, Istoria, vol. 2, 43 (1. The said Trediakovskii undertakes to do everything in his might for the benefit of Her Imperial Majesty, and the honor of the academy; 2. To perfect
Trediakovskii was important as an initiator of language management activities, and as a translator. In concrete terms, however, the reforms proposed by him had little or no long-term effect, as has been concluded by scholars such as Issatschenko.  

3.3.3 A New Function: The Founding of the Russian Conference

In his enumeration of language management agencies, Bernard Spolsky notes the importance of terminology committees. In modern times, terminology committees deal with the ideological and practical elaboration of new terminologies in a language, often as parts of a language academy. The work of such committees results from the need of language management due to a changing linguistic reality and is often carried out quietly in the background, Spolsky explains. At the Imperial Academy of Sciences, its translators’ assembly, the Российское собрание (Russian Conference) can, as we shall see, be said to at least partly have fulfilled the role of a terminology committee.

With no formal agency previously in existence, the prevalent image of language management in eighteenth-century Russia is that the academy translators assumed this “civilizatory task,” as V. M. Zhivov has referred to it. During the first two decades of its existence, the academy employed a group of about ten translators. Important research on their work and organization has been published by E. G. Pivovarov. The translators seem to have been a close-knit group of people who knew each other well: “будущие сотрудники имели большой опыт совместной деятельности.” V. K. Trediakovskii and V. E. Adodurov, allegedly, even shared the same living quarters during the early 1730s.

In 1727–1755, the Academy of Sciences press printed over three quarters of all books that came from secular printing houses. In view of this near monopoly, the academy was the main channel by which linguistic norms could influence

---


130 Zhivov, *Ocherki*, 545.
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The instruments used were translated books, which introduced new terminology the Russian language, and the Primechaniia, which functioned as a kind of popular science journal-cum-reference dictionary for the readers of Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti, explaining new and foreign terms (cf. above, section 4.2.2).

The Russian Conference was established on March 14, 1735, with the purpose of improving the Russian language. The order reads:

По указу Ея И. В. въ академіи наукъ обрѣтающій главный командиръ, дѣйствительный камергеръ баронъ фонъ Корфъ, приказалъ: Академіи наукъ переводчикамъ сходиться въ академію два раза въ недѣлю, а именно: въ среду и въ субботу, поутру и послѣ обѣда, и имѣть между собою конференцію, снося и прочитывая всѣ, кто что перевѣль, и имѣть тщаніе въ исправленіи россійскаго языка въ случающихся переводахъ. Чего ради въ оныхъ конференціяхъ присутствовать секретарю Тредиаковскому, адъюнкту Адодурову и ректору нѣмецкаго класса Швановичу; а о тѣхъ конференціяхъ журналъ содержать Тауберту, и всегда въ понедѣльники оный предлагать его превосходительству господину камергеру Корф.

Korff.

133 Zhivov, Istoriia, 999–1000.
135 Sukhomlinov, Materialy, vol. 2, 633 (By orders from Her Imperial Majesty, the Commander-in-chief High Chamberlain Baron von Korff, present in the academy, ordered: The academy translators shall come together at the academy twice a week, namely: on Wednesdays and Saturdays, in the morning and after lunch, and hold a conference, bringing together and reading everything that each has translated, and they shall take care to ensure the accuracy of the Russian language in the translations that come before them. For this reason, present at these conferences shall be Secretary Trediakovskii, Adjunct Adodurov, and the director of the German class, Schwanwitz; and Taubert shall keep a journal of the proceedings, and always present this on Mondays to His Excellency the Chamberlain Korff).
And a couple of months later, Korff wrote to the Imperial Cabinet:

Въ Академіи наукъ воспріято сіе попеченіе, чтобы такія книги, которыя здѣшнему народу пользу принести могууть, въ печать произведены были. … Полѣзные оныя плоды, которыя я отъ учрежденьаго россійскаго собранія въ исправленіи и приведеніи въ совершенство природнаго здѣшнаго языка себѣ представляю, произведутъ первый свой корень въ обучающемся при здѣшней гимназіи юношествѣ, а отъ онаго потомъ и во всемъ народѣ распространится.136

Uspenskii finds that the initiative for the Russian Conference “undoubtedly” belonged to Trediakovskii.137 However, as expected, the documents clearly state that the order came from Korff. This fact that is recognized by Pivovarov.138

At the inauguration ceremony, Trediakovskii delivered a speech laying out the plans for the conference’s future activities.139 The speech has been analyzed by generations of scholars, most recently by Pivovarov who also points to his predecessors.140 In the speech, which is written in a rich panegyric style, Trediakovskii extols the virtues of Peter the Great, Empress Anna Ioannovna, and Baron von Korff. He underscores the importance of following Latin, French, and German authors in order to create a Russian rhetoric.141 He also points to the imperial ministers, bishops, the court, and the nobility as linguistic role models.

As positive examples, Trediakovskii refers to the Florentine Accademia della Crusca and to the Académie française. Less often discussed is his reference to the Deutsche Gesellschaft (German Association) in Leipzig:

---

136 Quoted from Pekarskii, Istoriiia, vol. 1, 524 (German original in Russian translation by Adodurov) (In the Academy of Sciences care is taken that such books should be produced in print as can be of use to the people of this country. … Those useful fruits of correction and perfection of the natural local language, which I envisage as a result of the established Russian Conference, will strike their first root among the young people that are being trained at the local school, and from there it will also spread in the entire people).
137 Uspenskii, Vokrug Trediakovskogo, 528.
139 Kunik, Sbornik materialov, 7–16.
141 Uspenskii, Vokrug Trediakovskogo, 126.
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This reference may indicate that, perhaps, the credit for having come up with the idea for the Russian Conference ought to belong to Trediakovskii and Korff collectively. They were both familiar with linguistic associations. Korff had received his education in Germany at a time when Sprachgesellschaften (linguistic associations) were very active in Northern Germany and along the Baltic coast. One, the Teutsche Gesellschaft, had been formed in Korff’s own university town of Jena in 1728. There was even such an association in St. Petersburg from 1748.  

3.3.4 The Demise of the Russian Conference

Work in the Russian Conference continued throughout Korff’s presidency, but it did not always run smoothly. Thus, in October of 1739, “In dato wurde resolviret, dass eine ordre an den secretair Tredjakoffsky, Wolschkoff, adjunctus Adoduroff und Taubert solle ausgefertigt werden, dass sie früher in der russischen conferentz sich einfinden und fleissiger arbeiten sollen.”

Korff’s term in office ended abruptly in the spring of 1740, when he was dispatched as envoy to Denmark. The reason for this turn of events is said to have been that the Regent, the mighty Ernst Johann von Bühren (Biron), was looking for a pretext for removing Korff from court. A year later, following Biron’s fall from power, Korff’s successor, Brevern, was also dismissed, having spent very little time at the organization that he had been appointed to lead. Brevern lost

---

142 Quotation follows Zhivov, Iazyk i kul’tura, 172 (In the beginning, it must have seemed impossible for the Leipzig association, I think, to imitate these aforementioned academies so successfully, since they ended up so lucky; it imitates, and it has imitated successfully).


144 Sukhomlinov, Materialy, vol. 4, 219 (On this day it was decided that an order should be made out to the secretaries Trediakovskii, Volchkov, Adjunct Adodurov, and Taubert, so that they show up earlier at the Russian Conference and work more diligently).

his position for political reasons. Following Brevern’s departure, the academy found itself without a president for five years, until the appointment of Count Razumovskii in 1746.

At that point, the situation in the academy became critical. All the best foreign professors left Russia, and the remaining ones fought each other bitterly: “L’académie sans adacémiciens, la chancellerie sans membres, l’université sans étudiants, les règles sans autorité, et au reste une confusion jusqu’à présent sans remède.” Personal tragedies befell a leading member of the Russian Conference, Trediakovskii, who lost his possessions in a fire in 1736. With his private economy in shambles, he was forced to leave St. Petersburg to live in the country for a year in 1738–1739. Back in the capital, he came into conflict with the nobleman A. P. Volynskii, received a beating and was forced to write and publicly declaim vulgar poems at a “fool’s wedding” organized at court. Later the same year, Trediakovskii was declared innocent and compensated for his suffering with the sum of 360 roubles. Other linguists who had been active in the Russian Conference were called away to other duties. Thus Adodurov remained in the employment of the academy until the spring of 1741 when he was appointed Deputy Herald at the Герольдмейстерская контора (Chief Herald’s Office).

Even the young Lomonosov experienced problems in the early 1740s. At the beginning of the decade, he was still a student in Germany. Upon his return to Russia he was employed by the academy, but due to “slanderous (and drunken) behavior at academy meetings” he was put under house arrest from May 1743 until January of the following year.

The early 1740s was also the time of the Schumacher affair, a power struggle in the Academy of Sciences, which led to the one-year dismissal of the academy’s

---

147 Kopelevich, Osnovanie peterburgskoi Akademii nauk, 132–133; Sukhomlinov, Materialy, vol. 6, 528.
148 A. A. Vasil’chikov, Semeistvo Razumovskikh, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich, 1880), 83 (The academy is without adacemicians, the chancellery without members, the university without students, and the rules without authority, and for the rest a confusion that so far has no remedy).
149 Reyfman, Vasilii Trediakovskii, 27.
153 Usitalo, The Invention of Mikhail Lomonosov, 223, footnote 37.
secretary, Johann Daniel Schumacher.\textsuperscript{154} He was later reinstated with full honors, but the difficult situation in which the academy found itself led to the cancellation of the \textit{Primechaniia} in October 1742.\textsuperscript{155}

The Russian Conference was dissolved by 1743, a development later deplored by Lomonosov.\textsuperscript{156} The academy’s translators no longer held official gatherings to discuss issues of language, and language management in Russia seems to have gone on hiatus.

In 1746, the academy received a new president in the person of Count K. G. Razumovskii (1728–1803). The young count’s career climb was rapid. He became president of the Academy of Sciences at a time when he was still an adolescent by modern standards:

\begin{quote}
... назначение молодого Разумовскаго объясняется не только исключительнымъ положеніемъ брата его при дворѣ, но еще тѣмъ полнымъ отсутствіемъ людей образованныхъ и способныхъ, которымъ отличалось, особенно въ началѣ, царствованіе Елизаветы Петровны.\textsuperscript{157}
\end{quote}

Not until the end of the 1740s, the sovereign, now in the person of Empress Elizabeth, took a renewed interest in linguistic matters:

\begin{quote}
Минувшаго генваря 27 дня сего 748 года Ея И. В. действительный камергеръ, кавалеръ и академіи наукъ господинъ президентъ, графъ Кирила Григорьевичъ Разумовскій объявилъ именной Ея И. В. высочайший изоустный указъ, которымъ повѣлено стараться при академіи наукъ переводить и печатать на русскомъ языкѣ книги гражданскія различнаго содержанія, въ которыхъ бы польза и
\end{quote}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{155} P. N. Berkov, \textit{Istoriia russkoi zhurnalistiki XVIII veka} (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1952), 69.
\textsuperscript{156} Buck, \textit{The Russian Language Question}, 213–214.
\textsuperscript{157} Vasil’chikov, \textit{Semeistvo Razumovskikh}, vol. 1, 82 ([T]he appointment of the young Razumovskii is explained not only by the exclusive position of his brother at Court, but also by that complete absence of educated and capable men, which characterized the reign of Elizaveta Petrovna, especially at the beginning).}
\end{flushleft}
The academy received a new charter in 1747 and new initiatives also resulted in the creation of a committee charged with the correction of translations: Историческое собрание (the Historical Conference). The members were partly the same as in the Russian Conference. Trediakovskii served as chairman of the new conference for the rest of the 1740s (until 1751), and I. I. Taubert was also a member. Thus, after a five-year pause, Russia again had an agency responsible for managing the language.

3.4 Language Management in the Administration

The empire’s laws prescribed that documents should be designed on the basis of templates. These template documents constitute a rather different way in which language management was performed by the Russian state. The General’nyi reglament (General Regulation), a legislative document regulating the function of the state administration introduced by Peter the Great in 1720, states:

Гл. XXXIV.—О канцеляристах.
Канцеляристамъ надлежитъ все то, что по реэстру изъ отправляемыхъ дѣлъ отъ Секретаря повелѣно будетъ изготовлять, какъ о томъ въ 20 и 30 пунктахъ изображено, такожь и тѣ дѣла, о которыхъ они генеральные формуляры (образцового письма) имѣютъ, а именно: дипломы, патенты и прочее. А что они сами сочинили, то имѣютъ прежде Секретарю для поправления подавать подъ такими же казньми и наказаніями, какъ выше о Секретарѣ упомянуто.160

---

158 Sukhomlinov, Materialy, vol. 9, 53 (On the 27th of January last of this year 1748, the High Chamberlain of Her Imperial Majesty, the Cavalier and the Lord President of the Academy of Sciences, Count Kirill Grigor’evich Razumovskii, made public Her Imperial Majesty’s Supreme oral decree by which it is ordered that the Academy of Sciences should strive to translate and print in Russian language books of varied civil content, in which usefulness and amusement is combined with morals suited for a civil life).

159 Moskovkin, Iazykovoe obrazovanie, 11.

160 Полное собрание законов Россискоi imperii, no. 3534, “Generalnyi Reglament ili Ustav,” 153–154, accessed October 31, 2021, http://nlr.ru/e-res/law_r/search.php (Ch. 34—On Clerks. The clerks are obliged to prepare all that the Secretary commands, according to the register of outgoing cases, as illustrated in points 20 and 30, likewise such cases for which
Instructions concerning the layout and composition of administrative documents were issued by the central administration and sent to towns and provinces in 1738.\textsuperscript{161}

Templates were also printed in the 1740s. Such documents regulated the form of official documents, from the highest level of government down to local administration. Below are two examples of template documents.

3.4.1 Template for the Imperial Title, 1741

The template for the imperial title\textsuperscript{162} regulated how the imperial titles were to be written in different kinds of documents. The longest and most elaborate template states all the Emperor’s titles and was intended for letters addressed abroad. For domestic use, shorter versions were prescribed.

ФОРМА
О ТИТУЛАХЪ ЕГО ИМПЕРАТОРСКАГО ВЕЛИЧЕСТВА:

въ Грамотахъ, которые отправлены имѣютъ быть въ Иностранные Государства.

БОЖІЕЮ поспѣшествующею Милостью, МЫ ИОАННЪ ТРЕТИИ, ИМПЕРАТОРЪ И САМОДЕРЖЕЦЪ ВСЕРОССІЙСКІИ, Московскіи, Кіевскіи, Владимирскіи, Новгородскіи, Царь Казанскіи, Царь Астраханскіи, Царь Сибирскіи, Государь Псковскіи, и Великіи Князь Смоленскіи: Князь Эстляндскіи, Лѣфляндскіи, Корельскіи, Тверскіи, Югорскіи, Пермскіи, Вятскіи, Болгорскіи: И иныхъ Государъ и Великіи Князь, Нова Города Низовскіихъ Земли, Черниговскіи, Резанскіи, Ростовскіи, Ярославскіи, Бѣлозерскіи, Удорскіи, Обдорскіи, Кондѣйскіи, и всея сѣверныя страны Повелитель.

---

\textsuperscript{161} L. V. Cherepnin, Russkaia paleografiia (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1956), 437.

\textsuperscript{162} Forma o titulakh Ego Imperatorskago Velichestva (St. Petersburg: Senat, October 19, 1740), accessed November 1, 2021, https://rusneb.ru/catalog/000200_000018_RU_NLR_UK_2094/.
И Государь Иверскія земли Карталинских и Грузинскихъ Царен, и Карбардинскія земли, Черкасскихъ и Горскихъ Князей, и иныхъ Наслѣдныхъ Государь и Обладатель.

2:
въ Грамотахъ же внутрь Государства.
БОЖІЕЮ МИЛОСТЬЮ, МЫ ІОАННЪ ТРЕТЬІИ, ИМПЕРАТОРЪ И САМОДЕРЖЕЦЪ ВСЕРОССІЙСКІЙ; и протчая, и протчая, и протчая.

3:
въ указѣхъ изъ Сената въ Колегїи и Губернїи, и изъ Колеген въ Губернїи.
УКАЗЪ ЕГО ВЕЛИЧЕСТВА, ИМПЕРАТОРА И САМОДЕРЖЦА ВСЕРОССІЙСКАГО, изъ Сената или изъ Колеген.

4:
въ челобитныхъ и въ отпискахъ.
ВСЕПРЕСВѢТѢЛИШІІ ДЕРЖАВѢНИИ, ВЕЛИКІІ ГОСУДАРЬ ИМПЕРАТОРЪ, И САМОДЕРЖЕЦЪ ВСЕРОССІЙСКІІ, ГОСУДАРЬ ВСЕМИЛОСТЬІЩѢНИИ.
въ челобитныхъ въ срединѣ передъпросенѢемъ.
ВСЕМИЛОСТЬІЩѢНИ ГОСУДАРЬ прошу Вашего ИМПЕРАТОРСКАГО ВЕЛИЧЕСТВА.
во окончанѢи.
Вашего ИМПЕРАТОРСКАГО ВЕЛИЧЕСТВА нижашѢей рабъ.
въ приговорахъ.
По указу ЕГО ИМПЕРАТОРСКАГО ВЕЛИЧЕСТВА.
въ Пашпрахъ.
По указу ЕГО ВЕЛИЧЕСТВА ІОАННА ТРЕТЬІГА, ИМПЕРАТОРА И САМОДЕРЖЦА ВСЕРОССІЙСКАГО, и протчая, и протчая, и протчая.
ПодлѢннои за подписанѢемъ Господъ Кабинетъ Министровъ, Октября 18 дня, 1740 года.
Печатанъ въ Санктпетербургѣ при Сенатѣ Октября 19 дня, 1740 года.
3.4.2 Template for a Letter of Credit, 1744

The following document is a template for a letter of credit.\textsuperscript{163} The text is quite detailed, and also has instructions in the margin concerning what information to include.


date
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\textsuperscript{163} Formuliar. Protiv kotorogo spetsial’noe (Moscow: n. p., 1744).
долгъ, на известную показывъ сумму, и въ оную сумму кто сколько (по тому кредиту) дасть денегъ, или какихъ товаровъ, тотъ долженъ на томъ кредитивномъ писмѣ подписать имянно, сколько далъ денегъ, или какихъ товаровъ, и на количную сумму, а они могутъ по силѣ уставу въ таможнѣ записать роздѣлку учинить, росписатца и деньги заплатить, […] на мои хозяискои имяреково счетъ дать отъ себя вѣзель на срокъ, на вышеозначенную сумму, и что они прикащикъ мои имярекъ вышеписаннымъ образомъ, сторгуетъ, заключить, и въ дѣйствство произведетъ, то все я хозяинъ имярекъ совершенно и дѣйствительно приму, и во всемъ отвѣтенъ буду, власно якобы я самъ все то чинилъ. [в скобках: 2: Ежели хозяинъ иностранныхъ товаровъ купиетъ не прікажетъ, то и 2 пункта въ кредитномъ писмѣ не писать, а какіе иностранные товары купить, онъ въ вѣрющемъ писмѣ и росписать надлежитъ, а буде хозяинъ прикащику своему дасть на волю какѣ товары купить онъ за благо разсудить, то оное тако генералными рѣчми, и въ вѣрющее писмо внесено быть имѣтѣ.]

Формуляръ.
Противъ котораго генеральное кредитное, (то есть вѣрющее) писмо, даемое отъ купца прикащику своему, или кому нѣбудь другому, которои подлинно не ево купцовъ прикащикъ, но только комисионеръ ево, (то есть кому кто какое поручить свое дѣло,) впредь засвидѣтельствомъ и печатью отъ магистрата или ратуши, (а гдѣ магистрата или ратуши нѣтъ,) то и отъ таможни дано быть имѣтѣ.
Сего 174 году, дня, такогота города купецъ, имярекъ съ отечествомъ и прозваниемъ объявляю, что я прикащику сего города, или мѣста жителю имяреку, симъ съ вышеписанного числа потакоето числа, или на цѣлои годъ, впредь полную мочь даю и вѣрую на мои хозяиское имяреково имя и счетъ къ тому порту торговатъ, внутреннѣе и заморскѣе товары покупать и продавать, принимать и отдавать, съ настоящею въ таможнѣ запискою, и въ тѣхъ товарѣхъ роздѣлку чинить и росписывать, контракты заключать, о онѣхъ въ таможнѣ записывать, денги принимать и платить, такожъ асигновать. и во оныхъ росписываться, вѣзели аксептовать, давать и брать и въ суды вступать, а
о арестованїи и о сложенїи арестовъ въ судныхъ мѣстахъ просить, и по обстоятельству дѣла миритца, и о прочемъ по торговому обряду во всемъ вольно поступать и дѣлать, какъ онъ прикащикъ имарекъ за благо разсуждать будетъ, и то все я хозяинъ имарекъ совершенно за дѣйствительно признавать буду, власно якобы я самъ то учинилъ, и подлинно всѣ оные дѣла самъ же производилъ, и того для нансианѣшѣ обяуюсь во всемъ томъ отвѣтнымъ быти, что прикащикъ имарекъ именемъ и вмѣсто меня дѣлалъ и въ чемъ обязался.

Подлиннои за подписанїемъ Правительствующаго Сената, Марта 14 дня, 1744 года. Печатанъ въ Москвѣ при Сенатѣ, 21 дня того же года.

3.5 Conclusions

In the realm of foreign policy, the decade between 1740 and 1750 was a comparatively peaceful period for the Russian Empire, a multiethnic state that had recently established itself as one of the most powerful states in Europe. Internally, turmoil at the highest level of government characterized the beginning of the decade but did not change the structure of Russian society, and the situation quickly stabilized. The government apparatus resided in St. Petersburg, as did the central organs of the comparatively small imperial bureaucracy.

Looking at the educational system, we can conclude that only a fraction of the population received education to such an extent that they could produce texts independently. This clearly influences the number and, not least, the social distribution of documents written by people outside the nobility. For the present investigation, this has important consequences. We cannot expect to find large quantities of ego-documents, or other documents written by peasants and simpler townspeople. Since literacy education was carried out using mostly traditional textbooks and pedagogical methods, this will, in all likelihood, be reflected in the handwritten material.

The latter part of this chapter was dedicated to the study of language management in Russia during the 1740s. As seen above, the 1730s were a very active period in this respect, not least through the formation of the Russian Conference. The 1740s, on the other hand, seems to be a period of decline of existing language management institutions: the publication of the Primechaniia was discontinued and the Russian Conference seems to have petered out during 1742. Hopefully, the following chapters will show if any conscious efforts to manage the lanaguage can be detected in Russian documents from the period.
CHAPTER 4

Available Sources

Because of the mass illiteracy that persisted for much of the history of Imperial Russia, social historians have been forced to rely on the legal-administrative records of the bureaucracy and/or the letters, memoirs, scholarship, literary works, and journalistic accounts of the educated classes.¹

This investigation also includes a wide variety of sources, with the addition of handwritten documents, newspapers and popular prints. These sources include printed and handwritten documents found in a variety of locations and are not necessarily representative of all texts from that period. The main disadvantage of diachronic linguistics when compared to the synchronic variety is familiar: “Introspection and native-speaker competence cannot be relied on in the study of the language of previous centuries and millennia.”² To complicate matters further, data from previous centuries are unevenly preserved. The spoken language, except for fragments, is gone forever. This makes it difficult impossible to study linguistic changes that were never written down, as modern dialectologists can do.³ A mere fraction of all texts that once existed has survived to modern times, causing the “bad data problem” referred to above (section 1.3).

Material for this investigation comes from both handwritten and printed sources in archives, libraries and on the Internet.⁴ Recreating a true image of

---

⁴ For terminological reference concerning documents from the eighteenth century, see A. S. Malitikov, ed., Kratkii slovar’ vidov i raznovidnostei dokumentov (Moscow: VNIIDAD, 1974); Gregory L. Freeze, From Supplication to Revolution: A Documentary Social History of Imperial Russia (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); M. V. Babich, Gosudarstvennye uchrezhdeniia Rossii XVIII v. Spravochnoe posobie (Moscow: URSS, 1999); A. N. Kachalkin,
Russian in the 1740s calls for circumspection in the selection of data. This chapter describes the diverse sources used for this study.

4.1 Electronic Corpora of Eighteenth-Century Texts

The most convenient way to perform a quantitative investigation on Russian from the 1740s would be to extract data from some pre-existing, annotated, electronic corpus. In a recent book, Mikhail Kopotev, Olga Lyashevskaya, and Arto Mustajoki have presented the current state of methods for analyzing Russian linguistic data using quantitative methods. They discovered that “we have large and deeply annotated corpora available for extended quantitative research.” While this is an accurate assessment for contemporary Russian, the situation is not at all accurate for the mid-eighteenth century.

The corpus best suited for the purposes of this investigation is the Russian National Corpus, which is available for non-commercial scientific or educational use. It has two constituent parts: contemporary texts and “mid-18th to mid-20th century texts.” The texts in the latter section of the corpus “представляют также различные жанры (художественная литература, научные тексты, частная переписка, публицистика), однако по причине доступности электронных версий и современных переизданий процент художественной литературы для этого периода гораздо выше, чем для второй половины XX в.”

The Russian National Corpus offers the possibility of creating a searchable subcorpus. Designing one for the 1740s is relatively simple. Putting together a customized subcorpus with the variable “year of creation” (год создания) set to “1740–49” and “genre and text type” (жанр и тип текста) set to “non-imaginative texts” (нехудожественные тексты) results in a subcorpus of 137 texts with a total of 212,361 words (as of April 13, 2021). However, the

---

number of individual authors represented in that subcorpus is limited. As many as 88 texts were written by only three authors: M. V. Lomonosov (49), V. N. Tatishchev (35), and V. K. Trediakovskii (4). Lomonosov alone is the author of more than a third of the subcorpus (35.7%). Furthermore, the corpus is exclusively written by men. Only two texts are marked as having a female author, and both are imperial decrees written in the name of Empress Elizabeth, that is, not personally by her.

Thus, the composition of the Russian National Corpus subcorpus for the 1740s renders it unsuitable as the only source for the present investigation. Given the high number of texts representing a small number of authors, we must take into account the possibility that the composition of the corpus may reflect the idiolects of these authors, i.e. their use of the language as individuals, rather than the mainstream written vernacular language of the period.\(^8\) This may have implications for our knowledge of Russian in the 1740s, such as the characterization of Lomonosov as “eher ein konservativer als ein revolutionärer Autor.”\(^9\) Contemporary scholars in diachronic linguistics also voice precautions “to avoid the effects of unwanted correlations or idiolectal bias.”\(^10\) Despite the disadvantages, the 1740s subcorpus of the Russian National Corpus remains an important source. For example, it allows comparison with other texts.

Apart from the materials listed above, some additional collections of eighteenth-century texts containing material from the 1740s are available on the Internet. These include collections of imaginative literature, memoirs and diaries, and other mixed collections.\(^11\) Some of these texts are published by official institutions, such as the Institute of Russian literature (Pushkinskii dom), while other publications are private initiatives. The orthography of such texts are typically modernized, which makes them less appropriate for the purposes of this investigation.

---


9 Issatschenko, *Geschichte*, 597 (rather a conservative than a revolutionary author).


4.2 Printed Texts

Large numbers of printed texts from the 1740s are available today. At the time, production was strictly centralized and controlled. Printed texts include books, newspapers, administrative documents, and other material. The history of printing and book production in the eighteenth century enjoys a rich scholarly literature and therefore will not be discussed here.

4.2.1 Books

During the period 1740–1749, a total of 400 books were published in Russia. The annual average of books published in the civil orthography was 22.6 in 1740–1744. That number fell to 17.0 in the second half of the decade. Books printed in the old orthography represented about half the total of printed books. Such books were written either in Church Slavic or—as in the case of sermons—in Russian with a strong admixture of Church Slavic.

4.2.2 Newspapers

Russia’s only newspaper during the 1740s was the Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti (Санктпетербургские ведомости). Chief editors during this period were

Johann Bröme (1735–1748) and Mikhail Lomonosov (1748–1751). The Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti succeeded Russia’s first newspaper, entitled simply Vedomosti. The Vedomosti was printed between 1702 and 1727, and the publication of the Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti began in 1728. Throughout the 1740s, the responsibility for newspaper production lay in the hands of the Academy of Sciences.

The process of gathering and processing the Russian materials intended for publication in Vedomosti has been described by T. Iu. Morozova. She concludes that although the Academy of Sciences was responsible for the editorship of the newspaper, the editorial work carried out by the officials of the academy was limited to the technical aspects of the publication. The state institutions that delivered information selected and organized the materials for publication.

In addition, Barbara Leitner’s master’s thesis investigates three years of the Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti: 1728, 1757, and 1774. The choice of these particular years, and the long pause between them, is due to the long-lasting “linguistic chaos” of the first half of the eighteenth century and the publication of Lomonosov’s Rossiiskaia grammatika in 1757. Leitner wanted to examine whether any reliance upon the latter can be traced in the Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti. Among the minor differences reported by Leitner, whose investigation deals with an intermediate period between 1728 and 1757, we find that the characters ⟨ѯ⟩, ⟨ѕ⟩, and ⟨ѵ⟩, present in 1728, can no longer be found in the editions from 1757. Leitner also observes an increased consistency in the use of ⟨ь⟩ in 1757, compared to the late 1720s. In the 1720s, this character was often absent in expected positions. Further observations by Leitner include differences in the adjectival declension, where, in 1728, -ый is the only form

Marker, Publishing, Printing, 86. It is sometimes also referred to in English as the St. Petersburg Gazette.

18 Morozova, “Organizatsiia sbora i obrabotki,” 35.
20 Ibid., 67.
21 Ibid., 75.
22 Ibid., 80.
encountered for masculine Nominative/Accusative, singular. The form -ой/-ей, on the other hand, was preferred in 1757.\(^{23}\)

The *Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti* remained Russia’s only newspaper in this period. It was accompanied by the *Primechaniia k Vedomostiam* (Примечания к Ведомостям), which was published several times annually between 1728 and 1742.\(^{24}\) As mentioned above (see, for example, section 3.3.4), the *Primechaniia* was Russia’s first literary and popular science journal and functioned as a kind of reference dictionary for the readers of *Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti*, explaining new and foreign terms.\(^ {25}\) The content of the *Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti* was dominated by notices, announcements, and laws. Gradually private ads also appeared, as did the occasional poem.\(^ {26}\) Advertisements were often repeated in several successive issues. They had a fairly simple structure, such as the one promoting V. K. Trediakovskii’s treatise on orthography in October, 1748:

Въ книжной Академической лавкѣ продается нынѣ новая книга, сочиненная на Российскомъ языкѣ господиномъ Профессоромъ Васильемъ Тредїаковскимъ, подъ титуломъ: Разговоръ между чужестраннымъ человѣкомъ и россїйскимъ о Правописании старинномъ и новомъ, и о всемъ, что принадлежитъ къ сей материї.\(^ {27}\)

The news was dominated by wars, trade, and translations from Western newspapers. As of the 1740s, general information about the state of the Russian Empire began to be included on a more regular basis.\(^ {28}\) Foreign news articles

\(^{23}\) Ibid., 88.
\(^{27}\) *Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti*, October 4, 1748, 6, accessed May 29, 2021, https://www.vedomosti1728.ru/pdf.cgi?r=99&key_pdf=rO5rFf861xiCHd (A new book in the Russian language by Professor Vasiliy Trediakovskii is now for sale in the academy bookstore. It is entitled: A conversation between a foreign person and a Russian on the old and the new Orthography and on all matters relevant to this).
published in the *Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti* were a translation of its German-language sister publication, the *St. Peterburgische Zeitung*. Among those who translated into Russian was the mathematician and translator V. E. Adodurov. While foreign news was translated into Russian, domestic news was not. As Eichhorn writes:


### 4.2.3 Popular Prints

Popular prints, especially the so-called *lubok*, roughly the Russian equivalent of chapbooks, is another type of printed text from this period. In all likelihood, such prints included short legends of only a few words and were one of few printed texts available to the illiterate majority of Russians. Because they contain short texts that were available to almost anyone in 1740s Russia, they are valuable to this investigation. A few such texts have been accessed via the web.
portal Natsional’naia elektronnaia biblioteka,\textsuperscript{33} including an interesting case of a newspaper text transliterated and printed as a lubok (cf. below, section 6.3.1).

### 4.3 Archival Material

Archival materials in Russian from the 1740s are available in vast quantities. Small fractions are available in printed editions that began to appear in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{34} Other resources can be found on the internet.\textsuperscript{35} In most cases, however, archival materials are only accessible in the respective archival institutions. For this investigation material has been gathered from archives in five countries:\textsuperscript{36}

- **Denmark:** Danish National Archives (Rigsarkivet), Copenhagen.
- **Finland:** National Archives of Finland (Kansallisarkisto), Helsinki.
- **Russian Federation:** Archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences (SPbFARAN), St. Petersburg.
- **Sweden:** Swedish National Archives (Riksarkivet) and Military Archives (Krigsarkivet), Stockholm; Regional Archives (Landsarkivet), Uppsala.
- **Ukraine:** Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine (TsDIAK Ukrainy), Kyiv.


\textsuperscript{34} For example, Mikhail Sukhomlinov edited ten volumes of material relating to the Academy of Sciences (Sukhomlinov, Materialy). Business texts are available in the edition by Sumkina and Kotkov, Pamiatniki, to which reference has been made above, and in T. N. Mezhenina and A. P. Maiorov, eds., Delovaia pis’mennost’ Troitskogo Selenginskogo monastyr’ia pervoi poloviny XVIII v. (St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriia, 2015).


\textsuperscript{36} Detailed information about the individual documents is available in the list of sources at the end of this book.
4.3.1 Selection of Sources

The vast majority of handwritten documents available in archives can be broadly categorized as business documents (деловые документы). However, within this macrogenre, a variety of sub-categories can be identified.\(^{37}\)

In order to be suitable for analysis in this investigation, documents must fulfill certain preliminary criteria.\(^{38}\) First, they must fit into the chronological framework of the investigation. This means that their date of composition must be between 1740 and 1749. Second, they must be written by individuals whose native language was Russian, or by persons of foreign extraction fluent in Russian. This is illustrated by the fluency of the writing, which demonstrates a familiarity with the use of pen and paper, Cyrillic lettering, etc.\(^{39}\) Third, the documents must be representative. This means that, ideally, the documents included in the analysis represent varying social and geographic origins, male and female writers, and so forth.

4.4 Paleographic Characteristics of the Material

Eighteenth-century Russian writers had to choose between the “old” and the “civil” orthography. The civil orthography refers to Peter the Great’s new, Romanized typeface, introduced from 1708 onwards, with a decreased number of characters, and a radically simplified system of diacritics, while the old orthography was a continuation of existing traditions. It was also employed for secular texts and not restricted to the religious sphere, which is a common misconception.\(^{40}\) A well-known handbook on paleography sums up the developments during the eighteenth century in the following terms:

---

37 Cf. Malitikov, *Kratkii slovar’,* section 2, for a list of document types.
38 A more detailed discussion of methodological considerations is found in chapter 5.
39 In the archival material available to me, only one document shows obvious signs of having been copied by a person not previously familiar with Russian handwriting. This is a copy of a letter from the commander of Russian forces in Sweden, Patrick Stuart, dated 24 June 1744 (RA, ULA, Södermanlands län, Nyköpings rådhusrätt och magistrat, Inneligande handlin-gar, F V1a, 47, Stuart). As it does not fulfill the criteria, this letter was not included in the investigation.
If these words are true for the eighteenth century as a whole, they apply less to handwriting from the 1740s. While printed texts from this period often appear “modern” to a twenty-first-century reader, handwritten documents—especially the more cursive forms—are an obvious continuation of earlier traditions. The difference can be seen not only in lettering, but also in the design of the entire writing system. When compared, printed and handwritten documents from the 1740s differ on many levels. This is due to the fact that typography and handwriting developed along diverging lines during the period:

Выказывавшееся в палеографии мнение, что введение гражданского типографического шрифта в России сыграло большую роль в изменении графики русского письма в начале века, надо признать необоснованным. … В основном же графика рукописного шрифта века развивалась самостоятельно, вне зависимости от типографского.

4.4.1 Developments in Printing during the 1740s

During the 1740s, books were printed in two different orthographies, the old and the civil. Whereas the old orthography continued traditions from earlier periods, the civil orthography went through a number of reforms. During the

41 M. N. Tikhomirov and A. V. Murav’ev, Russkaia paleografìa, 2nd ext. ed. (Moscow: Vysshaia shkola, 1982), 29 (Unification in the outline of lower-case letters, reduction and later complete elimination of supralinear letters, coherence of writing, division of the text in words and phrases and marking of capital letters are the most important characteristics in the development of Russian writing during the eighteenth century).

42 A. G. Shitsgal, Russkii grazhdanskiy shrift 1708–1958 (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1959), 76. Similarly, see P. N. Berkov, “O perekhode skoropisi XVIII v. v sovremennoe russkoe pis’mo,” in Issledovaniia po otechestvennomu ostochnikovedeniu: Sbornik statei, posviashchennykh 75-letiui professora S. N. Valka (Moscow and Leningrad: Nauka, 1964), 38 (The view expressed in paleography that the introduction of the Civil typeface in Russia played a significant role in altering the graphics of Russian writing at the beginning of the century must be considered unfounded. … Fundamentally, the graphics of handwriting during the century developed autonomously, without being dependent on typography).
1730s, in addition to graphemes ⟨ѧ⟩, ⟨ѫ⟩, ⟨ѱ⟩, ⟨ѡ⟩, already abolished through the Petrine reforms, the graphemes ⟨ѯ⟩, ⟨ѵ⟩, and ⟨ѕ⟩ fell out of official use. In 1758, ⟨ѵ⟩ (izhitsa) was reintroduced and remained in use until 1918. Also, the use of ⟨і⟩—rather than ⟨ї⟩—was regulated, at least theoretically.43

In 1744, the Academy of Sciences published a collection of official typefaces, twelve of which were Russian. The collection was reissued four years later. These samples reflect a new era in the development of the civil script: the form of the new typefaces differ sharply from those of the Petrine times.44

A typical feature of printed texts from the 1740s is the use of uppercase letters for titles denoting important people. This may vary from capitalizing only the first letter, such as the word ⟨Маэоръ⟩ (major) with an upper-case ⟨М⟩, to printing entire titles in upper-case: ⟨ЕЯ ІМПЕРАТОРСКОЕ ВЕЛИЧЕСТВО⟩ (Her Imperial Majesty, cf. below, chapter 6). These examples show that, despite the academy’s efforts at regulating the civil script, its usage was by no means uniform.

### 4.4.2 Handwritten Documents

In printed texts, uppercase and lowercase letters are differentiated, and all letters are of proportional size and homogenous design, and they rest on the same line. However, no such distinction was made in handwriting. In handwritten documents, graphemes vary greatly in size and occur in varying forms. Also, these texts teem with superscript signs, abbreviations, and a variety of accentuation marks.45 Elements such as these are especially prominent in carefully written examples of civil writing (гражданское письмо), or ceremonial cursive (парадная скоропись), reminiscent of semi-uncial script (полуустав), with supralinear elements similar to those found in books printed in the old orthography.46 In less prestigious documents, such elements are missing or occur sporadically.

---

44 A. G. Shitsgal, Russkii tipografskii shrift: Voprosy istorii i praktika primeneniiia (Moscow: Kniga, 1985), 52–53.
45 Accents, breathings, and supralinear graphemes, see the list below and cf. illustration in Cherepnin, Russkaia paleografiia, 377.
46 Shitsgal, Russkii grazhdanskii shrift, 72–74; Berkov, “O perekhode,” 43.
Sometimes they can be found at the beginning of a document, but missing in the end:

В скорописных текстах XVIII в. в сравнении с материалами XVII в. выносные буквы менее употребительны, но возможны в тех же положениях, как и в текстах XVII в.: перед последующей согласной внутри слова и на конце слова (последние случаи более редкие). Отступления от этих норм единичны. 47

During the 1740s, texts were separated into words according to rules that differ from modern usage. For example, prepositions are frequently adjoined to nouns, and negations to verbs.

Highly prestigious documents were written in a clearly legible ceremonial cursive, in which each character was written separately and often had supralinear elements (cf. chapter 7). Scribes did not differentiate consistently between upper and lowercase characters. Titles and names were often spelled with a capital letter, and sometimes capital letters occurred randomly. The following short excerpt illustrates this:

Бо́жиею По́спѣшествующею Милостию мы́емъ Императри́ца И самоде́ржца Всероссі́йская, Москво́нская, Ки́евская, Влади́мирская, Новгородская, Цари́ца Каза́нскай, Цари́ца Астраханской, Цари́ца Сибирской, Госуда́рьны Псковская, И Вели́кая Княгиня Смоле́нская ... 48

Occasionally, characters are enlarged at the end of a line, in order to fill empty space.

The supralinear elements occurring in the material are:

\{ ́ \}  oksiia (stress)
\{ ́́ \}  variia (stress in absolute final position) 〈стороны́〉
\{ ̀́ \}  paerok

47 Sumkina and Kotkov, Pamiatniki, 7 (In cursive texts of the eighteenth century, compared to materials from the seventeenth, superscript letters are used less frequently, but permissible in the same positions as in texts from the seventeenth century: word-internally before a consonant, and in final position [the latter cases are rarer]. Deviations from this norm are infrequent).

48 Swedish National Archives, Muscovitica 623.
The scribes behind documents in ceremonial cursive make use of both ⟨е⟩ and ⟨ѣ⟩, most often in their etymological positions, although individual variations occur.

The characters ⟨и⟩, ⟨й⟩, ⟨i⟩, and ⟨j⟩ occur in something resembling free variation: ⟨ъ привѣдъ, иъ приведъ, и приведъ⟩.50 The same is true for ⟨о⟩ and ⟨о⟩, ⟨у⟩ and ⟨ꙋ⟩, and ⟨ѧ⟩ and ⟨я⟩. ⟨ѧ⟩ occurs at the end of lines. For /f/ we find ⟨ө⟩ alternating with ⟨ф⟩.

Compared to ceremonial cursive, documents written in skoropis’ (скоропись), the traditional cursive of administrative documents, private letters etcetera, have their own characteristic features. Cursive characters vary greatly in size and occur in varying forms. In some documents it ⟨ь⟩ and ⟨ъ⟩ appear indistinguishable. Similarly, some superscript diacritics have been reduced to dots. In the handwritten material, numbers, especially dates, are often surrounded by ⟨„ „⟩: ⟨въ „21ом” сего мѣца⟩.51

4.5 The People behind the Material

Given the considerable variation found in handwriting from the 1740s, let us consider the people who wrote the documents.

49 This is reminiscent of the system employed in Cyrillic printed books, the старопечатная система (old printing system): A. A. Zalizniak, Ot praslavianskoi aktentuatsii k russkoi (Moscow: Nauka, 1985), 200–201. The number of supralinear diacritics is considerably higher than the one employed for a short time in books printed in the civil alphabet. The latter is sometimes referred to as the новопечатная система (new printing system): I. A. Kornilaeva, “Iz istorii russkoi aktentuatsii XVIII veka,” in Slavianskoe i balkanskoe iazykoznanie: prosadiia, ed. A. A. Zalizniak, V. A. Dybo, and R. V. Bulatova (Moscow: Nauka, 1989), 193.
50 Swedish State Archives, Militaria 1588. Letter of safe conduct for Swedish vessels, signed by Russian General-en-Chef Count Peter de Lacy, in the camp at Helsinki, August 27, 1742.
51 Swedish National Archives, Muscovitica 623.
The age structure of the Russian population in the 1740s is not easy to calculate, even though impressive attempts have been made.\textsuperscript{52} Infant mortality was extremely high by modern standards with 334 deaths per 1000 births. We should note, however, that these numbers are only slightly higher than those reported for France in the same period (317 per 1000). An individual in Russia who reached adulthood and was aged thirty in 1745 could expect to live another 27.2 years, while a person who had reached the age of sixty could be expected to live another 10.6 years.\textsuperscript{53}

Although there may be exceptions, it was assumed that the authors of the majority of texts used for this investigation were between the ages of twenty and seventy.\textsuperscript{54} An individual aged seventy in 1740 was thus born in 1670 and most probably received his/her education in the late 1670s and 1680s. On the other hand, a person aged twenty in 1740 was born in 1720 and likely educated during the late 1720s and 1730s. The rich graphic variation found in the material thus becomes more understandable when we consider this sixty-year period. We can expect to encounter writing by individuals educated before the reforms of Peter the Great, as well as writing by individuals who were educated in the post-Petrine society.

\textsuperscript{52} Alain Blum and Irina Troitskaya, “Mortality in Russia During the 18th and 19th Centuries: Local Assessments Based on the Revizii,” *Population: An English Selection* 9 (1997): 130.

\textsuperscript{53} Blum and Troitskaya, “Mortality in Russia,” 133.

\textsuperscript{54} For the sake of illustration, the ages on January 1, 1740 of a few famous individuals from the period: General Field-Marshal Peter von Lacy, born October 30/November 9, 1678: sixty-one years (cf. below, section 6.3.5); Empress Anna Ioannovna, born January 28/February 7, 1693: forty-six years; Mikhailo Lomonosov, born November 8/19, 1711: twenty-nine years.
CHAPTER 5

Methodological Considerations

The review of existing research in chapter 2 demonstrated that the Russian sociolinguistic situation of the 1740s has been insufficiently explained. In an attempt to shed more light on it, this chapter examines what research method(s) might be suitable to provide an accurate interpretation. On the following pages, a number of methodological issues will be discussed. These issues require our attention, especially since there are no immediate precursors to the present investigation.

5.1 Existing Methods

The Russian language has been recorded for many centuries using a well-known writing system, the Cyrillic alphabet. Furthermore, the structure of Russian and its vocabulary are well understood both synchronically and diachronically. With this in mind, there can be no reason why the conditions that apply to diachronic linguistics in general would not also apply to Russian in equal measure, including eighteenth-century Russian. This view is not shared by the entire scholarly community, however. For example, O. V. Nikitin expresses doubts concerning the applicability of “многочисленные зарубежные разработки” in historical sociolinguistics on Russian material.¹

Nikitin is partly correct in stating that methods applied to other languages cannot be implemented without modifications. The application of a method to another language is dictated primarily by the nature of the sources. As discussed in chapter 3, the literacy situation in Russia during the eighteenth century was such that scholars today have little access to first-hand written

¹ Nikitin, Problemy etnolingvisticheskogo izuchenia, 77 (a lot of foreign research).
information—ego-documents—from broad sections of the population. This problem is felt not only in linguistics, but also in social history:

Indeed, because of the mass illiteracy that persisted for much of the history of Imperial Russia, social historians have been forced to rely on the legal-administrative records of the bureaucracy and/or the letters, memoirs, scholarship, literary works, and journalistic accounts of the educated classes.

If due attention is paid to the specific conditions of the Russian material, investigations may yield new insights. However, if sources are scant, results must be interpreted cautiously.

Sociolinguistically oriented studies of eighteenth century Russian do exist, as we saw in section 2.3. Also, sociolinguistic research has been conducted on Russian material beyond the borders of Russia, namely by Anna Kretschmer, whose study of private letters from the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries is particularly important. While taking this into account, I find it necessary to include diachronic linguistics in a broader sense so as not to exclude any potential sources.

If any single method can be said to dominate research on eighteenth-century Russian, it is the quantitative. Well-known research employing primarily quantitative method includes Gerta Hüttl-Folter’s syntactic investigations and V. M. Zhivov’s investigation of historical morphology from 2004.

In terms of orthographical and grammatical description, Michael Moser sets a high standard in his recent analysis of the language of Юности честное зерцало (The Honorable Mirror for Youth), an example of Russian eighteenth-century pedagogical literature. Chapter 7 of Moser’s book contains detailed analyses of orthography, morphology, syntax, and lexis. A short comparison is helpful since his work is one of the most recent, covers a period in chronological vicinity to

---


4 Kretschmer, Zur Geschichte des Schriftsprachischen. Kretschmer’s work includes a few texts from the 1740s.

5 Hüttl-Folter, Syntaktische Studien; Zhivov, Ocherki.

6 Michael Moser, „Iunosti chestnoe zertsalo“ 1717 g.: U istokov russkogo literaturnogo iazyka (Vienna: LIT, 2020.).
that covered by the present investigation, and also deals with topics that are of interest for the current investigation.

While Moser’s volume is impressive in many ways, there are three principal reasons why this book cannot go into a similar degree of detail. First of all, the purpose of the present investigation is to examine the function of language in society. While Moser focuses on a single text that is studied from every angle, the present investigation has a more general focus. Second, the sources analyzed here constitute a heterogeneous collection of texts of varying lengths. Elements in the long text analyzed by Moser often do not have corresponding elements in the shorter texts examined in this study. Excluding short texts in favor of longer ones would create an unwanted bias. Third, a minute analysis of the material included in the present investigation would result in a very long description without necessarily leading to new insights.

While quantitative investigations based on vast text corpora provide reliable statistical results, not all data is well suited for a quantitative analysis. As a consequence, data that fails to reach the requirements of a quantitative investigation has sometimes been discarded. This is why Zhivov chose to exclude short texts—notably business texts and private correspondence—from his investigation on methodological grounds.7 Such a decision cannot be criticized as long as the researcher clearly states what is being done, as Zhivov did. Similarly, Alexander Issatschenko at one point discarded data from business texts, something that provoked a strong reaction from Anna Kretschmer: “[и]сключение же какого бы то ни было жанра является, на наш взгляд, принципиальной методологической ошибкой.”8

There may be perfectly good reasons for excluding certain data. However, a decision to include or exclude data will obviously affect the outcome of any investigation. When facing the data, each researcher has two options: to exclude data that does not agree with a chosen method or to adapt the method. I argue that methodological adaptations are the way forward if we wish to attain as profound an understanding as possible of the linguistic situation in the 1740s or any other linguistic situation we investigate.

The alternative to methodological adaptation is exclusion, discarding certain varieties of language or certain text types on the grounds that they are insufficient for one reason or another. This approach has been tried many times and the result is familiar. Previously, in languages such as German and

7 Zhivov, Ocherki, 29–30.
8 Kretschmer, Chelovek za pis’mom, 284 (the exclusion of any genre whatsoever constitutes, in our opinion, a fundamental methodological error).
French, language history has often been written “from above” and viewed as “the inexorable march towards a uniform standard.”\textsuperscript{9} In French, for example, “[t]his has resulted in a sanitized version that makes the language history appear more homogeneous than it surely was.”\textsuperscript{10} Russian also has had more than its fair share of “sanitized” language history, as was explained in chapter 2.

Today, in the study of Western European languages, the situation has changed radically. Diachronic linguistics strive to include new sources: “The approach to language history that focusses on such sources [that is, sources written by women and individuals from outside the elite—T.R.] and that aims to repair the social and gender bias found in many language histories, has come to be known as language history ‘from below.’”\textsuperscript{11}

A historical sociolinguistic analysis requires methods that allow conclusions to be drawn about the linguistic realities facing the people behind the texts. In other words, the method should enable the researcher to say something about the social and educational background of the individuals and/or communities represented in the data. If this cannot be achieved, then the analysis has failed.

Since a sociolinguistic analysis must take into account information from many levels of a text, it is doubtful whether a single method is sufficient. For example, counting particular morphological elements will tell us something, but the message may be difficult to interpret out of context. This is why a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods provide a more holistic picture of a given situation. I suggest that a truly exhaustive analysis can be achieved by a combination of methods. Also, an investigation such as this may benefit by drawing on methods originally developed for other fields of linguistic inquiry beyond historical linguistics.


\textsuperscript{10} Ashby, review of \textit{Sociolinguistic Variation in Seventeenth-Century France}, 1403.

5.2 Methodological Renewal

As a remedy for the incomplete nature of available data (cf. above, chapters 1 and 4), it has been suggested that historical linguists should strive for informational maximalism—“the utilization of all reasonable means to extend our knowledge of what might have been going on in the past, even though it is not directly observable.”

One of the aims of the present investigation is to suggest a basic inventory of functional spheres, or registers, of Russian in the 1740s (section 1.1). Such an inventory can be seen as a map of sorts. Register, as a term, has not always been used consistently. In the Introduction, we saw that Zhivov uses this term (Ru. регистр) to refer to varieties of language used in various communicative situations. I also adhere to this definition and find it similar to the definition proposed by Richard A. Hudson:

The term R E G I S T E R is widely used in sociolinguistics to refer to “varieties according to use”, in contrast with dialects, defined as “varieties according to user”. ... The distinction is needed because the same person may use very different linguistic items to express more or less the same meaning on different occasions, and the concept of “dialect” cannot reasonably be extended to include such variation.

Asif Agha further explains:

From the standpoint of function, distinctive registers are associated with social practices of every kind—such as law, medicine, prayer, science, magic, prophecy, commerce, military strategy, sports commentary, the observance of respect and etiquette, the expression of civility, social status, etc.

13 Zhivov, Istoriiia, 26.
One way of creating a tentative set of registers for Russian of the 1740s is to apply the uniformitarian principle.

5.2.1 The Uniformitarian Principle

The logical basis for the uniformitarian principle in linguistics is that: “[i]n a fundamental sense, human beings as biological, psychological and social creatures have remained largely unchanged over time.”16 Essentially, the uniformitarian principle says that language in society is likely to function similarly today as it did in the past. This can be explained by the fact that modern humans are biologically more or less identical to humans that lived thousands of years ago, and thereby also have a similar capacity for human language. At the same time, many societies in which humans live have experienced radical technological developments.

5.2.2 The Uniformitarian Principle and the Registers of Eighteenth-Century Russian

In 1991, the renowned Soviet scholar Iu. N. Karaulov identified the following forms and spheres of existence of the contemporary Russian language:

- мертвый язык памятников письменности;
- устный язык русских народных говоров, диалектный язык;
- письменный язык литературы, прессы, государственной документации;
- повседневный разговорный язык и просторечие;
- научно-технический и профессиональный язык;
- русский язык в машинной (электронно-вычислительной) среде;
- неисконная русская речь;
- язык русского зарубежья.17

---

17 Iu. N. Karaulov, O sostojanii russkogo iazyka sovremennosti: doklad na konferentsii “Russkii iazyk i sovremennost’. Problemy i perspektivy razvitiia rusistikii” (Moscow: AN SSSR. Institut russkogo iazyka, 1991), 9 (The dead language of literary monuments; the spoken language of Russian dialects, dialect language; the written language of literature, the press, and state documentation; everyday informal speech and prostorchie; scientific, technical, and professional language; Russian language in a machine (computer) environment; non-native Russian
Notably, Karaulov makes no mention of жаргон (jargon, slang) in his enumeration of the forms and spheres of existence of modern Russian. Why he fails to do so is unclear. It may be an attempt to keep his classification as simple as possible; he emphasizes that further elaboration of the list would only lead to confusion. Another explanation is the ban on jargon studies in the Soviet Union. From the 1930s to the 1970s such studies were taboo.18 Since the early 1990s, however, the discipline has been fundamentally renewed by the field studies of M. A. Grachëv, who suggests an elaborate classification of social dialects. In abbreviated form this classification includes:

Жаргоны: Классово-прослоечные: дворян, мещан, крестьян, духовенства и т. д. Производственные. По интересам и увлечениям. Молодежные. Семейные (идиолекты). Арго—лексика деклассированных (асоциальных) элементов.19

If the uniformitarian principle is applied to Karaulov’s spheres of existence (incorporating the sociolects identified by Grachëv), we can argue that a number of these spheres most likely had equivalents in the 1740s. For obvious reasons, however, the results of previous research give reason to believe that the spheres were probably structured differently. First, beginning with the most salient difference, “Russian language in a machine (computer) environment” did not exist during the eighteenth century. Second, it seems necessary to merge a number of the spheres of existence identified by Karaulov in the modern language. Thus “the spoken language of Russian dialects” and “everyday informal speech and prostorechie” belong together since no standard language had yet developed in

speech; diaspora Russian). For further elaboration of Karaulov’s classification applied to contemporary Russian, see Arto Mustajoki, “Raznovidnosti russkogo iazyka: analiz i klassifikatsiya,” Voprosy izerkamstviia 5 (2013): 3–27. I am indebted to Professor Mustajoki for providing me with a copy of Karaulov’s paper. A note on prostorechie: Zemskaiia and Shmelëv define prostorechie as “the unprepared, unconstrained speech of persons who have not mastered the literary language” (неподготовленная, непринужденная речь лиц, не владеющих литературным языком), cf. E. N. Zemskaiia and D. N. Shmelëv, Gorodskoe prostorechie: problomy izucheniiia (Moscow: Nauka, 1984), 10.


19 M. A. Grachëv, “Sovremennaia klassifikatsia sotsial’nykh dialektov,” in Prepodavanie i izuchenie russkogo iazyka i literatury v kontekste sovremennoi iazykovoi politiki Rossii, ed. L. I. Ruchina (Nizhnii Novgorod: Natsional’nyi issledovatel’skii Nizhgorodskii gosudarstvennyi universitet im. N. I. Lobachevskogo, 2002), 73 (Jargons: those developed by a social class: jargons of noblemen, town-dwellers, peasants, clergy, and so forth; by people of a certain profession; by people who share the same interests and hobbies; the language of young people; family jargons (idiolектs); and argot: the vocabulary of marginalized groups).
the 1740s. Consequently, no spoken variety of such a standard language existed. Sociolects should be added where appropriate to this sphere of informal speech and to the sphere of professional language. Third, it is doubtful whether a separate sphere of “diaspora Russian” is relevant for the 1740s. It would represent an insignificant number of people. For example, the Russian-speaking minority of the formerly Swedish province of Ingria, where St. Petersburg was founded in 1703, no longer found itself outside Russia by the early eighteenth century. Fourth, it seems necessary to split some of the spheres based on what is already known about the eighteenth-century Russian language. Research on administrative documents from the 1740s indicates that a part of the state documentation most likely belongs in a separate sphere, continuing the business language traditions from earlier periods. We may label this “traditional administrative documentation.” Also, printing was under strict government control, which would require a specific sphere for the language found in printed sources. We thus end up with a hypothetical set of macro spheres looking something like this:

- traditional literature and religious language;
- the language of printed texts (imaginative literature, the press, state documentation, science and technology);
- traditional administrative documentation;
- informal speech;
- professional language;
- non-native Russian speech.

5.2.3 What May Have Influenced the Registers?

For the sake of discussion, let us allow for the possibility that the varieties of Russian in the 1740s could be divided as above or in some similar way. It is likely that changes and innovations to the spheres came from different sources. William Labov explains:

Changes from above are introduced by the dominant social class, often with full public awareness. Normally, they represent borrowings from other speech communities that have higher

---

20 The sphere “traditional literature and religious language” is added as a way to unite genres that had texts composed in either Church Slavic or hybrid Church Slavic, not in vernacular Russian. Cf. Zhivov, Ocherki, 76.
prestige in the view of the dominant class. Such borrowings do not immediately affect the vernacular patterns of the dominant class or other social classes, but appear primarily in careful speech, reflecting a superposed dialect learned after the vernacular is acquired. ... Changes from below are systematic changes that appear first in the vernacular, and represent the operation of internal, linguistic factors. At the outset, and through most of their development, they are completely below the level of social awareness.21

If we consider how the history of Russian has been written throughout the modern period, it is not unfair to conclude that the “top down” approach has been predominant.

If we wish to study the language usage of as large a portion of Russian eighteenth-century society as possible, we must take into account that the nature of the evidence is liable to fluctuate: the amount of texts, length of individual texts, and other parameters may vary. For instance, certain groups in society may have produced only short texts, while other groups are represented by long texts. I suggest that a suitable method is available in the form of register analysis. By applying the successive steps of register analysis (explained below), we are in a position to analyze material of every kind and are not confined by such things as quantity (a parameter that includes both length and amount of texts).

5.2.4 Register Analysis

Register analysis is the umbrella term for a set of methodological techniques to carry out analyses of text varieties.22 It consists of three basic constituents: situational context, linguistic analysis and functional analysis. As Douglas Biber and Susan Conrad show, register analysis does not have to focus exclusively on contemporary data. It is applicable to historical material as well.23

The situational context can be analyzed on the basis of seven characteristics. In describing these characteristics, this investigation draws on the method described by Biber and Conrad.24 Their model represents an “informational

---

22 Biber and Conrad, Register, Genre, and Style.
23 Ibid., 222–253.
24 Ibid., 40–48.
maximum,” and not all the features they list can be found in all texts. These features include:

(1) **Participants.** How many participants feature prominently in the text? Can we identify their social characteristics such as age, education and profession?
(2) **Relations among participants,** that is, status, personal relationship.
(3) **Channel,** or medium (speech, writing). For Russian language of the eighteenth century, writing is the only medium available, but this can be divided into print and handwriting.
(4) **Processing circumstances,** that is, the history of editing.
(5) **Setting.** Is the place of communication public or private?
(6) **Communicative purposes.** Was the document written as a report, for entertainment or in a diary? Does it summarize information from different sources? Is it factual or imaginative?
(7) **Topic.** Can the document be placed in a specific topical domain, such as domestic life, business, education, politics, and so forth?25

The linguistic analysis is central to a register analysis and will determine the characteristics of the text in terms of vocabulary, morphology and syntax. It generally includes a quantitative analysis of linguistic features.26

The final step in a register analysis is the functional interpretation, trying to answer why a certain text combines certain formal characteristics with a certain content.27 While Biber and Conrad find that a register analysis typically begins with the situational context, there is also a cyclical element involved. The cyclical element may make it necessary to go over the analysis more than once.28

### 5.3 Register Analysis of Russian from the 1740s

Based on the lines of reasoning followed in this chapter, a combination of methods has been chosen for the present investigation. The basis for this combination is Register Analysis, but certain adaptations are necessitated by the historical material of the present investigation. The result is an analytical tool containing qualitative as well as quantitative elements. In choosing between qualitative

---

26 Ibid., 51–69.
27 Ibid., 69–74.
28 Ibid., 39.
and quantitative approaches, it is worthwhile to consider Edgar Schneider’s recommendation:

A qualitative investigation is usually less sophisticated but more robust than a quantitative one, because some potentially distorting effects (such as overuse of a salient form) skew frequencies of occurrence but not necessarily the qualitative inventory of forms in a variety. It is possible that a written corpus allows reasonable (but isolated) observations, though not broader generalizations.29

In the present study, while mindful of its potential weaknesses, qualitative approach was chosen in order to allow investigation of texts regardless of length.

29 Schneider, “Investigating Historical Variation,” 75–76.
CHAPTER 6

Situational Analysis of Registers

Since texts from the 1740s differ greatly in content and format, fitting all available data into a single, one-dimensional methodological solution may cause a methodological bias. Therefore, it was suggested in chapter 5 that the data undergo a three-pronged analysis in order to take into account as much information as possible. The goal was to allow the examination of all texts suitable for quantitative analysis, regardless of their length. The combination of methods chosen after these considerations draws on the register analysis framework, but has been adapted to suit this investigation.

The first step in a register analysis is to establish the situational context of the data. The importance of understanding the conditions in which a text has been created is emphasized in the Register Analysis framework as well as many other handbooks on textual analysis: “… communication does not take place in a vacuum, and texts are not constructed and interpreted in a vacuum. Therefore, to identify the meaning of a text, a careful examination of the circumstances in which the text is created and understood is always needed.”

To briefly summarize, a situational analysis can be achieved by studying seven features of the data: participants, relationships among participants, channel, processing circumstances, setting, communicative purpose, and topic.

6.1 Participants

In written communication, the participants are the author and the addressee. Authors are sometimes individuals or groups, sometimes institutions, and

1 Bodil Helder, Textual Analysis (Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur, 2011), 13.
the same is true for the addressee. We also find texts written by anonymous authors—sometimes institutions—and addressed to an anonymous recipient.

From a strictly linguistic point of view, it may be impossible to determine exactly who should be considered the author of Russian documents from the 1740s. There are several reasons for this. Sometimes, documents are entirely anonymous, leaving no clues about the identity of their creators. In other cases, as pointed out in chapter 3, the difficulties in ascribing a text to a particular author relate to the circumstances surrounding the text’s production. This process may have involved template texts and/or cooperation between several individuals, including a secretary and a clerk, which makes pinpointing the author(s) essentially impossible.

6.1.1 Individuals

Beginning with printed texts, we generally find that authored and translated books from the 1740s provide the names of authors and translators on the title pages:

Краткое руководство къ краснорѣчію, книга первая, въ которой содержится Риторика показующая общія правила обоего краснорѣчія, то есть ораторіи и поэзіи, сочиненная въ пользу любящихъ словесныя науки трудами Михайла Ломоносова Императорской Академии Наукъ и Историческаго собранія Члена, Химіи Профессора. Въ Санктпетербургѣ при Императорской Академіи наукъ 1748.²

Разговоръ между Чужестраннымъ человекомъ і Россійскімъ объ ортографіи старинной новой і о всѣмъ что принадлежитъ къ сей матеріи, сочиненъ ВасільЕмъ Тредіаковскімъ Профессоромъ елочвенціи. Въ Санктпетербургѣ прі Императорской Академіи наукъ 1748.³

Совершенное воспитаніе детей содержащее въ себѣ молодымъ знатнаго рода, и шляхетнаго достоинства людямъ,

---

² Mikhailo Lomonosov, Kratkoе rukovodstvo k krasnorocheiu ... (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia Akademiiia nauk, 1748).
³ Tredniakovskii, Razgovor.
However, not all printed texts contain information about their authors. Authored or translated books constituted only a portion of the output from the printing shops, while the majority of printed texts were imperial edicts. For example, consider the number of imperial legislative documents compared to the total number of titles in the *Union Catalogue of Russian Eighteenth-century Secular Printed Books (1708–1800)*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of titles</th>
<th>Of which edicts (указы)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in section 3.1.3, Russia’s monarch was the sole formal legislative authority. While the monarch signed the laws and may have dictated minor changes to them, the texts themselves were produced by the relevant state agencies. Thus, laws were published in the name of Emperor Ioann Antonovich, born on August 12, 1740, from the very beginning of his brief reign:

---

4 Abat Belegard [Jean-Baptiste Morvan de Bellegarde], *Sovershennoe vospitanie detei* …, trans. Sergei Volchkov (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia Akademiia nauk, 1747).

Божией милостію Мы Иоаннъ третій, Император и Самодержецъ Всероссійскій и протчая, и протчая, и протчая.

Имѣя всеподданнѣйшее попеченіе о своихъ вѣрныхъ подданныхъ, кои отъ банкротовъ въ крайнее разореніе были привожены, и милосердную къ нимъ указали по всеподданнѣйшему Намъ, Нашего Сената представленію съ тѣми банкротами, кои до сего явились, а дѣла ихъ не рѣшены, и которые впредь явится, поступать по учиненному, и подъ симъ Нашимъ Всемилостивѣшнѣйшему указомъ напечатанному уставу во всемъ непрѣменно. ... Подлинной Именемъ Его Императорскаго Величества: отъ Ея Императорскаго Высочества Государыни Правительницы Великїя Княгини Анны Всєа Россїи, апробованъ Декабря 15 дня 1740. Печатанъ при Сенатѣ того же Декабря 17 дня. 6

In handwritten documents, we find that various kinds of texts were written by all literate levels of society. At the highest level, the imperial court produced diplomatic correspondence. Letters often took the form of personal missives, as exemplified by the following message from Empress Elisabeth to the Swedish crown prince Adolf Fredrik, notifying him of the marriage between the future emperor, Peter III, and the future empress, Catherine II:

[hand 1] Свѣтлѣишій кронъ принцъ; дружебно-любезный/ племяникъ:/ како по особливомъ всевышшаго бога предѣ-/ усмотренію, и по моемъ соизволенію, мой/ вселюбезнѣйшій племяникъ Его ймператорское/ высочество великий князь всероссіискій Петръ;/ наслѣдникъ норвежской, владѣющей герцогъ/ шлезвигъ голстинской, штормарнской, и дитмарѣ-/ ской, графъ олденбргской и делмэнгорстской &с./ съ ея императорскимъ высочествомъ великою княгинею всероссіскою Екатериною, урожденъ-/ ною княгинею ангальтскою, герцогинею саксонскою,/ энгерскою, и вестфалскою, графинею асканскою, госдарию цербстскою, бернбргскою, эверскою,/ и нипгаузенскою &с. въ здѣшней мой импера-/ торской столицѣ въ „21омъ” сего мѣцца благополучно/ въ брачное сочетаніе встѣпилъ. Тако я ни-/мало

6 Ustav o bankrutakh (St. Petersburg: Senat, December 17, 1740).
умедлитъ не хотѣла, что бъ вашемь/ королевскомь высочествѣ и любви, ̆ такомъ/ благополдѣчномъ, и мнѣ толь радостномъ/ произшествіи, чрезь сіе ѣзвѣстно не учинить, ̆ ни како не сымѣвався, что ваше королевское высочество и любовь не токмо мнѣ, ̆ моемь/ императорскомь домѣ все то, еже я моемь/ и о "ного удалоствію и благополдѣчію касается, ̆ охотно желать, но и ваше в томъ участіе/ принять, слѣдователно же о съ семь счастливо/ совершшишемся брачномъ сочетаніи порадоваться/ и вышеупомянѣтѣмъ высокимъ новосочетаѣннѣмъ и с вашей стороны о милости всѣ-вышшаго, всѣаго благословенія и благополдѣчія/ желать соизволите. впрочемъ же/ с неотмѣнною благоволительною дрѣжбою всегда/ пребываю./ вашего королевскаго высочества я люби/ дрѣжебно сожалѣная тетка./ [hand 2] Елисаветъ/ [hand 1] в санктъ петербурѣ/ "26" августа. 1745.7

The Empress personally signed the letter, but the text was written by one of the administration’s anonymous scribes. To a large degree, the original content of the letter is minimal while the majority of it consists of titles and set formulas.

Formulaic expressions are also a well-known feature of Russian private letters. However, the expressions used are characteristic to the domain of the personal correspondence:

желаю вамъ гдѣрѣмъ моимъ во множество летъ здравствовати с государями моими братцами.8

In a situational analysis, the use of formulaic expressions in a text tells us that the author wishes to situate the text within a particular social context. Purely linguistic aspects of the use of formulaic expressions will be discussed further in chapter 7.

The tradition of scribes writing private letters was not limited to the highest levels of state administration. This phenomenon also in other parts of society. For example, in a private letter from signed by the Prince Mikhail Ukhtomskii in 1742, the Prince himself has written only the last few lines of the letter and the signature. The scribe was responsible for the rest:

7 Swedish National Archives, Muscovitica 623.
8 Swedish National Archives, Militaria 1588.
Finally, the following description of individuals involved in the production of documents would not be complete unless we acknowledge a formulaic expression that is very common throughout the period under investigation: the tradition of vouching for the content of a document written by another by “laying one's hand” to it:

… к сей сказке попь Михаил/ ёгняевъ рѣкъ приложил.¹⁰

… ксемѣ допросу вмѣсто гранодера василя едорова по ево прошению кабардинской гранодерской роты ротной писар
никіеор рябовъ рѣкъ приложилъ.¹¹

As seen in the last example, a soldier asked the company scribe to vouch for his information. Considering that historian Boris Mironov calculated the literacy among army recruits to be about 0.5 percent (section 3.2.2), it is highly likely that Vasilii Fёdorov was unable to sign his own name.

What do we know about the authors? Well-known historical individuals such as the Empress Elisabeth, Mikhailo Lomonosov, or Vasilii Trediakovskii have been thoroughly studied. The majority of authors, however, remain largely anonymous. Some have indicated their name and professional title, but still they remain anonymous in the sense that we know nothing about them other than their name. We have the documents that they left behind and, based on the content, we can determine some information about the author's educational background.

---

¹¹ Swedish State Archives, Extranea Ryssland 157.4. It should be noted that “laying hand” does not imply putting one’s fingerprint on a document. This idea, which is sometimes found in popular descriptions, is erroneous. In eighteenth-century Europe, fingerprints were not used as means of identification, cf. “Fingerprinting History,” accessed May 26, 2021, https://tristatefingerprinting.com/fingerprinting-history/.
Peter the Great, in his *General’nyi reglament* of 1720, established the rules for training young men as administrators. In order to be hired, the candidate was to be trained in copying text and arithmetic. Once hired, they were to receive further training under the guidance of a secretary. Both noblemen and commoners could be trained and later employed.\(^\text{12}\)

A tentative conclusion is that junior clerks whose names appear in documents were, by twenty-first-century standards, young men in their twenties and thirties and thus born and educated in the 1710s to 1730s. Only a handful of people mentioned in the material can be positively identified as being older than sixty. Two such individuals are Field-Marshal Peter de Lacy (born 1678) and the diplomat and military leader, Count A. I. Rumiantsev (born 1680). Unfortunately, neither wrote more than his signature.

### 6.1.2 Institutions

In many cases, printed texts originate from institutions, notably the state. In such cases, the institution appears as the author and no mention is made of the individuals behind the text:

> Описание обоихъ тріумфальныхъ воро́тъ поставленныхъ въ честь Всепречистой Державнейшей Великой Государынь Императрицы Елизаветы Первой Самодержицы Всероссійской по восприятии въ Москвѣ короны Шведовъ побѣдившей всю Финландію державь своей покорившей и торжественно въ Санктпетербургѣ возвратившейся для засвидѣтельствованія всеподданнѣйшѣй ревности и всесерднѣйшѣй желаній Ея Императорскому Величеству съ глубочайшимъ благоговѣніемъ отъ Сенатской канторы поднесенное. Въ Санктпетербургѣ декабря 22 дня 1742 года.\(^\text{13}\)

The *Vedomosti*, Russia’s newspaper during the 1740s, belongs to the category of institutional texts. Articles in the newspaper were not signed, and as discussed in section 4.2.2, Russian-language content was delivered to the editorial office

---


13 *Opisanie oboikh triumfal’nykh vorot* … (St. Petersburg: n. p., 1742).
from various state agencies. Although not named, the author of the *Vedomosti* is the state. Focusing exclusively on the Russian content of the *Vedomosti*, that is, excluding the translated foreign news, we find that much of the domestic reporting consists of matters concerning the state, such as court festivities and government matters. This is true also for the advertisements, although private initiatives also occur, as the following. Foreign news in the *Vedomosti* were translated into Russian while domestic news was sent to the *Vedomosti* editorial office from various state agencies. The domestic content below is from a single issue of the *Vedomosti*, no. 1 (1741) and serves as an illustration.

Отъ города Архангельского 12 декабря.
Ея императорскаго высочества нашей пресвѣтлѣйшей великой княгини и государыни правительницы всеа Россїи Анны высокїй день рожденїя 7 числа, а высокое тезоименитство Ея же императорскаго высочества 9 дня сего мѣсяца, съ великою радостїю и всенароднымъ восклицанїемъ здѣсь праздновано. При отправленїя божїя службы въ россїйской соборной церкви была съ крѣпости пушечная пальба, а отъ поставленныхъ въ параду полковъ трикратная пальба изъ мѣлкаго ружья учинена. О полудни Его превосходительство господинъ вице-губернаторъ и обер-комендантъ фонъ Лицкинъ, всѣхъ присутствующихъ здѣсь /знатнѣй-/
знатнѣйшихъ, военныхъ, статскихъ, и лучшее купечество, богато и себя трактовалъ; а какъ при столѣ за высокїя здравїи пили, въ то время происходила изъ поставленныхъ передъ оберъ-комендантскимъ домомъ пушекъ пальба. При наступленїи вечера всѣ дома здѣшняго города были илюминованы, а притомъ всякъ ревностно старался, дабы искреннюю свою радость для сихъ высокоторжественныхъ дней, разными образы публично засвидѣтельствовать.

Въ Санктпетербургѣ 2 генваря.
Вчерашняго утра то есть въ день новаго года; бывшїе у двора здѣшнѣй и чужестранны господа министры, и прочѣе обоего пола знатнѣйшіе персоны Еѣ императорскому высочеству государыни великой княгини и правительницѣ всея Россїи Аннѣ, симъ торжественнымъ праздникомъ всенижайше поздравляли.
Для известия.
О поставке въ Кронштатскую и Ораніенбомскую морскія гошпитали, на дачу больящимъ генваря съ перваго сего 1741 года чрезъ цѣлой годъ свѣжаго говяжья мяса многократно уже публиковано; а буде кто оное мясо ставить пожелаетъ, тѣ бѣ заблаговременно являлись въ здѣшней Адмиралитействѣ коллегіи по экспедиціи комиссаріатской.

Въ гварнизонномъ зейггаузѣ находящися, ямбургскія чистья стекла числомъ двести девяносто девять, да пять зеркалъ стѣнныхъ, велѣно по опредѣленію здѣшней гварнизонной канцеляріи продать съ публичнаго торгу; а ежели кто оныя купить желаетъ тѣ бѣ являлись въ упомянутой гварнизонной канцеляріи заблаговременно.

О перевозѣ нынѣшнею зимою съ Нарвской ломки казенной ординарной плиты, тысяча семи сотъ тритцети восьми кубическихъ саженъ, такожъ и изъ находящемся въ Крон-штатѣ/штатѣ на тѣхъ мѣстахъ гдѣ по привозѣ выгружена была, ординарной штуковой и тесаной плиты, до тысячи кубическихъ и квадратныхъ саженъ, неоднократно уже публиковано, только еще и по нынѣ охотниковъ къ тому не явилось, ежели же кто означенную плиту; а именно Нарвскую съ ломки на судовую въ Нарвѣ же пристань, а изъ находящейся въ Кронштатѣ съ мѣстъ внутрь заворотовъ, въ каналѣ и въ другія показанныя мѣста нынѣшнимъ зимнимъ временемъ перевозить, и ставить пожелаетъ, тѣ бѣ для торгу и договору въ цѣнѣ являлись въ канторѣ кронштатскихъ строений недмедлѣнно.

Сего генваря седьмаго, восьмого девятаго числа въ второмъ часу по полуночи будетъ продавать, на Адмиралитейскомъ островѣ у Галерной верфи, во второмъ домѣ отъ Крюкова канала указомъ опредѣленной аукціонистъ Суточъ, серебреной сервісы, а притомъ мѣдную и оловянную посуду, агинскія кабинеты, зеркалы, столы, стулья, хрустальные паннидилы, и подсвѣшники стѣнныя, галанскіе полотна, корѣты каллаксы, и другія вещи а буде кто изъ оныхъ купить что пожелаетъ, тѣ бѣ являлись въ вышеозначенной домѣ по вышеписаннымъ днямъ въ уреченные часы.
As the text demonstrates, domestic newspaper articles and advertisements are all preoccupied with the state's affairs. The domestic news report begins with a piece on the celebrations of the Empress's birthday and name day in the northern town of Arkhangelsk. This is followed by a short notice, a court circular of sorts, that describes how foreign ambassadors and other dignitaries paid their respects by personally bringing their New Year's wishes to the Empress. Following the news, we find a section devoted to the state, which includes a government invitation for tenders for the delivery of beef to military hospitals. The text reveals that the invitation has already been published several times. Then there is an advertisement for glass and mirrors to be sold at a state auction organized by the garrison office. This section of the newspaper, focused on the state and its needs, ends with another invitation of tenders, this time for transport. Only at the very end of the newspaper do we find advertisements for private enterprises: Sutov's auction house has placed an advertisement, and Ivan Brunlant, a "foreign merchant," is selling moderately priced fresh oysters.

Comparing the texts found in the *Vedomosti* in 1741 and 1748, we find texts that are very similar in structure. Two advertisements—one by the state and one private—serve as evidence:

14 *Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti* 1 (1741).
16 *Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti*, January 1, 1748, 8.
The advertisements from the beginning and end of the 1740s contain closely related patterns. This can be explained in two possible ways. First, by assuming that the Russian economy—state and private—worked in similar ways in the beginning and the end of the decade: state infrastructure projects were conducted according to similar principles, as was privately organized trade. Second, by assuming that the Vedomosti editorial office maintained essentially the same organization throughout the 1740s. Johann Bröme (cf. section 4.2.2) edited the newspaper in both 1741 and 1748.

Similar to newspapers, the author of administrative documents also appears to be an institution. The composition of texts involved a team of individuals, as the following example shows:

Judging by the handwriting and Ivanov’s signature, we can see that the clerk Stepan Ivanov was the individual holding the quill. The text, however, hardly
reflects his individual linguistic choices. The text is a memorandum and closely follows the typical sequence for that particular type of text: author and addressee, description of the matter at hand introduced by понеже, and instructions concerning the desired action introduced by того ради. At the end of the document, the officials involved have signed their names. While the document contains examples of spelling emanating from the scribe, it may in equal measure contain input from the other members of the team, in this case Schultz and Mikhailov.

6.2 Relationships among Participants

The relationships among participants can be grouped into three categories: superior, equal, and inferior. In the third category is included the relationship between the imperial power and its subjects. In the style of the times and similar to forms of address employed elsewhere in Europe, official documents prescribed that Russian subjects should refer to themselves as “the lowest slaves” when contacting the authorities in supplications:

Вашего Императорскаго Величества нижашшй рабъ.18

The deep respect was typical of correspondence with the government, as well as in traditional epistolary style between family members:

покорно вась гдорь батюшка/ прошу пожаловать отдать/ мой нижашш поклонь гдорю/ моему и зато петру гаврилевй/ чу и гдорьне моей сестрице/ лукере гересимовне и въсем/ нашим приятелим/ присем писавъ вашь/ государей мой покорны/ слуга и сынь миха/ила турченков/ земны свои поклон/ отдаю и благословления вашего/ прошу.19

Minimizing self-importance was the rule in correspondence between perceived social equals. Thus, a Russian major general—writing from a position of power—would conclude a letter to a Swedish count with the formula:

18 Forma o titulakh Ego Imperatorskago Velichestva.
19 National Archives of Sweden, Militaria 1588.
The first category—a superior ordering an inferior—is found in countless orders from the Empress, the state, and its agencies to subordinate levels. For example:

… сия вѣдомость побѣждаетъ насъ исполния Ея императорскаго величества повеления преодолѣть всѣ трѣдности возполздающихся отъ оттепели, которая близь трехъ недель продолжалась, и спѣши какъ наиболее возможно съ вашими превосходительствами увидится и трѣдится въ мирномъ дѣлѣ. …

6.3 Channel

In the register analysis framework, channel is used to refer to the medium of the information, that is, speech or writing. Fragments of spoken language can be preserved in writing, although, for the most part, Russian language of the eighteenth-century is accessible to us only as written language. This, in turn can be divided into printed, engraved, and handwritten texts.

Handwritten documents are quite heterogeneous: some texts are the result of meticulous preparation while others represent little more than scribbling. Rather than dividing handwritten documents according to genre or text type, I suggest dividing them into three groups labeled elaborate, intermediate, and basic, based on how carefully they have been prepared.

Documents in the elaborate group show evidence of meticulous preparation. Evidence of such preparation exists in the form of drafts archived along with a fair copy, or documents carefully penned in ceremonial cursive (парадная скоропись). This group includes official documents originating in the central Imperial administration or in close proximity to it. Such texts were produced by professional scribes. The intermediate group is by far the largest and consists of

---

20 Regional Archives, Uppsala, Södermanland, Landskontoret, D VI 17 (Your Highness, [I am] Your Lordship’s humble servant).
21 National Archives of Sweden, Muscovitica 664.
civil and military administrative documents and correspondence. Such documents are often written by professionals but display fewer features of careful editing than the documents in the *elaborate* group. Finally, the *basic* group includes texts that show little or no signs of having been edited. They may or may not be written by a professional scribe and may represent a draft or a simple note.

### 6.3.1 Change of Printed Medium: A Weather Phenomenon in Spain

In late December of 1743, a curious phenomenon was observed and heard in Cartagena, Spain. The incident was so remarkable that it sparked an interest across Europe. Exactly what caused the incident is difficult to say. Perhaps it was an electrical discharge or parts of a meteorite breaking up in Earth’s atmosphere.

In Russia, an article about the event was published in the *Vedomosti*. Later, this *Vedomosti* text was transliterated from the civil typeface to a more traditional one, engraved, and printed in the form of a popular print. The Russian text was a translation from a source in some other language. Although not identical, the Russian and English texts contain significant similarities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the <em>Vedomosti</em> version</th>
<th>the <em>lubok</em> version</th>
<th>the <em>Scots Magazine</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Въ четвертокъ февраля 16. дня 1744. года.</td>
<td>Вчетвертокъ февраля 16 днѧ 1744.</td>
<td>A surprising Phenomenon was observed at Carthage in Old Spain on the 17th of December. About five in the evening there appeared, on the side of the mountain of Roland, situate some leagues to the West of that city,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Изъ Мадрида отъ 6. января</td>
<td>измандрида отъ 6: генваря.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Изъ Картагены увѣдомляютъ, что декабра 28. дня поутру въ началѣ 6. часа</td>
<td>Изъ Картагены 8вѣдомляютъ что декабра 28 дня поутрѣ въ началѣ 6 часа</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>усмотреть на воздухъ весьма чрезвычайное явленіе</td>
<td>усмотрѣнно на воздухѣ весьма чрезвычайное явление</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Въ четвертокъ февраля 16. дня 1744. года.</td>
<td>Вчетвертокъ февраля 16 днѧ 1744.</td>
<td>A surprising Phenomenon was observed at Carthage in Old Spain on the 17th of December. About five in the evening there appeared, on the side of the mountain of Roland, situate some leagues to the West of that city,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Изъ Мадрида отъ 6. января</td>
<td>измандрида отъ 6: генваря.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Изъ Картагены увѣдомляютъ, что декабра 28. дня поутру въ началѣ 6. часа</td>
<td>Изъ Картагены 8вѣдомляютъ что декабра 28 дня поутрѣ въ началѣ 6 часа</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>усмотреть на воздухъ весьма чрезвычайное явленіе</td>
<td>усмотрѣнно на воздухѣ весьма чрезвычайное явление</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>the Vedomosti version</strong>&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th><strong>the lubok version</strong>&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th><strong>the Scots Magazine</strong>&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>къ Роландовой горѣ, которая лежитъ на нѣсколько миль отъ помянутого города къ западу.</td>
<td>оно представляло огонь на подобие рѣки въ немалой широтѣ разливающейся, которое/рои распространилась къ востоку, и производилъ такую ясность, что глаза едва того терпѣть могли.</td>
<td>a vast stream of light, resembling a river of fire, with a kind of fall or cascade; which afterwards formed a sort of sheet of fire, extending several leagues to the East, affording so bright a light, that the eye could scarce endure it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Послѣ сего перемѣнилась оная рѣка въ горящей шарѣ, которой на нѣкоторое расстояніе по воздуху катались, вдругъ раздѣлись на 4. разныя огня, изъ которыхъ одинъ съ великою силою обратился къ северу, другой къ югу, третій къ востоку, а четвертой къ западу,</td>
<td>послѣ сего перемѣнилась оная рѣка въ горящей шарѣ, которои на нѣкоторое расположіе по воздухѣ катались, вдругъ раздѣлись на 4 разныя огня, изъ которымъ одинъ съ великою силою обратился къ сѣверу, другому къ югу, третьемъ къ востоку, а четвертой къ западу.</td>
<td>There afterwards appeared a great globe of fire beneath it, which, in the space of some minutes, broke into four lesser balls, that flew off to the North, South, East, and West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и при томъ здѣлся такой жестокой громъ, что всѣ жители на нѣсколько миль вокругъ оной услыпывши, устрашились.</td>
<td>и при томъ здѣлся такой жестокой громъ, что всѣ жители на нѣсколько миль вокругъ оной услыпывши устрашились.</td>
<td>This irruption (sic!—T.R.) was attended with a clap of thunder, so loud, that it wakened, and even stunned, the inhabitants for several leagues around.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Послѣ сего сльышны были еще 4. другие такіе удары, но не такъ сильны какъ первой,</td>
<td>Послѣ сего сльышны были еще 4. другіе такие удары, но не такъ сильны какъ первой.</td>
<td>The four lesser balls broke each with a thunder-clap, but nothing near so loud as the first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>а чрезъ все сіе время небо было весьма ясно, также и звѣзды сильно свѣтлыми.</td>
<td>и чрезъ все сіе время небо было весьма ясно (sic!—T.R.) ласно, также и звезды сильно свѣтлыми</td>
<td>During the whole time, the sky was perfectly serene, and the stars shone very bright.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a business perspective, the easiest thing for the producer of the lubok version would have been to simply copy the civil typeface text of the Vedomosti version without alterations. The transliteration of the entire text to a more traditional graphic style and orthography was a labor-intensive process and occurred for a reason. In all probability, the producer of the lubok version was aware of the reading habits of his intended audience and knew that it was unfamiliar with text printed in the civil typeface. This, in turn, supports the idea that during the
1740s, texts printed in the civil typeface were not very common among ordinary people.

6.3.2 Speech to Writing: Witness Statements

Fragments of spoken language from the eighteenth century are scarce. However, legal documents, such as witness statements may contain short passages of spoken language. The following example, taken from a witness statement, tells the story of a conflict between a landlady and a group of soldiers living in her house. A fight breaks out when the landlady tears the sheet from one of the beds:

... в то время/ пришла квартиры моих хозяев/ прастью с постелью которою товарищи мои/ гранодеръ Василя Егоровъ вырвал 8 н\\u043em обратно/ j за то сержантъ шиповалъ ево Егорова/ \(8\)дари вощокъ и обявленно \(sic!\)—T.R.) м\\u043eжикъ нылъ/ юнъ сонъ схватилъ ево зади за волосы j повалилъ промеж к\\u043eля м\\u043eки и шкапа j сель коленками/ на гр\\u043eди и били к\\u043eлакомъ по голове j бранилъ/ р\\u043eсинъ каналия шелма а потомъ схва/演化 ткпоящикъ близ шкапа р\\u043eже j бил прикъ/ладомъ в гр\\u043eди и (\(sic!\)—T.R.) сорвал на немъ р\\u043eба/шк8 тогда онои Егоровъ схватил за при/клад одной р\\u043eюо и заказрил мн\\u043em јто все (\(sic!\)—T.R.) сила чтоб ево отнял ибо тотъ м\\u043eжикъ бьетъ ево см\\u043eртено а м\\u043eя сержантъ/ шиповалъ тогда тоскал за волосы/ а квартиры мои хозяень работник j дёвка/ 8хватя меня поперекъ и за р\\u043eки держали чтоб ево Егорова отъ побояи я н\\u043em отнелъ о\\u043eнакоj/ 8сльша тотъ ево Егорова крикъ приб\\u043emалъ еще гранодеръ быковъ и какъ приб\\u043emалъ/ то оне j спужали бить меня j Егорова/ покинули j покинувши пошли вонъ отъ насъ/ то я вк\\u043em въ гранодеромъ сержантъ Едоровымъ о тех своих побояхъ на обявленного м\\u043eжика/ нилъ юнсона пришедъ 8 г\\u043emна подпор\\u043emъчика/ ёорма простили дк и онои м\\u043eжикъ пришедъ на дворъ к подпор\\u043emъчикъ8 почему онои г\\u043emднъ подпор\\u043emъчникъ сего амръ привал к себ\\u044c нацmana\(^{26}\) и говорил ем8 чтоб зато м\\u043eжика штрао/вал и далъ бы сати свакцю то онои лецманъ/ штраё ем8 никакова н\\u043em 8чинил за чтоб

\(^{26}\) Sw. лё́нсман (county sheriff).
The witness statement is taken from a group of documents containing a statement by the grenadier Afanasii Shcherbakov, a statement by his fellow soldier Vasilii Fëdorov, and a statement by an officer, Lieutenant Andreian von Amers. The different versions tell the same story in almost identical words. While it is tempting to consider Shcherbakov’s statement as a case of spoken language transferred to writing, we must apply caution. It may well be that the language of the statements has been edited by the scribe, Nikifor Riabov, the sergeant Aleksandr Starkov, who signed the documents, or by some unnamed commanding officer. This example illustrates that it is indeed very difficult to access the spoken language of the 1740s.

6.4 Processing Circumstances

Processing circumstances differ widely between the various parts of the material. Printed texts and the elaborate group of handwritten texts are the result of careful editing.

In one case, we have access to a draft as well as the finished product. The document in question is a manifesto published in the name of the infant Emperor, Ioann Antonovich. In reaction to the declaration of war by Sweden in late July, 1741, the Russian government published a manifesto in mid-August. The printed version was signed by the young Tsar’s mother, the regent Anna Leopoldovna.
There is also a German version translated from Russian. What is most important for the present investigation is the preservation of the handwritten draft of the text, entitled *Formular manifesta* (Формуляръ манифеста). This document allows us to follow the changes that were introduced when a handwritten text was typeset. The printed version appears in the left column below and the handwritten draft in the right. In the handwritten draft, some words have been crossed out and others have been added. The additions appear in bold:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Манифестъ.</th>
<th>Формуляръ манифеста</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Божію милостію Мы Иоаннъ третій, императоръ и самодержецъ всероссійскій.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Хотя отъ короны Шведской какъ съ того времени что Мы на Самодержавной и наслѣдной Нашъ Всероссійской Императорской престоль вступили, такъ и прежде того при предкахъ Нашихъ Блаженныя и Вѣчнодостойныя памяти ИМПЕРАТОРСКИХЪ ВЕЛИЧЕСТВЪ, по заключеніи со Всероссійскою имперіею съ 1721 году вчнаго мира трактата, и потомъ постановленныхъ и съ обоихъ сторонъ подтвержденныхъ союзовъ, къ Нашей имперіи въ разныхъ случаяхъ множественныя предосудительныя и нарушительныя оному блаженному миру поступки происходили,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Бжіею мѣстію мы иоаннъ третій</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Хотя отъ короны шведской какъ при нашемъ втруствованіи съ того времени что мы на самодержавной и наслѣдной нѣмъ всероссійскои императорскои престолъ вступили,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>такъ и прежде того при предкахъ нашихъ, блаженныя и вѣчнодостойныя памяти императорскихъ величествъ, по заключеніи совероссійскою имперіею въ 1721 го6 вечного мира трактата,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и потомъ постановленныхъ и съ обоихъ сторонъ подтвержденныхъ союзовъ къ нашей имперіи въ разныхъ случаяхъ множественныя предосудительныя и нарушительныя обнам блаженному миру поступки происходили,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

30 Comparisons of printed texts with their handwritten drafts have been undertaken before by Zhivov, who analyzed the *Geometria*, printed in 1708, with its draft, cf. Zhivov, Ocherki, 186.
Маніфест.

и особливо от нѣкоторых льть къ
наилучшивающемся Намъ оскорблению и
пожерщдению Нашихъ интересовъ и
gосударства Нашего благополучія, отъ оной
короны такихъ недружескихъ и злобныхъ
образомъ къ Намъ поступлено, что отъ
явно декларированного непріятеля вящие и
горше того ожидать было невозможно, какъ
весь безпрістрастной свѣтъ, предъ очами
котораго все то происходило, праведное
свидѣтельство тому подать не отречется.

Однако жъ Мы желая оной вѣчнаго
мира трактатъ и союзъ съ своей стороны
свѣтъ и ненарушимо содержать, и дабы
Наши вѣрные поданныя плодами мира
и благословеніемъ отъ Всевышшаго
Бога покоямъ въ совершенной тишинѣ
пользоваться могли,

все то съ терпѣливою сносилъ, упова, что
при усмотрѣніи такой Нашей великодушной
неотвѣчаемой умѣренности напослѣдокъ съ
Шведской стороны всѣ противны мирному
трактату поступки дружескимъ образомъ
къ полѣвъ и благополучію обоихъ странъ
поданныхъ поправлены и пресѣчены будуть,
къ чему съ Нашей стороны съ вѣрнаго
желанія къ непоколебимому содержанію мира
и покоя, ко убѣжанію Богу противной войны
и напраснаго человѣческаго кровопролитія
не оставлены, всякѣ пристойны и съ
Императорскимъ достоинствомъ Нашимъ
cходныя пути употреблять.

Однако жъ всѣ тѣ Наші миролюбительныя
поступки, вмѣсто желаемаго доброго успѣха
только къ тому служили, что сія короны зло
злымъ умножать продолжала, и ужъ давно
предвѣдимое свое намѣреніе, къ начатію
явной неправдѣ войны толь скорѣй къ
dѣйствіе произвести поспѣшила, понеже
получена нынѣ изъ Стокгольма вѣдомость,
что помянутая корона Шведская наруша
явля имѣющеей съ Нами вѣчнаго мира
трактатъ и союзъ минувшаго Июля 24 числа
противъ Нась и Нашей Всероссійской
имперіи войну дѣйствительно объявила, и о
томь въ Стокгольмѣ въ народѣ публиковано,
якоже межъ тѣмъ и Шведскіе войска и
карабини и други военныя суда къ дѣйствіямъ
воинскимъ ужѣ въ готовности находятся.

Формулярь маніфеста

и особливо от нѣкоторых льть къ
наилучшивающемся намъ оскорблению и
пожерщдению нѣкоторыхъ интересовъ и дѣйствъ
нѣкоторого доброго непріятеля вящие и горше того
ожидать было невозможно какъ всѣ
безпрістрастной свѣтъ предъ очами
котораго всѣ то происходило праведное
свидѣтельство тому подать не отречется.

однакожь мы желая оной вѣчнаго
мира трактатъ и союзъ съ своей стороны
свѣтъ и ненарушимо содержать, и дабы
наши вѣрные поданныя плодами мира
и благословеніемъ всѣ всевышшаго
Божа покоямъ въ совершенной тишинѣ
пользоваться могли;

все то съ терпѣливою сносилъ упова, что
при усмотрѣніи такого нашей
великодушного нѣдѣлѣмого вѣрности
напослѣдокъ съ шведской стороны всѣ
противны

мирномъ трактатѣ поступки дружескими
образомъ къ полѣвъ и благополучію
обоихъ странъ

поданныхъ поправлены и пресѣчены

68889,

къ сенѣ съ нашей стороны всѣ вѣрнаго желанія
къ непоколебимому содержанію мира
и покоя ко убѣжанію боѣ противной
войны и напраснаго человѣческаго
кровопролитія не оставлены всѣки
пристойны и съ императорскимъ
dостоинствомъ нашимъ sходныя пути
употреблять;

однакожь всѣ тѣ наши миролюбительныя
поступки вмѣсто желаемаго доброго
успѣха только къ тому служили что сия
корона зло злымъ умножать продолжала и
дѣйственно вѣдомость что помянутая корона

по послѣдней подчина нѣкѣ изъ Стокгольма
вѣдомость что помянутая корона
Ми́ниестрь. | Формуля́рь маніфєста
---|---
шведскія на́рдла я" висо имьющае съ нами вѣчнаго мира тракта́тъ и соо́ль минувающего | шведскія на́рдла я" висо имьющае съ нами вѣчнаго мира тракта́тъ и соо́ль минувающего
юля 24 жися противъ насъ и нажен всероссийскому йымереръ войну8 обявила, и о томъ въ Стокгольмѣ въ народь публиковано, я"ко межъ тѣмъ и шведскія войска, и
карабчи и дрѣгие военные сѣда къ дѣйствамъ воинскимъ уже въ готовности
находяться.//
Между не́тьрными и дикими бг | Между не́тьрными и дикими бг
неисповѣдающими паганами не токмо | неисповѣдающими паганами не токмо
межъ храниксиическими державами еще не | межъ храниксиическими державами еще не
смыкало было, чтобъ не объявля напередь | смыкало было, чтобъ не объявля напередь
о причинахъ неудовольства своего, или | о причинахъ неудовольства своего, или
не ученя по послѣдней мѣрѣ хотя мало | не ученя по послѣдней мѣрѣ хотя мало
основанныхъ жалобъ, и не требуя о | основанныхъ жалобъ, и не требуя о
прійстомъ поправленіи оныхъ войну начать, какъ то дѣйствительно нынѣ отъ | прійстомъ поправленіи оныхъ войну начать, какъ то дѣйствительно нынѣ отъ
Швеціи чини".
При такому оной коронамъ мира нарушений и | При такому оной коронамъ мира нарушений и
объявленной противъ Насъ, и Нашего | объявленной противъ Насъ, и Нашего
имперіи войнѣ, Мы по положенному на | имперіи войнѣ, Мы по положенному на
Насъ отъ Бога о безопасности Нашыхъ | Насъ отъ Бога о безопасности Нашыхъ
gосударствъ попеченію необходимо | государствъ попеченію необходимо
принуждены, для обороны и защищенія | принуждены, для обороны и защищенія
gосударствъ, и вѣрныхъ Нашихъ | государствъ, и вѣрныхъ Нашихъ
поданныхъ призвавъ въ помощь | поданныхъ призвавъ въ помощь
всеправеднаго и всемогущаго Бога, отъ | всеправеднаго и всемогущаго Бога, отъ
негоже Намъ дарованные силы употребить, | негоже Намъ дарованные силы употребить,
и чрезъ оружіе государства и подданныхъ | и чрезъ оружіе государства и подданныхъ
Нашихъ отъ семъ мира нарушенія и | Нашихъ отъ семъ мира нарушенія и
злостнаго непріятеля, надлежаще защищать | злостнаго непріятеля, надлежаще защищать
и оборонять.
Того ради Мы о томъ чрезъ сие ко | Того ради Мы о томъ чрезъ сие ко
всенародному извѣстію публиковать повелѣли, дабы всѣ Нашѣ вѣрны подданные о семѣ вѣдали, и всевышшему Богу о | всенародному извѣстію публиковать повелѣли, дабы всѣ Нашѣ вѣрны подданные о семѣ вѣдали, и всевышшему Богу о
благословленіи къ ихъ собственной пользѣ | благословленіи къ ихъ собственной пользѣ
и оборонѣ употребляемыхъ Нашихъ противъ Шведовъ праведныхъ оружей, | и оборонѣ употребляемыхъ Нашихъ противъ Шведовъ праведныхъ оружей,
усердно и со всѣми благоговѣніемъ молились, и отъ него яко отъ источника всѣхъ блага щастливаго благоповѣдія | усердно и со всѣми благоговѣніемъ молились, и отъ него яко отъ источника всѣхъ блага щастливаго благоповѣдія
сихъ справѣдливыхъ Нашихъ намѣреніи просили, въ чемъ и толь наікрѣпчайшую твердую и бессмѣрную надежду на | въ чемъ и толь наікрѣпчайшую твердую и бессмѣрную надежду на
всемогущество его имѣть, яко оной есть | всемогущество его имѣть, яко оной есть
отмститель неправды, и да ввергнетъ враговъ | отмститель неправды, и да ввергнетъ враговъ
и супостатовъ Нашихъ въ яму, юже Намъ | и супостатовъ Нашихъ въ яму, юже Намъ
искаяывают.

Манифест.

Впрочемъ чрезъ сие какъ подданнымъ такъ и всѣмъ прочимъ службою и присягами Намъ обязаннымъ Всемилостивѣйшее повелѣвается,

отъ сего времени съ подданными Швецкой короны никакой коммуникаціи, пересылокъ, комерціи и корреспонденціи всякаго званія не имѣть, и отъ всякаго неприятельскаго нападенія, отъ шпионовъ и другихъ подобныхъ неприятельскихъ людей и предвоспрѣятіи быть всегда во всякой твердой осторожности, и при всѣхъ случаяхъ за Насъ, государство и отечество Наше стоять и защищать не щадя жизни своей, какъ вернымъ подданнымъ по присяжной своѣй должности принадлежитъ и достоинъ, подъ опасеніемъ за неисполненіе сего тяжчайшаго отвѣта и жестокаго наказанія, для вящаго увѣренія всѣмъ мы сей Нашъ манифестъ во всей Нашей имперіи публиковать повелѣли. Данъ въ Санктпетербургѣ Августа 13 дня 1741 года.

Подлинной подписанъ именемъ ЕГО ИМПЕРАТОРСКАГО ВЕЛИЧЕСТВА Ея Императорскаго Высочества Государыни Великой Княгини и Правительницы всея Россіи собственною рукою, тако: АННА.

МП

Печатанъ въ Санктпетербургѣ при Сенатѣ Августа 14 дня 1741 года.

Comparing the printed text to its handwritten draft, we find many alterations. The number of characters has been reduced, excluding variation such as ⟨у/ꙋ⟩. The orthography and punctuation has been modified to correspond to the practices of the Senate printing office. The character ⟨ѣ⟩ is found in both the draft and printed text. In the draft it is not used in all etymologically correct positions. This error is corrected in the printed version. In the spelling of case forms of the adjectives, occasional differences are found in the Genitive singular, such as ⟨-ѡгѡ⟩ (draft) vs. ⟨-аго⟩ (print) but this is not systematic. In the morphology, the draft we find a Genitive singular ingleton where the printed version has года. Both the draft and printed version contain one example of an aorist (наруш.), which was most likely chosen in order to add to the solemnity and
gravity (cf. below, section 8.1). In almost all cases, the differences between the draft and the printed version of the manifesto are of a graphic and orthographic nature. A plausible interpretation is that such alterations were made routinely by those involved in the typesetting process. At the same time, other elements have not been corrected, not even the obviously faulty interpretation of империя (empire) as a masculine noun: (Насъ, и Нашего империя) (printed version). Elsewhere in the manifesto the word is treated correctly as a feminine noun.

6.5 Setting

Most of the texts available for this investigation were produced in and for the public sphere. The printed texts were, of course, produced in order to be read by an audience, and the purpose of administrative documents was to convey public information or to request such information. There is one source that represents the private sphere: personal correspondence. We can assume that private letters and personal notes were produced in great quantities during the 1740s but, unfortunately, have been poorly preserved.

6.6 Communicative Purpose

In the corpus of texts gathered for the present investigation, many different communicative purposes can be identified: information, family matters etc. Other purposes are less frequent, such as entertainment. At the high end of the social spectrum, we find that by the 1740s opera librettos were being translated into Russian and printed by the Academy of Sciences. One such work was the opera Seleuco with its libretto by Giuseppe Bonecchi. The Russian translation is anonymous but associated with the names of A. V. Olsuf’ev and A. P. Sumarokov. For the majority, written texts intended for entertainment took the form of traditional novels and chapbooks, so-called lubok. Sometimes, a text could “migrate” functionally, as in the case of the newspaper article on the meteorological phenomenon in Cartagena, taken over from Vedomosti. This was transliterated and printed with an illustration, likely meant to arouse people’s imagination, it would enjoy a long afterlife.

6.7 Topics

The data in the present investigation was gathered from texts dealing with a wide range of topics, including science, news, diplomacy, information, administration, and more. Only a small portion of the material concerns the private sphere.

6.8 Conclusions

This chapter has presented a situational analysis of texts in Russian from the 1740s. The analysis has resulted in several important points that must be considered when conclusions are made about the Russian language of the 1740s.

The first and most important observation is that men produced the entire corpus of texts. Although women are referred to in the texts, and some of the texts have been signed by women, no single text can be positively identified as written by a woman. The age of the men behind the texts cannot be precisely determined. However, since so much of the material was written by professional scribes, it is reasonable to conclude that the writers were adult men, probably aged between twenty and fifty. No texts written by children have been identified in the material.

Some texts were written by highly educated men although the majority of texts appear to have been written by individuals who had an intermediate educational background, that is, professional scribes. Secondly, most of the material was written by professional scribes, who were part of the official administration. Even in texts whose contents can be classified as private, the author’s involvement is often limited to a greeting and a signature. Since the production of the texts often involved more than one person, conclusions regarding the personal linguistic habits of individuals require great caution.

Finally, any comments concerning the social background of authors must also be made with great care. In most cases, professional scribes were young men from outside the nobility. Because many documents were produced jointly by several people, they contain little linguistic evidence of their social background.

When examining texts in Russian from the 1740s, we must realize that they come nowhere near to showing us the true picture of the Russian linguistic situation. They do, however, provide glimpses into parts of the linguistic reality.
From a linguistic point of view, using written sources to learn about language is riddled with problems because “a written record of a speech event stands like a filter between the words as spoken and the analyst.” Like any other investigation of the distant past, written records is our only option when investigating the registers of Russian in the 1740s. So far, in the previous chapters, we have investigated the circumstances under which texts were created, and we have drawn some tentative conclusion about the people who created them. In chapter 6, we saw that the majority of sources available were written by professional scribes. The number of *bona fide* autographs, also known as holographs, that is, documents written in the author’s own hand and linked to an identified individual, is minimal. In the present chapter, the focus of attention will shift to the linguistic evidence offered by the sources. The goal of this linguistic analysis is to investigate orthography, morphology, syntax and vocabulary, and how these can be linked to various registers of the language.

The general development of Russian morphology during the eighteenth century, as it is reflected in printed sources, is comparatively well known thanks to research performed during recent decades (cf. chapter 2). The same is true for the vocabulary found in printed texts (cf. section 4.1.2).

### 7.1 Autographs

In an attempt to get a glimpse of the living Russian language of the 1740s, a natural starting point is to examine autographs. As already stated, such sources are scarce in the corpus gathered for the present investigation. Another obvious weakness of the corpus is its glaring gender bias. Considerable efforts to locate sources written by women have yielded no results.

---

7.1.1 Mate Filipp Lanikin’s Receipt

The first autograph to be examined is a short receipt. It is written and signed in the same hand. Judging by the signature, the signature belonged to First Mate Filipp Lanikin of the Russian imperial navy. A brief explanation of the document’s context will assist in its interpretation.

While maneuvering in Stockholm Harbor during the summer of 1748, a Swedish merchant vessel collided with the Russian ship Shturman. The Shturman was a small ship, known as a galiot, propelled by sail and oars. Memory of the collision would have faded quickly were it not for the fact that it resulted in minor damage to the rigging of the Russian ship. The parties involved did not agree on the issue of compensation, and the authorities were notified. From the Russian side, the case was handled by the ambassador to Stockholm, later the famous foreign minister of Catherine the Great, Nikita Ivanovich Panin (1718–1783). In the end, Peter Brauer, the captain of the Swedish merchantman, agreed to pay three Dutch ducats for the damages sustained by the Russian ship, and its first mate gave him a receipt.

The receipt is written in an untidy cursive. The shaping of the characters ⟨л⟩, ⟨ш⟩, ⟨ѣ⟩, and ⟨ъ⟩ support the idea that the document was written and signed by the same person, first mate Filip Lanikin. The document gives the impression that it was written in a hurry. Also, the form ⟨затолою⟩ is an obvious error for an intended ⟨золотою⟩ and may also support this interpretation. The character variants in the document include ⟨у⟩/⟨ꙋ⟩ and ⟨ф⟩/⟨ѳ⟩. The character ⟨ѣ⟩ is entirely absent. The text contains relatively few superscripts and among those included, ⟨и⟩ and ⟨м⟩ are reduced to slanting lines.\(^2\)

---

\(^2\) Swedish National Archives, Muscovitica 628, Ryska beskickningar, memorial och noter 1744–58, Panin 1748–58.

\(^3\) Cf. the illustration in Cherepnin, Russkaia paleografiia, 444.
Among noteworthy examples of spelling, we find the form ⟨принелъ⟩, modern принял(accepted), and the forms ⟨наци⟩ and ⟨россискаго⟩ for нации (nation) and российского (Russian). In both these cases, we would have expected a double ⟨ии⟩. Lanikin’s spelling ⟨россискаго⟩ shows that he had been taught a spelling, which deviates from the pronunciation [-əvə]. Michael Groening, in his grammar from 1750, lists two possible spellings of the Genetive singular of adjectives in the masculine: доброго and доброва.4 Lomonosov allows only -аго.5 The adjectival endings in Nominative/Accusative plural appear to be gender-neutral: запорченые … вещи (referring to feminine noun) and которые червонцы (referring to a masculine noun).

The text contains a syntactically interesting clause: a relative clause with a repeated antecedent,

… три червонца которые червонцы/ галландская …

Zhivov claims that this construction disappears forever from the new linguistic standard during the second half of the 1730s.6 In business texts such as Lanikin’s receipt, however, the construction obviously remains.

Despite being very short, the text of the receipt contains a number of nautical terms of Dutch and German origin:

боумъ кливеръ шпирта (a triangular sail on the bowsprit, from Dutch kluiver),
гюисъ (jack, from Dutch geus),
элашток (jackstaf, from Dutch vlaggenstok, vlagstok), and
кезерсъ влаг (imperial flag, from German Kaiserflagge)

The meaning of ⟨шпира⟩ is unclear but might be “finial.” It is obviously related to Dutch spire (point, summit).

The composition of the receipt follows a clear pattern: date, payer, specification, amount paid, and signature. A similar structure is found in other receipts from the period, written by professional scribes and signed by military officers:

5 Lomonosov, Rossiiskaia grammatika, 77.
[hand 1] 1744 году февреля 6 дня дана сия квитанция в том что взято в городе Линикинга два коркинга лощадей шесть; пар кекс' голмского полку под денежную казну и от коркинга до мызы нес разстоянием; два коркинга до сонной мызы две мили; оныя вышеописанные подводы шесть; пар под сонной денежною казною два коркинга, сонной мызы были в том сия им и квитанция дана; [hand 2] прапорщик к: шаховский⁷

And in the following:

[hand 1] Квитанция/ 1744 году 8 июля.3д. дня дана сия квитанция сьркинскому обывателю магнись. 8дюю сонд в том что имелся он на данной из коркинга шведской яхте шхипорном на которой посадены были нйсовское пехотное полку садаты и протчия чинны таюки и полковъ тягости погружены на которой яхте он шхипор от коркинга до острова романскъ прибылъ благополучно котдой и отпущен обратно в коркинг в чем и подпис[ую]сь/ [hand 2] A.S. von Brevern⁸

Similarly structured receipts were produced all over the Russian Empire at the time.⁹

Lanikin’s adherence to the structure suggests different possibilities: that he was previously familiar with the structure of receipts, that he had a written template, or that the structure was dictated to him. Either way, his short text is a witness to the central role played by templates in Russian eighteenth-century writing.

From the perspective of registers, Lanikin’s receipt can be associated with two of the hypothetical registers suggested in section 5.2.2: traditional administrative language and professional language. The receipt format clearly belongs in the traditional administrative language, while the use of nautical terminology

---


⁸ Swedish National Archives, Military Archives, 1742–58, års krigsrustningshandlingar, Div. krigsrustningshandlingar 1744-46, vol. 10; Rosén, “Fragmenty odnoi voyny,” 64.

⁹ Cf. Mezhenina and Maiorov, Delovaia pis’mennost’ Troitskogo Selenginskogo monastyr, 114.
suggests that a new register had developed in Russian at this point: it was now possible to discuss nautical matters in Russian.

7.1.2 Mikhail Turchenikov’s Letter and Its Cultural Context

In the summer of 1742, in the second year of war between Russia and Sweden, a merchant vessel, the *fluyt Somers*, captained by one Cornelius Kurt, was boarded and captured by units of the Royal Swedish Navy. The incident took place off the island of Hogland (Ru: Гогланд, Fi: Suursaari) in the Gulf of Finland. The thirty-six-member Russian crew, under the command of its captain, Cornelius Kurt, and a commissar of the fleet, Prince Mikhail Petrovich Ukhtomskii, was brought to Stockholm as prisoners of war.

Mikhail Turchenikov was one of the navy cadets on board the *Somers* en route to various other ships of the Imperial navy where they were to receive training by serving as second mates. Since Turchenikov held this junior training position, it can be assumed that he was a very young person, perhaps in his mid- to late teens. Most likely, he was educated during the late 1730s and early 1740s.

A letter from Turchenikov to his parents is preserved in the National archives of Sweden. The letter was never sent, most likely because there was an armistice, and the prisoners of war were released. Turchenikov writes in his own hand:

| milostivyi moy гдерь/ batюшка герасимъ јванови/чъ и milostivai moy гдерь матушка матрен/а/ stепановна/ желаю вам/ гдерьмъ мои (sic!—T.R.) во множество/ летъ здравствовалъ и з государ/ями моими братцами/ а о себе доношу ежели изволните/ milostiu svoego napametovam/ и я по нещастию своему взятъ въ полонъ въ 23 числа/ при гоглантье острове въ швед/скихъ во полонъ и по/ ныне обретаюсь при стекгольм/ за помощью божескою живъ хотя/ и содежуся по милости токмо/ в пропитани по милости!/ королевскаго величества/ я нужды не имею и для нашей/ краинои нужды выданъ намъ и мне/ покорно васъ гдерь батюшка/ просшу пожаловать отдать/ мои нижанишки поконь гдерь/ моему и зато петру гаврилеви/чъ и гдерьне мой сестрице/ лукере гересимовн въсем/ нашим |

приятелям/ присем писав[ъ] вашъ/ государей мой покорны/ слуга и сынъ миха/ила турченковъ/ земны свои поклон/ отдаю и благословения вашего/ прошу ... // а кто изъ наших 8ченниковъ/ со мною обретаются о том/ явствуеть ниже сего/ гаврила богомоловъ/ юванъ кандратевъ/ семень никифоровъ/ дмитре серебренковъ/ василен дунаевъ 8мре при сътек/голме/ мца ноября дня/ 1742 году/

On the reverse side:

пожаловатъ 8мдать сие/ писмо в санктъ питер/буркхе во адмиралтенстве/ чесоваго дела мастеру/ герасиму ивановичу турченку/ никову/ истекголма

Mikhail Turchenikov probably did not spend his days writing letters. His handwriting is unwieldy, he sometimes corrects himself, and his orthography reflects his pronunciation: ⟨эъ полонъ⟩, ⟨мундеръ⟩. Turchenikov’s addressee, his father, the clockmaker Gerasim Ivanovich, whose name and title are found on the back of the letter, offers an interesting example of pronunciation and spelling norms: ⟨чесоваго дела мастеру герасиму ивановичу турченкову⟩. The word ⟨чесоваго⟩ may suggest that the writer pronounced the reduced /a/ of the first syllable as [е], an example of eкан’e (еканье). The form ⟨-аго⟩ of the Genetive singular of the adjective is a spelling rule, most probably learned at school.

Although Turchenikov’s letter is an autograph, it is a poor witness to the writer’s personal linguistic habits apart from the information offered by the spelling. This is partly because of its brevity, partly also because the entire content, with the exception of personal names, are formulaic expressions typical of the traditional epistolary style, or information borrowed from another source. The reason why Turchenikov’s letter has been chosen as an example is that it forms part of a group of closely related texts. The documents, which are held at the National Archives of Sweden, consist of an official report and three personal letters. Apart from Turchennikov’s text, the other two letters were, for the most part, written by an anonymous scribe who left no clues as to his identity. He was, presumably, one of the persons listed in the report to the Admiralty. The second

11 National Archives of Sweden, Militaria 1588.
12 L. L. Kasatkin, “Ekan’e,” in Russkii iazyk: Entsiklopedii, ed. F. P. Filin (Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediiia, 1979), 81. Today, ekan’e is found in central and northern dialects of Russian and was considered the normative pronunciation during the nineteenth century.
hand in these letters belongs to Prince Ukhtomskii, also added short sentences at the end of the letters.

The official report belongs to a genre known as *donoshenie* (доношение), a message from a subordinate official to a higher-level authority. It was also written by a scribe and signed by Prince Mikhail Petrovich Ukhtomskii. Mikhail Petrovich was a progeny of the ‘Tver’ branch of the Ukhtomskii family of nobles, as far as can be established. He survived his time as a prisoner of war, was repatriated and went on to pursue his military career. He retired in 1771 as a lieutenant colonel and krigs-komisar. Based on this genealogical data, Mikhail Petrovich Ukhtomskii was a young man during his time as a prisoner of war, probably in his twenties. If this assumption is correct, he was most likely educated during the 1730s.

a) *The Report*

The report was prepared by Prince Mikhail Ukhtomskii for his superiors at the Admiralty explaining the circumstances surrounding the capture and imprisonment:

В государственно Адмиралтействъ коллегию/ Покор-неишвье доношение/ В нынешнем годѣ въ июне мѣсяц въ 19./ числѣ командированы мы изъ главной кронштатской канторы/ надъ портомъ во елотъ на флотѣ/ сомерсе съ шхиперомъ корнильдѣсь кгѣртмъ которой флотъ нагруженъ/ был пивомъ при оному же елоте и ко/мандиръ былъ помяндойъ шхиперѣ/ я и академи ѵченникѣ въ должности/ подштурманской „6“, члвкѣ поса/женъ на оной флотъ для отво/дѣ на разные карабайъ ж во ономъ же/ мѣсяци а „23“, числѣ взятъ мы при ѳстрове гогланте въ полонъ въ ѳлѣтъ и содержали/ при ономъ/ елоте сентябрѣ по „28“, числѣ а во ѣ/ном числѣ изо ѳлѣтѣ отосланы/ въ стекголмѣ где и по ныне обретаемся/ и по высокой егѣ къролевскаго величества милости ж высокопревосходительныхъ гсдѣ/ сенаторовъ ученена съ нами милость/ и для нашен краинѣ нѣды какъ мне/ такъ и академи ѵченникамъ „5“, члвкѣмъ/ выданъ мѣндири о взроѣ нѣшей а гсдѣ/ снятелны графѣ и сенаторъ Юлинбужѣ/

13 Malitikov, *Kratkii slovar’,* 60.
14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
милоściю своею мне отдал взятъ/ от меня „12„ червонцо притом же объявил что/ досталося платье и денги отобранное/ от меня и от прочих слѣжителя возвратно/ нам отдано бѣдѣть да и матросам же на/шим мѣнцер выдан бѣдѣть же притом/ же изволилъ приказать мне чтоб юмет/ над вышереченными учениками я матрѣ/замѣ камиандѣ и обо всем обстоятельнѣ/ писать в санктѣ петербѣрхѣ в камиандѣ а в пропитаній и в содержаніи нас явять/ к нам всякая высокѣю свою милость а содѣй жились под караѣлом токмо для нѣжды/ выходом свободно а шхиперь куртъ умеръ/ вѣ их швецом елоте авгѣста „22„ дня а ско/лѣ ю каки чинов взеты в полонъ ј с того/ чѣсла помре и ныне на лицо явствѣть/ ниже сего имянной списокъ всепокорно/ прошѣ пѣдрстѣнѣю адмиралтенствѣ/ колетио явит к нам высокою свою милость// и ю пожаловать приказатъ писать/ о” удоволствѣ нас в пище в Стекгольмѣ/ ж высоки их сенатъ чтоб мы ј впрет/ в пропитаній не оставлены были ю содержанѣ б были вѣ их милости или ѕ/ отпѣском в Росію оѣвобождены были хотя/ на разменѣ. [hand 2] „Олота“ ка”мисар кѣзъ Михаиѣ/ илѣ/ 8хтомскѣ/16

Ноября „17„ дня/ 1742 гоѣдѣ

"Имѣнной списокъ морским и адмиралтенским слѣжителям бывшим на флеите сомерсе

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Полки</th>
<th>Роты</th>
<th>Рѣаки и імяна</th>
<th>Сотбытне</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Шхиперь Корнилиѧсь Кѣртъ</td>
<td>Умеръ 22 дня авгѣста</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Камиасарь Кѣзъ Михаила Петровъ сѣть Ухтомской</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>в должности подштурманском академи ѣченики</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Дмитрій Єдоровъ сѣть Серебряковъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Гаврила Семеновъ сѣть Багамоловъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Семенъ Никифоровъ сѣть Никитинъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Іванъ Єдоровъ сѣть Кандратьевъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Михаила Герасимовъ сѣть тѣрчениковъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Василій Фаминъ сѣть Дѣнаевъ</td>
<td>Умеръ 17 дня октября</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 In Ukhtomskii's signature the character (а) has a diacritic that is difficult to interpret. It is rendered here as (’).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Полки</th>
<th>Роты</th>
<th>Рейсы и имена</th>
<th>Отбытие</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Карл Иванов сын Сысоев</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Семён Иванов сын Киселев</td>
<td>Умре при Стокгольме 23 дня октября</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Василий Васильев сын Патакин</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Иван Данилов сын Левищев</td>
<td>Умре при флоте</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Сергей Еомин сын Еомин</td>
<td>Даниил Елизаров сын Елизаров</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Сидор Петров сын Петров</td>
<td>Григорий Прокофьев сын Борка</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Василий Еодоров сын Кокилев</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Еремей Еодорев сын Шепенков</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Михаил Денисов сын Денисов</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Юрий Архипин</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Григорий Иванов сын Попков</td>
<td>Умре при флоте</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Михаил Иванов</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Аарон Андреев сын Козмин</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Григорий Иванов сын Иванов</td>
<td>Умре при Стокгольме</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Павел Петров сын Леонов</td>
<td>Умре при флоте</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Игнатий Иванов сын Иванов</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

И того всех чинов взяты в полон „36“ чавкъ
We shall have reason to return to the report below.

b) The Letters

The description of events found in the report are retold, sometimes verbatim, in the three letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter A</th>
<th>Letter B</th>
<th>Turchenikov’s letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>милостивои гздърь мой јванъ ивановичъ</td>
<td>милостивой гздърь мои василен павловичъ/</td>
<td>милостивы мои гздърь/ батюшка герасимъ јванови/ чъ и милостивая мои/ гздрйна матушка матрен/ стернова/ желаю вам/ гздрмъ мои (sic!—T.R.,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>во много/жество летъ желаю здравствовать купно/ ј с любящими вашими/</td>
<td>во множество летъ желаю вашм здравство/вать купно ј с любящими вашими;/</td>
<td>во множество/летъ здравствован и з государя/ рями моими бранциами/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>а про меня ежели јзволишъ напаметован/</td>
<td>а про меня ежели јзволишь напаметован/</td>
<td>а о себе доношу ежели изволиле/ милостиню своею напаметован/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и я вны/нешнемъ году вь мѣсцѣ изъ кронштарцкой кан/торы надъ портомъ командированъ бы во олотъ на/ карабль сантъ андреи при том же ј академи ученикі/ в должности подштюрмонской (/sic!—T.R.,) „6“ члвкъ и поса/ жены для отвозу во онои олотъ на олентъ соммерс/ на которомъ командиръ былъ шхиперъ куртъ/</td>
<td>и я по нечасто моему въ нынешнемъ годѣ въ/ јюне мѣсцѣ „23м“ числь взятъ вполонъ въ швец/кон олотъ</td>
<td>и я по нечастиню своему взятъ въ полонъ въ јюне мѣсцѣ въ 23 числа/ при голнагтѣ остробъ въ шв/цкихъ олотъ о /полонъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ј по нечастиню нашему въ вышереченномъ мѣсце въ/ „23м“ числь взятъ мы при острове гольганте/ въ швецкого олотъ въ полонѣ всехъ чиновъ служителемъ/ взято „36“ члвкъ и были при ономъ олотѣ сентябрѣ/ по „28“ числа</td>
<td>ј по нечастиню моему въ нынешнемъ годѣ въ/ јюне мѣсцѣ „23м“ числь взятъ вполонъ въ швец/кон олотъ</td>
<td>ј на ономъ олоту въ сентябрѣ мѣс/ отосланы въ стекгольмѣ где и понѣнь обретаемся за помощью/ божию и съ холпцамъ своимъ живъ а шхиперъ и служи/теленъ „7“ члвкъ умере достаны/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>а во ономъ числь изо олоту свезены въ сте/когдѣ где и понѣнь обретаемся за помощью/ божию я и съ холпицамъ своимъ живъ а шхиперъ и служи/теленъ „7“ члвкъ умере достаны/</td>
<td>и по/ нынѣ обретаетъ при стекгольмѣ за помощью божеской живъ хотя/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter A</td>
<td>Letter B</td>
<td>Turchenikov’s letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>служители/ обретаотца при стеколмеж благополучно:/</td>
<td>только содержимся под караулом а для наших нуждь/ выпуском под карауломже свободны а по высоко коро/ левскаго величества милости и г⁴дья сенаторов/ для нашей крайни нужды какъ мне такъ уче/ муск / выданъ на мо/</td>
<td>и содержжусь пот краялом токмо / в пропитании по милосгти/ королевскаго величества/ я нужды не имею и для нашей/ крайни нужды выданъ нам и му/ не мать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>служители/ обретаотца при стеколмеж благополучно:/</td>
<td>только содержимся под караулом а для наших нуждь/ выпуском под карауломже свободны а по высоко коро/ левскаго величества милости и г⁴дья сенаторов/ для нашей крайни нужды какъ мне такъ уче/ муск / выданъ на мо/</td>
<td>и содержжусь пот краялом токмо / в пропитании по милосгти/ королевскаго величества/ я нужды не имею и для нашей/ крайни нужды выданъ нам и му/ не мать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>служители/ обретаотца при стеколмеж благополучно:/</td>
<td>только содержимся под караулом а для наших нуждь/ выпуском под карауломже свободны а по высоко коро/ левскаго величества милости и г⁴дья сенаторов/ для нашей крайни нужды какъ мне такъ уче/ муск / выданъ на мо/</td>
<td>и содержжусь пот краялом токмо / в пропитании по милосгти/ королевскаго величества/ я нужды не имею и для нашей/ крайни нужды выданъ нам и му/ не мать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>служители/ обретаотца при стеколмеж благополучно:/</td>
<td>только содержимся под караулом а для наших нуждь/ выпуском под карауломже свободны а по высоко коро/ левскаго величества милости и г⁴дья сенаторов/ для нашей крайни нужды какъ мне такъ уче/ муск / выданъ на мо/</td>
<td>и содержжусь пот краялом токмо / в пропитании по милосгти/ королевскаго величества/ я нужды не имею и для нашей/ крайни нужды выданъ нам и му/ не мать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>служители/ обретаотца при стеколмеж благополучно:/</td>
<td>только содержимся под караулом а для наших нуждь/ выпуском под карауломже свободны а по высоко коро/ левскаго величества милости и г⁴дья сенаторов/ для нашей крайни нужды какъ мне такъ уче/ муск / выданъ на мо/</td>
<td>и содержжусь пот краялом токмо / в пропитании по милосгти/ королевскаго величества/ я нужды не имею и для нашей/ крайни нужды выданъ нам и му/ не мать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>служители/ обретаотца при стеколмеж благополучно:/</td>
<td>только содержимся под караулом а для наших нуждь/ выпуском под карауломже свободны а по высоко коро/ левскаго величества милости и г⁴дья сенаторов/ для нашей крайни нужды какъ мне такъ уче/ муск / выданъ на мо/</td>
<td>и содержжусь пот краялом токмо / в пропитании по милосгти/ королевскаго величества/ я нужды не имею и для нашей/ крайни нужды выданъ нам и му/ не мать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter A</td>
<td>Letter B</td>
<td>Turchenikov’s letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>алёзандровичу/ нашонину</td>
<td>дмитрรวичу еремеввников</td>
<td>покорно васъ гдывр батюшку/ прошу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>семену јвановичу лыкову</td>
<td>еже/ли кто изъ братей моих</td>
<td>пожаловать отдать/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>никинорову јванов вичу</td>
<td>при санктпетербурге</td>
<td>мой нижайшемъ поклонъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сьянову антону еремеевичу</td>
<td>то єдина сьянова письмо</td>
<td>гдывр/ моему и зато петру</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>валуеву благородны</td>
<td>вручи[т] изъ нихъ кому:/</td>
<td>гаврилову, /и ієдрыне</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>михаилъ мичмано</td>
<td>моей сестрице/ лукерь</td>
<td>моей сестре/ лукерь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>андрею андреевичу левашеву/</td>
<td>гдывр моему батюшку и</td>
<td>гересимову и въсть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>евстигнею ѳедоровичу лаптеву морски</td>
<td>к радостию слышать желаю./</td>
<td>нашимъ приглелымъ/ присем</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сьянову антону еремеевичу</td>
<td>покорно прошу</td>
<td>писавъ/ вашъ/ государей</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>михаилъ мичмано</td>
<td>ежели возможно то</td>
<td>мой покорны/ слуга и сынъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>моему батюшку и</td>
<td>пожаловать/ писат ко мне</td>
<td>михаилъ/ ила турченков/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>моимъ братья</td>
<td>о своев здоровье чегоо</td>
<td>земны свои поклон/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>где они обретаются что я</td>
<td>єхотьно/ о радостию</td>
<td>отдаю и благословения</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вполон у пристеко</td>
<td>слышать желаю./</td>
<td>вашего/ прошу ... // а кто</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>мичмано михаилъ</td>
<td>покорно васъ гдывр</td>
<td>изъ нашихъ чениковъ/ со</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>моему батюшку и</td>
<td>батюшку/ прошу</td>
<td>мою обретающа о томъ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>моимъ братья</td>
<td>пожаловать отдать/</td>
<td>явствуетъ ниже сего/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>где они обретаются что я</td>
<td>моей сестрице/ лукерь</td>
<td>гаврила богомоловъ/ јванъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вполон у пристеко</td>
<td>здоровье чегоо</td>
<td>каньдарановъ/ семень</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>мичмано михаилъ</td>
<td>о радостию слышать желаю./</td>
<td>никироовоа/ дмитрре</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>моему батюшку и</td>
<td>покорно васъ гдывр</td>
<td>серебрековъ/ василеи</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>моимъ братья</td>
<td>батюшку/ прошу</td>
<td>дунаевъ бмре при цытку/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>где они обретаются что я</td>
<td>пожаловать отдать/</td>
<td>голме/ мца ноября дня/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вполон у пристеко</td>
<td>моей сестрице/ лукерь</td>
<td>1742 году/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Турчеников’s letter

возвратно еще жь вас гд’рь про/шо онъдать мои поклонъ обретаящемуся у прави/антских дел јвану гавриловицу головину и потребовал/ от него замоео рукою регестръ и потому от него/ взать мои богажъ которои я у него оставил/ ј[3]о взять оного богажу хотя дал ему и росписку/ а тотъ багажъ прошу пожаловать создать/ братья моимъ пожалуй гд’рь не отставь/ меня в своем приязне в чемъ на вас имео надежд8/

[hand 2] Тако’ пребуду ваш гд’рь/ моего’ добърържелателны слугъ/ каминар кинъ михало (sic!— T.R.) 8хтомскаго/ Ноября .17г. дня:/ .1742 га. году/ из стекъголма:/

On the reverse side:

пожаловать вручить сие писмо”/ всѣ вчччстъ петербургхе морсьскихъ полковъ/ фейрэрику ивану ивановичу съюнову или/ брата ево’ олota лентентау высоко/ благородному гд’ну никноору ивановъ/ вично съюновж./ изъстекъгольма [a corrected from 8]
rendered by (‘). Other supralinears include the *titlo* of abbreviations (’’) *iso* over vowels (‟обрещется).

Prince Ukthomskii’s handwriting suggests that he was used to writing by hand. His style is readable and distinctly separate from that of the scribe. This distinction is indicated by the use of dots above vowel characters, as well as by the form and the character (ж) that appears as two overlapping (х).

In terms of morphology, the language of the documents contains little that cannot be expected in a text from the 1740s. An exception is the verb “to die,” which occurs in the aorist tense in both Ukhtomskii’s and Turchenikov’s texts:

... василие дунаевъ Ȝмире при сътехолме.

The letters share several formulaic elements at the beginning and end of the letters. These elements are reminiscent of formulas found in letters from the beginning of the eighteenth century, investigated by Kretschmer. Kretschmer distinguishes between *opening formulae* (*Anfangsformel*) and *closing formulae* (*Schlußformel*), and the letters concerned in the present investigations display obvious similarities with the structure described by her. The presence of such formulae indicate that there was considerable continuity in the general composition of private letters throughout the first half of the eighteenth century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unnamed scribe, signed by Mikhail Ukhtomskii, letter A</th>
<th>Unnamed scribe, signed by Mikhail Ukhtomskii, letter B</th>
<th>Mikhailo Turchenikov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening formulae:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>милостивої ḡдръ мои јванъ ивановичъ</td>
<td>милостивои ḡдръ мои василие павловичъ</td>
<td>милостивы мои ḡдръ батюшка герасимъ јвановичъ и милостивая мои ḡдрьня матушка матиrena степановна</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>во множество леть желао заздравовать купно ј с любящими вашими</td>
<td>вомножество леть желао вамъ заздравовать купно ј с любящими вашими:</td>
<td>желао вамъ ḡдрямъ моим  во множество леть заздравовані</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>а про меня ежели јзволишъ напаметовалъ</td>
<td>а про меня ежели јзволишъ напаметовалъ</td>
<td>а о себе доношу ежели изъволите милостию своею напаметовалъ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 Ibid., 74.
The formulaic elements are not restricted to the text or the letters. They can be found also in the address: “пожаловатъ сотдать сие писмо …” (Turchenikov). The “пожаловатъ сотдать” is also found in seventeenth-century letters. As Anna Kretschmer points out, even during the late eighteenth century the language found in Russian letters is in many ways the same as at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Reading Turchenikov’s letter and comparing it to what Kretschmer terms parental letters (Elternbriefe), it becomes clear that Turchenikov forms part of a long tradition:

Although the phrase “отдать нижайший поклон” is encountered also in Ukthomskii’s letter, the final salutations in Letters A and B form part of a different tradition, one with Western origins:

It is not surprising that the language found in the report and in letters A and B should contain parallels since they were written by the same scribe and associated with Prince Ukhtomskii. It may be more surprising that Turchenikov’s letter echoes the same phrases. Thus, the episodes of the capture, present

---

20 Ibid., 289.
21 Ibid., 246.
22 Cf. D. A. Sdvizhkov, Pis’ma s prusskoi voiny: liudi rossiisko-imperatorskoi armii v 1758 godu (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2019).
whereabouts, material needs, and the benevolence of the king all reflect the corresponding passages in the report and in letters A and B.

The private letters borrow much of the information and formulations from the report. This is not surprising. As Kretschmer points out, there are great similarities of expression between private letters and other text types of the business language.23

Due to the generous use of formulaic language in private letters, some might consider them to be weak representatives of ego-documents. Why, it may be asked, should we study them? The primary reason is to come closer to the language used by individuals outside the elite, and private letters offer one of very few possibilities to do this. Due to the literacy situation in eighteenth-century Russia, and the traditions prevalent in letter-writing, we do not have access to vast quantities of ego-documents, as is the case in some other European countries.

The situation characterizing mid-eighteenth-century Russia, with few sources written by non-elite authors, has parallels in other European cultures. Pál Nagy, a Hungarian scholar who has studied Roma people in eighteenth-century Hungary, uses the term “semi-ego-document” when referring documents focused on individuals, such as court cases and petitions.24 Nagy writes: “There is not a single documentary source that conveys the words of a Roma person directly. We can only obtain information indirectly through partial and fragmented evidence.”25 While the situation is different in the case of Russian from the 1740s—private letters exist in which the voices of individuals can be heard—they are far from plentiful. However, large quantities of documents containing “ego-elements” are available.

While Russian private letters of the eighteenth century continue the tradition of formulaic expressions originating in earlier periods, they do not provide a complete picture. During the post-Petrine period, new kinds of formulas appeared in Russian letters.26 In contrast to the traditional letters exemplified above, the new expressions came from abroad, notably from the French-speaking area.27

The following example contains a request by a Russian military commander, Patrick Stuart, to a Swedish government administrator, Count Bonde. Neither man is Russian, but the letter is composed in the Russian military headquarters

23 Kretschmer, Zur Geschichte des Schrift russischen, 73.
25 Ibid., 96.
26 Kretschmer, Zur Geschichte des Schrift russischen, 233.
27 Offord, Rjéoutski, and Argent, The French Language in Russia, 332.
in the Swedish town of Nyköping in early 1744. As the letter shows, the formulas are more similar to Western European letters of the eighteenth century than to Russian private letters of the period:


As this letter, and many others like it, show, the inspiration for the closing salutation is not to be sought in traditional Russian letter-writing, but in the French Votre humble serviteur (your humble servant). In circles familiar with western practices during the 1740s, the private letter became a ground for competition between old traditions and new impulses from abroad.

7.2 The Language of Regional Administration

Above (sections 6.1.2 and 7.1.2a), we saw examples of administrative documents from the 1740s. One document was sent from the Artillery and Fortifications Office of the Kamer-kollegia to the Office of Livonian and Estonian Affairs. The Kamer-kollegia was later replaced by the Ministry of Finance, cf. Amburger, Geschichte der Behördenorganisation, 119.
writing to an administrative unit at the provincial level. The document in question is a promemoria, that is, a memorandum. Prince Ukhtomskii’s report, as was stated above, represents the opposite direction, that is, a subordinate reporting to a senior officer.

In the Russian Federation, and in other countries, archival institutions hold administrative documents like promemoria, donosheniia, and other administrative documents whose structure was regulated. Such documents originate from all corners of the empire: from the center, from the Baikal area, and from the Russian North.30

Regional business documents from the middle and second half of the eighteenth century, are characterized by a tendency towards standardization of the formulaic language.31 In specific documents, the boundaries between formulaic language and original content can sometimes be observed on the basis of the frequency of the letter iat’ ⟨ѣ⟩. The character is sometimes found in formulae, such as the heading of reports: ⟨В государственно Адмиралтействъ коллегию, покорнейше доношение⟩, but diminishes or disappears in the informational portion of texts.32

Thanks to scholars like Kotkov, Maiorov, Nikitin and many others, the traditional administrative register belongs to the most well-known spheres of Russian eighteenth-century language. In view of this, the topic will not be pursued further. Our attention will turn to other, less well-known topics.

### 7.3 The Language of Diplomacy

Among the most prestigious forms of Russian eighteenth-century language belong international treaties and correspondence with foreign rulers. For the purposes of the present investigation, Russia’s diplomatic correspondence with two neighboring states has been investigated: Sweden (a traditional rival of Russia) and Denmark (a traditional ally). By the 1740s, a number of terms of French origin had entered Russian diplomatic correspondence, and later in the century, Russian diplomats even used French to communicate among

---


31 Nikitin, Delovaia pis’mennost’, 215.

32 Cf. Sumkina and Kotkov, Pamiatniki moskovskoi delovoi pis’mennosti, 3.
themselves. With its Baltic Sea neighbors, however, Russia still undertook much of its correspondence in Russian.

The texts examined were:

- An assurance by the Empress concerning subsidies to Sweden.\(^{34}\)
- Letters to the Swedish royal family, 1740–1748.\(^{35}\)
- Letters to the Danish royal family, 1740–1749.\(^{36}\)
- A diplomatic letter from Russian Plenipotentiary, Count A. I. Rumiantsev to the Swedish Chancellery president (Prime Minister), Count Carl Gyllenborg, November 29, 1742.\(^{37}\)

### 7.3.1 The Treaty on Subsidies

Божию поспѣшесвѣдующе миѣстію, мы елисаветъ перва императрица/ и самодѣржца всероссійская, московская,/ кіевская, владиѣмская, новгородская, царица/ казанская, царица астраханская, царица сибирская, господарыня псковская, и великая княгиня смольянская, княгиня эстляндская,/ лифляндская, карлсская, тверская, югорская,/ пѣрмская, вятская, бохорская и іныхъ здѣрна, и великая княгиня нова города низовския земли, черниговская, рязанская, ростовская, юрослаѣ-ская, бѣлоозерская, удорская, обдорская, конди-ская, и всѣ сѣверныя страны повелительни-ца, и господарыня иверския земли, карталинѣ-скихъ и граѣнскихъ царей, и кабардинския земли, черкаския, и горския князей, и іныхъ на-/ слѣдныя господарыня и обладательница./ Божиєю милостію пресвѣтлѣйшему/ державѣйшему князю и господарю гдѣрну фри-дирхи королю свѣйскимъ, готскимъ, и вѣнг-/

---

34 Assurance of subsidies, June 22, 1745. RA, Originaltraktater med främmande makter (trakt-tater), 25 juni 1745, SE/RA/25.3/2/28/E (1745)
35 Swedish National Archives, Muscovitica 623.
36 Danish National Archives, 301 Tyske Kancelli, Udenrigske Afdeling, 1516–1769, Rusland: Breve fra russiske kejser og kejserinde. Kejserinde Anna Ivanovna Romanov 1730–1740 m.m.; Danish National Archives, Copenhagen, Denmark, 301 Tyske Kancelli, Udenrigske Afdeling, 1516–1769, Rusland: Breve fra russiske kejser og kejserinde, Kejserinde Anna Ivanovna Romanov 1730–1740 m.m.
37 Swedish National Archives, Kabinettet UD E1 A2.
денском, и протчая, и протчая, и протчая, ландъ/графъ гессенском, князю в гиршфелде, графъ/ в кашен эленбогене, дице, цыгентейне, нидье, и шамбрехе, и протчая, вашемъ вельчествъ [in bottom margin: его вельчеству королю швецком]/ // / наше дружебно сосдское поздравление. наше/ упователно уже довольно известные к вашемъ/ вельчествъ, отличные сентимены, к смнѣнію/ мѣста не оставляютъ, о томъ удовольствіи, с ка-/ковымъ мы полчили грамотъ вашего/ величества, о тѣхъ четырехъ ста тысячъ рѣбляхъ, кой от/ нась/ его королевскомъ въвчествъ прошлоого 1743: годъ/ по-/ причинѣ тогдашнихъ обстоятельствъ были обе-/щаны. и хотя/ по отмѣнѣ бывшихъ в товремя/ дѣль и минованію всякой, для шведской короны/ опасности, и помянвтное наше/ обещаніе натрѣдал-/но состоятельнымъ признаваемо быть не можеть/ о болѣе в себѣ не настоить, однако мы юстинно/ же-/дая во всѣхъ слѣдяхъ, какъ нашѣ к угодностямъ ва-/шего величества особливдню агенцию не лицемѣрно/ засвидѣтельствовать, такъ и коронѣ шведской/ действительно/ удостоверительныя опыты и томъ/ подать, колико мы хотимъ, даже до наимѣнйшихъ/ лѣча, какой либо по причинѣ/ постановленныхъ/ в союзнномъ трактѣ/ секретныхъ артикловъ/ касающихся до гаранции голштинского/ владѣнія/ нашего вселюбѣннйшаго племянника великаго/ князя всероссіиского, и содержаній в полчѣ тишны/ тягости предупреждать, и онѣю по возможности обв-/ легчать. то сѣмвмъ четыреѣ сотъ тысячъ рѣблевъ/ рѣблевъ/ для того/ определили, которых в четырѣ одинъ за-/ дѣлаемъ слѣдующіе годѣ, счетя от ратифицации// союзнаго трактата, а юмнно/ по преступніи каждѣ-/ыхъ ста тысячъ рѣблевъ/ и справно шведской коронѣ платима/ быть юмбетъ, а при насилийшемъ о томъ обнадеживаніи/ совершенно/ увѣренья находимся, что вѣше величество, его корона/ шведская по счастливо пребывающемъ междѣ/ наш./ми обуходными дворами узд крѣпкаго соединенія:/ какъ нашемъ намѣренію, в непремѣннѣмъ додержаніи/ постановленныхъ обязательствъ совзамиствоватъ/ такъ особливо во всякомъ благосостояніи и защищеніи/ герцокско-голштейнскаго владѣнія нашемъ вселюбѣннй-/ шемъ племянникъ юскренно усердствовать соизволите./
The first impression of the text is its strong emphasis on formal, symbolic expressions. The text, which has much in common with private letters, begins by stating the full title of the Empress of Russia, followed by titles of the King of Sweden.

The business part of the text is signaled by a greeting:

вашемъ величествѣ наше дружесное сосѣдское поздравление.

This is followed by another formulaic expression, expressing the satisfaction experienced by the Empress upon receiving a letter from the King, for whom she has warm feelings:

… наше уповательно уже довольно известные к вашему величеству, отличные сентимены, к сожалѣнію мѣста не оставляютъ, о томъ удовольствіи, с каковымъ мы полчили грамоту вашего величества.

Only following this greeting does the letter go on to discuss specific issues.

7.3.2 Letters to the Royal Families

The majority of letters in this group are addressed to the kings, but there are also examples of letters to other members of the royal families, such as the queen and crown prince.

During the 1740s, the Russian Empire and the Kingdom of Sweden found themselves at war for two years, August 1741–August 1743. The war caused a certain coolness in the salutations. Thus, a letter written before the war, on October 18, 1740, from the infant Emperor Ioann Antonovich to the King of Sweden includes the salutation

Вашего величества/вѣрны братъ другъ ј соѣсдѣ.
During the war, on July 30, 1742, the new Empress, Elisabeth, instead chose to restrict herself to expressing a desire for friendship:

Вашего величества дръжебнообхотна сестра …

The Empress expressed herself in more affectionate terms to the King of Denmark, a traditional ally of Russia:

Ва́шего короле́вского вели́чества ј любві вѣрная сестръ и принятелница …38

As in the assurance of subsidies, letters to the monarch begin with the formulaic titles of the Russian and Swedish rulers, occupying approximately the first 200 words.39 Letters to the Danish court have exactly the same structure, although with a different set of titles for the Danish monarch.40

The letters’ statement of purpose follows the titles and greetings. This statement, or explanation, is often marked by an initial понеже (since, because), familiar from administrative documents. Following the statement of purpose an account of measures taken or decisions made is often marked by того ради (for that sake) or something similar. The letters generally end with a lengthy formula requesting the blessing of the Almighty upon the recipient and declaring the writer’s general benevolence.

The final element reports the place and date of issue, and an indication of the regnal year of the sender.

The corpus also contains examples of shorter, somewhat more informal greetings. Although the titles of the recipient may be somewhat short, long enumerations of titles may occur also in the business part of the letter if the matter treated

38 Letter to Christian VI, May 25, 1744, Danish National Archives, Copenhagen, Denmark, 301 Tyske Kancelli, Udenrigske Afdeling, 1516–1769, Rusland: Breve fra russiske kejser og kejserinder, Kejserinde Anna Ivanovna Romanov 1730–1740 m.m.


40 Cf., for example, Empress Elisabeth, letter of condolence to Frederik V, August 31, 1747, Danish National Archives, Copenhagen, Denmark, 301 Tyske Kancelli, Udenrigske Afdeling, 1516–1769, Rusland: Breve fra russiske kejser og kejserinder, Kejserinde Anna Ivanovna Romanov 1730–1740 m.m.
happens to concern people in high places. Such an example is illustrated in the letter announcing the marriage between the future Tsar Peter III and the future Empress Catherine II:

Свѣтлѣишій Кронъ принцъ; Дружебно-любезный/ племянникъ. Яко по особливомъ всевышшаго бога предь-/ усмотрѣнію, и по моемъ соизволенію, мой/ вселюбезнѣшій племянникъ Его јмператорское/ высочество великій князь всероссійскій Петръ, наслѣдникъ норвежской, владѣющей герцогъ/ шлезвигъ голстинской, штормарнской, и дитмарѣской, графъ ´олденбргской и делменгорстской &с./ съ ей јмператорскімъ высочествомъ великою княгинею всероссійскою Екатериной, урожденной/ю княгинею англійскою, герцогинею саонской, энгернскою, и вестфальскою, графинею асканской, господарьною цербстскою, бернбргскою, зверскою, и княгаузенскою &с. в здѣшней моей импер-торской столицѣ въ „21дъ” сего мѣсяца благополучно въ брачное сочетаніе встпили. Тако я нинь/-мало ѣмѣдлить не хотѣла, чтобы вашемъ королевскомъ высочествѣ и любви, я такому/ благополучномъ, и мнѣ толь радостномъ/ произшествіи, чрезъ сіе звѣстно не учинить, // ни како не сѣмѣвався, что ваше королевское высочество и любовь не токмо мнѣ, но моемъ јмператорскомъ домѣ все то, еже к моемъ и о”наго удовольствію и благополучію касается,/ охотно желать, но и ваше в томъ участіе/ принять, сѣддоватья же о” семъ счастливо/ совершишемся брачномъ сочетаніи порадоваться/ и вышеупомянутымъ высокимъ новосочетан-/ънымъ и с вашей стороны оип милости все-/вышшаго, всякаго благословенія и благополучія/ возжелать соизволите. въ прочемъ же/ с” неотмѣнною благоволительною дружбою всегда/ пребываю./ вашего королевского высочества и любви/ дружебно охотная тетка./ [hand 2] Елисавѣт” [hand 1]въ санктъ петербргѣ/ „26дъ” августа. 1745.41

41 Empress Elisabeth to Adolf Fredrik, Heir Apparent of Sweden, February 12, 1745, Swedish National Archives, Muscovitica 623.
From the point of view of morphology, the imperial letters are reminiscent of administrative documents and contain few surprises. The titles have examples of archaic forms, such as the Genitive singular of adjectives ⟨кабардинская⟩.

The most characteristic traits of this group of documents are found in their highly formulaic language, expressed through a long-winded syntax, teeming with subordinate clauses. There is a strong tendency towards placing the verb at the end of sentences.

7.3.3 A Letter by A. I. Rumiantsev

Although Russia and Sweden were at war during the first half of the 1740s, there was no change in the level of diplomatic courtesy. In the following example, the Russian diplomat A. I. Rumiantsev writes to a leading politician. Sweden has been soundly beaten, and the Russian delegate will conduct the negotiations from a position of strength. Nonetheless, he adheres to the formal demands of letter-writing.
с прошениемъ/ что б под приказаниемъ вашихъ оной мдрзинъ могъ/ имѣть честь королю самому подать онѣю объявить/телно грамотъ, коѳрдю буде в томъ какое за/трѣднѣніе найдетѣся врѣдить и вашему превосходштву, въ дѣйствіемъ {: на онѣю грамотъ} отвѣте я дѣлъ/ себя что возимѣется стараніе внести 8потребляемыя/ предкамъ ея величества титлами и без которыхъ всеавгустейшная моя гдрина императрица ни/какой грамоты принять не соизволить, о чемъ ѣмѣю/ честь вѣдѣмъ превосходштву дать знать 8по/вай что вы не захотѣите за сѣмъ неспоримыя/ напред сего дѣломъ и должнымъ высокомъ достоинствъ/ ея императорскаго величѣства остановить/ и вновь отдѣлать тѣль крѣтиво повторѣнные к мирѣ/ добрыя склонности./ Его превосходштство вицеканцлеръ графъ/ бестѣжевъ рюминъ в отвѣте своемъ гднъ баронъ нол/кин обещая скорое назначеніе втораго ена/ величѣства пономочнаго я не хотѣль безъ 8вѣдома/ ния вѣмъ моемъ гднъ соотѣвить чтосо/ гдрина императрица его превосходштву/ гдна генерала аншѣфа барона фонлюбраса вместе/ со мною к сенѣ полезномъ дѣлѣ определить соизволила/ сие известие мнѣ напаче нѣжно показалось, понеже/ в слѣдае что б его королевское величѣство изволилъ/ переменить вѣто назначеній к томѣ же съ шведской/ стороны или пожелаалъ бы объявить {: еже однако въ его/ соизволеніи состоитъ} кого своймъ вторымъ мини/стромъ кто б соотвтственѣмъ былъ рантѣ гдна любраса/ и слѣдственно посланные с капитаномъ дрентелемъ/ пашпорты недѣйствительны были, то я по первому/ о томъ отъ ващаго превосходштва ѣли вашихъ/ полномоченыхъ 8вѣдомленію в состояніи находясь/ новыя приславъ и о всѣмъ томъ еже до конгреса/ касается с ними постановить/ ѣного мнѣ ничего не остается какъ/ в благосклонность ващаго превосходштва/ гдна мдрзина рекомендовать с прошеніемъ оного/ безпрдолжитель но отправить с такою безопасною стио какову имѣли у насъ присылаемыя изъ шведскихъ/ ѣмѣю честь бысть спочителную обязанію/нибудь, вашего превосходштва всепослушныя ѣ нижашпин слѣдь/ [hand 2] а румянцев/ [hand 1] ноября 20ѣ дня/ 1742 году/ изъ выбора
As the letter clearly shows, the characteristics of Russian diplomatic language were not restricted to imperial letters. The syntax and wording of Rumiantsev’s letter, which is written by a professional scribe, suggests that the Russian foreign administration possessed a staff of highly trained secretaries and scribes. The orthography maintains ⟨ѣ⟩ in its etymological places with occasional deviations: ⟨в отѣве⟩.

The examples of diplomatic language shown above support the idea of a specific register for state documentation, separate from that of traditional administrative documents, although elements of the administrative registers are found also in the diplomatic correspondence.

7.4 The Life of Printed Texts

When a text is copied by hand, minor errors and changes inevitably occur. This fact forms the basis of textual criticism, a branch of scholarship that explores the history and development of textual traditions.\textsuperscript{42} Greatly simplified we can say that textual traditions contain patterns of changes that we can follow, like rings of a tree.

Printed texts behave altogether differently. Since printed texts can be mass produced, there is no longer any need to copy them by hand, and all copies turn out identical. Changes between versions of a printed text can occur between editions but not between individual copies. When studying printed text from a limited time span—a single decade, as in the case of the present investigation—it is of interest to note whether the text represents a first edition, or if it is a second or later edition. This is significant because in second and later editions, traces may be left behind from one or more of the earlier editions. If we are analyzing an edition from 1745 of a text first published in 1720, can we be sure that the language represents that of the 1740s, or does it represent the language used in the 1720s?

7.4.1 Printing and Obsolete Characters

In the 1730s, two reforms of the civil alphabet were introduced. Prior to 1735, the characters representing /i/ were not used consistently. In theory, ⟨i⟩ was employed in positions before vowels, ⟨и⟩ was used in foreign words, ⟨и⟩ in most

other cases, and ⟨ѵ⟩, *izhitsa*, in a handful of words. In 1735, the Academy of Sciences introduced ⟨ї⟩ while abolishing ⟨ѯ⟩ (ksi) and ⟨ѵ⟩. In 1738, a new reform abolished the use of ⟨и⟩ while reserving ⟨і⟩ for use before vowels, and ⟨ꙋ⟩ in other positions.43

Examining the set of characters in printed texts from the 1740s, and the rules for their combination, we sometimes find that the rule explained above is not without exception, and that printed texts from the 1740s contain traits from an earlier period. As an example, in the margin of a template text for a letter of credit printed in 1744 (section 3.4.2), we find evidence that this particular template is based on an earlier text because the editor/typesetter has neglected to bring the use of ⟨і⟩ up to date:

Ежели хозяинъ іностранныхъ товаровъ купїть не прїкажеть.44

During the decades following the introduction of the civil typeface, the character ⟨і⟩ representing /i/, occurred initially, between consonants, as well as before vowels and /j/ in ⟨-їя⟩, ⟨-їе⟩ and other endings. In 1744, however, this was no longer the case. By the mid-1740s, the use of ⟨і⟩ in printed texts had been limited. It was usually no longer found in initial position or between consonants.

The use of obsolete characters or outdated orthographic rules in a text cannot always be explained as a consequence of second editions. Sometimes, a deviation may simply be result of the work of an individual typesetter, as the following example suggests.

In a series of reports from the front in Finland, in 1742, Field-Marshal Peter de Lacy sent a number of reports to the government that were deemed interesting enough to merit printing. The printing was carried out in the civil typeface at the Senate printing shop in Moscow. The present investigation has had access to a collection of front reports comprising approximately 21,120 words. For the most part, the texts adhere to the character sets and orthographic rules current at the time, but there are also seemingly inexplicable deviations. The word экстрактъ (extract, résumé) occurs fifteen times in the corpus. In twelve of these cases, the spelling is the expected ⟨экстрактъ⟩ spelled with ⟨кс⟩. In three cases, however, all from the same issue, printed on October 17, 1742, the form ⟨эѯтрактъ⟩ is used despite the fact that the character ⟨ѯ⟩ was abolished in the 1730s (section 4.4.1). Why does this character suddenly reemerge in

44 *Formuliari. Protiv kotorogo spetsial’noe.* ...
print? The front reports were written just a few weeks prior to being printed, so this is clearly not a case of second edition. Instead, it most likely did so due to the habits of an individual typesetter. Perhaps he adhered too closely to the handwritten draft, or maybe he received his training during earlier decades, when the character ⟨ѯ⟩ was still being used in text printed in the civil typeface.

There is additional evidence suggesting that the use of characters formally abolished by the Academy of Sciences continued to be used throughout the 1740s. Thus in the printed announcement of the marriage between the future Peter III and Catherine II, the patronymic of the bride uses ⟨ѯ⟩:

Понеже Мы съ помощью и благословениемъ божиимъ Всемилостивѣйшее намѣреніе воспріяли, благопоставленное ихъ Императорскихъ Высочествъ, Нашего Вселюбезѣйшаго Племянника, Великаго Князя Всероссійскаго владѣющаго Герцога Шлезвихъ Голстинскаго ПЕТРА ІЕФОРОВИЧА, и обрученнои невѣсты Его Великои Княжны ЕКАТЕРИНЫ АЛЕѯѯЕВНЫ сочетаніе бракомъ совершить, …45

The situation concerning izhitsa ⟨ѵ⟩ is similar. In an imperial edict from the very end of the decade, printed at the Senate printing office in Moscow and concerning forbidden books, the words ⟨сѵнодъ⟩ and ⟨Іеромонахъ⟩ use characters that appear archaic. ⟨ѯ⟩ also occurs in the text, as does the Locative plural ⟨городѣхъ⟩ featuring an obsolete case ending.46 This, however, may depend on the topic.

7.4.2 The Development of Printed Texts

How did texts printed in successive editions during the first half of the eighteenth century develop over time? A practical way of illustrating this is to present parallel texts of three editions. The text chosen for this purpose is the Artikul voinskii (Articles of War) in the editions from 1715, 1735, and 1744.

---

45 Понеже Мы съ помощью и благословениемъ божиимъ (St. Petersburg: Senat, March 17, 1745).
46 Указ ея императорскаго величества (Moscow: Senat, June 3, 1749).
The *Artikul* is a collection of military laws and regulations that first appeared in 1714,47 and the Russian collection was modeled on international prototypes.48 For the purposes of this investigation, a portion of the text, found in three successive editions (1715, 1735, and 1744) has been analyzed.49 The full text, in its 1744 edition, comprises 255 printed pages.

The text of the *Articles of War* was intended for public use and represents legal language. The portion of the text analyzed here consists of two parts: a declaration and an oath. It is written in the name of the tsar and directed to officers and soldiers of the armed forces. There is a clearly defined relationship among the participants: they take the oath owe their allegiance to the sovereign. On the whole, the situational context does not change between the three editions examined here. The institution of the monarchy remains the same, as does the relationship between the monarch and the individuals taking the oath. The only element that changes is the person of the ruler. When the text was originally composed, Russia was ruled by Peter the Great (1672–1725). By the time of the second edition, his niece, Anna (1693–1740), had acceded to the throne. In 1744, when the last of the three editions was printed, Peter’s daughter, Elisabeth (1709–1761), was in power.

The *Articles of War* are a collection of military laws and regulations that first appeared in 1714, and the Russian collection was modeled on international prototypes.50

---

47 *Artikul voinskii*, NEB Knizhnye pamiatniki, accessed May 5, 2021, https://kp.rusneb.ru/item/material/artikul-voinskii-2. The title of the Russian text is in the singular—Артикулъ—while in the German parallel text, it is in the plural—Articuln. Here and below, the title in English is in the plural, as is traditional in the English-speaking world.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1715</th>
<th>1735</th>
<th>1744</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>БОЖІЄЮ МІЛОСТІЮ МЫ ПЕТРЪ ПЕРВЫЙ,</td>
<td>БОЖІЄЮ МІЛОСТІЮ МЫ ПЕТРЪ ПЕРВЫЙ,</td>
<td>БОЖІЄЮ МІЛОСТІЮ МЫ ПЕТРЪ ПЕРВЫЙ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЦАРЬ И САМОДЕРЖѢЦЬ ВСЕРОССІЙСКІѢ. и</td>
<td>ЦАРЬ И САМОДЕРЖѢЦЬ ВСЕРОССІЙСКІѢ. и</td>
<td>ЦАРЬ И САМОДЕРЖѢЦЬ ВСЕРОССІЙСКѢ. и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прочая, и прочая, и прочая</td>
<td>прочая, и прочая, и прочая</td>
<td>прочая, и прочая, и прочая</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Повелѣваемъ всѣмъ обще нашимъ Генераломъ, штатъ оборъ и ундеръ офицерамъ, и салдатамъ, какъ подданнымъ, такъ и чужестраннымъ, въ службѣ нашѣн пребывающимъ, покорнымъ и послушнымъ быть по своей должности. и всѣ пункты сего артїкула право исполнять, и всякому особо высокого и нїкого чїна, безъ всякаго изъятїя намъ яко государю своему присягу чинить:</td>
<td>Повелѣваемъ всѣмъ обще нашимъ Генераломъ, штатъ оборъ и ундеръ офицерамъ, исалдатамъ, какъ подданнымъ, такъ и чужестраннымъ, въ службѣ нашѣн пребывающимъ, покорнымъ и послушнымъ быть по своей должности. и всѣ пункты сего артїкула право исполнять, и всякому особо высокого и нїкого чїна, безъ всякаго изъятїя,</td>
<td>Повелѣваемъ всѣмъ обще нашимъ Генераламъ, Штабъ Оберъ и ундеръ Офицерамъ и салдатамъ, какъ подданнымъ, такъ и чужестраннымъ, въ службѣ нашѣн пребывающимъ, покорнымъ и послушнымъ быть по своей должности. и всѣ пункты сего артїкула право исполнять, и всякому особо высокого и нїкого чїна, безъ всякаго изъятїя,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>въ томъ да бы имъ вѣрно честно съ доброю охотою себя содержать, и какъ сїи послѣдствующїе пункты въ себѣ содержать. какъ честнымъ воїинскимъ людемъ благопрїстоїно, противъ всѣхъ нашихъ и государствъ нашихъ непрїятелей, тѣломъ и кровїю хотя въ полѣ во осадахъ сухїмъ и водянымъ путемъ прилучитца, служитъ, и по крайнѣй возможности тщательно радѣть,</td>
<td>въ томъ дабы имъ вѣрно честно съ доброю охотою себя содержать, и какъ сїи послѣдствующїе пункты въ себѣ содержать. какъ честнымъ воїинскимъ людемъ благопрїстоїно, противъ всѣхъ нашихъ и государствъ нашихъ непрїятелей, тѣломъ и кровїю хотя въ полѣ во осадахъ сухїмъ и водянымъ путемъ прилучитца, служить, и по крайнѣй возможности тщательно радѣть,</td>
<td>въ томъ дабы имъ вѣрно честно съ доброю охотою себя содержать, и какъ сїи послѣдствующїе пункты въ себѣ содержать. какъ честнымъ воїинскимъ людемъ благопрїстоїно, противъ всѣхъ нашихъ и государствъ нашихъ непрїятелей, тѣломъ и кровїю хотя въ полѣ во осадахъ сухїмъ и водянымъ путемъ прилучитца, служить, и по крайнѣй возможности тщательно радѣть,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и чтобъ имъ нашъ и государства нашїхъ подданныхъ убытокъ отвращати, противъ тогоже прибытокъ и лугтую пользу знати и вспомогати, и въ томъ никакова ради страха не отбѣгатъ, нижъ трудовъ жалѣти толь долго пока Богъ всякому жївотъ продолжїтъ,</td>
<td>и чтобъ имъ Нашъ и государства нашїхъ подданныхъ убытокъ отвращати, Противъ тогоже прибытокъ и лугтую пользу знати и вспомогати, и въ томъ никакова ради страха не отбѣгатъ, нижъ трудовъ жалѣти толь долго пока Богъ всякому жївотъ продолжїтъ,</td>
<td>и чтобъ имъ Нашъ и государства нашїхъ подданныхъ убытокъ отвращати, Противъ тогоже прибытокъ и лугтую пользу знати и вспомогати, и въ томъ никакова ради страха не отбѣгатъ, нижъ трудовъ жалѣти толь долго пока Богъ всякому жївотъ продолжїтъ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и да бы невъдѣнїемъ никто не отговаривался, надлежит сен артикль насмотрѣхъ, а особливо про всякому полку по единоїдъ прочитать въ недѣлю, чтобъ всякъ своего стыда наказания и безчестія удалялся и бѣгалъ, противъ того же о благоѣдянїи храбрости и повышеніи прилѣжанїе имѣлъ.</td>
<td>и да бы невѣдѣнїемъ никто не отговаривался, надлежит сен артикуль насмотрѣахъ, а особливо при всякомъ полку по единоїдъ прочитать въ недѣлю, чтобъ всякъ своего стыда наказания и безчестія удалялся и бѣгалъ, противъ того же о благоѣдянїи храбрости и повышеніи прилѣжанїе имѣлъ.</td>
<td>и дабы невѣдѣнїемъ никто не отговаривался, надлежитъ сей артикулъ на смотрѣхъ, а особливо при всѣхъ полкахъ по единожды прочитать въ недѣлю, чтобъ всѣкъ своего стыда наказания и безчестія удалялся и бѣгалъ, противъ того же о благоѣдянїи храбрости и повышеніи прилѣжанїе имѣлъ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>О ПРИСЯГѢ. какимъ образомъ присягу или обѣщаніе чинить.</td>
<td>О ПРИСЯГѢ. какимъ образомъ присягу или обѣщаніе чинить.</td>
<td>О ПРИСЯГѢ. какимъ образомъ присягу или обѣщаніе чинить.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Отъ ГЕНЕРАЛОВЪ и до ФЕНДРІХА. Положїть лѣвую руку на евангеліе, а правую руку поднять въ верхѣ съ простертыми двѣмя большими персты. А салдатамъ{понеже ихъ множество} правую только руку поднять предъ предлежащимъ евангеліемъ, и говорїть за читающїмъ присягу, и по прочтенїи цѣловать евангеліе.</td>
<td>Отъ ГЕНЕРАЛОВЪ и до ФЕНДРІХА. Положить лѣвую руку на Евангеліе, а правую руку поднять вверхъ съ простертными двѣма большими персты. А салдатамъ, {понеже ихъ множество} правую только руку поднять предъ предлежащимъ Евангеліемъ, и говорить за читающимъ присягу, и по прочтении цѣловать Евангеліе.</td>
<td>Отъ ГЕНЕРАЛОВЪ и до ФЕНДРІХА. Положить лѣвую руку на Евангеліе, а правую руку поднять предъ предлежащемъ Евангеліемъ, и говорить за читающимъ присягу, и по прочтении цѣловать Евангеліе.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Сїя присяга бываетъ генералитету въ воинской консилии, а Штабъ, Оберъ и ундеръ офіцерамъ, и салдатамъ при полку или ротѣ, при распущеномъ знамени.</td>
<td>Сїя присяга бываетъ Генералитету въ воинской консилїи, а Штабъ, Оберъ и ундеръ офицерамъ, и салдатамъ при полку или ротѣ, при распущеномъ знамени.</td>
<td>Сїя присяга бываетъ Генералитету въ воинской консилїи, а Штабъ, Оберъ и ундеръ офицерамъ, и салдатамъ при полку или ротѣ, при распущеномъ знамени.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ПРИСЯГА, или обѣщаніе всякаго воинскаго чина людемъ. Я {имя рекъ} обѣщаюсь всемогущымъ Богомъ служить, всепрестѣпнѣйшему нашему Царю Государю вѣрно и послушно что въ сихъ постановленныхъ такожъ и въ предѣ поставляемыхъ воинскихъ артикулахъ, что онѣ въ себѣ содержати будутъ,</td>
<td>ПРИСЯГА, или обѣщаніе всякаго воинскаго чина людемъ. Я {имя рекъ} обѣщаюсь всемогущимъ Богомъ, служить всепрестѣпнѣйшему нашему Царю Государю вѣрно и послушно что въ сихъ постановленныхъ такожъ и въ предѣ поставляемыхъ воинскихъ артикулахъ, что онѣ въ себѣ содержати будутъ,</td>
<td>ПРИСЯГА, или обѣщаніе всякаго воинскаго чина людемъ. Я {имя рекъ} обѣщаюсь всемогущимъ богомъ, служить всепрестѣпѣйшему нашему Царю Государю вѣрно и послушно что въ сихъ постановленныхъ такожъ и въ предѣ поставляемыхъ воинскихъ артикулахъ, что онѣ въ себѣ содержати будутъ,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
все исполнять исправно. Его Царского величества, государства и земель его врагамъ тѣломъ и кровию въ полѣ и въ крѣпостяхъ, водою, и сухъмь путемъ, въ баталияхъ, партіяхъ, осадахъ, и штурмахъ, и въ протчихъ воинскихъ случаяхъ.

его Царскаго величества, государства и земель его врагамъ тѣломъ и кровию въ полѣ и въ крѣпостяхъ, водою, и сухъмь путемъ, въ баталияхъ, партіяхъ, осадахъ, и штурмахъ, и въ протчихъ воинскихъ случаяхъ.

какова оныя званія нѣ есть храброе и силенное чинить противленіе, и всѣми образомъ оныхъ повреждать потщусь.

и ежели что вражеское и предосудительное противъ персона Его Величества, или его войскъ, такожде его государства люди, или интересу государственного, что услышу, или увижу, то обѣщаю обь ономъ по лутчей моей совѣсти, и сколько мнѣ извѣстно будетъ, извѣщать и ничего не утаить.

но толь паче во всемъ, пользу его и лутчее охранять и исполнять.

а командирамъ моимъ поставленнымъ надомною, во всемъ, гдѣ Его Царского Величества войскъ Государства и люди благополучно и приращенію касается. въ караулахъ въ работахъ и въ протчихъ случаяхъ, должное чинить послушаніе и весма повелѣнню ихъ непротивитися.

отъ роты и знамя гдѣ надлежу, хотя въ полѣ обоѣвъ или гварнізонѣ никогдѣ не отлучаца, но за онымъ пока живъ непремѣнно, добровольно и вѣрно такъ какъ мнѣ прѣтна честь моя, и живуть мои, слѣдовать буду.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1715</th>
<th>1735</th>
<th>1744</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>и во всемъ такъ поступать какъ честному вѣрному послушному, храброму и не тороплївому салдату надлежїтъ.</td>
<td>И во всемъ такъ поступать, какъ честному вѣрному послушному, храброму и не тороплївому Салдату надлежїтъ.</td>
<td>И вовсемъ такъ поступать, какъ честному вѣрному послушному, храброму и неторопливою Салдату надлежїтъ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Въ чемъ да поможетъ мнѣ господь богъ всемогущїй.</td>
<td>Въ чемъ да поможетъ мнѣ господь Богъ всемогущїй.</td>
<td>Въ чемъ да поможетъ мнѣ Господь Богъ всемогущїй.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Понеже сїя прїсяга въ обще всякому чїну положена, того ради надлежїтъ тому, кто къ прїсягѣ прїводїтъ, выпїсывать, которому чїну что принадлежїтъ, а ундеръ офицерамъ и салдатамъ все.</td>
<td>Понеже сїя присяга въ обще всякому чину положена, того ради надлежитъ тому, кто к присяге приводитъ, выписывать, которому чину что принадлежитъ, а ундеръ Офицерамъ и Салдатамъ все.</td>
<td>Понеже сїя присяга въ обще всякому чину положена, того ради надлежитъ тому, кто к присяге приводитъ, выписывать, которому чину что принадлежитъ, а ундеръ Офицерамъ и Салдатамъ все.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the three versions, we see that the texts remains identical in terms of vocabulary and syntax. The only changes observable are found in orthography and morphology.

The most salient change in the orthography concerns the use of the character ⟨ï⟩. In the 1715 edition, it occurs initially, medially between consonants, and in final position. All these usages were later abandoned in favor of ⟨и⟩:

... и ежели что вражеское и предъосудїтелное протївъ персоны Его Велїчества, или его воїскъ, такожде его государства люди, їлї їнтересу государственного что услышу, или увижу ... (1715).

И ежели что вражеское и предосудительное противъ персоны Его Величества, или его войскъ, такожде его государства людей, или интересу государственного, что услышу, или увижу (1744).

In the 1735 edition, the use of ⟨ï⟩ seems to follow a different rule, although not entirely consistently. For example, ⟨ï⟩ is admissible in words of foreign origin: ⟨їнтересу⟩, ⟨їгарнїзонѣ⟩, ⟨Офицерамъ⟩, and so forth. The soft sign ⟨ь⟩ is not used consistently in the 1715 edition, but greater consistency exists in the 1735 edition. In the edition from 1744, the distribution of ⟨ь⟩ almost coincides with the situation found in modern texts, with a few exceptions: ⟨сианое⟩. A peculiar use of the hard sign ⟨ъ⟩ is found in the 1715 edition: ⟨предъосудїтелное⟩. This is abandoned already in the 1735 version.
According to Shitsgal, ⟨v⟩ was abolished in 1735. The character was reintroduced in 1758 (cf. section 4.4.1). It would therefore have been expected that ⟨v⟩ would be absent from the 1744 edition, but this is not the case. The 1715 edition has евангелие while both subsequent editions have a variant with izhitsa: Евангелїе. This means that the decisions of the Academy of Sciences were not unanimously obeyed.

The spelling of reflexive verbs changes between the different editions. Thus, in 1715, we find ⟨касаетцa⟩ (third person, singular, present), and ⟨отлучатца⟩, ⟨протївїтца⟩ (infinitives). In 1744, these have all been changed to ⟨касается⟩, and ⟨отлучатися⟩, (противитися) respectively:

въ караулахъ въ работахъ и въ протчїхъ случаяхъ, должное чїнїть послушанїе и весма повелїнїю ихъ непротївїтца (1715).

въ караулахъ, въ работахъ и въ протчихъ случаяхъ, должное чинить послушаніе, и весьма повелѣнію ихъ не противитися (1744).

An orthographical feature that clearly saw change between the editions was the use of capital letters. Whereas in 1715, capital letters are found at the beginning of sentences and in words denoting the Tsar and God (the latter, however, not obligatory), by 1744 the use of capital letters has spread to include the word Евангелїе. When denoting human beings, the distribution of capital letters seems to be based on social hierarchy. Words denoting higher officers are written with a capital initial, while other ranks are not:

Штабъ, Оберъ и ундеръ офицерамъ, и салдатамъ при полку или ротѣ ...

The latter rule is not used consistently. Spellings contradicting the “hierarchy rule” are also encountered:

... а ундеръ Офицерамъ и Салдатамъ все.

How does the orthography of the Artikul compare to other printed texts from the 1740s? For reasons of comparison, we compared it to two other printed texts

51 Shitsgal, Russkii grazhdanskii shrift, 82.
from the 1740s: the *Ustav o bankrutakh*, a legislative text regulating bankruptcy, printed at the beginning of the decade, and M. V. Lomonosov’s textbook on rhetoric, the *Kratkoe rukovodstvo k krasnorechiiu* from the end of the 1740s. These particular texts were chosen exclusively on the basis of their date of production. They were printed in separate printing offices. The *Ustav* was produced at the Senate’s printing office, which had been established at the Senate chancellery in 1727 and charged with the printing of edicts. The *Kratkoe rukovodstvo* was printed at the Academy of Sciences, as was the *Artikul*.

Beginning with the issue of capital letters, we find that the *Ustav* uses them at the beginning of sentences, in proper names, and in words denoting origin:

... и во ономъ числѣ кураторовъ, быть двумъ Иноzemцамъ, двумъ же Россййскимъ ...

The hierarchical perspective is visible in words denoting the tsar, the state, institutions, and individuals in the imperial administration.

In the *Kratkoe rukovodstvo*, the hierarchical rule is applied in a way similar to the *Ustav*:

Ибо Генералы, Сенаторы, и сами Консулы, какъ Ирцїй и Панса, будучи на высочайшемъ степени Римскїя власти ...

The *Kratkoe rukovodstvo*, however, also uses captitalization for emphasis:

Первымъ образомъ сочиняются Проповѣди, Исторїи, учебныя книги; другимъ составляются Имны, Оды, Комедїи, Сатиры, и другихъ родовъ стихи.

In both the *Ustav* and the *Kratkoe rukovodstvo*, the distribution of ⟨ï⟩ agrees with that found in the 1744 edition of the *Artikul*.

Spelling both in the *Ustav* and the *Kratkoe rukovodstvo* is relatively consistent. The character ⟨ѣ⟩ is employed in its etymologically correct places.
All three texts use stress markings in word forms that might cause ambiguity, such as ⟨слова⟩. In the examined portion of the Artikul, such a stress marking is encountered only once, in the word ⟨ниже⟩. It does, however, occur in other parts of the book. In the Kratko rukovodstvo, stress markings sometimes occur several times on a page and it is not always clear why. Thus, on page 287 we find ⟨пото́мъ, ча́сти, сво́йства, пра́вилахъ⟩, and also ⟨сво́йствъ⟩ where it is clearly redundant since the word only has a single syllable.

The rules for spelling reflexive verbs is unstable in the Ustav, which has ⟨лишаетца, почитаетца, называетца⟩ alongside ⟨имѣется, обрѣтается⟩ for the third person, singular, present. Infinitives are spelled with ⟨тьс⟩: ⟨оберегаться⟩. The Kratko rukovodstvo has no examples of ⟨-тца⟩.

In the field of morphology, earlier editions of the Artikul contain archaic forms, some of which have been changed, and some remain in the later editions. To the first of these belong the Dative plural of nouns, where the 1715 and 1735 editions have ⟨нашїмъ генераломъ⟩, and in 1744, this has been changed to ⟨нашимъ генераламъ⟩. On the other hand, all editions agree on another case: ⟨честнымъ воинскимъ людемъ благопристойно⟩.

When examining the linguistic characteristics of the text, the most striking change takes place between the editions of 1735 and 1744. In the latter, the dative plural генераломъ has been changed to генераламъ. This is an example of a-expansion and indicates the following changes: -омъ/-емъ → -амъ/-ямъ (Dative plural), -ы/-ыми → -ами (Instrumental plural) and -ехъ/-ѣхъ → -ахъ/-яхъ (Locative plural). The process whereby an older system of case forms in the plural was supplanted by forms characterized by -а- has been investigated by Zhivov, among others.56 In his 2012 investigation of the instrumental case in sources from the eighteenth century, Nikita Mikhaylov reports that the whole process of a-expansion among nouns in the plural had been concluded by the beginning of the eighteenth century.57 However, traces of the earlier system remain. Therefore, людемъ is encountered in all three editions of the Articles of War, rather than the a-expansion form людямъ.

In the Instrumental plural, the excerpt contains two examples of the old type: ⟨двѣмя большими персты⟩ and ⟨всякими образы⟩, but no examples of a-expansion forms. According to Mikhaylov, the old declension is encountered as a stylistic variant for masculine and neuter nouns in texts until the late 1760s.58

56 Zhivov, Ocherki, chapter 3.
58 Ibid., 270.
In addition to the section of the text analyzed here, endings in -ами are found in many places throughout the Article of War. For example:

Артикуль 4. Кто пресвятую Матерь Божию Деву Марию, и святых ругательными словами поносит, онъ имѣет по состоянію его особы и хуленія, тѣлесным наказаніемъ отсѣченія сустава наказанъ, или живота лишень бысть.59

In the Locative plural, only forms in -ахъ/-яхъ occur.

The endings of adjectives in Nominative/Accusative plural have been the object of detailed studies by Zhivov.60 Of particular interest to the present investigation are the developments following the so-called Rule of 1733 (masculine -ые/-ие; feminine and neuter -ыя/-ия), which remained in force until the orthographic reform of 1917–1918.61 As Zhivov points out, the so-called Rule of 1733 was not universally implemented during the 1740s: “в середине XVIII в. многие авторы, непосредственно не связанные с Академией наук, продолжали писать так, как они привыкли.”62 However, the Articles of War were, indeed, a product of the academy’s printing shop. Does this mean that the spelling rules were consistently implemented?

In the excerpt from the Articles of War, the endings concerned appear three times, producing a mixed impression. The first example,

… сии послѣдующіе пункты …

has the endings -їи and -їе referring to a masculine noun in the plural. A search performed in the Russian National Corpus reveals more than a hundred examples of сии from the 1740s. The demonstrative was gender-neutral.63 In the second example,

… въ прочихъ воинскихъ случаяхъ, какова онъ званія ніесть …

59 Artikul voinskii (1744), 16 (Article 4. Whoever reviles the most holy Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, and the saints with bad language, he should, considering the position of his person and the abuse, be punished corporally by the severing of a limb, or lose his life).
60 Zhivov, Ocherki, 408–528.
61 Ibid., 488–489.
62 Ibid., 489–490 (in the middle of the eighteenth century, many authors who were not directly connected with the Academy of Sciences, continued writing as they were used to).
-ъя refers to a masculine noun (случай). This ending could also be used as a gender-neutral variant. The third example

... что въ ... воинскихъ артикулахъ, что оныя въ себѣ содержати будутъ, все исполнять исправно ...

has the ending -ые, which can be interpreted either as a masculine by the “Rule of 1733” or as a gender-neutral form.

Moving on to verbs, we see that the 1744 edition of the Articles of War preserves infinitives in -ти (five instances: вспомогати, жалѣти, знати, отвращати, содержати) alongside infinitives in -ть (twenty-five instances). This contrasts with Zhivov’s findings, according to which infinitives in -ти gradually fell out of use, reduced to a variant found in the poetic language of individual authors, notably Sumarokov.64

In infinitives of reflexive verbs, the 1715 edition uses -тца exclusively (непротївїтца, прїлучїтца, отлучатца), and the 1735 edition uses -тца and -итися (не противитися, отлучатся). The 1744 edition has abandoned -тца in favor of -итися and -атся for the infinitive (не противитися, отлучатся).

In the area of syntax, the Articles of War often place the verb at the end of sentences:

и всѣ пункты сего артикула право исполнять, и всякому особо высокаго и низкаго чина, безъ всякаго изъятїя, Нам яко Государю своему присягу чинить.

While there may exist other possible explanations, it is likely that verb placement was influenced by the German parallel text of the Articles: “und alle Puncta dieser Artickul getreulich zu erfüllen, und sollen alle und jede so wohl hohen als niedrigen Standes ohne einige Ausnahm, Uns als Ihrem Czaaren und Herren einen Eyd ablegen.” Remember, the Articles were modeled on foreign examples.

The examined portion of the Articles has one example of a Locative plural where the editions diverge. In the 1715 and 1735 editions, the ending is ⟨-ѣхъ⟩:

надлежїтъ сеи артїкулъ на смотрѣхъ, а особлїво про всякому полку по едїножды прочїтать въ недѣлю (1715).

64 Zhivov, Ocherki, 198–209.
In 1744, this has been changed to ⟨-ахъ⟩.

All editions agree in their use of an archaic ending in the Instrumental plural in the sentence

а правую руку поднять вверхъ съ простертыми двѣмя большими персты.

In the *Kratkoe rukovodstvo* Instrumental plurals in –ами dominate, but there are occasional examples of –ы:

§215. Отвѣтствованіе есть. когда сочинитель слова самъ себѣ на свой вопросъ отвѣщаетъ, что бываетъ разными образы ...

Such examples are not surprising since the ending was used as a stylistic variant during the period.

### 7.4.3 Parallel Editions: Field-Marshal de Lacy’s Reports from the Front

In rare cases, separate versions of a single text were printed twice within a short period. The rarity of this phenomenon makes existing parallel editions all the more interesting. Studying two versions of a single text, printed within a short time of each other by separate organizations, gives us an excellent understanding of the degree of variation at the time.

It is possible that other parallel editions exist, but during the preparation for this investigation only one example from the 1740s was encountered: Field-Marshall Peter de Lacy’s reports from the front in the Russo-Swedish war of 1741–1743. Twelve such reports, written during the summer and fall of 1742, have been available for the present investigation. The first version of these texts

---

66 Peter de Lacy (1678–1751) was born in Ireland as Pierce Edmond de Lacy but is better known under his Germanized name Peter von Lacy, or sometimes Peter Lacy. In certain older sources, he is also known as Lascy: Friedrich Rühs, *Finland och dess invånare*, vol. 1 (Stockholm: Olof Grahn, 1811), 207. Beginning in 1700, de Lacy spent more than half a century in Russian service and is known in Russia as Pëtr Petrovich Lassi (Пётр Петрович Ласси) and various other spelling variants. De Lacy himself signed his name “P. Cte de Lacy”; Swedish State Archives, Militaria 1588. Cf. Timothy C. Dowling, ed., *Russia at War: From the Mongol Conquest to Afghanistan, Chechnya, and beyond* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2015), 463.
was printed in Moscow, at the Senate printing office (“Moscow version”). The second version was issued in St. Petersburg, in the *Primechaniia* (“St. Petersburg version”).

Front reports such as these were not new. Similar reports were prepared during the Turkish war of the 1730s. Some of these reports were probably also printed in the Senate printing office since they have ornaments that are identical to those found in de Lacy’s Moscow editions of 1742.

De Lacy’s reports contain very detailed information about operations, as well as weapons and material conquered from the enemy, translations of interrogation protocols and confiscated letters. The composite nature of the reports shows that they were assembled from a large number of individual sources and contained language from a variety of registers.

Of the Moscow version, only the editions dated July 10, 14, 18, 21, 28, 31; August 9, 22, 24, 31; September 4 and 11 have been found, even though it is possible that other reports exist. These reports include lengthy and cumbersome descriptive titles, as the following example demonstrates:

Послѣ публикованныхъ сего мѣсяца 5 и 10 чиселъ, о благополучныхъ отъ арміи Ея императорскаго величества надъ непріятелемъ въ Финляндіи дѣйствіяхъ изъ репортовъ генерала фельдмаршала Лессія экстрактовъ сего мѣсяца 10 числа, вновь еще отъ него жъ фельдмаршала изъ лагеря при рѣкѣ Кимисъ отъ 4 сего настоящаго мѣсяца полученъ репортъ слѣдующаго содержанія.


68 Although not relevant to a discussion of Russian in the 1740s, the texts contain examples of language from preceding centuries, as in the case of a church bell found by the Russian troops in the city of Borgå/Porvoo, on the Southern coast of Finland: “7053 году слитъ бысть колоколь сїй къ живоначальнѣй Троицѣ въ Александрову пустыню при великомъ Князѣ Иванѣ Васильевичѣ вса Руссїи, и при Архїепискупѣ Ѳеодосїи Великаго Новагорода и Пскова, повелѣнїемъ Игумена Родїона Кочнева” (Moscow version, August 22, page 2). The year 7053 corresponds to 1544/1545 AD.

69 (Following the extracts published here on the fifth and tenth day of this month from reports by General Field-Marshal Lacy on the tenth of this month, concerning the successful actions against the Enemy in Finland by the Army of Her Imperial Highness, yet another report, from the fourth of this month, has been received from the said Field-Marshal from the camp at the river Kimis, of the following content.)
A few weeks later, in St. Petersburg, the same reports appeared in the *Primechaniia*. The reports are found in the 1742 issues of the *Primechaniia* from 61 and 62 (July 29) to 84 (September). Front reports had been printed prior to this as well, as evidenced by issues 30–32, but the parallel versions are not available for consultation. Also, it has not been possible to establish whether all reports were printed twice or if this happened only to parts of the material.

Due to the size of the parallel sources, reproducing all texts below is not feasible. We can, however, use the Moscow version of a report dated July 14, 1741 as an illustration.

Послѣ публикованныхъ сего мѣсяца 5 и 10 чиселъ, о благополучныхъ отъ армій Ея императорскаго величества надъ непріятелемъ въ Финляндіи дѣйствіяхъ изъ репортовъ генерала фельдмаршала Лессія экстрактовъ сего мѣсяца 10 числа, вновь еще отъ него жъ фельдмаршала изъ лагеря при рѣкѣ Кимись отъ 4 сего настоящаго мѣсяца полученъ репортъ слѣдующаго содержанія.

Сего мѣсяца отъ 1 числа всеподданнѣйше отъ меня донесено, что я отъ урочища Сумъ съ высокославною Вашего ИМПЕРАТОРСКАГО ВЕЛИЧЕСТВА арміею маршировалъ налехкѣ въ слѣдъ за непрїятелемъ до рѣки Кимись, и того числа до оной рѣки маршировали 15 версть, къ которой прибыли на вечеръ и непрїятеля на нашей сторонѣ рѣки уже не застали, а ретировался на другую сторону, и мостъ, какъ видѣть можно, незадолго до нашего приходу зжегъ, и на той сторонѣ [непрїятель] имѣлъ весьма крѣпкое мѣсто. Первое что рѣка неуская быстрая и глубокая. Второе съ той стороны по берегу горы, и по тѣмъ горамъ поставлены были въ разныхъ мѣстахъ пушки, изъ которыхъ по нась производили жестокую пальбу, и за тѣмъ не можно было близъ рѣки лагеремъ стать; ибо мѣсто случилось открытое, и принуждены были къ ночѣ остановиться въ лѣсу, пока наша артилерія прибыла. И какъ поставлена наша артиллерія въ пристойныхъ мѣстахъ и взамно имъ отвѣтствовано, то и пушки ихъ съ преждепоставленныхъ мѣстъ збиты, которые они принуждены были съ мѣста на мѣсто перевозить, и тако со обѣихъ сторонъ изъ пушекъ произвождаема была чрезъ 12 часовъ прежестокая пальба, причемъ съ нашей стороны и изъ гоубицъ дробью по непрїятелѣ дѣйствовано было. И какъ
подъ оборонною нашихъ пушекъ мы начаты работою чрезъ рѣку мосты ко окончаниію приводить стали, и изъ нашихъ пушекъ у непрїятеля съ немалою торопостію ретировался, и прошедъ съ три версты паки за рѣку [которая сей вдвоє ширѣ будетъ] позади себя мостъ зжегъ, и хотя наши гусары за нимъ и гонялись; но дальнего поиску учинить не могли, понеже шель имѣя въ арїергардїи пушки; а что жъ непрїятель съ торопостію ту свою ретираду производилъ, изъ того наибольє видно: ибо 12 ящиковъ съ пулями въ своемъ лагерѣ намъ въ добычу оставилъ, и во время мой бывшей у насъ съ непрїятелемъ пушечной стрѣльбы съ нашей стороны побито и ранено съ 30 человѣкъ, а у непрїятеля, какъ языки показываютъ, отъ нашихъ гоубицъ зѣло немалое число побитыхъ и раненыхъ считаю.

Упомянутая жъ впереди лежашая рѣка называется Кимисъ же, {ибо сего званїя рѣка въ здѣшнемъ мѣстѣ натрое раздѣлилась,} и впереди непрїятеля третья неуже жъ здѣшней находятся, и /для/ // для того, ради осмотру ситуацїи я вчерашняго числа подѣзжалъ къ непрїятельскому лагерю, которой по усмотрѣнїю стоитъ за второю отъ сей лежашею рѣкою полумѣсяцомъ и въ немаломъ числѣ; а по тракту къ намъ здѣланы батареи, и поставлены пушки; и хотя жъ и въ вышеупомянутомъ первомъ непрїятельскомъ лагерѣ такїежъ батареи здѣланы, и на нихъ пушки поставлены были, однако они оной покинули.

Сего числа вверхъ по сей рѣкѣ отъ нашего лагеря близъ версты, за рѣкою на мысу оказалась немалая непрїятельская партїя, имѣя при себѣ 4 пушки; но посланную съ нашей стороны партію съ 2 пушками съ помощїю божїею съ немалымъ урономъ прогната, причемъ съ нашей стороны ранено изъ пушки кананеровъ два.

Отъ галерной эскадры Г енерал-Лейтенанта де Брильли отъ 1 числа сего мѣсяца репортуетъ, что онъ обрѣтается при островѣ Мартинсарѣ, и уже и отъ карабельнаго флота два прама и три бомбандирскїя карабля къ нему прибыли же; но въ дальней путь за противною погодою итти ему тогда было не возможно: непрїятельскїе же де галеры стоятъ напротиву ихъ за островомъ не въ дальности, а какъ де погода поутихнетъ, то онъ Г енераль Лейтенантъ призвавъ Бога въ
помощь имѣть слѣдовать къ поиску надъ непрѣятельскими галерами.

брегадиръ Краснощокой съ Донскими и Чюгуевскими казаками, отправленъ отъ меня для диверсій непрѣятелю и учиненія поиска до Тавастъ-Густа.

По непрѣятельскимъ же всѣмъ робостнымъ поступкамъ видится, что когда онъ сей немало крѣпкой лагерь оставилъ, то и далѣе ретираду свою продолжать намѣренъ. И хотя въ поискѣ надъ онѣмъ намъ немало препятствуютъ частые переправы чрезъ рѣки; однако мы съ непрѣятельской стороны ежедневно языковъ получаемъ, но по большей части попадаются фины, которые заподлинно о непрѣятельскомъ состояніи и преднамѣреніяхъ ево хотя и не знаютъ, но однако какъ тѣ въ полкахъ служащіе фины, такъ и изъ мужиковъ почти всѣ большую частью показываютъ, что имѣютъ склонность къ подданству Вашего ИМПЕРАТОРСКАГО ВЕЛИЧЕСТВА, и для того отъ меня наижеччайше посылаемымъ въ партіи гусарамъ и казакамъ, также и во всей арміи подтверждается, отнюдь жителей, кои ружьемъ не противятся, не токмѣ не побивать и не грабить, но и жилищъ ихъ не жечь и не разорять.

Впрочемъ за благодать всевышнаго Бога состоятъ у насъ благополучно. А каковъ при самомъ сего отправленіи полученъ съ галерной эскадры отъ Генерала-Лейтенанта де Брильлѣя, отъ 2 сего мѣсяца репортъ, съ онаго копію всенижайше присемъ подношу. /копія/ // Копія съ репорта генерала-лейтенанта де Брильлѣя.

Сего числа по полуночи въ 7 мѣ часу отъ острова Мартисара съ галернымъ флотомъ въ походъ благополучно я выступилъ, и дошедъ до острова Люмилота разстояніемъ версть съ 8 остановился для ожиданія идущихъ позади насъ бомбандрирскихъ караблей и прамовъ, понеже для буксированія онѣхъ командировано отъ флота 10 галеръ тако жѣ и за противнымъ вѣтромъ. А поставленная отъ непрѣятельскаго флота на бранд-вахтѣ галера съ судами стоитъ на томъ же мѣстѣ разстояніемъ отъ насъ верстахъ въ двухъ, и ежели завтрешняго дня будетъ благополучная погода, то призвавъ всемогущаго Бога въ помощь надѣ оною галерою и съ имѣющимиися при ней судами [чтобѣ ихъ
The versions differ in the use of stress marks and a few obvious misprints, such as ⟨въ⟩ for intended ⟨въ⟩. In both versions the soft sign occurs inconsistently: ⟨фельдмаршала⟩/⟨фелдмаршала⟩, ⟨больные⟩/⟨болные⟩, ⟨мѣльничной⟩/⟨мѣлничной⟩, and so forth. It appears that free variation in the use of the soft sign occurs in both versions of the texts.

A more stable example of variation, which clearly separates the Moscow and St. Petersburg versions, is offered by the spelling of prefixes. The Moscow version favors an unchanging form: ⟨разстояніемъ⟩, ⟨разсуждаетъ⟩, ⟨подтвердили⟩, ⟨изтекающаго⟩, while the St. Petersburg version has varying forms, depending on the voicing of the consonant following the prefix: ⟨расстояніемъ⟩, ⟨рассуждаетъ⟩, ⟨потвердили⟩, ⟨истекающаго⟩.

For the most part, the Moscow and St. Petersburg versions show identical case endings, with a few minor differences. In the Nominative/Accusative plural of adjectives and pronouns, the texts contain 181 instances of -ые (119) and -іе (62). These may refer to masculine nouns like ⟨А драгунскіе швецкіе четыре полка⟩ (полк, m., “regiment”), neuter nouns such as ⟨бомбандирскіе суда⟩ (бомбандирское судно, n., “bomb vessel”), and feminine nouns like ⟨двѣ лежащїе по тому тракту рѣки⟩ (река, f., “river”). The endings -ыя/-ія are represented by a total of 71 cases (29 -ыя and 42 -ія) referring to masculine nouns

три бомбандирскїя карабля (корабль, m., “ship”),

70 St. Petersburg version, Primechaniia, issue 61, 238.
71 Moscow version, July 10, 2.
feminine nouns

пѣхотные гранодерскїя роты и мушкатеръ 200 человѣкъ (рота, f., “company”),

пули дѣтающїя около головъ нашихъ побуждаютъ насъ къ бѣгу (пуля, f., “bullet”),

and neuter nouns:

опредѣленныя свои мѣста (мѣсто, n., “place”).

The ending -їи is only represented in the St. Petersburg version:

въ полкахѣ служащїи фины.72

The Moscow version has ⟨служащіе⟩.

No differences in verbs can be found between the St. Petersburg and Moscow versions.

Among nouns in the Dative plural, only forms in -амъ/-ямъ are encountered: ⟨bastionamъ⟩, ⟨обывателямъ⟩, and so forth. Similarly, in the locative, forms in -ах/-ях are pervasive with only two exceptions, both involving the noun люди:

хотябъ онъ и въ половинѣ вышеписаннаго числа полковъ былъ, немалыебъ намъ препятствїи и убытокъ въ людехъ причинить могъ.73

The instrumental case in nouns is represented by the endings -ами/-ями, -'ми and -ы. As reported by Mikhaylov in his investigation of the Instrumental, -ами/-ями is the most frequent ending during the eighteenth century, while -'ми and -ы occur occasionally.74 In de Lacy’s reports, -’ми is encountered with a few nouns: ⟨вещьми, дверьми, дѣтьми, лошадьми, людьми, обывательми, перевезьми, принадлежностью⟩. Of these, only принадлежность (belonging, accessory) also occurs with -ями: ⟨принадлежностями⟩. The ending -ы

72 St. Petersburg version, Primechaniia, issues 61 and 62, 244.
73 Moscow version, July 31, 7; St. Petersburg version, Primechaniia, issues 70–72, 286.
74 Mikhaylov, “Tvoritel’nyi padezh,” 270.
occurs a total of thirteen times. The latter is sometimes encountered in cases of “hypercorrection” for feminine nouns. Our selection of de Lacy’s reports contains one such example:

Генераль Лейтенант призвавъ бога въ помощь имьеть слѣдовать къ поиску надъ непрїятельскими галеры.76

The Soviet philologist and literary scholar G. O. Vinokur noted the importance of the administrative language (приказной язык) for the study of Russian historical syntax and exemplifies this by mentioning the widespread relative construction with a repeated antecedent:

А по отписям, каковы отписи положил в Володимерской чети перед дьяком перед Михаилом Огарковым.77

Zhivov observes that the construction with a repeated antecedent entered the “Petrine pool” from the non-literary registers and that it was adopted by the academy translators who prepared the Primechaniia during the 1730s. After the 1730s, however, “эта конструкция из текстов нового языкового стандарта навсегда устраняется.”78 As a basis for this claim, Zhivov presents Trediakovskii’s 1737 translation of Marsigli’s L’état militaire de l’Empire Ottoman and Hüttl-Folter’s 1996 investigation of that text.79 In de Lacy’s reports the construction occurs in several cases:

Какъ то отъ 29 минувшаго Іюня всеподданнѣйше отъ меня донесено, коимъ образомъ непрїятель зажегши крѣпость Фридригсъ-Гамскую ретировался по Гелсинъ-Форской

75 Cf. ibid., 25.
78 Zhivov, “Literaturnyi iazyk i iazyk literatury,” 18 (this construction disappears forever from the texts of the new linguistic standard).
дороге, ... которую ретираду неприятель съ такою робостью производил, что довольно багажу по тракту металъ. ... 80

... двѣ впереди отъ насъ лежащѣе рѣки мостовъ, которые рѣки текуть по каменью порогами такъ быстро, что съ превеликимъ трудомъ чрезъ оные мосты утвердить могли. ... 81

... неприятельскія галеры и прочѣе суда назадъ тому третей день пошли къ Боргову и Гельсинъ-Форсу, на которыхъ галерахъ для покупки табаку онъ и самъ былъ. ... 82

... но имъ дали волю во всей землѣ до Фридрихсъ-Гама жечь и палить, подъ которымъ городомъ они нынѣ стоять. 83

... два депутата ... которымъ даны на весь уѣздъ 11 Салвогвардїй, которые депутаты за весь вышеписанной уѣздъ въ подданствѣ Вашему Императорскому Величеству и присягали. 84

While Zhivov’s conclusion is right concerning the texts that he offers as evidence, additional facts show that this construction was common in other registers.

80 Moscow version, July 10; St. Petersburg version, issue 61, 238.
81 Moscow version, July 21.
82 Moscow version, July 28.
83 Ibid.
84 Moscow version, July 31.
CHAPTER 8

Functional Analysis

Following an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the creation of different documents in Russian during the 1740s, and after an analysis of the language found in texts representing different registers, this investigation has arrived at its third step: the functional analysis of registers. In the register analysis framework, the aim of a functional analysis is to explain why certain linguistic features are encountered in a particular context.1

The functional uses of linguistic elements during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are well-known and have been discussed by V. M. Zhivov, S. Mengel, and O. Siebert, among others.2 However, as far known to this author, vernacular Russian of the 1740s has not been the subject of such discussions. Also, the decade had not seen the publication of Lomonosov’s ideas about the three styles, which were published a decade later, in 1758.3

A comparison of the findings in the preceding subsections of this investigation enables us to identify a number of functional factors. In the individual registers, the relative proportions of these factors influence the characteristics of the language.

Before going on to a presentation of the functional factors, we must first briefly review some delimitations. In section 5.2.2 of this investigation, a hypothetical set of registers was suggested for Russian in the 1740s following an application of the uniformitarian principle. Three of the registers in this tentative set were not examined in this investigation: “traditional literature and religious language,”

---

1 Biber and Conrad, Register, Genre and Style, 69.
“informal speech,” and “non-native Russian speech.” These registers were left out for specific reasons. The register “traditional literature and religious language” was not investigated because the language of its texts is predominantly hybrid Church Slavic and Church Slavic. Since vernacular Russian formed, at best, a minor linguistic component in this register, it should logically be excluded from an inventory of Russian linguistic registers. Nonetheless, it was kept in the list of registers since its texts—notably the Bible and the religious sphere—were important parts of Russian literate culture of the eighteenth century. By ignoring the existence of this register, we run the risk of creating a faulty image of eighteenth-century Russian language.

The registers “informal speech” and “non-native Russian speech” were not investigated due to lack of data. From the modern linguistic situation we can infer that these registers must have existed, but since they were inadequately recorded in writing, or not recorded at all, we cannot study them. Court documents, such as the witness statements discussed in section 6.3.2, contain fragments of informal speech, but have been edited. This fact casts doubt on their value as evidence. Our conclusions about factors influencing a register from a functional perspective are also most likely applicable to the registers that have not been investigated. But, for the reasons explained above, we cannot say that for sure.

### 8.1 Tradition

Tradition is an important factor in the employment of linguistic elements for functional purposes. In the material analyzed above, we encounter a few cases of such traditional uses. Thus, in Emperor Ioann Antonovich’s manifesto (section 6.4), we see that the Genitive singular of feminine adjectives in -ыя is used, rather than the -ой/-ей, which was common in most texts of the period:

... при предкахъ Нашихъ Блаженныя и Вѣчнодостойныя памяти Императорскихъ Величествъ ...

In the same text, an aorist of the verb, rather than the usual past tense form in -ла is used in order to emphasize the gravity of the situation:

... что помянутая корона Шведская наруша явно имѣющей съ Нами вѣчнаго мира трактатъ и союзъ.

In another context (see section 7.1.2), an example of the aorist is used to talk about death:
... а шхиперъ куртъ умре въ их швецком ѳлоте авгста „22“ дня ...

It should be emphasized that these examples are in no way typical for Russian in the 1740s. Examples of the Genitive singular of feminine adjectives in -ыя are found in the imperial diplomatic correspondence, another high-status text. Forms of the aorist, however, have not been found outside of the contexts previously mentioned.

8.2 Education

The educational background of an author was arguably the most important factor determining the form of written language in the 1740s. The vast majority of Russian speakers had very basic education, and most were unable to compose a written text of any kind. On the other hand, their abilities to create oral texts may have been considerable, but this escapes our judgement due to lack of evidence.

In a semi-literate society like eighteenth-century Russia, people were aware of the power of the written word, and the value of being able to send information in writing. We should interpret the widespread use of formulaic language during the eighteenth century with this in mind.

Since most people did not know how to write or chose not to write for some other reason, such as social status, most writing was done by a corps of professional scribes who often did not know the intended recipient of the message they created. Resorting to a predetermined structure and formulaic expressions was a practical way of conforming to social expectations. At the same time, this structure provided a practical framework into which important pieces of information could be inserted.

8.3 Social Identity

In the Russian Empire, “[a]mong civil and military servicemen of all ranks there were enormous socioeconomic, cultural and political differences.”4 From 1722 and onwards, the entire state apparatus was divided according to the Tabel’ o

4 Wirtschaft, Social Identity in Imperial Russia, 47.
rangakh (Table of Ranks). In the registers of the language employed in the state administration and in maintaining relations with foreign powers, the idea of hierarchy is constantly present.

As seen in the examples of imperial correspondence discussed in the preceding chapters, titles and long marks of courtesy were characteristic. They often dominated the text, taking up more than half of the entire document. Since both addressor and addressee were well informed about each other’s titles, the preoccupation with titles in letters was clearly not due to a desire to provide new information. Instead, the titles can be interpreted as verbal signals of power and prestige of monarchs. As we saw in section 3.4.1, the rules prescribed the full title of the emperor to be used in letters going abroad, while a considerably shorter one was intended for domestic use. Interestingly enough, flamboyant demonstrations of power and prestige were combined with courteous expressions according to the fashion of the period.

In Russian majority society, family hierarchy was also keenly felt, but its linguistic expressions were different. As evidenced by the private letters we examined, social identities were communicated in terms of expressions of submission that reduced the importance of the letter-writer, inquiries about the health of the addressee, and so forth.

In the highest levels of society, expressions of social identity and status—real or perceived—also formed a central part of written communication. This is a likely interpretation of the many Vedomosti texts that deal with events at court. They described—and were most likely also read by—the involved parties: courtiers, ladies-in-waiting, officers, and foreign ambassadors—people to whom rank and status at court were significant. Descriptions of festivities and ceremonies followed certain compositional patterns that remained similar for long periods. With their elaborately detailed composition, these texts communicated the prestige and importance of the court to the readers in Russia and abroad.

---

5 Tabel’ o rangakh vsekh chinov, voinskikh, statskikh, i pridvornykh ... (Moscow, January 30, 1722), accessed November 18, 2021, https://www.prlib.ru/item/454265.
8.4 Efficiency of Administration

Historian Simon Franklin writes about the role of printing in the administration of the Russian Empire during the eighteenth century:6

An oral message depends on the reliability of its bearer. Writing is an improvement, both because it is visible and verifiable, and because the handwritten text can be preserved and re-used. In production, however, each handwritten message depends on the reliability of its scribe.7

Franklin notes that the widespread use of printed texts facilitated distribution, standardization, and the “emblematic projection of authority.” The term “emblematic projection of authority” refers to the perceived power in the printed text itself when displayed in public, even to illiterate persons. But from sources such as Ivan Pososhkov’s document (cf. section 3.2.2) we see that handwritten texts possessed the same power. The sources suggest that the authority of the written or printed word in eighteenth-century Russia was so great that it was enough to show a decree, or even to claim to possess one, for the masses to believe it.

The use of formulaic expressions, either in print or in written form, was an important functional factor in the linguistic and administrative life of the Russian state. If the central authorities of the empire received information from the provinces written in similar or even identical wording, the interpretation of the information was made easier. It also minimized the risk of misunderstanding. Texts also moved in the opposite way. By distributing printed texts to provincial representatives, the central authorities could guarantee that all intended recipients got the same information. For the next step, however, the printed text would be copied by hand and distributed at the provincial level, as the following example from the archives of the Consistory of Hamina, Finland, demonstrates:

7 Franklin, “Printing and Social Control in Russia 2,” 481.
Russian in the 1740s

As the extract shows, the handwritten copy alters the text by adding words and by changing the orthography from the civil to the traditional. Further copying of handwritten texts could potentially lead to further alterations, influencing not only the language, but also the message.

### 8.5 Informativity

At the heart of administrative documents, such as supplications, is informational content often introduced by formulae such as “а о чем мое доношение, тому следуют пункты.” The private letter of naval cadet Mikhail Turchenikov also contains elements of administrative language:

… а кто изъ наших щениковъ со мною обретаютца о том явствуетъ ниже сего.

---

1. [Ukaz eia imperatorskago velichestva ... V vedenii v Pravitelstvuushchii Senat ...](Moscow: Senat, June 3, 1749).
2. Finnish National Archives, 1 Hamnin konsistorin arkisto, saapunet asiakirjat (1720–1784), June 26, 1749.
Besides administrative texts, the informative function played an important role in the printed output of books from the Academy of Sciences and from the editorial office of Vedomosti and Primechaniia. In printed books and newspapers, the reading public accustomed to texts in the civil typeface could keep abreast of world affairs, happenings at court, private advertisements, science, literature, and more. However, the portion of the public capable of—or interested in—reading these kinds of texts remained small throughout the 1740s. As we saw in section 3.2.2, although statistics pertaining to the mid-eighteenth-century are not available, it is likely that considerably less than 1.5 % of the population read these types of texts in the 1740s. Zhivov describes the situation around the middle of the eighteenth century:

Новый языковой стандарт остается достоянием небольшой части образованной элиты, а возникшие за этот период образовательные институции (Академическая гимназия, Шляхетный корпус, Московский университет) существенной экспансии нового идиома пока еще не дают.5

8.6 Conclusion

Above, an attempt has been made to identify some functional factors that were relevant for text production in Russian during the 1740s. We must not exclude the possible existence of additional factors that have not been identified here.

If, during earlier periods, the language registers were distinguished with the help of morphological forms, it was not frequent during the 1740s. As far as can be seen from the material, during this period, the primary markers were lexical: specific collocations and formulae. A collocation in this context is a combination of words, a lexical bundle, that is, a recurrent sequence of words,6 while formula is a longer unit of the same kind. For example, the following formula is found in imperial decrees:

5 Zhivov, “Literaturnyi iazyk i iazyk literatury,” 20 (The new linguistic standard remains the property of a small portion of the educated elite, and the educational institutions appearing during this period (the Academy Grammar School, the Cadet Corps, Moscow University) do not yet result in any significant expansion of the new idiom).
The reliance on collocations and formulaic language at many levels of the Russian language during the 1740s is the lasting conclusion of this analysis. We find formulaic language in diplomatic correspondence, throughout the administration, in newspapers, and in private letters. The formulaic language did not fulfill identical purposes in all varieties of written Russian. Different collocations and formulae were employed in various functions depending on the needs, or social status of the writer. In a society like the Russian, where most people could not communicate independently in writing, formulae played an important role. They were used in countless documents during the 1740s for a range of purposes, and at all levels of society. In private letters, they were an expression of traditional Russian culture. When employed by the authorities, they helped to organize the administration of the world’s biggest empire.
CHAPTER 9

General Conclusions

This investigation of the written Russian during the 1740s reveals that the conditions in which the linguistic registers existed were quite diverse. While some registers were closely interconnected and displayed similarities in the use of formulaic expressions, others appear to have had a more independent existence. The linguistic situation of the 1740s is best understood when viewed against the background of concurrent societal developments.

9.1 Territorial Expansion and the Need for Trained Specialists

Events earlier in the eighteenth century led to the expansion of the Russian Empire’s territory. New population groups had been incorporated, speaking languages not previously represented. These languages included Estonian, Livonian, Latvian, and the German of the Baltic Nobility. Russia’s large population centers, notably Moscow and St. Petersburg, became increasingly multilingual, at least in their leading circles. Among foreign languages, the prestige of French as a language of the elite grew in importance.

Russia’s newly acquired role as a great power in Europe demanded ever-expanding cadres of educated administrators. Research on the development of education shows that, during the 1740s, the student recruitment problems were not satisfactorily solved. The number of students graduating from Russian schools and the Academy University remained low and failed to meet demands. Russia therefore continued to invite foreign specialists and to send Russians abroad for higher education. Perhaps the most important academic development that had great significance for the future was the coming of age of a first generation of Russian-born scholars who assumed leading positions during the 1740s.
9.2 Education and Literacy

Throughout the 1740s, most Russian speakers were serfs, who were restricted in terms of movement. They spoke the local dialect of their village and the immediate surrounding area. While the nobility doubled in size during the initial decades of the eighteenth century, and members of the nobility—almost exclusively men—received a far broader education than had previously been available, the access to education did not significantly improve for the majority of the population.

Literacy cannot be taken for granted even for those members of society who held respectable positions, such as mid-ranking military officers. For example, if they had come from a modest background and worked their way up through the ranks, their formal schooling did not result in high levels of literacy, ultimately barring them from further advancement.

Literacy levels feature prominently in the discussion of education. In Russia, basic literacy training during the first half of the eighteenth century was carried out according to traditional methods. Based on what is known today, we must deal with rudimentary literacy rates below ten percent for the majority of the population and intermediate literacy rates below five percent. For the production of texts, this had immediate consequences: only a fraction of the population received education that enabled them to produce texts independently. In the sources, texts written by professional and often anonymous scribes are the rule, while autographs are exceptions.

Research on literacy in eighteenth-century Russia stands out as a field where much work remains to be done. Such research should include both methodological refinement and introduction of new types of sources, but also where possible, studies of how people’s attitudes towards the written word may have changed. Kravetskii’s and Pletnëva’s research on Church Slavic literacy as opposed to literacy in the vernacular deserves to be taken into account for the eighteenth century.

Low literacy levels explain the lack of Russian ego-documents during the 1740s. For the present investigation, this has significant consequences. The number of documents in which the voices of the peasant population or women of all classes can be heard is virtually non-existent. For these strata of the population, not a single primary source document has surfaced during the archival searches underlying the present investigation. Ego-documents are difficult to find in Russia, despite being a rich source of knowledge about the lives and languages of non-elite people in the eighteenth century in other European countries. In the absence of primary sources, we must rely on information offered
in secondary sources. Continued work on “semi-ego-documents” such as petitions, court documents, and so forth is therefore a necessity.

9.3 Organized Language Management

Established in the 1720s, the Imperial Academy of Sciences had grown into an important hub for the production and dissemination of information by the 1740s and was the leading operator in organized language management activities. During the 1730s, its staff had launched important language management initiatives. Notable in this respect are the head of the academy, Baron Johann Albrecht von Korff, and its Russian translators and linguists such as V. K. Tредиаковский and V. E. Адодуров. Arguably most important was the formation of the Russian Conference in 1735, a terminology committee where translators discussed each other’s work and suggested new items to be potentially added to the Russian vocabulary to represent concepts occurring in foreign texts. When compared to the 1730s, the 1740s stand out as a period of decline. Leading figures in language left the academy, the publication of the academy’s journal, Primechaniia, was discontinued and the Russian Conference petered out towards the end of 1742. In fact, the academy itself lacked leadership for much of the decade, and it was only towards the end of the 1740s that language management once more became a priority. The middle of the decade appears uneventful in terms of linguistic matters, and it is only towards the end of the 1740s that language management activities were once again revived. The publication of Lomonosov’s handbook on rhetoric and Tредиаковский’s treatise on orthography provide evidence of ongoing debate on linguistic matters.

9.4 Functional Spheres of Russian in the 1740s

The analyses undertaken in this investigation were conducted in order to uncover the properties of the functional spheres, or registers, represented in the source material. Chapter 5 discussed and evaluated various existing methods. It was determined that an analysis should be based on a combination of methods, striving towards informational maximalism in order to find answers to the questions posed in the Introduction. The uniformitarian principle was implemented to identify a plausible set of registers in Russian of the 1740s. According to this principle, language in society is likely to function similarly today as it did in the past. Therefore, compared to the set of functional spheres for modern Russian
suggested in the early 1990s by Iu. N. Karaulov, a revised set of hypothetical registers were suggested for the 1740s:

- traditional literature and religious language;
- the language of printed texts (imaginative literature, the press, state documentation, science, and technology);
- traditional administrative documentation;
- informal speech;
- professional language;
- non-native Russian speech.

The register analysis framework—a combination of methods involving situational analysis, linguistic analysis and functional analysis—inspired this investigation's analytical instruments for texts of the 1740s. The sources were subjected to three types of analysis. First, a situational analysis explored the circumstances surrounding the creation of the preserved source material. Second, a linguistic analysis mapped the characteristic features of the sources. Third, the functional analysis identified a number of factors determining the choice of linguistic features.

The results of these analyses highlighted the need for revision of the hypothetical set of registers proposed in chapter 5. First of all, vernacular printed texts should have a register of their own. In 1740s’ Russia, the editing of printed texts in the vernacular was the responsibility of a small cadre of highly professional translators, editors and printers. The printed texts resulting from their work look modern since printed texts often use capitalization and punctuation in ways similar to that of today’s printed material. However, since there was no codified spelling norm at the time, texts produced in different printing-shops show minor differences, such as in the use of ⟨ь⟩.

According to the analyses, it seems relevant to combine state documentation, administrative documents and private papers under the heading “vernacular handwritten language.” Sources ranging from imperial diplomatic correspondence to simple, every-day documents, such as receipts, are included in this category. Clearly, the handwritten vernacular register contains many subregisters. Nonetheless, all documents in this category share important features.

The first feature they share is that the graphic and orthographic principles of handwritten texts are the same in high-status documents and simple notes. All forms of handwriting make use of supralinear characters, diacritics and abbreviations. The use of capitalization in handwriting differs markedly from that found in printed texts, and the same is true for punctuation. When a printed text in
the civil typeface was copied by hand, scribes did not simply imitate the printed text. Instead, they transliterated it into the traditional system, which contained a broader range of character variants as well as entirely different diacritics. Certain characters, notably ⟨ѣ⟩, are often absent or used inconsistently in handwritten documents. Even the elaborate handwritten texts written in ceremonial cursive, produced by the central imperial administration, under what we can assume were very closely supervised circumstances, employ sets of characters and orthographical conventions reminiscent of earlier periods.

A second shared feature found in handwritten high-status documents as well as simple notes is the important role of formulaic expressions. The vocabulary in these formulae varies depending on the subject of the document and its function. In administrative documents, the language and structure adhere to rules dictated by the central authorities. When applied correctly by the team of administrators behind writing an official report, such rules guaranteed that their document would meet their superiors’ expectations.

Private letters continued to be written as they had been for most of the century. They were influenced by formulae from the administrative language. However, in private correspondence, the formulaic language was used less to achieve administrative accuracy, and rather to highlight the addressee’s social status and express courtesy and respect for parents and older relatives.

In diplomatic correspondence dispatched from the imperial court, the use of formulaic language is ubiquitous. The informational part of such letters is often limited to half a page, while the titles of the author and the addressee, and intricate marks of courtesy and well-wishing, make up most of the letter. In addition to being carriers of messages, such letters can be interpreted as symbols of power and prestige.

It should be noted that printed texts are not entirely devoid of formulaic language. Among them, newspaper texts most closely resemble handwritten administrative texts. In particular, advertisements make use of formulae that remain consistent throughout the 1740s.

### 9.5 Perspectives

Libraries and archives in the Russian Federation and its neighboring countries preserve rich collections of handwritten texts in eighteenth-century Russian. The results of this investigation clearly indicate that these handwritten texts form a crucial key to a fuller understanding of how the written language functioned in Russian society.
Handwritten texts inform us about people’s everyday lives, relationships, administration, and education. Until now the study of handwritten texts has not been particularly prioritized, and it deserves considerably more attention in the research endeavors of the eighteenth-century language.

This investigation has illustrated that the inventory of characters and the underlying orthographic systems in documents from the 1740s were not uniform. It remains to be seen how regionally based or register-based orthographic systems were distributed. Hopefully, this will be achieved through studies of other periods of the century and documents from a wider geographical area. While there exist investigations that discuss specific regions, a general synthesis of the various factors remains a thing of the future.

The work done on regional business language by researchers in the Russian Federation (E. N. Borisova, N. V. Chugaev, V. Ia. Deriagin, E., L. A. Glinkina, O. V. Nikitin, and many others) deserves special attention, as does work on historical dialectology. Hopefully, in this century, the research of Russian language history will continue and receive increased support.

The research of non-elite language of the eighteenth century would be greatly helped by the creation of a corpus on a large scale. The goal of creating such a corpus appears realistic given the potential of today’s computer-driven resources, such as optical character recognition software. When combined with innovative research methods, a corpus of handwritten texts will yield important new insights into the linguistic life of the fascinating society that was eighteenth-century Russia.
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January 13, 1743, Letter from Plenipotentiaries Andrei Rumiantsev and Ivan fon Liuberas (Johann Ludwig Pott von Luberas) to their Swedish counterparts, Barons Cedercreutz and von Nolcken.
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