

NOTES ON THE SEMANTIC DEVELOPMENT OF OLD CHURCH SLAVIC *NRAVŮ* AND *ROVANIJE*¹

MARTIN DIWEG-PUKANEC

Department of Slavic Philology, Faculty of Arts,
Constantine the Philosopher University, Nitra, Slovakia

DIWEG-PUKANEC, Martin: Notes on the semantic development of Old Church Slavic *nravŮ* and *rovanije*. *Jazykovedný časopis (Journal of Linguistics)*, 2024, Vol. 75, No. 2, pp. 175–185.

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to analyse Old Church Slavic *nravŮ* ‘nature, character’ and *rovanije* ‘gifts’. As the meanings of the words from Proto-Indo-European **(H)nōrH-* point out, Proto-Slavic **norvŮ*, from which Old Church Slavic *nravŮ* derives, had a semantics similar to that pervasive in Latin *mōrōsus* ‘hard to please’ or ‘qui suit son humeur, difficile, capricieux, chagrin’. In the Old Church Slavic period, however, the word *nravŮ* ‘manner, custom’ had a neutral connotation, like Latin *mōs* ‘custom, usage’. As for the word-form *rovanije*, it originated in a period when gifts and taxes were distinguished. Taxes were given (**da-nŮ* ‘tax’, **da-rŮ* ‘gift’ < **da-ti* ‘give’), offered first to pagan deities and then to the Christian God. They were also brought as (voluntary) gifts to Slavic princes. According to the etymology of *rov-anije* < **rov-ati* ‘to make a notch, cut; to determine the amount of a fee (tax/gift)’, nevertheless, they were written down (or prescribed) in the Old Church Slavic period in Great Moravia.

Keywords: etymology, moral words, Old Church Slavic, semantic change, semantics, Slavic languages

The aim of this paper is to analyse some recent etymological and especially semantic considerations of Old Church Slavic *nravŮ* ‘nature, character’ and to look at them from the point of view of the time when Old Church Slavic literature was established. In addition, we will attempt an etymological and semantic analysis of a somewhat enigmatic Old Church Slavic hapax legomenon *rovanije*, since previous interpretations of this word from Slavic sources are regarded as inadequate (cf. ESJS 13, pp. 777–778, s.v. *rovanii*), and the only accepted etymology, which considers the word to be a borrowing from Old High German, is more than hypothetical. In our opinion, the two words under analysis are not etymologically related, although at some point in the reasoning of our article they do touch, and their etymological connection is hypothetically possible, though unlikely. The choice of these words

¹ Funded by the EU NextGenerationEU through the Recovery and Resilience Plan for Slovakia under the project No. 09I03-03-V04-00670 *Inverted Morality: Reversed Semantics in Old Church Slavonic Moral Words (OXYMORAL)*.

was made, among other things, because they show the advantage of following some of the principles and methods used by the father of Slovak scholarly etymology, Š. Ondruš (see more Diweg-Pukanec 2022, p. 353).

A new and modern etymology of Old Church Slavic *nravъ* ‘nature, character’, which is the main subject of this study, was published in 2013 by the original Slavist T. Pronk. This Old Church Slavic word, as he rightly claims, is cognate with masculine *o*-stems Russian *nórov*, Polish *narów*, Old Czech *nřav*, Czech *mřav*. He also states that Serbian/Croatian *nárav* is indeed a feminine *i*-stem but it was still masculine in the 16th century (RJA VII, p. 556, s.v. *nárav*) and Slovene *naráva* became an *ā*-stem, in analogy to *priroda* ‘nature’, while Slovene *nřav* is a borrowing from Church Slavic. He does not give examples from other Slavic languages. The traditional reconstruction is **norvъ* (ĚSSJa 25, p. 192ff., s.v. **norvъ*), but this reconstruction, in his view, does not explain Serbian/Croatian *nárav*, Slovene *naráva* nor Polish *narów*. It is assumed that these forms arose through insertion of a prop-vowel between **n* and **r* because the sequence **nr-* at the beginning of a word was not tolerated (cf. ĚSSJa 25, p. 194, s.v. **norvъ*). According to T. Pronk, however, this explanation is convincing only in the case of Church Slavic variants *nřravъ* and *nřravъ* (borrowed into Old Russian *nřravъ*) (Pronk 2013, p. 294).

Therefore T. Pronk thinks that most likely we are dealing with an original form **nā-orv-*, consisting of prefix **nā-* and the root **-orv-*, which was contracted to **norv-* in part of Slavic. In Serbian/Croatian, Slovene and Polish the Proto-Slavic form was not contracted and regularly yielded *nárav*, *naráva* and *narów* respectively. The root of the Slavic noun was thus **-orv-* and he finds a similar root in the adjective **orvъnъ* ‘even, straight’, which is usually connected with Old Prussian *arwis* ‘true, real’. Especially in view of the semantics of the Old Prussian word, he considers it attractive to connect Proto-Slavic **nāorv-* ‘nature, character’ – thus T. Pronk reconstructs the Proto-Slavic meaning – with **orvъnъ* ‘even, straight’. He identifies a semantic parallel in Sanskrit *ṛtá-* ‘proper, truthful’, which derives from the same root as German *Art* ‘nature, character, manner’ (cf. Pronk 2013, p. 294–295).

Taking Balto-Slavic **arų-* at face value, T. Pronk states that we are dealing with a derivative in *-u-* from a root **ar-*. This root may go back to **h₂er-* ‘to fix, adjust, make proper’. The root is widespread in Proto-Indo-European but has not survived in Balto-Slavic, as he claims. Proto-Slavic **nāorv-* ‘nature, character’ and Old Prussian *arwis* ‘true, real’ can be derived from the meaning ‘that what is proper’, while Proto-Slavic **orvъnъ* ‘straight, even’ may have developed from ‘to straighten, make even’ < ‘to make proper’. According to him, the derivative in *-u-* may be shared by Germanic where we find Old Norse *qrr* ‘generous’, and Old English *earu* ‘quick, ready’. These words probably go back to Proto-Indo-European **h₂er-u-* and G. Kroonen adds to them in his dictionary Gothic *arwjo* ‘ready’ (cf. Kroonen 2013, p. 37, s.v. **arwa*). T. Pronk also mentions Tocharian A *ārwar*, Tocharian B *ārwer*

‘ready’ as possible cognates. Within Tocharian they can be explained as derivatives from Tocharian AB *ār-* ‘to cease, come to an end’ and this verb may reflect **h₂er-* ‘to fix, adjust, make proper’ through an intermediate ‘to bring to a proper end, fix’ (cf. Pronk 2013, p. 296).

We extend T. Pronk’s reasoning in this paper with the example of Gothic *arwjo* and the meaning ‘to bring to a proper end’, mainly because of the existence of Old Church Slavic form of the accusative plural *rovaniję*, which to this day has no satisfactory etymology from Slavic sources. The only interpretation that is considered satisfactory is that of R. Nahtigal (cf., e.g., ESJS 13, p. 777; Schaeken 1987, p. 131), based on the above-mentioned Gothic *arwjo*, which translates in the biblical texts Greek *δωρεάν* ‘by a gift, for free’. On the basis of the existence of Old High German *ar(a)wūn*, *ar(a)wingūn* ‘for free, in vain’, R. Nahtigal reconstructs an undocumented Old High German noun **ar(a)vanī* with a reconstructed meaning ‘gift’, of which Old Church Slavic *rovaniję* is supposed to be a borrowing (cf. Nahtigal 1936, pp. 28–29). The meaning ‘to bring to a proper end’ is interesting because the second of the two scribes (translators) of the Kiev Leaflets, where the hapax legomenon *rovaniję* is attested, used the expression *prinosъ* ‘brought gift, offering’, literally ‘that what is brought, offered’, in a context similar to that in which the word *rovaniję* occurs.

Old Church Slavic *rovaniję* is a translation of Latin *munera*. The first scribe (translator) of the Kiev Leaflets (see Pukanec 2020, pp. 21, 28), in addition to translating *rovaniję* from Latin *munera* (*mūnera*) ‘gifts’ in the 2nd prayer, used the common and frequent Old Church Slavic word *darъ* ‘gift’ as a translation of Latin *dona* (*dōna*) ‘gifts’ in the 7th prayer (the last one he translated; prayers 1–7 are, unlike the remaining ones, dedicated to specific saints). In this connection it should be noted that in the Canon of St. Wenceslaus, where there is a second attestation of the word under analysis, though not as convincing as in the Kiev Leaflets, the accusative plural form *rovanije* ‘gifts’ occurs in the same sentence alongside *dary* ‘gifts’ (see Vajs 1929, p. 139). That is, it seems as if there are two different kinds of gifts. A. Ernout and A. Meillet write something similar for the entry *mūnus*: “le sens de ‘présent que l’on fait’ (et non que l’on reçoit) est secondaire, mais très fréquent” (Ernout – Meillet 1932, p. 749, s.v. *mūnus*). In the Canon of St. Wenceslaus the *dary* ‘gifts’ are “obtained (from God)” and the *rovanije* ‘gifts’ are “poured out, i.e. brought (to people)”. In the 2nd prayer of the Kiev Leaflets, the *rovaniję* ‘gifts’ are brought by us to God, while the 7th prayer speaks of gifts (*darъ*) from God to us.

Nevertheless, we do not want to absolutize this semantics, because the second scribe (translator) of the Kiev Leaflets may not have been fully aware of it. He did not use in the *Super oblatam* prayers, in addition to the expressions *darъ*, *dary*, the synonymous *rovaniję*, but three times *prinosъ* ‘brought gift, offering; benefit, gain’ (cf. ESJS 9, p. 538, s.v. *nesti*); this is how it is in the prayers 13, 17 and 33 (see Pukanec 2020, pp. 36, 42, 63). And the lexical distinction ‘gift received’ versus ‘gift

brought’ is not consistently observed; the terms *darъ*, *dary* are used in a general sense, while *prinosъ* in the restricted sense of ‘gift brought’. The semantic interpretation of A. Ernout and A. Meillet and the considerations of T. Pronk, in any case, create some room for explaining why the first scribe (translator) of the Kiev Leaflets used the hapax legomenon *rovaniję* next to the frequented word *dary*. The former expression may hypothetically reflect the meanings of the Proto-Slavic root **orv-*, which are better attested in non-Slavic languages, such as Old Norse *qrr* ‘generous’, and Gothic *arwjo*, as well as Old High German *ar(a)wûn*, *ar(a)wingûn* ‘for free, in vain’, which are referred to by R. Nahtigal in his etymology.

R. Nahtigal (1936, p. 5ff.) argues in favour of higher probability of his interpretation by the fact that another Old High German loanword occurs in the Kiev Leaflets. It is supposed to be Old Church Slavic *вѣсѣдѣ* ‘Host, wafer’ < Old High German *wizzôd*. However, borrowings from Old High German are rare in Old Church Slavic, and this particular etymology is far from perfect, since here the Slavic nasal *ѣ* stands opposed to *o* (cf. Schaeken 1987, p. 133), and one would also expect *ѣ* instead of *ѣ*. An interpretation of this word has also been offered by Š. Ondruš (1984), who regarded it as a deverbative of Slavic *вѣседлiti/вѣселiti* or *вѣсадiti* ‘insert’, since Hosts are inserted into the mouth. Whatever the etymology given by Š. Ondruš is correct or not, we must agree with him at least in that the etymologist should look for interpretations of words with unclear origins first in the native and only then in the foreign languages. Therefore, with this principle in mind, we must also bring a new explanation of the word-form *rovaniję*.

The most presumable etymological interpretation of this word-form, in our opinion, is to base it on Proto-Slavic verb **rovati* (cf. Králík 2015, p. 511, s.v. *rov*), which is in a similar relation to **roviti* as the synonymous **rqbati* to **rqbiti* ‘to chop, hem’ (cf. Králík 2015, p. 513, s.v. *rub*). The verb **roviti* is attested in Old Slovak as *rowiti* with the meaning ‘to make a notch, cut’, of which Old Slovak *rubiti* is a synonym. The *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka* puts it thus – *facere dicam, incidere dicae: rubiti aliis rowiti* (HSSJ 5, p. 86, s.v. *rovit’*). These notches are mentioned by monk Khrabr from as early as around 900: “*prěžde ubo Slověne ne iměxъ knigъ, nъ črъtami i řězami čtěxъ i gataaxъ, pogani sъšete*” = formerly the Slavs had no books, but from cuts and notches they counted and read, being yet pagans (cf. Kralčák 2014, pp. 12–13).

It is important that the word *rubiti* from Proto-Slavic **rqb-iti* is attested in Old Slovak also in the meaning ‘to determine the amount of a fee (tax)’ – e.g. in 1574: *panov Kremnjčanov statek budeme zytra rubity* (cf. HSSJ 5, p. 187, s.v. *rubit’*). We assume this meaning also for the synonymous (and less frequent or more archaic) *rowiti*, although it is not directly attested, which is the weakest point of our etymology. Moreover, Moravian *po-rub* meant ‘inventory of cattle (the shepherd receiving the cattle made notches)’ (cf. Machek 1971, p. 522, s.v. *rubati*). In Old Slovak, the wooden stick on which such notches were made was called *v-rub* (cf.

HSSJ 6, p. 450, s.v. *vrub*); the word has survived in Slovak to the present day, and so, for example, in Czech. Old Slovak *rub* meant ‘(tax) assessment’, *rub-čí* ‘(tax) assessor’, and finally *rubenie* meant ‘(repeated) tax assessment’ – e.g. in 1611 it is written: *czo se rubenj kralowskeho dotycze* (HSSJ 5, p. 185, s.v. *rub*; p. 186, s.v. *rubčí*; p. 187, s.v. *rubenie*). Slovak *vy-rub-it’ daň* ‘to assess a tax’ has persisted to this day as a common phrase.

From a semantic point of view, it should be recalled here that taxes were originally cultic gifts that were given, brought initially to the deity, then similar voluntary gifts were given to the prince (cf. Machek 1971, p. 110, s.v. *daň*) or the king, as in the example above (in the 17th century, of course, the voluntary nature had long been lost). Proto-Slavic **da-nb* ‘tax’ and **da-rb* ‘gift’ have the same root as the verb **da-ti* ‘give’. Thus, on the basis of the evidence in Old Slovak, we must reconstruct the precise meaning of Old Church Slavic *rovaniję*, which translated Latin *munera* ‘gifts’, as ‘offered taxes, i.e. cultic, voluntary gifts’. Taking into account the derivations of *rubiti* < **rqb-iti* in Old Slovak, it cannot be excluded that the form of the word *rovaniję* was influenced by Old Church Slavic synonym *darovanije*, also in order to avoid homonymy with Old Church Slavic *rovb* ‘ditch, pitch’. In a similar semantic relation as Proto-Slavic **rovati* (= **rqbiti*) ‘to determine the amount of a tax/gift’ and Old Church Slavic *rovaniję* ‘taxes/gifts’ is apart from *dariti/darovati* and *darb/darovanie* (cf. ESJS 2, p. 122, s.v. *darb*), e.g. *blažiti* ‘to beatify, i.e. to determine who is beatified, to determine beatification’ and *blaženije* ‘beatitude, beatification’ (cf. ESJS 1, p. 64) and many other Old Church Slavic words.

If we accept the interpretation of the word-form *rovaniję* from Proto-Slavic **rovati*, which belongs to the family of words from Proto-Indo-European **(H)reuH-* ‘to dig, engrave, etc.’, and is thus not very far from the etymology of J. Hamm (cf. 1979, p. 69) from Proto-Slavic **ryti*, which has been rightly rejected on both phonological and semantic grounds (cf. ESJS 13, pp. 777–778, s.v. *rovanii*), we would exclude one potentially West Slavic phenomenon in the Kiev Leaflets, which testifies in favour of their Great Moravian origin, since in the case of this etymology we would have to rule out the metathesis of liquids at the beginning of the word. The word-form *rovaniję* in this instance would only be a semantic Moravism, or more precisely a Slovakism, as the Kiev Leaflets are linguistically most probably either Slovak-Croatian (cf. Kortlandt 1980) or East Slovak (cf. Pukanec 2020), possibly Czech-Slovak (cf. Pukanec 2019) literary monuments.

The metathesis of liquids at the beginning of the word as such, however, is another argument in favour of the etymology of *rovaniję* from **rovati* against the interpretation from the undocumented Old High German noun **ar(a)vanī*. Indeed, the term **rovati* does not require metathesis, and this Proto-Slavic change is clearly attested once in the Kiev Leaflets, but it does not have the result *roC-* (*C* = consonant). An example of this change is the expression *razdrěšenje* (see Pukanec

2020, p. 51), i.e. *raC-*, and we can assume that two different reflexes should not be found in the same (relatively short) text. So this fact also strengthens the interpretation from **rovati* compared to the etymology of R. Nahtigal. Nevertheless, the main point is that the etymology presented shows that *rovaniję* was a native term, as was the synonymous *prinosъ* used by the second scribe (translator) of the Kiev Leaflets. Although Old Church Slavic *rovaniję* is not directly attested in modern Slavic languages, the verb *rowiti*, its explicitly named synonym *rubiti*, as well as the derived noun *rubenie* ‘(repeated) tax assessment’ are attested in Old Slovak, and semantically there is nothing contradicting this interpretation.

In any case, the different semantics in terms of some nuance of the synonyms *rovaniję*, *prinosъ* ‘brought gift(s), offering(s); benefit(s), gain(s)’ versus *darъ*, *dary* ‘gift(s)’ in the Kiev Leaflets is, in our opinion, certainly a better explanation than was the famous explanation of V. Jagić (1890, pp. 54–55) that *rovaniję* was formed by abbreviation for *darovanije*: “Das auffallende und unerklärte *Rovaniję* rührt vielleicht daher, dass in einer früheren Vorlage *Da*, zum Worte *Darovanija* gehörig, nicht ausgeschrieben war (freigelassen wegen der nachträglich vorzunehmenden Ornamentation), der spätere Abschreiber machte dann aus dem nicht verstandenen ‚*Rovanija*‘ ein Subst. fem. gen. und setzte es von neuem in den Acc. plur., daher – *Rovaniję* prinesenyę!” This is because (a) although the term *darovanije* is a synonym of Old Church Slavic *darъ*, the ornamental syllables are nowhere to be found in the text of the Kiev Leaflets, only letters; (b) the word is attested a second time, where we would thus have to reckon with a similar error a second time; (c) the expression *darovanije* does not appear in the Kiev Leaflets at all, always only *darъ*, *dary* (six times in total). The explanation of V. Jagić has led to the fact that to this day the Kiev Leaflets are regarded as a transcript, not a protograph, although there is no relevant argument in favour of this (cf. Večerka 1989–1990, p. 69).

If we return to the interpretation of Old Church Slavic *nравъ* by T. Pronk from Proto-Slavic **nā-orv-*, we can reason independently of T. Pronk also on the etymology of the word **grěxъ* ‘sin’, which can be considered an antonym of Proto-Slavic **norvъ*, because later in Christian times it has meant in several Slavic languages ‘morals’. The word **grěxъ* might at first glance favour the interpretation by T. Pronk, but in the final analysis it rather weakens it. In fact, Proto-Slavic **grěxъ* most likely derives from **groi-so-* and its cognates are Lithuanian *graižùs* ‘oblique’ and Latvian *grēizs* ‘crooked’; to this day, for example, in Slovak dialects, *hriška* means ‘an unploughed piece of land made by deviating from the furrow’ (cf. Králik 2015, p. 209, s.v. *hriech*), so that the word **grěxъ* seems to have been in pre-Christian times the opposite of Proto-Slavic **orv-* ‘even, straight’.

However, such an argument would probably not be correct, as is proved by Old Church Slavic composites *зълонравънъ* ‘wicked, immoral’, literally ‘one who has bad manners’ (not ***nenравънъ* ‘one who has no [good] manners’), *зълонравije* or *подобонравънъ* (ESJS 9, p. 553, s.v. *нравъ*), i.e. ‘one who has similar manners’. The

meaning of ‘morals’, i.e. in accordance with Christian morals, seems, on the basis of the evidence, to be only later than the Old Church Slavic period. This is also indirectly confirmed by the Old Russian text on the Slavic tribes: “Имаху бо обычаи свои и законъ отецъ своихъ и преданья кождо свой нравъ” (Niederle 1924, p. 12). Each tribe had its own morals, that is, each tribe had potentially different morals, was differently moral. Semantics is thus the biggest problem of the etymology of T. Pronk, since manners could also be bad or sinful, i.e. “crooked”. Proto-Slavic **orъnъ* meaning ‘even, straight’ appears to have no reason at all to be semantically related to Old Church Slavic *nравъnъ* and *nравъ* ‘manner, custom’.

The semantic considerations in the ESJS do not seem to be entirely correct for Old Church Slavic *nравъ* either. Most often, Proto-Slavic **norъnъ* or **nôrnъ*, from which Old Church Slavic *nравъ* ‘manner, custom’ arose, is derived from Proto-Indo-European **(H)nôrH-* (cf. Derksen 2008, p. 356). It is related to Sanskrit *nar-*, Avestan *nar-*, Armenian *air* (genitive *arn*), Greek *άνήρ*, Albanian *njer*, Osco-Umbrian *ner* ‘man’, in addition also to Sanskrit *sūnara-*, Greek *εὐ-ήνωρ* both ‘full of vitality’, Old Irish *ner* ‘boar’, and especially Lithuanian *narsūs* ‘bold, fierce’, *nóras* ‘will’, *norėti* ‘to will’ (cf. ESJS 9, p. 553, s.v. *nравъ*). These words can be further expanded to include at least Old Prussian *nertien* ‘rage, fury’, Old Indic *nṛtú-* ‘hero’, Luwian *annara/i-* ‘vigorous, virile’, Old Irish *nert* ‘strength, power’, *sonairt* ‘valiant, strong’, Welsh *nêr* ‘hero’, *nerth* ‘manfulness, courage; army’, *hynnerth* ‘valiant, strong’ (see more Pokorny 1959, p. 765), to shed light on the semantics of expressions in Slavic languages such as Polish *narowny* ‘stubborn, obstinate, defiant, disobedient’, Serbian/Croatian *náran* ‘natural’, Slovene *naráven* ‘natural’, Russian dialect *noróvnyj* ‘stubborn, headstrong, willful’, Old Polish and Polish *narów* ‘bad habit, stubbornness’, Old Russian *norovъ*, *nравъ* ‘manner; pig-headedness, headstrongness, wilfulness; effort, desire; courage, dignity; reason, etc.’, Russian *noróv* ‘manner; stubbornness’ (ESSJa 25, pp. 192–195, s.v. **norъnъ*). Besides these meanings, in almost all Slavic languages we also see the Old Church Slavic meaning of ‘manner, custom’, and in Old Russian, Old Czech, Old Slovak, Slovene also ‘morality, virtue’.

However, this most common etymological interpretation is partially rejected in the ESJS for semantic reasons, because, as it is stated here, it corresponds only to the marginal meaning ‘high-spirited (defiant) behaviour (especially in horses)’, less so to the meaning ‘habitual behaviour, behaviour conforming to custom’ (cf. ESJS 9, p. 554, s.v. *nравъ*). The dictionary does not, nevertheless, explain in any way why defiant behaviour would not be habitual, or would not be behaviour conforming to custom. We have, of course, from the early Christian Slavic period of Central Europe references almost exclusively to the life of the elites, but if we consider, for example, the lives of the rulers in Great Moravia, it seems that such behaviour was quite customary. Mojmir I expelled Pribina, Pribina defied, so he was probably killed by Rastic. Rastic defied the king, Svatopluk defied both Rastic and

Methodius, Rastic wanted to get rid of Svatopluk, it ended up the other way around. Saint Methodius, who was defied by Bishop Wiching, had a similar outcome. Before that, Slavomir had declared a revolt against the king, then Svatopluk I defied the king, Svatopluk II defied Mojmir II, etc. This was, according to the surviving historical documents, quite usual behaviour, behaviour corresponding to custom, at least among the elites.

Christianity, of course, delegitimized such behaviour over time, but it never disappeared in European feudal society (at least among the elites). There is therefore, in our view, no reason to etymologize Old Church Slavic *nravъ* from Proto-Indo-European **(s)ner-* ‘to sew together, to web, spin’ (see more Pokorný 1959, p. 975ff., s.v. 2. *(s)ner-*), which is attested especially in Germanic and Baltic languages and, semantically, is supposed to point to obligatory action (cf. ESJS 9, p. 554, s.v. *nravъ*). While the former interpretation perfectly explains customary (and inherently socially binding) behaviour, this second, alternative interpretation does not explain customary behaviour in the early Middle Ages in Central Europe, but most importantly it does not explain the meanings attested in Polish and Russian at all.

Moreover, a perfect semantic parallel – if one follows some of the principles and methods used by Š. Ondruš – to the etymology of Proto-Slavic **norvъ* from Proto-Indo-European **(H)nōrH-* is Latin *mōs* ‘custom, usage’, from which Latin *mōrōsus* ‘hard to please’ (cf. Vaan 2008, p. 390, s.v. *mōs*, *mōris*) or ‘qui suit son humeur, difficile, capricieux, chagrin’ (Ernout – Meillet 1932, p. 738, s.v. *mōs*, *mōris*; cf. Špaňár – Hrabovský 1998, p. 378, s.v. *mōrōsus*) is derived. From the semantic point of view, therefore, the best of the above-mentioned etymologies should be considered the one that treats the Russian and Polish marginal meanings as Proto-Slavic, which the preferred etymology of the ESJS avoids. This most widespread etymology takes into account that in Old Church Slavic the meaning of the word *nravъ* was still undecided from the ethical point of view, it had no clearly positive or negative connotations, which in turn is to some extent ignored by the interpretation of T. Pronk.

To conclude these semantic notes on Old Church Slavic words *nravъ* and *rovanije*, we will try to outline their semantic background. As the aforementioned meanings of the words from Proto-Indo-European **(H)nōrH-* point out, Proto-Slavic **norvъ*, from which Old Church Slavic *nravъ* derives, had a semantics similar to that pervasive in Latin *mōrōsus* ‘hard to please’ (cf. Vaan 2008, p. 390, s.v. *mōs*, *mōris*) or ‘qui suit son humeur, difficile, capricieux, chagrin’ (Ernout – Meillet 1932, p. 738, s.v. *mōs*, *mōris*; cf. Špaňár – Hrabovský 1998, p. 378, s. v. *mōrōsus*). In the Old Church Slavic period, however, the word *nravъ* ‘manner, custom’ had a neutral connotation, like Latin *mōs* ‘custom, usage’; an attribute had to be used to specify it (cf. Old Church Slavonic *zъlonravъnъ* ‘one who has bad manners’, not **nenravъnъ* ‘one who has no [good] manners’). Only later, during the flowering of Christianity, did it acquire the meaning ‘morality, virtue’ in several Slavic languages.

As for the word-form *rovanije*, it originated in a period when gifts and taxes were distinguished. Taxes were given (**da-nъ* ‘tax’, **da-rъ* ‘gift’ < **da-ti* ‘give’), offered first to pagan deities and then to the Christian God. They were also brought as (voluntary) gifts to Slavic princes. According to the etymology of *rov-anije* < **rov-ati* ‘to make a notch, cut; to determine the amount of a fee (tax/gift)’, nevertheless, they were written down (or perhaps even prescribed) in the Old Church Slavic period in Great Moravia, so their voluntary nature certainly changed rapidly with the advent of Christianity and feudalism, and the very beginnings of taxation among the Slavs can possibly be seen in this word.

References

- DERKSEN, Rick (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden – Boston: Brill. x, 726 p.
- DIWEG-PUKANEC, Martin (2022): Etymologické výskumy v časopise Slovenská reč. In: *Slovenská reč*, vol. 87, No. 3, pp. 389–401.
- ERNOUT, Alfred – MEILLET, Antoine (1932): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck. xx, 1108 p.
- ESSJ – *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského*. Vol. 1–14 (1989–2008). Praha: Academia. – Vol. 15–21 (2010–2022). Brno: Tribun EU.
- ÈSSJa – *Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond* (1974–). Moskva: Nauka.
- HAMM, Josef (1979): *Das glagolitische Missale von Kiew*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. 136 p.
- HSSJ – *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka* (1991–2008). Bratislava: Veda.
- JAGIĆ, Vatroslav (1890): *Glagolitica. Würdigung neuentdeckter Fragmente. Mit zehn Tafeln*. Wien: in Commission bei F. Tempsky. IV, 62 pp.
- KORTLANDT, Frederik (1980): Zur Akzentuierung der Kiever Blätter. In: *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 1–4.
- KRALČÁK, Ľubomír (2014): *Pôvod hlaholiky a Konštantínov kód*. Martin: Matica slovenská. 207 p.
- KRÁLIK, Ľubor (2015): *Stručný etymologický slovník slovenčiny*. Bratislava: Veda. 704 p.
- KROONEN, Guus (2013): *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden – Boston: Brill. xli, 794 p.
- MACHEK, Václav (1971): *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha: Academia, nakladatelství Československé akademie věd. 868 p.
- NAHTIGAL, Rajko (1936): *Starocerkvenoslovanske študije*. Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna. 77 p.
- NIEDERLE, Ľubor (1924): *Slovanské starožitnosti. Oddíl I. Sv. IV. Původ a počátky Slovanů východních*. Praha: Bursík & Kohout. 289 p.
- ONDRUŠ, Šimon (1984): Z lexiky Kyjevských listov: *въсѣдѣ*. In: *Slavica Slovaca*, vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 36–42.

POKORNY, Julius (1959): *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern – München: Francke Verlag. 1183 p.

PRONK, Tijmen (2013): Notes on Balto-Slavic etymology: Russian *norov*, *mjat'*, *ruž'ě*, dialectal *xajat'* 'to care', *xovat'* 'to keep' and their Slavic and Baltic cognates. In: S. M. Newerkla – F. B. Poljakov (eds.): *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch. Neue Folge. Band 1*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 294–303.

PUKANEC, Martin (2019): *Antológia textov (nielen) slovenských redakcií starosloviensčiny*. Brno: Tribun EU. 236 p.

PUKANEC, Martin (2020): *The Kiev Leaflets as Folia Glagolitica Zempliniensia*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 144 p.

RJA – *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* (1880–1976). Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

SCHAEKEN, Joseph (1987): *Die Kiever Blätter*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. IX, 274 p.

ŠPAŇÁR, Július – HRABOVSKÝ, Jozef (1998): *Latinsko-slovenský a slovensko-latin-ský slovník*. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo. 1222 p.

VAAN, Michiel de (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden – Boston: Brill. xiii, 825 p.

VAJS, Josef (1929): *Sborník staroslovanských literárních památek o sv. Václavu a sv. Lidmile*. Praha: Česká akademie věd a umění v Praze. 147 p.

VEČERKA, Radoslav (1989–1990): Lingvistická skica k Velké Moravě a raně středověkým Čechám. In: *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. E, Řada archeologicko-klasická*, vol. 38–39, No. E 34–35, pp. 61–76.

Resumé

POZNÁMKY K SÉMANTICKÉMU VÝVINU STAROSLOVIENSKÉHO NRAVĚ A ROVANIJĚ

Cieľom tohto príspevku bolo rozobrať niekoľko najnovších etymologických a najmä sémantických úvah o staroslovienskom *nравъ* 'zvyk, obyčaj' a pozrieť sa na ne z hľadiska doby, kedy vzniklo staroslovienske písomníctvo. Okrem toho sme sa v ňom pokúsili o etymológiu a sémantickú analýzu trochu záhadného staroslovienskeho hapax legomenon *rovaniję*, pretože doterajšie interpretácie tohto slova z domácich zdrojov sú považované za nedostatočné a jediná uznávaná etymológia, ktorá slovo považuje za výpožičku zo starej hornej nemčiny, je viac než hypotetická. Tieto dve analyzované slová spolu podľa nás etymologicky nesúvisia, aj keď v istom bode úvah v našom článku sa dotýkajú a ich etymologická súvislosť je hypoteticky možná, hoci nepravdepodobná. Výber slov bol zvolený okrem iného aj z toho dôvodu, že v príspevku sa zámerne snažíme dodržiavať viaceré zásady a metódy, ktoré používal popredný slovenský jazykovedec a otec slovenskej vedeckej etymológie Š. Ondruš a ktoré sú hodné nasledovania.

Na základe našich sémantických úvah o staroslovienských slovách *nравъ* a *rovaniję* v článku načrtávame ich sémantický vývin. Ako ukazujú významy slov z indoeurópskeho *(H)nōrH-, teda sanskritské *nar-*, avestské *nar-*, arménske *air* (genitív *arn*), grécke *αἰήρ*, albánske *njer*, osko-umbrijské *ner* 'muž', sanskritské *sūnara-*, grécke *εὐ-ήνορ* 'opľývajúci ži-

votnou silou’, staroírske *ner* ‘diviak’, litovské *narsūs* ‘odvážny, zúrivý’, *nóras* ‘vôľa’, *norėti* ‘chcieť’ a množstvo ďalších indoeurópskych výrazov, ale najmä slovanské významy ‘tvrdohlavý, tvrdšíjny, vzdorovitý, neposlušný’, ‘tvrdohlavý, svojhlavý’, ‘zlozvyk, tvrdohlavosť’, ‘mrav; zaťatosť, svojhlavosť; úsilie, túžba; odvaha, dôstojnosť; rozum’, praslovanské **norvъ*, z ktorého pochádza staroslovienske *nravъ*, malo podobnú sémantiku, aká presvitá v latinskom *mōrōsus* ‘mrzutý, nevrlý’, ‘tvrdohlavý, hlavatý, zaťatý, neústupný’. V staroslovienskom období však slovo nadobúdalo čoraz väčšmi neutrálnu konotáciu, podobne ako latinské *mōs* ‘zvyk, obyčaj’, a neskôr, za rozkvetu kresťanstva, vo viacerých slovanských jazykoch dokonca získalo význam ‘mravnosť, cnosť’.

Tento najčastejší etymologický výklad sa v ESJS odmieta zo sémantických dôvodov, pretože mu vraj nezodpovedá význam ‘obvyklé správanie, správanie zodpovedajúce zvyklostiam’. Nijakým spôsobom sa tu však nevysvetľuje, prečo by vzdorovité správanie nebolo obvyklým, alebo by nebolo správaním, ktoré zodpovedá zvyklostiam. Keď zoberieme do úvahy napríklad osudy panovníkov na Veľkej Morave, zdá sa nám, že takéto správanie bolo úplne obvyklým. Mojmír I. vyhodil Pribinu, Pribina vzdoroval, a tak ho pravdepodobne zabil Rastis. Rastis vzdoroval kráľovi, Svätopluk vzdoroval Rasticovi aj Metodovi, Rastis sa chcel Svätopluka zbaviť, skončilo sa to naopak. Podobne skončil Metod, ktorému vzdoroval biskup Wiching. Predtým ešte vyhlásil revoltu voči kráľovi Slavomír, potom vzdoroval kráľovi Svätopluk I., Svätopluk II. vzdoroval Mojmírovi II. atď. Bolo to podľa dochovaných historických dokladov úplne obvyklé správanie, správanie zodpovedajúce zvyklostiam, minimálne medzi elitami.

Pokiaľ ide o slovo *rovanije*, vzniklo v období, keď sa ešte rozlišovali dary a dane. Dane sa dávali (**da-nъ* ‘daň’, **da-rъ* ‘dar’ < **da-ti* ‘dať’), prinášali najprv pohanským božstvám a následne kresťanskému Bohu. Prinášali sa tiež ako (dobrovoľné) dary slovanským kniežatám. Podľa etymológie slova *rov-anije* < **rov-ati* ‘robiť zárez, vrub’, ‘určovať výšku poplatku (dane/daru)’ sa však v staroslovienskom období, v období Veľkej Moravy zapisovali alebo možno dokonca predpisovali, takže ich dobrovoľnosť sa s príchodom kresťanstva a feudalizmu isto rýchlo zmenila a v tomto slove môžeme zrejme vidieť počiatky zdaňovania u Slovanov.

Kľúčové slová: etymológia, výrazy z morálnej oblasti, starosloviensky jazyk, sémantická zmena, sémantika, slovanské jazyky