

D. E. COLLINS

**THE STRENGTH OF THE CASE:  
INTERPRETING THE НАРАХ LEGOMENON ДОУЖЕБОУ  
IN NOVGOROD BIRCHBARK 855\***

**1.0.** Novgorod birchbark 855, dated ca. 1140—1160, was written in the aftermath of a brawl involving the servants of a prominent boyar and six other men. It was discovered in Plot E of the Trinity Excavation; in the mid-twelfth century, this was the site of a large complex of judicial-administrative buildings, probably including the joint court of the prince's representative and the elected mayor. Indeed, N855 is one of several law-related birchbarks that Janin [Янин 2001: 10—11; 2003: 20] cites in demonstrating that the site had a judicial function.

The beginning of N855 is missing; the surviving portion is given in (1), and its standard Modern Russian (Ru) translation in (2)<sup>1</sup>.

(1) ... н[гы]не  
[въ горъ]дъ но не леґо ѿ дѣа : а зоубъ въыбитъ  
а нежатиници отроки били шьсть : :хъ а доу-  
жебоу а испралоу : :мъ [НГБ-11: 69; ДНД: 325]<sup>2</sup>.

(2) ⟨...⟩ [следовало бы ехать] ныне в город, но не позволяет дьяк. А вы-  
бит зуб. Нежатиничевы отроки били их шестерых. А [что касается  
денег на] лечение, то я выплачу им [НГБ-11: 69; ДНД: 326].  
⟨...⟩ [should have come] now to the city, but the *d'jak* [judicial clerk—  
DEC] does not permit it. And a tooth was knocked out. Nežatinič's lads

---

\* A preliminary version of this article was presented at the conference «Язык и культура древней Руси» (Novgorod, August 2011). My thanks go to A. A. Gippius, A. Timberlake, A. A. Zaliznjak, and V. M. Živov for their feedback on the presentation, and to J. Schaecken for his comments on the written version.

<sup>1</sup> [НГБ-11] and [ДНД] use square brackets for letters whose interpretation is not completely certain [ДНД: 232]. To distinguish my own interpolations, I use [...—DEC]. English translations are mine unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>2</sup> In the drawing of N855, interpuncts can be seen in the words **леґо** and **нежа.т.иници** and **шьсть** (see [НГБ-11: 68—69]; [gramoty.ru/index.php?no=855&act=full&key=bb](http://gramoty.ru/index.php?no=855&act=full&key=bb), accessed October 29, 2011); these are not indicated in the transcriptions published in [НГБ-11] or [ДНД].

beat six of them [or ‘the six of them’—DEC]. And [as for the money for] recovery, I will pay it off for/to them.

There is a lacuna of some 30 letters before the partially legible first word **н[ъ]нѣ**, judging from the number of letters in the second and third lines (32 and 33, excluding punctuation). Because the incipit is missing, the author and addressee are unknown; the only name preserved is *Nežatinič* ‘Nežatinič-POSS.M.NOM.PL’. *Nežatinič* (a patronymic) was evidently the son of the boyar *Nežata*, known from texts of ca. 1090—1140 [ДНД: 266; Янин 2001: 98, no. 14].

As Janin [Янин 2001: 10] notes, N855 recalls § 68 of the Extended *Russkaja Pravda* (RP), the lawcode of medieval Rus’, which specifies penalties for violence causing damage to teeth: «If they knock out a tooth, and blood is visible in his [the victim’s] mouth, then 12 *grivnas* as a fine, and for the tooth a *grivna* [to the victim]» (Synodal copy, 1282 [ПП, 1: 128]). Indeed, the link between N855 and the RP may go even farther. Not only does the birchbark deal with battery, the subject of §§ 23—31 in the lawcode, but, as I will argue, the hapax legomenon **ДОУЖЕВОУ**, read as *лечение* (‘recovery, cure’) in (2), may be reinterpreted in connection with a Rus’ian (OR) legal concept of ‘strength’ or ‘strength-fine’, mentioned in § 27 of the Extended RP.

It will take several steps to demonstrate this connection. While the authors of (2) interpret **ДОУЖЕВОУ** as ‘recovery, cure’ based on its cognates, its meaning cannot be established by etymology alone; its synchronic usage must also be considered. Thus the first step will be to get the clearest reading of its context. I will begin in § 2 by identifying the possible resolution(s) of **:ѠМЪ** ‘them-DAT.PL’ in the final clause in order to define its relation to referential items in the prior text. The different referential scenarios identified in this way will imply different relations between the first-person author and the third-person referents, each of which can be evaluated in terms of sociopragmatic plausibility. On this basis, I will show that the verb **испралоу**, the word translated as *выплатчу* (‘pay off-PRS.ISG’) in (2), should be reinterpreted; I will discuss two plausible interpretations in §§ 3—4.

The reinterpretation of **испралоу** will provide a new context for understanding **ДОУЖЕВОУ**. Thus the next step (§ 5) will be to examine the cognates of the hapax in order to reconstruct the range of meanings conveyed by its root, and to determine which can be plausibly colligated with the newly identified senses of the verb. In § 6, I will show how **ДОУЖЕВОУ** denotes a concept in the same semantic field as an etymologically different noun, **вѣкъ**. As will be shown in § 7, the unexpected semantic affinities between these two nouns will challenge prevalent interpretations of passages in the RP, the 1229 Smolensk Treaty, and other texts. Thus, beginning with a single difficult phrase in N855, the discussion will ultimately lead to a better understanding of certain OR legal terms and new readings of major OR and Middle Russian (MRu) documents.

**2.0.** The antecedent of the final word of N855, the anaphoric pronoun **:ѠМЪ**, presumably appears in the penultimate clause. If it occurred in a more distant

clause, the resulting referential complexity and ambiguity would border on incoherence; the actual antecedent would be less accessible than with two competing referring expressions, **НЕЖАТИНИЦИ ОТРОКИ** ‘Nežatinič’s lads’ and **ШЬСТЬ :I:ХЪ** ‘(the) six of them’. In OR, the tendency was to use demonstratives rather than anaphoric pronouns in situations involving this kind of switch-reference.

Moreover, in the surviving text, there is no clear antecedent for **:I:МЪ** outside the penultimate clause. In the third clause from the end, the only referring expression is **ЗОУБЪ**—probably ‘tooth-NOM.SG’ (*zubъ*), but possibly ‘teeth-NOM.PL’ (*zube*) (see [НГБ-11: 70]); however, the latter would be an unlikely antecedent for dative **:I:МЪ** on semantic grounds. In the fourth clause from the end, the only referential item is **ДЪА**, which has been treated as **ДЪ[АК]А** or **ДЪА[КА]** ‘judicial clerk-GEN.SG’ [Там же: 69—70; ДНД: 326]. Alternatively, it could be interpreted as **ДЪА[КЪ]** GEN.PL; if so, it would be a potential antecedent for **:I:МЪ**, though again a relatively inaccessible one<sup>3</sup>. Conceivably, there could be a referential chain going through the penultimate clause: **ДЪА[КЪ]** → **ШЬСТЬ :I:ХЪ** → **:I:МЪ**; or {X-PL + **ДЪ[АК]А/ДЪА[КЪ]**} → **ШЬСТЬ :I:ХЪ** → **:I:МЪ**, where X is a referent from the missing text.

Given, then, that **:I:МЪ** is likely to refer to an antecedent in the penultimate clause, it has three possible resolutions—**НЕЖАТИНИЦИ ОТРОКИ** (3a); **ШЬСТЬ :I:ХЪ** (3b); or the sum of the two (3c)<sup>4</sup>.

- (3a) **А НЕЖАТИНИЦИ ОТРОКИ<sub>i</sub> БИЛИ<sub>i</sub> ШЬСТЬ :I:ХЪ<sub>j</sub> А ДОУЖЕБОУ А ИСПРАЛОУ :I:МЪ<sub>i</sub>**  
 And Nežatinič’s lads<sub>i</sub> beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will pay the доужьба to/for them<sub>i</sub>.
- (3b) **А НЕЖАТИНИЦИ ОТРОКИ<sub>i</sub> БИЛИ<sub>i</sub> ШЬСТЬ :I:ХЪ<sub>j</sub> А ДОУЖЕБОУ А ИСПРАЛОУ :I:МЪ<sub>j</sub>**  
 And Nežatinič’s lads<sub>i</sub> beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will pay the доужьба to/for them<sub>j</sub>.
- (3c) **А НЕЖАТИНИЦИ ОТРОКИ<sub>i</sub> БИЛИ<sub>i</sub> ШЬСТЬ :I:ХЪ<sub>j</sub> А ДОУЖЕБОУ А ИСПРАЛОУ :I:МЪ<sub>i+j</sub>**  
 And Nežatinič’s lads<sub>i</sub> beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will pay the доужьба to/for them<sub>i+j</sub>.

<sup>3</sup> [НГБ-11: 69] and [ДНД: 326] do not discuss the possibility that **ДЪА** could be GEN.PL; they offer two readings, both GEN.SG—**ДЪ[АК]А** and **ДЪА[КА]**—but prefer the former on the grounds that the spelling *vowel letter* + **А** would be a Slavonism in a text with no other Slavonic features. Note that the spelling **ДНАКУ** occurs in a roughly contemporary birchbark, N739 (1120—1140) [ДНД: 291—292], which likewise has no other Slavonic features.

<sup>4</sup> Anaphora to multiple antecedents is common in OR; cf. the 1176 entry in the First Novgorod Chronicle: «и яша князя Глѣба<sub>i</sub> и съ сыномъ<sub>j</sub> и Мъстислава<sub>k</sub> съ братомъ Яропѣлкомъ<sub>i</sub>, порубиша я<sub>i+j+k+1</sub>» («and they<sub>i</sub> captured Prince Gleb<sub>i</sub> and his son<sub>j</sub> and Mstislav<sub>k</sub> with his brother Jaropolk<sub>i</sub> [and] imprisoned them<sub>i+j+k+1</sub>» [ПСРЛ 3: 35]).

The published interpretation (2) is compatible with (3b), where **:I.MЪ** refers to the closer antecedent, **ШЬСТЬ :I:ХЪ**, and with (3c), where it refers to the sum of the previous two antecedents. Scenario (3a), where it is an anaphor of the farther antecedent, **НЕЖАТИНИЦИ ОТРОКИ**, is more doubtful. While anaphoric pronouns are usually co-referential with the nearer of two possible antecedents (see above), this tendency can be overruled if the referent is highly salient in the discourse; however, the use of a full noun phrase (**НЕЖАТИНИЦИ ОТРОКИ**) instead of a shorter reference (**ОТРОКИ**) or an anaphoric pronoun suggests that the given referents have not been established as major topics.

**2.1.** The reason why it is important to establish the possible referential scenarios is that they imply specific relationships between the author, as first-person subject/agent of the verb in the final clause, and the referents of the anaphoric pronoun **:I.MЪ**, which are critical for the interpretation of the verb and, ultimately, **ДОУЖЕБОУ**. In the published translation (2), **ИСПРАЛОУ**, PRS.1SG of the polysemous verb **ИСПРАВИТИ**, is interpreted as ‘pay off’; the meaning ‘pay; settle accounts’ is attested in other birchbarks (see [ДНД: 745]). Accordingly, the author of N855 is undertaking financial responsibility to/for the referents of **:I.MЪ** (a dative of recipient, like the dative valence of Ru *выплатить*, or a dative of beneficiary). The only possible referents seem to be the culprits in the battery (3a), the victims (3b), or all the participants of the brawl (3c).

According to the norms of OR law (see [Kaiser 1980: 81]), it was the culprits who were liable for the financial penalties (fines and victim’s compensation) in acts of violence. If the culprits had gone missing or were unable to pay, liability fell on their close associates—e. g., kin or community—in accordance with cultural assumptions of collective responsibility<sup>5</sup>. Thus, in the reading in (2), the only sociopragmatically plausible explanation is that the author is party to the crime, either directly or by close association with the culprits.

The crux of the interpretation, then, is why the author should be liable to or for the referent of **:I.MЪ**. Scenario (3a) is entirely implausible, because the author would be paying the perpetrators of the battery, Nežatinič’s lads, rather than the victims. Scenario (3c) is likewise dubious, since the author would be taking responsibility for the perpetrators as well as the victims; moreover, there is nothing in the text to indicate that Nežatinič’s lads were injured so that they would need some form of cure. While scenario (3b) involves payment to/for the victims only, it remains unclear why the author has to pay at all. The culprits are associates of Nežatinič, but it is clear from the third-person reference that the author is not Nežatinič himself. Indeed, given the use of the full noun phrase **НЕЖАТИНИЦИ ОТРОКИ**, it would seem that the author is not familiar with them. Thus it is puzzling that he should have any legal responsibility for them.

<sup>5</sup> On collective responsibility in medieval Russian law, see [Dewey, Kleimola 1970; 1982; 1984].

2.2. While one can assume liability voluntarily, this altruistic scenario can be ruled out for N855 because of the absence of a subject pronoun in the final clause. In OR, such pronouns were obligatory whenever the subject is emphasized—e. g., in focus with an element in another clause [ДНД: 170—171], a condition that favors subject pronouns in modern Slavic languages with unmarked pro-drop like Cz and Sk. If the author of N855 were paying *nolens volens* for someone else's crime, we would expect contrastive focus and hence a subject pronoun: \*а испралоу or \*испралоу а 'I will pay'. That very situation occurs in N421. All the subjects in this letter can be inferred from person marking on the verbs; while the first four are implicit, the last two (underlined) are expressed by personal pronouns because they are in focal contrast:

- (4a) + Ѡ брѠтѠтѠѠ кѠ нежилоу понди соуноу (sic!) домовъ свободне еси пакѠ ли не идеши а послоу<sup>н</sup> тѠ ѡвѡтъникѠ а заплаатиѠ .к. грѡвнѠ а ты свбонѠ (ca. 1120—1140) [ДНД: 293].  
+ From Bratjata to Nežil. Go home, son; you are free. If you aren't going, I'll send a court-official (*jabetnik*) against you. I have paid the 20 *grivnas*, and you are free.

For N855, another factor that might have favored a subject pronoun in the last clause is the fact that the author does not mention himself in the previous three clauses. While the first person is always available as a potential discourse topic, explicit pronouns are preferred over null anaphora in birchbark letters when the topic changes [ДНД: 171]. This is illustrated by N717:

- (4b) покланѡние Ѡ нгоуѡменне кѠ офросенне присли привитѠкоу и повонци ти многи повон а присли до ѡти повон а а ноугене пецалоуѡса (sic!) цереницами простригати въ борозе томоу дан попытан есте ли мафеї оу манастири (ca. 1160—1180) [ДНД: 396].  
A bow from the abbess to Ofrosenija. Send the habit and wimples. If [you have] a lot of wimples, send up to five wimples. [As for me,] I am very busy taking care of the nuns; they have to be tonsured soon. Therefore, do find out if Mafej is at the monastery.

In principle, the person-marking on пецалоуѡса 'take care of-PRS.1SG' should have been enough to convey the switch from second to first person in N717. The pronoun а 'I-NOM' is not conveying contrastive focus, new information, or special emphasis. Its function is purely pragmatic—to signal a change in footing or in empathy perspective; at that point, the abbess shifts from her institutional role—ordering property for the convent—to her private concerns—asking for a favor that will lighten her workload.

Similarly, a personal pronoun would be expected in the last clause N855 if the author were signalling his move into an unexpected role (voluntarily taking on someone else's liability), especially given the accompanying shift of discourse type from narrative to performative (commissive speech act). The absence of a personal pronoun suggests that the author is not moving into an unex-

pected role; that is, it was not out of the ordinary for him to perform the act denoted by **испралоу** in the given situation. The likely explanation for this is that the act was a normal part of his social role.

**2.3.** Thus it appears that the reading in (2), «А [что касается денег на] лечение, то я выплачу им» («And [as for the money for] recovery, I will pay it off for/to them»), invokes a sociopragmatically implausible situation. The anaphoric pronoun **:имъ**, the dative argument of the verb **испралоу** in the final clause, must co-refer with one of the expressions in the penultimate clause. If the verb **испралоу** meant ‘I will pay (off)’, this would entail that the referent of its subject — the author himself — bore liability to/for the referent of the dative, i. e., was culpable in the battery described in the birchbark. While the absence of a first-person pronoun in the final clause suggests that the author has not been put on an unexpected footing, the form of the referring expressions in the penultimate clause shows that he was not closely associated with the aggressors in the beating. The only way out of this dilemma is to find an alternative reading for the verb **испралоу** and, consequently, a new interpretation of the final clause.

**3.0.** As noted above, **исправити**, the verb in the final clause, was polysemous; the major historical dictionaries assign it 7–10 main definitions (with subsenses in some cases). Only two of these meanings have been identified thus far in the birchbark corpus — ‘settle accounts (with); pay’, hereafter **исправити-PAУ**; and ‘discharge (an obligation, a promise)’, hereafter **исправити-DISCHARGE** [ДНД: 745]. Both these senses can be ruled out for N855 on the grounds given in § 2.1: they would entail that the agent of **испралоу** (the author) had a social obligation to perform the given action for the referent of the dative **:имъ**. This obligatory nuance can be seen in sharp relief in (5), an excerpt from birchbark N644 (ca. 1100–1120)<sup>6</sup>.

- (5) **Ѡ нѣжеке ко завидѹ чемоу не восолешн чето ти есемо водала ковати · Ѡ дала тобѣ а нѣжатѣ не дала [...—DEC] а не сестра Ѡ вамо оже тако дѣлаете не исправитѣ ми ничето же [...—DEC]** [ДНД: 267]).  
From Nežka to Zavid. Why won’t you send what I gave you to forge? I gave [it] to you; I didn’t give it to Nežata [...—DEC] Am I not your sister, that you should do thus? You won’t discharge anything for me [...—DEC].

<sup>6</sup> Other cases of the meaning ‘discharge’ occur in N849 (mid-twelfth century) [ДНД: 318], involving some kind of official action, and N749 (extra-stratigraphically 1380s–1450), where the addressee is ordered to uphold an agreement (**слово то** ‘that word’ [ДНД: 635]). (On legal meanings of **слово**, see [Schaeken 2011a: 3–4].) In N344 (1300–1320), **правити** appears in the related sense ‘act in accordance with (an obligation)’; the nuance of obligation is made explicit by the phrase **по сомолове** ‘according to the agreement [**сѣмълава**]’ [ДНД: 526].

The author of this birchbark draws specific attention to her addressee's social obligations. First, she stresses that she has entrusted the task to him rather than another brother («I gave [it] to *you*; I didn't give it to Nežata»); then she reminds him of the duties of kinship («Am I not your sister»; the plural possessive extends her reproach to all her brothers). Given this contextual emphasis, it is not surprising that **исправити**-DISCHARGE takes a dative of beneficiary (ми 'me-DAT').

**3.1.** In OR, **исправити** is the perfective of **правити** (as well as certain derived imperfectives). In birchbarks, **правити** can denote 'appropriate; collect as payment'. As this meaning is telic, it was undoubtedly possible for **исправити** as well; indeed, this is evidently attested in N724 (1161—1167), roughly contemporary with N855 (6a); and N615 (ca. 1280—1300) (6b):

- (6a) **Ќ савѣтъ поклананне къ братьи и дружинѣ оставили ма бѣли людѣ да остатъ дани исправити бѣло имѣ досени [...—DEC] [ДНД: 350].**

From Sava, a bow to [my] brethren and companions. The people have left me, and they were supposed to collect the rest of the tribute before spring...

- (6b) + поклананне · **Ќ ла{ха}ха · къ Хларевн · исправилъ ли еси · десатъ гривенъ : на рѹсилѣ · съ микѹлою послн семо · или еси не исправилъ · а исправи и кланяюса · а дѣцьскни прнма · [ДНД: 498—499].**

Greetings from Ljax to Flar. If you have collected the ten *grivnas* from Rusila, send [them] here with Mikula. If you haven't collected [them], collect [them] — and I bow [to you] — having obtained a *detskij* [bailiff].

In context, the given meaning (hereafter **исправити-EXACT**) can be paraphrased either as 'receive material commodities', where the subject/agent is a creditor, or as 'confiscate from a debtor and transfer to the lawful owner', where the subject/agent is «an intermediary, usually a representative of state power» [Зализняк 1986: 176]. Although 'exact' and 'pay' seem like antonyms, they are both contextual realizations of a more general sense—'cause a transfer of material goods to take place in accordance with the law' [Ibid.].

If we posit that **испралоу** in N855 means 'exact' rather than 'pay', we get a reading that avoids the pragmatic problems discussed in § 2. We should still exclude referential scenarios in which **:I.MЪ** is co-referential with **нежатиници отроки**, cf. (3a), or the sum of the preceding referents, cf. (3c), since they involve the cultural anomaly of the culprits being rewarded for their crime. (The OR dative has directional rather than ablative meaning, which excludes the possibility that **:I.MЪ** referred to the party from whom the fine is to be collected.) However, the scenario in which **:I.MЪ** is co-referential to **шьсть :I:ХЪ** alone, cf. (3b), makes good sense (7):

(7) Nežatinič's lads<sub>i</sub> beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will collect the **ДОУЖЬБА** for them<sub>j</sub>.

Here the pronoun **ѡ:ѡѡ** functions as a dative of beneficiary, as in (5), above. The referents from whom the money is to be taken (cf. **НА РУСИЛѢ** in N615) are left implicit, but they could be easily inferred from the context and from the cultural knowledge that culprits have to pay penalties.

The reading in (7) leads to one immediate conclusion about the hapax *legomenon* **ДОУЖЬБА**: as the object/patient of a verb meaning 'collect, exact', it cannot be interpreted in any direct sense as a *nomen actionis* meaning 'recovery, cure'. Rather, it must refer to a transferable object—some form of payment—either directly or by metonymy in this specific context.

**4.0.** For the commissive speech act in the final clause to be felicitous, the author has to believe that he has the power to perform the promised action. Given the new interpretation in (7), that means that he feels prepared to collect something from Nežatinič and/or his lads, who are known to be belligerent and probably armed (thus [ДНД: 326]). Presumably, then, the author can count on support from the law. He may have in mind the services of a bailiff like the one mentioned in (6b), but it is also conceivable that he is himself a court official empowered to execute justice and collect fines, perhaps with the help of an armed posse.

There are two arguments in favor of the author being a court official. First, as noted in § 1.0, N855 was unearthed at the site of the main court of twelfth-century Novgorod. This is a logical site to find a report by a court official; it would be merely random if the author of N855 were a private party. (A private individual might send the court a petition, complaint, or denunciation, but these possibilities are ruled out by the commissive speech act at the end.) Second, the hypothesis that N855 was written by an official has the value added that the birchbark can be assigned to a recognizable genre of judicial-investigation reports, which also includes N247 and N907 (see [ДНД: 239—240, 255—257; Schaeken 2011b]). Though interpersonal, these texts are not private letters but official communications. Note that the law-related content in N855 is not limited to the account of the brawl; the word **ДЪ[ѦК]Ѧ** probably refers to a type of court official—a meaning attested in Novgorod even in the eleventh century—rather than a cleric<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. two inscriptions from Holy Wisdom Cathedral [Медынцева 1978: 252, plates 75—76]. Inscription no. 143 [Ibid.: 94] reads [пѣ]трѡ псалль | [ос]тромирѡ | [Ѧ]накъ Ѧ[м]и(нѡ) («Peter wrote [this], Ostromir's *d'jak*. Amen»). Medynceva's interpretation of no. 144 [Ibid.], as corrected by A. A. Gippius and S. M. Mixeev (personal communication), reads (про)х(о)ръ псалль | остромирѡ дѦкъ («Proxor wrote [this], Ostromir's *d'jak*). Ostromir, who died in 1054 or 1057 [Хорошев 2009: 374], was the prince's viceroy; thus it is likely his *d'jaki* were court officials rather than deacons.



4.1. If the author of N855 is a court official, there is another meaning of (ис)правити to consider—‘restore justice; establish the correct position’ (hereafter **исправити**-JUDGE). This is a clear-cut extension of the primary meaning ‘make correct, put right’; the verb is a causative from the root *prav-* ‘right; correct’. In legal contexts, **исправити**-JUDGE can denote ‘determine the truth by investigation; judge; adjudicate’, as in (8a—b)<sup>8</sup>. (The investigation and the verdict were stages of the same legal process, conducted by the same official.)

(8a) ... помини о осуженыхъ ѿ тебе, и **исправн** кто кого **вклеветалъ**, и самъ **разсжди** (Epistle of Metropolitan Nicephoros to Vladimir Monomach, 1113—1121, in a copy of ca. 1500 [Понырко 1992: 70; Срезневский s. v. **исправити**; СРЯ s. v. **исправити** 4]).

... remember those condemned by you, and investigate who has slandered whom, and render judgment yourself.

(8b) ... **сѣтополкъ** **кнѣзь** **всадилъ** **ваше** **в** **погребѣ**. **два** **мѹжа** **нѣ** **в** **которои** **винѣ** **хочѹдѣ** **окована**. и **не** **испр<sup>а</sup>вивъ** **нѣ** **послушавъ** **облыгающихъ** (Tale of Boris and Gleb, Sil’vestrov Miscellany, fourteenth century [Срезневский 1860: fol. 136b3—8]).

... Prince Svjatopolk had put two men in the dungeon, because of some bad guilt, shackled, and without having investigated, but having listened to liars...

This is probably also the meaning of **исправн** in birchbark N4 (1310s—1360s)<sup>9</sup>. Cf. the cognate noun **исправа** ‘judicial investigation; decision made as a result of an investigation’ in N480 (1300—25) [ДНД: 498] and N361 (turn of the fourteenth century; probably 1380—1400) [Ibid.: 614]<sup>10</sup>.

There are two major ways in which **исправити**-JUDGE differs from **исправити**-EXACT. First, the subject/agent is establishing the position of the law rather than executing it; his determinations are a prerequisite for a legal confiscation or fine. Second, the direct object can refer to an accusation, case, or question: *investigate the battery, judge whether X committed battery, determine/adjudicate the damages*. Cf. the colligation of the (near-)synonym **сѹдити** ‘judge’ with objects such as **вещь**, **орѹдык**, and **дѣло** ‘case’ [Срезневский s. v. **сѹдити**].

As noted in § 3.1, the only referential scenario compatible with **исправити**-EXACT is the one in which the pronoun **:имѣ** refers to the victims of the battery (7).

<sup>8</sup> See [СДЯ s. v. **правити** 6; СРЯ s. vv. **исправити** 4, **правити** 9; Срезневский s. v. **правити**]. This meaning may date to prehistory; it is also attested for the cognate in medieval BCS [RHSJ s. v. *ispraviti* 1d].

<sup>9</sup> In Zaliznjak’s reconstruction [Зализняк 1986: 182], the author of N4 had acted as surety on a loan on which the debtor had defaulted; the imperative **исправн** began his request for the addressee to settle the legal wrangle.

<sup>10</sup> [СДЯ s. v. **изправа** 1; СРЯ s. v. **исправа** 2; Срезневский s. v. **исправа**, first definition].

By contrast, if the meaning in N855 is ‘investigate’, **Ѹ:мъ** most probably refers to the sum of the antecedents (9a), because the scenario presupposes that guilt or innocence has not yet been established. If **исправити** has the subsense ‘judge, adjudicate’, **Ѹ:мъ** can refer either to one of the antecedents or to their sum (9b).

(9a) Nežatinič’s lads<sub>i</sub> beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will investigate the **доужьба** for them<sub>i+j</sub>.

(9b) Nežatinič’s lads<sub>i</sub> beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will judge the **доужьба** for them<sub>i/j/i+j</sub>.

In these readings, the function of the dative can be either recipient or beneficiary. In OR, judgment is something that can be metaphorically ‘given’ (**да(ва)ти соудъ/исправоу**) to a recipient in the dative; thus the verb **соудити** ‘judge’ has dative valences in several of its subsenses [Срезневский s. v.]. Alternatively, judgment can be ‘done’ or ‘rendered’ to someone, that is, created by the judge’s action with some effect on a dative beneficiary—hence the dative valence with **(оу)чинити исправоу** [СДЯ s. v. **изправа**].

**5.0.** On the basis of the evidence examined thus far, the readings with **исправити-EXACT** and with **исправити-JUDGE** seem equally valid. One factor that may decide the case is how well each meaning combines with plausible interpretation(s) of the object **доужьбоу**. As noted above, [НГБ-11] and [ДНД] treat this hapax as a *nomen actionis* denoting ‘recovery, cure’ («лечение»), based on the meanings of apparent cognates (see 5.1, below). If this is correct, the noun would be unable to colligate with either **исправити-EXACT** or **исправити-JUDGE** except as a metonymy; hence the interpolation ‘[money for] healing’ in the published translation. However, it seems questionable to assume metonymy when the direct meaning of the word has yet to be established.

We should begin by considering whether **доужьбоу** meant directly ‘money for healing’. In the Short RP, reflecting eleventh-century norms, a victim of battery injured so severely that he cannot avenge himself is to receive «payment for the healer»; a separate fine of three *grivnas* is paid to the prince (10a)<sup>11</sup>. The Extended RP, reflecting somewhat later norms, only mentions such a fee in cases of battery by sword causing incised or penetration wounds (10b).

(10a) ... **ОЖЕ ЛИ СЕБЕ НЕ МОЖЕТЬ МЪСТИТИ, ТО ВЪЗЪТИ ЕМОУ ЗА ОБИДОУ 3 ГРИВНѢ, А ЛѢТЦЮ МЪЗДА** (Academy I Copy, 1440s, § 2 [ПІ, 1: 70]).

If [the victim] is unable avenge himself, then he is to take for the offence 3 grivnas, and also payment for the physician [Kaiser 1992: 15].

<sup>11</sup> There has been debate about whether the three *grivnas* in the Short Redaction (10a) were compensation or a fine, as in the Extended Redaction (10b) (see [ПІ, 2: 59—64; ПРІ 1: 87—88; Kaiser 1980: 80—81]).

(10b) **Аже оударитъ мечемь, а не оутнетъ на смертъ, то 3 гривны, а са-  
момоу гривна за раноу, оже лѣчебноу; потынетъ ли на смертъ, то  
внра** (Synodal Copy, 1282, § 30 [PI, 1: 125])<sup>12</sup>.

If he strikes [the victim] with a sword but does not cut him to the death, then [the fine is] 3 *grivnas*, and to [the victim] himself a *grivna*, and also [*or*: which is] a leech-fee; if he cuts him to the death, then [he is subject to] the bloodwite.

The «payment for the physician» in (10a) and the «leech-fee» (лѣчебноу; cf. лѣчѣба ‘healing; medicine’) in (10b) may be linked with the ancient Indo-European institution of *sick-maintenance*, which is known from Hittite, Germanic, Old Irish, and Indic law. This was a penalty separate from the victim’s compensation; it was imposed on the culprits when the victims’ healing was a protracted process (see [Binchy 1934; Watkins 1976; Oliver 2008]).

It is tempting to interpret доужевоу as an alternative term for ‘leech-fee’. As noted in [НГБ-11] and [ДНД], some of the East Slavic derivatives of the root *dug-* denote concepts from the semantic field of health. However, as will be shown in 5.1, the root is also well attested in other semantic fields. In any case, there is no evidence that the author of N855 was a physician who would be entitled to a leech-fee, and in general it seems odd that he should focus on a tertiary sanction rather than the fine or victims’ compensation. Moreover, the leech-fee, judging from (10b), would have been irrelevant for the injuries described in N855. In the Extended RP, it is mentioned solely in the context of penetrating wounds, which medieval leeches could in principle treat; it is not mentioned in the context of blunt-force trauma (§§ 23—26, 31), broken teeth (§ 68), or mutilations (§§ 27—28) — injuries for which leeches could do little or nothing.

**5.1.** While etymology alone is insufficient for determining the meaning of a hapax, it can provide a good starting-point<sup>13</sup>. In the subsequent discussion, I will adopt the etymology proposed in [НГБ-11: 70] and [ДНД: 326], which links доужевоу with reflexes of CSI *\*dug-* (PSI *\*doug-*, PIE *\*dheugh-*) and *\*dog-* (PSI *\*dong-*, PIE *\*dheng-*)<sup>14</sup>. I will assume, following Shevelov [1965: 321—22]

<sup>12</sup> Similarly in most other manuscripts [PI, 1: 106, 151, 170, 189, 218, 248, 263, 303, 331, 349, 374]. One copy has metathesized целѣбноу (cf. цѣлѣба ‘medicine; healing’), which is synonymous with лѣчѣбноу [Ibid.: 303, n. 7].

<sup>13</sup> The following abbreviations are used: *BCS* Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian; *Bg* Bulgarian; *BR* Belarusian; *CSl* Common Slavic; *Cz* Czech; *dial* dialect; *Mc* Macedonian; *MBR* Middle Belarusian; *MRu* Middle Russian; *MUk* Middle Ukrainian; *OCS* Old Church Slavonic; *OCz* Old Czech; *OPo* Old Polish; *OR* Old Rus’ian (Old East Slavic); *PIE* Proto-Indo-European; *Po* Polish; *PSl* Proto-Slavic; *Ru* Russian; *Sk* Slovak; *Sl* Slovenian; *Uk* Ukrainian.

<sup>14</sup> For PIE *\*dheugh-*, cf. Greek τέχῃ ‘prepare’, Old Irish *dúal* ‘fitting’, Gothic *daug* ‘it is useful’, Old English *gedēgan* ‘endure’, Old High German *tuht* ‘power’, Old Norse *duga* ‘be useful’, Lithuanian *daũg* ‘much’. For PIE *\*dheng-*, cf. Sanskrit *dagh-* ‘achieve’,

and Vasmer [Фасмер s. v. -*дыз*], that these originally separate roots underwent a prehistoric merger in Slavic. As far as *ДΟΥЖЕВОУ* is concerned, they would have the same outcome in any case because of the East Slavic merger of \**o* and tautosyllabic \**ou*<sup>15</sup>.

Semantically, the reflexes of \**dug-*/*dog-* cluster around the concept of ‘physical strength’, where the denotatum is a state, rather than ‘healing, recovery’, where it is an action or change of state<sup>16</sup>. The meaning ‘physical strength’ is actually attested for the root, and the other senses can be derived from that by one-step extensions. By contrast, taking one of the other meanings (e. g., ‘health’) as the starting-point would involve a larger and more complicated set of shifts.

The unsuffixed noun \**dug-ь* is preserved only in Cz and Sk, primarily in the idiomatic prepositional phrases *k duhu*, *v duh* ‘beneficial/useful to’ (11a). It is plausible to interpret *duh* in these idioms as ‘strength’; cf. English *go to the strength of* ‘work to the benefit of’<sup>17</sup>. In any case, numerous derivatives of \**dug-*/*dog-* in East and West Slavic reflect the meaning ‘physical strength’ directly (11b), while others reflect connotations like ‘strength to endure’ (11c), ‘strength to engage in labor’ (11d), and ‘health’, i. e., ‘strength of constitution’ (11e)<sup>18</sup>.

- (11a) Cz dial *jít (byt) v duh*, Sk *íst’ (byt’) k duhu* ‘be of use’ (lit. ‘go (be) to strength’); Cz dial *sloužit (jít, prospívat) k duhu* ‘benefit’ (lit. ‘serve (go, avail) to strength’).

---

Greek *ταχύς* ‘quick’, Old Irish *daingen* ‘strong’, Old English *denczan* ‘knock, dent’, Old Norse *dengja* ‘hammer’, Lithuanian *danginti(es)* ‘move’. See [Pokorny s. vv.; Orel 2003: 68; ЭССЯ s. v. \**dōžiti*, \**dugь*, \**dužiti*, \**dužьь*, \**nedogь*/*\*nedoga*, *nedožьje*; Фасмер s. vv. -*дыз*, *недыз*].

<sup>15</sup> Vasmer [Фасмер s. v. -*дыз*] cites Bg *недыз*, Po *duży* (\**ou*) vs. Bg *недыз*, Po *dążyć* (\**on*) as evidence that \**dog-* was an allomorph of \**doug-* with a nasal infix. Conversely, Machek [1968 s. v. *neduh*] and Fiedlerová [1973] treat \**dug-* as a back formation from \**nedog-*. This does not explain Vasmer’s doublets and is implausible, given the large number of non-negated derivations in North Slavic. See also [ЭССЯ s. v. \**nedogь*/*\*nedoga*].

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *e*-grade reflexes like Ru dial *дыга* ‘strength; growth’, *дылный* ‘strong; healthy; well-grown; working’, *дыгнуть* ‘get strong; recuperate; grow’ [СРНГ s. vv.; ЭССЯ s. vv. \**dęga*, \**dęnoti*].

<sup>17</sup> V. Rosa (died 1689) glosses *duh* as ‘strength, freshness, liveliness’ [Rosa 2008 s. v.], and Jungmann as ‘power, strength’. M. Benešovský (1587) defines *duh* as *vegetativa vis*, one of the Aristotelean «souls», along with *duch* ‘spirit’ (*vis sensitiva*) and *duše* ‘soul’ (*vis rationalis*) [Zibrť 1906: 198]. While probably a figment of Benešovský’s imagination, this suggests that he associated *duh* with Latin *vis* ‘strength, power’.

<sup>18</sup> Soft initial /d’/ is non-etymological. See [Bartoš s. vv. *duh*, *duží*, *dužný*; БРС s. v. *дужэць*; ЭССЯ s. vv. \**dugь*, \**dužati* (*se*), \**dužiti*, \**dužьь*; ЕСУМ s. v. *дужий*; SP s. v. \**dužь*; Jungmann s. v. *duh*; Machek s. v. *neduh*; PSJČ s. vv. *duh*, *duží*, *dužný*; СРЯ s. v. *дюжий*; СРНГ s. vv. *дужий/дужой*, *дюжий/дюжой*, *дюжеть*, *дюжить*].

- (11b) Cz dial *duží, dužný*, Sk *dúži*, Po *duży*, Uk (no) *дужий*, BR *дужы*, MRu **дѹжнѣ**, Ru dial *дужий, дужий/дужою* ‘strong’; Cz dial *dužet*, Sk (*z*)*duž(n)iet’*, Uk *дужати*, BR *дужэць*, Ru dial (*вы*)*дужеть, одюжи(ва)ть* ‘become strong’; Cz dial *dužiti* ‘strengthen’; Sk *dúže*, Po *dužo*, Uk *дуже, дужо*, BR *дужа*, Ru dial *дуже, дужо, дуже, дужо* ‘strongly; very’.
- (11c) Cz *duží*, Po *duży*, Ru dial *дужий/дужою* ‘durable; tough’; Ru dial *дужить, выдуживать* ‘resist wear’; Ru dial (*вз-, вы-, на-, о-*)*дужи(ва)ть* ‘endure; withstand’.
- (11d) Ru dial *дужить* ‘work tirelessly; remain able to work (of the elderly); stay serviceable (of things)’; Ru dial *отдужить* ‘do heavy labor, enduring all its hardships’.
- (11e) Po *duży*, Uk *дужий* ‘healthy’ (*бездужний* ‘ill’); Uk dial *дужати*, BR *дужэць*, Ru dial *сдужать* ‘be healthy’; Uk *видуж(ув)ати, одуж(ув)ати*, Ru dial *одужи(ва)ть, отдужить, вздужеть, одужи(ва)ть/одужать, отдужеть* ‘recuperate’, etc.

The formation found in **дѹЖЕВОУ**, with the suffix *-ьб-*, is also attested in the OCz deadjectival abstractum *dužebnost*, cited by Jungmann from an unknown manuscript<sup>19</sup>. Jungmann glosses this as ‘strength; digestive power’ (‘Stärke, Verdauungskraft’), but the second meaning is probably contextual. In Jungmann’s only example, *dužebnost* is modified by *žaludka* ‘stomach-GEN.SG’ and conjoined with *zažiwnost* ‘power of digestion’. This suggests that the lexeme did not inherently refer to alimentation: «*zažiwnost i dužebnost žaludka zemdljwá*» («the digestive power and strength of the stomach declines [*sic*]»).

The converse of the complex of meanings in (11a—e) appears in compounds of *\*dug-/\*dōg-* with the negative prefix (‘non-strength’), which date to the CSI period (12). These denote not a passing sickness but a lasting debility—a state that can be caused not only by chronic ill-health but, in various Slavic languages, also by bad luck, underdevelopment, or incompetence.

- (12) OCS **недѹжѣ**, Bg *недѹж*, Mc, BCS *недуж*, Cz, Sk *neduh*, OR **недѹжѣ** ‘infirmary’; OR **недѹжѣ** ‘illness; misfortune’, Sl *nedōžje* ‘misfortune’; OPo *nieduży* ‘sick; lazy’, Po dial, Sk dial *nedúži* ‘weak; underdeveloped’, OR **недѹжнѣ** ‘incompetent; useless’, MUK *недужий* ‘sickly; unfortunate’, Ru dial *недужий* ‘sickly; weak’; etc.<sup>20</sup>

Many of the other derivatives of *\*dug-/\*dōg-* reflect metonymic extensions from ‘physical strength’ to states or changes of state culturally associated with

<sup>19</sup> Jungmann’s source («Ms. bib. 121») cannot be identified, but its language was no earlier than the late fifteenth century [Černá, Stluka 2005]. Jungmann’s headword *dužebný* was his own back-formation from *dužebnost*.

<sup>20</sup> [ЭССЯ s. vv. *\*nedōžь/\*nedōga, \*nedōžьje, \*nedōžьь/nedužьь*; Фасмер s. v. *-дуж*]. The OCS, Bg, and Sl forms unambiguously reflect *\*dōg-*, and the OPo and Pol *\*dug-*; the other forms are ambivalent.

strong entities, e. g., ‘large size’ (13a); ‘heftiness’ (13b); and ‘maturation’ (‘growing to full strength’) (13c)<sup>21</sup>.

- (13a) Po *dužy*, Sk *dúži*, BR dial *дужы*, Ru dial *дюжий/дюжкой, дюжный* ‘big; well-grown’; Sk *dužiet*, Ru dial *(вы)дюжет, одюжи(ва)ть* ‘grow; get big’  
 (13b) Po *dužy*, Cz dial *duží*, Sk *dúži* ‘heavy’; Cz dial *dužný* ‘fat’, *dužit se* ‘get fat’.  
 (13c) Po *dužy*, Ru dial *дюжий/дюжкой* ‘mature’; Ru dial *одюжи(ва)ть* ‘reach manhood’.

The complex of senses in (13c) may also explain why **ДОУЖИИ/ДЮЖИИ** is used to signify ‘legally competent’ (‘old enough to be legally independent’) in some copies of the Extended RP (§ 99)<sup>22</sup>.

Still other derivatives of *\*dug-/\*dɔg-* involve metonymic extensions from ‘physical strength’ to ‘use of strength’, either to achieve desired ends (14a) or to engage in acts of force (14b)<sup>23</sup>.

- (14a) Po *dążyć* ‘strive’; Po *dążność* ‘effort’; Uk *здужати, подужати, придужати*, Ru dial *(вз-, за-, на-, о-)дюжить* ‘have the strength (to do something)’; Ru dial *дюжить* ‘lug’; Ru dial *надюж(ив)аться* ‘exert oneself to the utmost’; Ru dial *надюжатъ* ‘overburden’.  
 (14b) BR *дужаць*, Ru dial *(о-, с-)дюжить, вздужетъ, одюж(ив)ать* ‘overcome’; Uk *дужатися*, BR *дужацца* ‘struggle’; Uk dial *подуга* ‘victory’; BR *дужанка* ‘sword- or knife-fight’; Ru dial *(за)дужить* ‘rob, assault’, *дугач* ‘assailant’.

The complex of meanings in (14a) may perhaps explain the use of Ru dial *дюжий/дюжкой* in the sense ‘skillful, artful’. The complex in (14b) can be com-

<sup>21</sup> Cf. also Ru dial *дюжить* ‘get juicy; ripen’; Cz dial *dužný* ‘fleshy (of fruit)’; Cz dial *duž(n)ina* ‘flesh of fruit’. See [ЭССЯ s. vv. *\*dužati (se), \*dužiti, \*dužьbь*; ЕСУМ s. v. *дужий*; SP s. v. *dužь*; PSJČ s. vv. *dužiti se, dužný, dužnina*; СРНГ s. vv. *дюжий, дюжкой, дюжетъ, дюжный*].

<sup>22</sup> Minors whose mothers are remarrying are said to be **НЕ ДУЖИ САМИ СОБОЮ ПЕЧАЛОВАТИ** («not competent to take care of themselves») in the 1493 Solovki V copy of the Archaeographic Redaction [ПП, 1: 313, n. 6]; similarly in the Tixonravov copy of the Mjasnikov Redaction, the Bal’zerov, RGB II, and Undol’skij III copies of the Museum Redaction, and, with **ДЮЖИ**, the Tolstoj IV copy of the Abridged Redaction [Ibid.: 198, n. 11, 386, n. 23, 272]. Four other copies of the Archaeographic Redaction have reinterpreted **ДОУЖИ** as a non-agreeing verb **ДОУЖИ СЯ** ‘be strong-PRS.3SG’ [Ibid.: 313]. Other manuscripts have the corruption **ДЪЖИ** or different lexemes in this passage.

<sup>23</sup> [БРС s. vv. *дужанка, дужаць, дужацца*; ЭССЯ s. vv. *\*dugъ, \*dužiti*; Миртов s. v. *дугач*; ЕСУМ s. v. *дужий*; СРНГ s. vv. *дюжий, дюжкой, дужить, дугач*]. Cf. e-grade reflexes like Sk *d’ah* ‘path; direction’; BR dial *дзяжыць* ‘run’ [ЭССЯ s. vv. *\*dęga, \*dęgnōti*]. The Po forms unambiguously reflect *\*dɔg-*; the East Slavic forms are ambivalent.

pared to English *with strength* (obsolete) ‘violently’; *force* (noun) ‘unlawful violence’, (verb) ‘assault sexually’; cf. also the metaphors *strong arm* «physical force or violence», «a criminal who resorts to violence; one who is employed or hired to use force against persons», and *strong hand* «the exercise of superior power or strength; the use of force» (OED s. vv.).

**5.2.** Clearly, not all of the meanings discussed in § 5.1 would be good fits for the final clause of N855. If **ДОУЖЕБОУ** denoted an abstracted quality like ‘physical strength’, ‘durability’, ‘ability to work’, or ‘health’ (11a—d), it would presumably only colligate with the meaning ‘investigate’ (**ИСПРАВИТИ**-JUDGE); the author of N855 would be preparing to assess the victims’ physical condition. However, this reading assumes a periphrastic, elevated style that would be incongruous with the practical orientation and straightforward wording of the rest of the birchbark. It is even less likely that **ДОУЖЕБОУ** conveyed some measurement of size, weight, or age (13a—c); such meanings would be hard to combine with any of the attested senses of **ИСПРАВИТИ** in a pragmatically coherent way, nor would they make sense in the overall context.

In fact, if the realizations of *dug-* in § 5.1 run the gamut of its meanings, the only plausible option is that **ДОУЖЕБОУ** denoted an act of force or some closely related concept. Accordingly, **ДОУЖЕБОУ** could have meant ‘brawl’, that is, a description of the incident discussed earlier in N855 (15a). This sense (hereafter **ДОУЖЬБА**-BRAWL) can be analyzed as ‘act of mutual force’; cf. other *nomina actionis* with the suffix *-ьб-* like **БОРЬБА** ‘fist-fight’, **ТАТЬБА** ‘(act of) theft’ (*tat-* ‘thief’) and **СОУДЬБА** ‘(act of) judgment’ (*sud-* ‘court’)<sup>24</sup>. Alternatively, **ДОУЖЕБОУ** could have been a term for ‘battery’, i. e., a classification of the breach of peace discussed earlier in the birchbark (15b). Depending on how the dative pronoun is read, this sense (hereafter **ДОУЖЬБА**-BATTERY) can be further analyzed as a ‘(mis)use of strength’ by an agent (15c) or an ‘act causing loss of strength’ to a patient (15d).

(15a) Nežatinič’s lads<sub>i</sub> beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will investigate/judge the brawl for them<sub>i+j</sub>.

(15b) Nežatinič’s lads<sub>j</sub>; beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will investigate/judge the battery for them<sub>i+j</sub>.

(15c) Nežatinič’s lads<sub>j</sub>; beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will investigate/judge the battery [done by] them<sub>i</sub>.

(15d) Nežatinič’s lads<sub>j</sub>; beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will investigate/judge the battery [done to] them<sub>j</sub>.

In (15a—b), the dative pronoun **:I:МЪ** can have a recipient or beneficiary function. The readings in (15c—d) assume that the noun **ДОУЖЬБА** has arguments (elaboration sites), like other *nomina actionis*, and that the pronoun is ad-

<sup>24</sup> See [Meillet 1961: 272—273; Горелова 1969: 30—33; Kiparsky 1975: 277; Ефимова 2006: 177].

nominal. In (15c), *:и:мъ* is a subject argument and refers to the agent of the battery; in (15d), it is an object argument and refers to the experiencer or patient (cf. [Eckhoff 2007: 81, 158—162]). However, there is debate about whether adnominal datives were characteristic of vernacular Rus'ian; they are uncommon outside the Slavonic register (see [Ibid.: 38—40, 300—302]). Hence (15a—b) seem more probable than (15c—d).

There is no difficulty in getting a coherent reading when either *ДОУЖЬБА-BRAWL* or *ДОУЖЬБА-BATTERY* is colligated with *ИСПРАВИТИ* in the meaning 'judge' ('investigate' or 'render judgment on'). Similar colligations, in which verbs meaning 'investigate' or 'judge' take objects denoting crimes or charges (accusations of crimes), are well attested in medieval East Slavic texts. This is illustrated by (16), from § 10 of the fifteenth-century Novgorod Judicial Charter.

(16) А кто на ком поищет наезда, или грабежа в земном деле: ино судити наперед наезд и грабеж: а о земли после суд [ПРИП, 2: 213].

And should someone accuse someone of an attack or robbery during a land lawsuit, then [the judge is] to investigate/judge the [charge of] attack and robbery first, and the trial about the land is [to be held] afterwards.

**5.3.** Unlike *ИСПРАВИТИ-JUDGE*, *ИСПРАВИТИ-EXACT* is difficult to reconcile with either *ДОУЖЬБА-BRAWL* or *ДОУЖЬБА-BATTERY*; however, that meaning would presumably combine readily with a term for a legal payment. Indeed, it is worth considering whether *ДОУЖЕВОУ* in N855 denoted a financial sanction imposed on the guilty party in a battery trial—either a fine paid to the prince or compensation given to the victim; the Extended RP provides for both types of penalties in cases of battery (§§ 27—28, 30) [ПИ, 1: 124—25]. The proposed sense, hereafter *ДОУЖЬБА-PENALTY*, can be analyzed as 'price for strength', a one-step metonymic extension from 'strength'—the quality lost by the victim(s)—to 'payment for that (lost) quality'. A parallel can be found in Greek τιμή 'honor, social status', which already in Homeric could denote 'compensation for (the loss of) honor' [LSJ s. v.; Buck 1949: 1447]. In such a metonymy, the concept of 'loss' does not have to be explicit, as it is presupposed by the very fact that compensation is warranted; cf. the interchangeability of English *avenge one's honor* and *avenge one's loss of honor*.

If *ДОУЖЬБА-PENALTY* is the correct meaning, the noun would belong to a group of legal terms formed with the suffix *-ьб-* that denote payments for the action, quality, or entity denoted by the roots. Cf. *ЛѢЧЬБЬНОК* 'leech-fee' (*lĕk-* 'heal'), discussed in § 5.0; *ВЛЪЗЬБА, ВЛЪЗЬБЬНОК* 'fee for detaining a fugitive' (*vĕz-* 'bind'); and *ВѢСЬБЬНОК* 'duty based on weight' (*vĕs-* 'weight')<sup>25</sup>. Likewise, in Rus'ian legal language *ТАТЪБА*, otherwise '(act of) theft', can signify a 'thief-fee', compensation equal in value to stolen property, which the commu-

<sup>25</sup> [СДЯ s. vv. *ВЛЪЗЬБЬНЫИ, ЛѢЧЬБЬНЫИ*; СРЯ s. vv. *ВѢСЬБНОЕ, ЛѢЧЬБНОЕ*; Срезневский s. vv. *ВѢСЬБЬНОК, ВЛЪЗЬБА, ЛѢЧЬБЬНЫИ*].



nity has to pay the victim if it fails to produce the thief (Extended RP § 77) [ПИ, 1: 131]<sup>26</sup>.

If **ДОУЖЬБА**-PENALTY combines with **ИСПРАВИТИ**-EXACT, the author of N855 can be seen as a proxy exacting compensation for the victims (17a) or an official charged with appropriating the fine for the prince (17b), like the **ВИРЬНИКЪ** ‘weregild-collector’ in cases of homicide (Short RP § 42 [ПИ, 1: 73]; Extended RP § 9 [Ibid.: 122—123]). It is also conceivable that **ДОУЖЬБА**-PENALTY is colligated with another meaning, **ИСПРАВИТИ**-JUDGE; this combination may be paraphrased as ‘determine by investigation the payment (that is legally warranted)’. In this second scenario (17c), the author would play the same role in the legal process as in (15a—c).

- (17a) Nežatinič’s lads<sub>i</sub> beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will exact the financial sanction for them<sub>j</sub>.  
 (17b) Nežatinič’s lads<sub>i</sub> beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will impose the financial sanction on them<sub>i</sub>.  
 (17c) Nežatinič’s lads<sub>i</sub> beat<sub>i</sub> six of them<sub>j</sub>, and I will adjudicate the financial sanction for them<sub>i+j</sub>.

**5.4.** Because of the polysemy of **ИСПРАВИТИ**, there is no way to be certain whether **ДОУЖЕВОУ** in N855 denoted ‘battery’ or ‘sanction for battery’. Such uncertainty is to be expected, since Rus’ian law tended to penalize the guilty with financial sanctions rather than other forms of punishment (see [Kaiser 1980: 90—91]). Thus, in law texts, terms for crimes can be extended to denote penalties; for example, as noted above, **ТАТЬБА** ‘theft’ is used to mean ‘thief-fee’ in § 77 of the Extended RP. Conversely, terms for penalties can be extended to denote accusations of the crimes that they are intended to punish. Thus in (18a—b), **ВИРА** ‘bloodwite’ (the fine for homicide) is used to mean ‘homicide charge (which, if proven, would entail the bloodwite)’.

- (18a) **А ОЖЕ СЪВЕРЖЕТЬ ВИРОУ, ТЪ ГРИВНА КОУНЪ СЪМЕТНАГА ШТРОКОУ...** (Extended RP, Synodal copy, 1282, § 20 [ПИ, 1: 124])<sup>27</sup>.  
 And if [someone] removes the bloodwite [sc. proves his innocence in the homicide], then [he pays] a «removal» *grivna* of *kunas* to the bailiff...  
 (18b) **АЩЕ БЪДЕТЬ НА КОГВ ПОКЛЕПНАГА ВИРА, ТО ЖЕ БЪДЕТЬ ПОСАДЪХОВ 7, ТО ТИ ВЪВЕДАТЬ ВИРОУ...** (Extended RP, Trinity I copy, fourteenth century, § 18 [Ibid.: 106]).  
 If there is a bloodwite [sc. a homicide accusation] against someone based on suspicion alone, and there are 7 witnesses [to vouch for him], then they take away the bloodwite [sc. find him innocent of the charge].

<sup>26</sup> [Срезневский s. v. **ТАТЬБА** («cost of the stolen thing»); ППИ, 1: 131 («the losses caused by the robbery»)].

<sup>27</sup> «If (someone) removes the suspicion of homicide from himself» [ППИ, 1: 123].

Notwithstanding the uncertainty, there is some value added in interpreting **ДОУЖЕБОУ** as a type of victim's compensation. Though N855 is thus far the only record of the word **ДОУЖЕБОУ**, it may not be the only OR text to contain a reference to payments for «strength» in the context of battery. As I will show below, such payments are also mentioned in the Extended RP and in other texts with legal content; the term that designated them was **ВЪКЪ**, which meant, inter alia, 'strength'.

**6.0.** The three major dictionaries of OR [СДЯ; СРЯ; Срезневский] give two separate headwords for **ВЪКЪ**; in so doing, they are making the claim that the two entries were separate lexemes<sup>28</sup>. The first lemma, hereafter **ВЪКЪ-TIME**, includes robustly attested nouns with temporal denotations, e. g., 'lifetime', 'age', 'millenium', 'eternity'. The second, hereafter **ВЪКЪ-HARM**, contains a few tokens glossed as *увечье* ('maiming/crippling'), a derivative of the same root<sup>29</sup>. Collectively, the dictionaries cite only three cases of **ВЪКЪ-HARM**; for [СДЯ], these were the only tokens in a corpus of 784 texts (eleventh—fourteenth centuries).

While one could conjecture a chain of unattested meanings connecting **ВЪКЪ-TIME** and **ВЪКЪ-HARM**, it would be a wild-goose chase; **ВЪКЪ-HARM** is a figment of lexicographic imagination. Properly interpreted, the tokens in the dictionaries mean virtually the opposite of 'crippling'; they reflect the concept 'physical strength', or what could be called, in view of the etymology (see § 6.1), 'fighting fitness'. This meaning (hereafter **ВЪКЪ-STRENGTH**) has been noted in a few older sources<sup>30</sup>. However, it has mostly been overlooked in more recent publications. Therefore, I will begin by showing that **ВЪКЪ** could indeed denote 'strength' (§ 6); then I will examine specific instances of **ВЪКЪ** as evidence for the concept of strength-fine (§ 7). The existence of such a concept would provide evidence for the interpretation of **ДОУЖЕБОУ** given in this section.

**6.1.** While OR **ВЪКЪ**, like its cognates in other Slavic languages, could have various temporal senses, the archaic meaning of PSI \**uoi-k-os* was 'strength'.

<sup>28</sup> In putting **ВЪКЪ-TIME** and **ВЪКЪ-HARM** in separate lemmas, [СДЯ] and [СРЯ] violate their own criteria for distinguishing polysemes (grouped under a single lemma) from homonyms: polysemes have the same etymology and belong to the same part of speech [СДЯ 1: 10; СРЯ 1: 9].

<sup>29</sup> The main part of [Срезневский] does not gloss **ВЪКЪ**<sup>2</sup> and puts a question mark after the headword; however, the Supplement glosses it as 'увечье' (vol. 6, separate pagination, col. 70). The same meaning is posited by [Дьяченко: 940; Кочин 1937: 42; Тихомиров 1953: 142; Szeftel 1963: 222 («mutilation»); Черных 1993: s. v. *век*: «maiming, traces of the application of force on the body of a person»]; see also [Ibid. s. v. *увечье*; Черных 1956: 27].

<sup>30</sup> [Востоков s. v. **ВЪКЪ** («health, wholeness of the limbs»); Miklosich s. v. **ВЪКЪ** («vigor»); Преображенский s. v. *вѣкъ* («strength»); Unbegaun 1958: 173 («vigor, bodily force»)]. Other etymological dictionaries cite 'strength' only as a prehistoric meaning to explain *увечить* 'cripple' [Черных 1993 s. vv. *век* and *увечить*; Фасмер s.v. *увечить*].

PIE *\*ueih<sub>1</sub>-* denoted ‘show strength, be vigorous’; cf. Greek ἰς ‘strength, force’, Latin *vīs* ‘strength, force, vigor, energy’, Sanskrit *váyas-* ‘energy, strength, health, vigor’, etc. [Olsen 2003: 313, 321]<sup>31</sup>. This was extended by metonymy to ‘fight’ (an expression of strength): OCS **вои** ‘soldiers’ (sg **воинѣ**), **воина** ‘war’. (Cf. figurative *fight* for ‘strength’ in English, e. g., *he still has some fight in him*.) Besides PSI *\*uoi-k-os*, derivatives with the stem extension *\*-k-* occur in Italic, Celtic, Germanic, and Baltic; these can reflect either ‘strength’ or ‘fight’: Latin *vinco* ‘vanquish’, *vix* ‘with difficulty’ (i. e., ‘requiring strength’); Old Irish *ficid* ‘fights’, *fecht*, Old Welsh *guith* ‘hostile expedition’; Welsh *gwyth* ‘wrath’; Gothic *weihan*, Old High German *wīgan*, Old Norse *vega* ‘fight’, *vīgr* ‘able to fight’; Lithuanian *apveikti*, Latvian *veikt* ‘overpower’<sup>32</sup>.

Prehistorically, PSI *\*uoi-k-os* underwent several metaphorical or metonymic (whole-for-part) extensions: ‘strength’ > ‘vital force’ > ‘lifetime’ (the period during which vital force endures; cf. Lit *viėkas* ‘strength; lifetime’) > ‘generation’ > ‘long period’ > ‘eternity’. All of these survived into the historical period in one or other Slavic language [Unbegaun 1958: 174]. In addition, the word underwent a further shift to ‘century’ in some Slavic languages under the influence of Greek αἰών or La *saeculum* [Ibid.: 174—176; Buck 1949: 956].

The archaic meaning ‘strength’ is attested in all three branches of Slavic. In West Slavic, it is reflected as a simplex in OCz *věk*, e. g., *věkem* (INS.SG) ‘hardly; with difficulty’ (sc. ‘only by strength/force’, cf. La *vix*), *za měho věku* (‘during my strength’ = *me florente*).<sup>33</sup> In South Slavic, there is a likely token in John the

<sup>31</sup> This is Pokorny’s second sense; the first is “attack, charge; go in a straight direction; strive, long for, want” (s. v. 3. *uei-*, *ueiə-*). According to Olsen [2003: 313—321], the meaning of the reflexes develop from connotations such as (a) ‘virility’ (Old Irish *fer*, Gothic *wair*, Lithuanian *vyras* ‘man’, Tocharian A *wir* ‘strong, vigorous man’, Sanskrit *vīrā-* ‘brave man; hero’, Avestan *vīra-* ‘man; hero’, Latin *vir* ‘man; one possessing manly virtues’, *virtūs* ‘manliness; valor; special property, power’; *virāgō* ‘manlike woman’); and (b) ‘liveliness; freshness’ (Tocharian A *wir* ‘youthful; fresh’, Latin *virēre* ‘be green; thrive; be full of vigor’, *virgō* ‘young girl’; *virga* ‘slender green branch’).

<sup>32</sup> [Pokorny s. v. 2. *ueik-*; Walde s. v. *ueiq-* («energetic, especially hostile manifestation of force»); Watkins 1985 s. v. *weik-*<sup>3</sup> («fight, conquer»); Borys s. v. *wiek* («show strength»)]. Baltic cognates with the *k*-extension can also reflect the connotation ‘liveliness’: Lithuanian *vaikas* ‘boy; child; young animal; descendent’, *vėikus* ‘quick; brisk’, *vikrūs* ‘lively’, *veikti* ‘make, do’; Latvian *vaiks* ‘youth’ [Pokorny s. v. 2. *ueik-*; Fraenkel s. v. *vaikas*].

<sup>33</sup> See Cards 2099, 2109 of Gebauer’s OCz dictionary (vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/kartoteky.aspx?db=2, accessed November 24, 2011); [Machek s. v. *věk*; Unbegaun 1958: 175]. Card 2109 quotes Miklosich’s *Lexicon*, but without any OCz examples. Kott [s. v. *věk*] cites NOM.SG *věk* ‘robur’ (‘strength’) from Genesis 49:3, as quoted by V. Zikmund (either *Sklaďba jazyka českého*, 1863, or *Grammatika jazyka českého*, 1865). I have not been able to find this wording in the available editions of the OCz Bible. I am grateful to Lukáš Záborský for directing me to the online Gebauer card-catalogue and for other help in looking for this example.

Exarch [Miklosich s. v.; Востоков s. v.]. In addition, *vek* ‘strength’ is attested in Sl, beginning in sixteenth-century Bible translations, where it was used not only of strength and power (19a), but also of the potency of salt (19b)<sup>34</sup>.

(19a) Ruben moj p̄rvorojeni Syn, ti li moj **věk**, inu moja p̄rva muzh (Genesis 49:3; Dalmatin).

Reuben, my first-born son, you are my **strength**, and my first might.

(19b) Dobra rezh ie ta Sul, kadar pag ta ful nee **uek** [gubi, fzhim to bote ui fazhinali? (Mark 9:50; Trubar).

A good thing is salt: but if the salt has lost its **strength**, with what will you season it?

In Dalmatin’s 1584 Bible and Megiser’s 1592 dictionary, *vek* is identified as the Carniolan equivalent of *moč* ‘strength’ in other dialects (cf. Megiser’s *vek dajatj* ‘give strength’ and *k veku perpraviti* ‘strengthen’)<sup>35</sup>. Subsequent dictionaries continue to gloss the simplex *vek* as ‘strength’ up to the early twentieth century; they also note derivatives such as *večen* ‘strong’, *nevečen* ‘weak; faint’ (lit. ‘not strong’), *malovečen* ‘weak’ (lit. ‘of little strength’), *odvēknoti* ‘strengthen’, *odvēk dati* ‘restore’, *slabovečen* ‘infirm’ (lit. ‘of weak strength’)<sup>36</sup>. Similarly, in BCS *věčan*, *v̄jěčan* can denote ‘strong enough to; sufficiently large; capable of’ [Речник s. v.], and *slabòvječan*, *slabověčan* ‘infirm’ (lit. ‘of weak strength’) [Skok s. v. *v̄jiek*]<sup>37</sup>.

**6.2.** Though the simplex **вѣкъ** is not glossed as ‘strength’ in the main historical dictionaries of Ru, that meaning undoubtedly persisted in MRu into the seventeenth century, as shown by (20a), a seventeenth-century proverb; (20b), a *čelobitnaja gramota* (petition) of 1600; and (20c), from the 1446 entry in the Nikonian Chronicle, in which Metropolitan Iona implores Prince Dmitrij Šemjaka to release his newly blinded rival, Grand Prince Vasilij II (20c).

<sup>34</sup> In (19a), *vek* corresponds to the Vulgate’s *fortitudo* [Colunga, Turrado 1983] and Luther’s *Kraft* (www.biblos.com, accessed August 1, 2011). Other examples of *vek* ‘strength’ appear in 2 Chronicles 20:6 (Dalmatin), Judith 4:13 (Dalmatin) and Psalms 68:36 (Trubar, Dalmatin). In his version of (19b), Dalmatin has *slanuft* (*slanost*) ‘salinity’; the same word appears in the equivalent verse in Matthew 5:13 (Dalmatin and Trubar) and Luke 14:34 (Dalmatin; Trubar has *shmah* (*šmah*) ‘taste’). Primož Trubar’s Psalter (1566) and New Testament (1582) and Jurij Dalmatin’s Bible (1584) are cited from www.biblija.net/biblija.cgi?l=sl (accessed August 1, 2011).

<sup>35</sup> [Lägreid 1967: 150, 193, 230, 231, 266, 269; Megiser 1977: 211].

<sup>36</sup> *Dictionarium latino-carniolicum* (1680—1685) and M. Cigale (1860), cited by [Lägreid 1967: 150]; [Miklosich s. v. **вѣкъ**; Bartel s. v. *Kraft*; Hubad 1908 s. vv. *vek*, *věčen*; Pleteršnik s. vv. 2. *věk*, *věčen I*, *nevěčen*, *nevěčnost*]. The meaning *nevěčen* ‘sleepy’ probably stems from ‘weak’ by a folk-etymological association with *veko* ‘eyelid’.

<sup>37</sup> The meaning ‘strength’ is not recorded for BCS *v(ij)ek* itself in [Daničić; Речник; RHSJ]. Skok (s. v. *v̄jiek*) derives *slabòvječan* from a temporal meaning, comparing it to the phrase *ni dūgoga vika* ‘not of long lifespan’.



negative prefix *ne-*, implying the absence of the positive quality denoted by the root ('no strength'): BR (*з*)*нявечиць, знявечаць* 'cripple by causing physical injuries; render useless'; MRu *невѣченъ* 'sickly; weak'<sup>42</sup>. In addition, there are a number of derivatives with the prefixes *iz-* and *u-*, which convey separation from the quality denoted by the root ('away from strength'): Ru (*из*)*увечить*, dial *извековать, извечить* 'cripple'; *извековаться, извечиться* 'be crippled by doing/carrying something beyond one's strength'; *извековатый* 'crippled, maimed', (*об*)*увечить* 'be spoiled; be crippled' [СРНГ s. vv.]. While these derivatives do not prove that the lexeme *вѣкъ* continued to denote 'strength' during the historical period, they do show that the morpheme *vĕk-* could have that sense, among others, at the time of the formations. By contrast, there are no East Slavic derivatives in without an ablative or privative prefix in which the root has a meaning like 'maiming/crippling'.

**6.3.** The notion that OR *вѣкъ* meant 'maiming/crippling' may spring from the sense of the prefixed stem reflected in *оувѣчник (оувѣчъкъ)* 'maiming/crippling', *оувѣчънъ* 'maimed/crippled', known from Muscovite law codes, and Ru (*из*)*увечить* 'maim/cripple', unattested in medieval texts<sup>43</sup>. Given the prefixation, these derivations are evidently deverbal. If the stem *u-vĕč-* meant 'cause harm (*vĕk-*) to', it would belong to the subclass of denominal causatives denoting 'cause X<sub>OBJ</sub> to experience Y', where Y is the denotatum of the root, and where the prefix *u-* appears in a non-spatial meaning: OR *оуврѣдннн* 'cause harm (*vrĕd-*) to-PFV', *оуранннн* 'cause a wound (*ran-*) to-PFV', *оуяззннн* 'cause a wound (*jazv-*) to-PFV', *оусилннн* 'strengthen-PFV' ('cause a feeling of strength (*sil-*) in-PFV'), *оустрашннн* 'cause fear (*strax-*) in-PFV', etc.<sup>44</sup>

However, that cannot be the correct path of derivation. The causatives of the given class are all perfectives; they are paired either with unprefixated verbs (e. g., *врѣдннн, ранннн*) or with derived imperfectives (e. g., *оусилати, оустрашати, оуязвлати*). By contrast, the causative verb from *vĕk-* is imperfective and forms derived perfectives by further prefixation; cf. Ru *изувечить*. This puts the stem reflected in *оувѣчъкъ* in a handful of archaic denominal formations in which the prefix *u-* appears in a spatial (ablative) meaning<sup>45</sup>. It is a close parallel

---

СРЯ s. v. *безвѣкий*; СРНГ s. vv. *безвече, обезвекнуть, обезвековать*]. The suffixless formation in *безвѣкъ* also occurs in *безбогъ* 'godless' (*bog-* 'God'), *бестоудъ* 'shameless' (*stud-* 'shame'), and *всечадъ* *besčadъ* 'childless' (*čad-* 'child') [Срезневский s. vv.].

<sup>42</sup> See [ТСБМ s. vv. *нявечиць, знявечиць, знявечаць*; СРЯ s. v. *невѣчный*].

<sup>43</sup> [Черных 1993 s. vv. *век, увече*; Греков 1952: 26, 148 (Law Codes of 1497, § 52, and 1550, § 26)].

<sup>44</sup> The OR verbs come from [Срезневский s. vv.]; I have paraphrased the glosses to bring out the causative meaning.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. [Фасмер s. v. *увечить*; Крылов s. v. *век*]. Суганенко [Цыганенко s. v. *век*] states that the prefix has a «negative» meaning and that the original meaning of the verb was «to deprive of strength, of the capacity to work».

to OR **оубожник** (**оубожьк**) ‘poverty (i. e., deprivation from wealth)’, **оубожити** ‘deprive of wealth-IPFV’ [Срезневский s. vv.], which reflect an archaic sense of the root *bog-* as ‘wealth, fortune’ rather than ‘god’; cf. the derived perfectives **пооубожити са** ‘become poor-PFV’ [СДЯ], Ru dial *изубожить* ‘impoverish; uglify-PFV’, *заубожиться* ‘start to pretend poverty’ [СРНГ s. vv.]<sup>46</sup>. Likewise, **оувѣчьк** can be analyzed as ‘deprivation from’ the property denoted by the root *vĕk-*. Clearly, ‘deprivation from maiming/crippling’ would make little sense, while ‘deprivation from lifetime’ (or any other temporal sense) would imply that the patient had died rather than experiencing non-lethal grievous bodily harm. However, all of the attested meanings of **оувѣчьк** and its modern cognates can easily be derived from the notion ‘deprivation from strength’.

**6.4.** In sum, there is firm evidence that the lexeme **вѣкъ**-STRENGTH survived, at least in Ru dialects, into the seventeenth century<sup>47</sup>. In addition, the morpheme *vĕk-* undoubtedly continued to mean ‘strength’, among other senses, in the historical period. On the other hand, there is no warrant for positing that either the lexeme **вѣкъ** or the morpheme *vĕk-* ever denoted a type of harm or injury. In § 7, I will demonstrate that the tokens of **вѣкъ** interpreted as ‘maiming/crippling’ in previous works were assigned that meaning due to a loose reading of the larger contexts in which they occur. Correctly understood, these tokens seem to denote the same concept as **доужевоу** in N855 or a closely related one.

**7.0.** The token of **вѣкъ** in (21), from § 27 of the Extended RP, is read as **вѣкъ**-HARM in the three major dictionaries of OR and in every modern translation that I have been able to consult<sup>48</sup>.

(21) **Аче ли оутнеть роукоу, и штпадеть роука или оусъхнеть, или нога, или вко, или не оутнеть, тъ полъ вирты 20 гривенъ, а томоу за вѣкъ 10 гривенъ** (Synodal Copy, 1282 [PII, 1: 124])<sup>49</sup>.

<sup>46</sup> Though none of the simplex reflexes of *\*bog-* preserve this initial meaning, it occurs not only in **оубогъ** but in OR **богатъ** ‘rich’ (with pan-Slavic cognates) and the theonym **дажьбогъ** ‘give-wealth’. Cf. the Indo-Iranian cognates reflecting the meaning ‘apportion’: Sanskrit *bhāgas* ‘Giver (epithet of Savitr)’, Avestan *baγa-*, *baga-* ‘good fortune; share’ [Pokorny: 107; Фасмер s. vv. *бог*, *богатый*, *Дажь(д)ьбог*, *убогий*; Polomé, Dexter 1997: 211].

<sup>47</sup> At least one example can be cited from modern Ru dialects. Old settlers in the Irtysk area used the following saying: *век есть, так и лекарство поможет, а веку нет, так и ничё не поможет* ‘If one has strength medicine will help him, if one has not nothing will help’ [СРСГСР: 88].

<sup>48</sup> The modern translations are (a) «maiming» [Kaiser 1992: 22; СЦСРЯ s. v. *вѣкъ*; Sokolov s. v. *вѣкъ*; Свердлов 2011; Szeftel 1963: 72]; I. N. Boltin, S. F. Platonov, V. N. Storožev, M. F. Vladimirkij-Budanov, J. F. G. Ewers, L. K. Goetz, cited in [PII, 2: 346—347; PPII, 1: 123, 150]; (b) «disfigurement» [Востоков s. v. *вѣкъ*]; (c) «wound» (J. Rakowiecki, cited in [PII, 2: 346]); (d) «injuries» [Vernadsky 1947: 39]; and (e) «lost health» [СЦСРЯ s. v. *вѣкъ*; Соколов s. v. *вѣкъ*; Востоков s. v. *вѣкъ*].

If [someone] cuts [someone else's] arm/hand, and the arm/hand falls off or withers — or a leg/foot or an eye — or if he does not cut [it but harms it in some other way], then [he must pay] half the bloodwite, 20 *grivnas*, and to that [victim] 10 *grivnas* for **вѣкъ**.

This passage undoubtedly deals with grievous bodily harm, so it is easy to understand why **вѣкъ** has been taken as a form of injury. If that were the meaning, **за вѣкъ** would be parallel to the many prepositional phrases in the RP where the object is a noun denoting some kind of harm, and the preposition **за** 'for' has the contextual meaning 'as penalty/ compensation for inflicting': **за раню** 'for the wound' (§ 30), **за обиду** 'for the offense' (§§ 23, 34, 47), **за соромъ** 'for the shame' (§ 65), **за мучкоу** 'for the torture' (§ 85), etc. [PII, 1: 124—125, 127, 131—132]. Indeed, the phrase *за увечие* 'for the maiming/crippling' (see § 6.3, above) is actually attested in the Muscovite law code of 1550 (§ 26) [Греков 1952: 148].

In the language of early East Slavic law, the preposition **за** also frequently occurs in statements of penalties with nouns that denote not the damage inflicted but the things damaged. In such cases, **за** has the contextual meaning 'as penalty or compensation for (the loss of)': **за голову** 'for a life' (lit. 'head', § 1); **за кобылоу** 'for a mare' (§ 45); **за зювъ** 'for a tooth' (§ 68); **за челнъ** 'for a dugout' (§ 79); etc. [PII, 1: 123, 126, 128, 131]. Similarly, the phrase **за вѣкъ** in (21) can be interpreted as 'for (the loss of) strength'; it can be compared, in particular, with **за голову** and **за зювъ**, which likewise involve inalienable possessions of the human victim.

A point in favor of this interpretation is the particular list of injuries that entail compensation **за вѣкъ** — irreparable damage to an arm or hand, a leg or foot, or an eye. In § 27, the culprit must pay the authorities 20 *grivnas*, a penalty equal to half the bloodwite for killing someone outside the prince's service (defined in § 1), and give the victim a payment **за вѣкъ** equal to a quarter of the bloodwite<sup>49</sup>. In all probability, the injuries mentioned in § 27 are counted as the punitive equivalents of half a homicide because they disable the victim for fighting or other labor that requires strength or physical functionality. (Cf. the earliest attestations of the derived adjectives **везвѣчныи**, **оувѣчныи** 'crippled' in fifteenth-century law codes, which refer to witnesses who are not physically fit enough fight judicial duels<sup>51</sup>.) By contrast, wounds that can be healed or do not

<sup>49</sup> Similarly in other copies [PII, 1: 106, 151, 169, 188, 218, 247, 284, 302, 331, 349, 373]. In a few late copies, **за вѣкъ** is reinterpreted as **завѣтъ** [Ibid.: 373, n. 27], perhaps because **вѣкъ**-STRENGTH was moribund or obsolescent.

<sup>50</sup> In the articles on battery, the crime is stated in a conditional clause; the punishment is specified in conjoined clauses, the first of which establishes the fine, the second the victim's compensation. The culprit, as major topic, is conveyed by null anaphora, and the victim contrastively by forms of the demonstrative **тъ** or the pronoun **самъ**.

<sup>51</sup> Pskov Judicial Charter, § 21 [PIPI, 2: 289]; Law Code of Ivan III, 1497, §§ 49, 52 [Греков 1952: 26].



involve the loss of functionality, which are covered in §§ 28—31, carry a smaller fine and a smaller compensation for the victim [П, 1: 124—25].

7.1. In (21), the meaning of *за вѣкъ* would be the same regardless of whether *вѣкъ* itself were read as ‘maiming’ or ‘strength’ because of the underspecification of the preposition *за*. However, in other examples the meaning assigned to *вѣкъ* can be critical for the interpretation of the larger context. This is the case in a second purported example of *вѣкъ*-HARM (22) cited by Sreznevskij, which occurs in a letter of ca. 1451 from Metropolitan Iona to Prince Mixail Andreevič:

- (22) и тѣтъ попь с теми твоими горо<sup>А</sup>скими лю<sup>А</sup>ми... двор<sup>А</sup> мон<sup>Х</sup>. пере[ви]ли: а вили, сказывають, на см(ε)ртъ. Но милостию пр(ε)-ч(и)<sup>С</sup>тыи, всѣ, да<sup>А</sup> в(о)гъ, живы<sup>И</sup>, а впрокъ дван и [sc. два и<sup>Х</sup> или — DEC] три вез вѣка (formulary edition of ca. 1535 [ACBP, 3: 25].

And that priest, along with the people of your city... beat my agents; and they were beating them, they say, to death. But by the mercy of the Virgin, they are all — God sent — alive, but two of them or three are without вѣкъ forever.

In [Срезневский, Supplement: 70 (separate pagination)], this example is glossed as «maiming». However, it is unlikely that Iona would trouble to report the good news that his servants were «without maiming»; that would have been impolitic, since it would mitigate the very crimes that he was denouncing. (Cf. his claim that the culprits were beating his servants «to death», i. e., with the intent to kill them.) Furthermore, the notion that the victims were «without maiming» is hard to reconcile with the use of the adverb *въпрокъ* ‘for the remaining time; forever; for the future’ (see [Срезневский s. v. прокъ]). It is more plausible to interpret the final two clauses in an adversative sense: Iona’s servants are alive, but some are disabled («without strength»).

The sense of unfitness for work (with or without actual crippling) can also be seen in derivatives of *věk-* recorded in obsolete or dialectal Ru (see § 6.2), which denote debility caused by illness, overwork, depression, or bad luck<sup>52</sup>. While these could be metaphorical extensions from ‘cripple’, a more straightforward derivation goes from the general meaning ‘weaken, cause disability’ to the particular senses ‘cripple’ (‘disable permanently’), ‘make ill’ (‘disable permanently or temporarily’), and ‘exhaust’ (‘disable temporarily’)<sup>53</sup>. In all these cases, the person who has lost the quality denoted by *věk-* is no longer «fighting fit» or

<sup>52</sup> See [Даль s. vv. безвѣчье, безвѣчить, обезвѣчиться, обезвѣкнуть, увѣчить; САР s. vv. увѣчить, увѣчный; СЦСРЯ s. v. увѣчиться; Соколов s. v. увѣчный; СРНГ s. vv. безвечить, безвечиться; ССРЛЯ s. v. увечный].

<sup>53</sup> Other senses are metaphorical: *увечить* ‘damage, spoil; distort, pervert (facts, reality, etc.)’, *увечный* ‘detrimental’ [ССРЛЯ s. vv.]; *обезвечить*, ‘deflower’ (i. e., ‘unfit for marriage’ in peasant culture) [СРНГ s. v.].

functional in expected activities. Cf. the maxim «Съ ремесломъ и увѣчный хлѣба добудеть» («With a craft, even a cripple will get his bread» [Даль s. v. *увѣчный*]), where the subject has not lost the ability to work per se but the ability to do peasant agricultural labor.

7.2. The third putative case of **вѣкъ**-HARM, cited in [Срезневский; СДЯ], occurs in § 3 of the Gotland redaction of the 1229 Treaty of Smolensk with Riga and Gotland (23).

(23) **Аже кого оуранать · полуторгы гривны серебра · аже боудѣте без вѣка** ∴ **Тако платити · оу смолѣнске · и оу ризѣ · и на гочкомъ берѣзѣ** ∴ (Copy A, ll. 20—22 [Schaeken 2000]; see also [Аванесов 1963: 21]).

If they wound someone, [the penalty is] one and a half *grivnas* of silver, if [he/it] is without **вѣкъ**. Thus one must pay in Smolensk and in Riga and on the Gotland Coast.

The somewhat later Riga redaction has a different phrase, **а хромоты на телѣ не боудеть** («and there will be no lameness on [his] body»)<sup>54</sup>. Assuming this is a close paraphrase, «no lameness» fills the slot of «without **вѣкъ**». Thus the word-index to Avanesov's edition [Там же: 97] translates the token in (23) as «maiming» and puts it in a separate lemma from **вѣкъ** 'perpetuity'<sup>55</sup>.

Example (23) seems, prima facie, to support the existence of **вѣкъ**-HARM. To be sure, one can get an intelligible reading by interpreting **без вѣка** in (23) as 'without strength': «If someone is wounded, [the penalty is] one and a half *grivnas* of silver, if [the victim] is without strength». The problem is that battery causing the functional loss of a body part—the context in which **за вѣкъ** occurs in the RP — is covered in the previous article of the treaty<sup>56</sup>. Presumably, then, we would expect crimes that permanently damage the victim's «strength» to be discussed in § 2, not in the article that actually contains the term **вѣкъ**. Moreover, even though the hypothetical victim in § 3 may be bleeding, contused, concussed from blunt-force trauma, or suffering from a penetration wound likely to require protracted healing, he is undoubtedly «without maiming» *sensu stricto*.

In reality, there is no need to take **без вѣка** in the 1229 Treaty as evidence for **вѣкъ**-HARM. Rather, it can be interpreted as a metonymic extension of

<sup>54</sup> This reading comes from Copy D, dating from 1270—1277 [Аванесов 1963: 36, ll. 33—34]. On the dating of the redactions and copies, see [Ibid.: 62]. The wording «and there will be no laming on [his] body» is also found twice in a treaty between Smolensk and Riga and Gotland from ca. 1223—1225 [Ibid.: 11].

<sup>55</sup> L. K. Goetz (cited in [Schaeken 2000]) translated *bez věka* as «ohne Verstümmelung».

<sup>56</sup> Copy A, ll. 16—18 [Schaeken 2000; Аванесов 1963: 21]. The specified fine of one-and-a-half *grivnas* in § 3 is half of the lowest penalty stated in § 2 (for knocking out a tooth). Goetz (1916) labels § 2 as «Verstümmelung» («Mutilation») and § 3 as «Kör-perverletzung» («battery») (cited in [Schaeken 2000]).

**ВѢКЪ**-STRENGTH with the meaning ‘penalty or compensation for (the loss of) strength’ (hereafter **ВѢКЪ**-PENALTY). This produces a plausible reading, in which the less injurious battery in § 3 is carefully delineated from the mayhem discussed in § 2: «If they wound someone, [the penalty is] one and a half *grivnas* of silver, if it is without payment for [the victim’s] strength» — that is, only if the provisions in § 2 do not come into play. Another benefit of this interpretation is that **ВѢКЪ**-PENALTY may be compared with **ДОУЖЕВА**<sup>2</sup>, one of the senses proposed for **ДОУЖЕБОУ** in N855 (see § 5.2).

7.3. The proposed shift from ‘strength’ to ‘payment for strength’ may have been facilitated by the ambiguity of the preposition **ЗА**. With terms for taxes or fees, **ЗА** could convey ‘(serving) in payment of’, as in (24a—b) (not to be confused with the sense ‘in exchange for’, where the object would be a commodity received by the payer). Thus **ЗА ВѢКЪ** ‘in compensation for strength’ could potentially undergo covert reanalysis to ‘in payment of the **ВѢКЪ**’.

(24a) **АЧЕ ЖЕ И КРЪВАВЪ ПРИДЕТЬ, ИЛИ БОУДЕТЬ САМЪ ПОЧАЛЪ, А ВЪСТОУПАТЬ ПОСЛОУСИ, ТО ТО КМОУ ЗА ПЛАТЕЖЪ, УЖЕ И ВИАИ** (Extended Redaction of the RP, Synodal Copy, 1282, § 29 [РП, 1: 124—125].

If he does come in bloody, if he started [the fight] himself, and witnesses come forth, then it [will suffice] him for payment that they beat him.

(24b) **АТЬ КМЛЕТЬ ПИСКОУПЪ ЗА ДЕСАТИНОУ Ѡ ВНРЪ И ПРОДАЖЪ. Ѡ ГРИВЕНЪ НОВЫХЪ КОУНЪ** ‘let the bishop take 100 *grivnas* of new *kunas* from the wergilds and fines as tithe-money’ (Church Rule of Svjatoslav Ol’govič, 1137, in a copy of the mid-fourteenth century [СДЯ s. v. **ЗА**, meanings II.8 and II.9]).

Whatever the mechanism, there is strong evidence that a shift to **ВѢКЪ**-PENALTY actually occurred. In the *Pravosud’e mitropolič’e*, a supplement to the RP probably compiled in the fifteenth century, it is stipulated that assailants who cause permanent damage to an eye must pay a penalty called a **ПОЛЪВѢКА** ‘half-*věky*’ (25):

(25) **УКО Ч(Е)Л(ОВЕ)КОУ СОУ<sup>А</sup>(И)ТЬ<sup>С</sup>(А) ЗА ПО<sup>А</sup>ВѢКА — 40 ГРИ<sup>В</sup>НЫ** (*Pravosud’e mitropolič’e*, early sixteenth century [АСБР, 3: 23]).

[The loss of] a person’s eye is judged at a **half-*věky***: 40 *grivny* [is the penalty].

Clearly it makes no sense to interpret **ПО<sup>А</sup>ВѢКА** in (25) as ‘half a maiming’, even metaphorically; an injury causing the loss or blindness of an eye is a whole maiming. Thus, paradoxically, **ПО<sup>А</sup>ВѢКА** has been recognized as a type of penalty even in sources that treat **ВѢКЪ** itself as ‘maiming’<sup>57</sup>. Logically, if the term *half-*

<sup>57</sup> An exception is [СРЯ s. v.], which interprets **ПО<sup>А</sup>ВѢКА** as «bodily harm for which half a fine is imposed».

**вѣкъ** denoted a monetary sanction, the term **вѣкъ** must have denoted a larger monetary sanction at the time of the derivation<sup>58</sup>.

**8.0.** In this article, I have suggested that N855 was not a private letter but a field report by a judicial officer. In addition, I have provided a variety of pragmatic and lexical evidence for new interpretations of the final clause in the birchbark. As shown in § 2, the published translation, while coherent, entails a socio-pragmatic incongruity; thus it is preferable to read the verb **испраоу** in a meaning other than ‘I will pay’ — either ‘I will collect’ or ‘I will investigate/judge’ (§§ 3—4). In combination with these meanings of the verb, the hapax legomenon **доуژهбоу** is unlikely to denote ‘recovery, cure’, as suggested in the published translation; rather, it can be understood as a term for either a financial penalty or a type of crime. Both of these senses permit fully coherent, socio-pragmatically plausible readings. Moreover, both meanings can be derived from the meaning ‘strength’, established for the root *dug-* by comparative reconstruction and analysis of other derivatives of the same root (§ 5). As shown in §§ 6—7, there is independent evidence that the concept of ‘strength’ was invoked in Rus’ian law in cases of battery, though the term used in other texts was **вѣкъ** (*věk-*). The fact that *dug-* and *věk-* both denote ‘strength’, at least in some of their attested forms, makes it plausible to interpret **доуژهбоу** as an alternative term for ‘strength-fine’, the payment imposed for damaging the victims’ ‘strength’. While there is no proof positive for this reinterpretation, there is a preponderance of evidence in its favor.

## References

Аванесов 1963 — Смоленские грамоты XIII—XIV веков / Под ред. Р. И. Аванесова. М., 1963.

АСВР Акты социально-экономической истории северо-восточной Руси конца XIV — начала XVI в. Т. 3 / Под ред. Л. В. Черепнина. М., 1964.

Борковский, Кузнецов 1965 — В. И. Борковский, П. С. Кузнецов. Историческая грамматика русского языка. 2-е изд. М., 1965.

БРС — Белорусско-русский словарь. Т. 1—2 / Ред. К. К. Атраховича. 2-е изд. Минск, 1988.

Востоков — Словарь церковно-славянского языка, составленный А. Х. Востоковым. Т. 1—2. СПб., 1858—1861.

<sup>58</sup> In N382 (later fourteenth century), [НГБ-6: 82] reads **лѣвѣканивѣка** as ‘forever and ever’. However, A. A. Gippius (personal communication) has reinterpreted the phrase as **(по)лѣвѣка и вѣка** ‘half-*věkь* and *věkь*’. He points out that ‘forever and ever’ would be **вѣкы и вѣкы**, not **\*вѣка и вѣка**. (M.NOM/ACC.PL *-á* is not attested in Novgorodian and only appears in other dialects in the later fifteenth century. See [ДНД: 109—110; Борковский, Кузнецов 1965: 212].

Горелова 1969 — И. В. Горелова. Из истории отвлеченных существительных с суффиксом *-ба* // Исследования по словообразованию и лексикологии древнерусского языка / Под ред. Р. И. Аванесова. М., 1969. С. 29—42.

Греков 1952 — Судебники XV—XVI веков / Под ред. Б. Д. Грекова. М., 1952.

ГСБМ — Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы. Вып. 1—27 / Гал. рэд. А. І. Жураўскі. Мінск, 1982—.

Даль — В. Даль. Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка. Т. 1—4 / Под ред. И. А. Бодуэна де Куртенэ. Репринт 3-го изд. М., 1903—1909/1998.

ДНД — А. А. Зализняк. Древненогородский диалект. 2-е изд., перераб. М., 2004.

Дьяченко — Г. Дьяченко. Полный церковнославянский словарь. М., 1899.

ЕСУМ — Етимологічний словник української мови. Т. 1—7 / За ред. О. С. Мельничука и др. Київ, 1982—2006.

Ефимова 2006 — В. С. Ефимова. Старославянская словообразовательная морфемика. М., 2006.

Зализняк 1986 — А. А. Зализняк. Новгородские берестяные грамоты с лингвистической точки зрения // В. Л. Янин, А. А. Зализняк. Новгородские грамоты на бересте (Из раскопок 1977—1983 годов). М., 1986. С. 89—219.

Кочин 1937 — Г. Е. Кочин. Материалы для терминологического словаря Древней Руси. М., 1937.

Крылов 2004 — Г. А. Крылов. Этимологический словарь русского языка. СПб., 2004.

Медынцева 1978 — А. А. Медынцова. Древнерусские надписи новгородского Софийского собора XI—XIV вв. М., 1978.

Миртов — А. В. Миртов. Донской словарь: Материалы к изучению лексики донских казаков. Репринт. изд. Leipzig, 1929/1971.

НГБ-6 — А. В. Арциховский. Новгородские грамоты на бересте: Из раскопок 1958—1961 гг. М., 1963.

НГБ-11 — В. Л. Янин, А. А. Зализняк, А. А. Гиппиус. Новгородские грамоты на бересте: Из раскопок 1997—2000 гг. М., 2004.

Понырко 1992 — Н. В. Понырко. Эпистолярное наследие Древней Руси. XI—XIII вв.: Исследования, тексты, переводы. СПб., 1992.

Преображенский — А. Г. Преображенский. Этимологический словарь русского языка. 1910—1914. Репринт. изд.: Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language. New York, 1951.

ППП — Памятники русского права. Т. 1—8 / Изд. подгот. С. В. Юшков и др. М., 1952—1961.

ПСРЛ 3 — Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 3: Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего извода / Под ред. А. Н. Насонова. Репринт. изд. М., 1950/2000.

ПСРЛ 8 — Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 8: Продолжение летописи по Воскресенскому списку / Под ред. А. Ф. Бычкова. Репринт. изд. М., 1859/2001.

ПСРЛ 12 — Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 11—12: Патриаршая, или Никоновская летопись / Под ред. С. Ф. Платонова. Репринт. изд. М., 1897—1901/1965.

ПСРЛ 25 — Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 25: Московский летописный свод конца XV века / Под ред. М. Н. Тихомирова. Репринт. изд. М., 1949/2004.

Речник — Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног езика / Ред. А. Белич и др. Београд, 1959—.

РП — Правда русская. Т. 1—3 / Под ред. Б. Д. Грекова. М., 1940—1963.

САР — Словарь Академии Российской, по азбучному порядку расположенный. Т. I—VI. СПб., 1806—1822.

Свердлов 2011 — М. Б. С в е р д л о в. Русская Правда (Пространная редакция) // [www.pushkinskiydom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4947](http://www.pushkinskiydom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4947). Accessed August 20, 2011.

СДЯ — Словарь древнерусского языка (XI—XIV вв.) Т. 1—8. М., 1988—2008.

Соколов — П. С о к о л о в. Общий церковно-славяно-русский словарь. Т. 1—2. СПб., 1834.

Срезневский — И. И. С р е з н е в с к и й. Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка. Т. I—III. СПб., 1893—1912. Репринт. изд. М., 1989.

Срезневский 1860 — И. И. С р е з н е в с к и й. Сказания о святых Борисе и Глебе: Сильвестровский список. СПб., 1860.

СРНГ — Словарь русских народных говоров. Вып. 1—41—. М.; Л., 1965—2007—.

СРСГСП — Словарь русских старожильческих говоров Среднего Прииртышья (А—З). Ч. 1 / Под ред. Г. А. Садретдиновой. Томск, 1992.

СРЯ XI—XVII — Словарь русского языка XI—XVII вв. Вып. 1—29—. М., 1975—2011—.

ССРЛЯ — Словарь современного русского литературного языка Академии наук СССР: В 17 т. М.; Л., 1948—1964.

СУМ — Словник української мови. Т. 1—11 / За ред. І. К. Білодіда. Київ, 1970—1980.

СЦСРЯ — Словарь церковнославянского и русского языка имп. Академии наук. Т. 1—4. 2-е изд. СПб., 1867—1868.

Тихомиров 1953 — М. Н. Т и х о м и р о в. Пособие для изучения Русской Правды. М., 1953.

ТСБМ — Тлумачальны слоўнік беларускай мовы. Т. 1—5 / Ред. К. К. Атрахович. Мінск, 1977—1984.

Фасмер I—IV — М. Ф а с м е р. Этимологический словарь русского языка. Т. I—IV / Под ред. О. Н. Трубачева. М., 1986—1987.

Хорошев 2009 — А. С. Х о р о ш е в. Остромир-Иосиф // Великий Новгород. История и культура IX—XVII веков: Энциклопедический словарь / Под ред. В. Л. Янина. СПб., 2009. С. 374.

Цыганенко — Г. П. Ц ы г а н е н к о. Этимологический словарь русского языка. Киев, 1970.

Черных 1956 — П. Я. Ч е р н ы х. Очерк русской исторической лексикологии: Древнерусский период. М., 1956.

Черных 1993 — П. Я. Ч е р н ы х. Историко-этимологический словарь современного русского языка. Т. 1—2. М., 1993.

ЭССЯ 1—36 — Этимологический словарь славянских языков: Праславянский лексический фонд. Вып. 1—36. М., 1974—2010.

Янин 2001 — В. Л. Я н и н. У истоков новгородской государственности. Новгород, 2001.

Янин 2003 — В. Л. Я н и н. Берестяные грамоты как исторический источник // Берестяные грамоты: 50 лет открытия и изучения. М., 2003. С. 15—23.

Bartel — A. B a r t e l. Deutsch-slovenisches Hand-Wörterbuch. 5th ed. Prevalje, 1921.

- Bartoš — F. Bartoš. Dialektický slovník moravský (Archiv pro lexikologii a dialektologii 6). Prague, 1906.
- Binchy 1934 — D. A. Binchy. Sick-maintenance in Irish Law // *Ériu* 12. 1934. P. 78—134.
- Boryś — W. Boryś. Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego. Kraków, 2005.
- Buck 1949 — C. D. Buck. A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages: A Contribution to the History of Ideas. Chicago, 1949.
- Černá, Stluka 2005 — A. M. Černá, M. Stluka. Lexém *vetech* ve staré češtině // *Naše řeč* 88/2. nase-rec.ujc.cas.cz/archiv.php?lang=en&art=7830. Accessed December 3, 2011.
- Colunga, Turrado 1983 — Biblia sacra, iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam (Biblioteca de autores cristianos, 14). 6th ed. / A. Colunga, L. Turrado (Eds.). Madrid, 1983.
- Daničić — Đ. Daničić. Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih. 2 vols. 1863—1864. Reprint. Graz, 1962.
- Dewey, Kleimola 1970 — H. W. Dewey, A. M. Kleimola. Suretyship and collective responsibility in pre-Petrine Russia // *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*. 18. 1970. P. 337—354.
- Dewey, Kleimola 1982 — H. W. Dewey, A. M. Kleimola. From the kinship group to every man his brother's keeper: Collective responsibility in pre-Petrine Russia // *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*. 30. 1982. P. 321—335.
- Dewey, Kleimola 1984 — H. W. Dewey, A. M. Kleimola. Russian collective consciousness: The Kievan roots // *Slavonic and East European Review*. 62/2. 1984. P. 180—191.
- Eckhoff 2007 — H. M. Eckhoff. Old Russian Possessive Constructions: A Construction Grammar Account. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Oslo, 2007.
- Fiedlerová 1973 — A. Fiedlerová. Z čtvrtého sešitu Staročeského slovníku // *Naše řeč* 56/4. 1973. nase-rec.ujc.cas.cz/archiv.php?lang=en&art=5713. Accessed December 1, 2011.
- Fraenkel — E. Fraenkel. Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. 2 vols. Heidelberg, 1962—1965.
- Hubad 1908 — Anton Janežičev slovenko-nemški slovar. 4th ed. / F. Hubad (ed.). Klagenfurt, 1908.
- Jungmann — J. Jungmann. Slovník česko-německý. 5 vols. 1834—1839. Reprint. Prague, 1989—1990.
- Kaiser 1980 — D. H. Kaiser. The Growth of Law in Medieval Russia. Princeton, 1980.
- Kaiser 1992 — The Laws of Rus' — Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries (The Laws of Russia, I: Medieval Russia 1) / D. H. Kaiser (Ed.). Salt Lake City, 1992.
- Kiparsky 1975 — V. Kiparsky. Russische historische Grammatik. Vol. 3: Entwicklung des Wortschatzes. Heidelberg, 1975.
- Kott — F. Kott. Českoněmecký slovník zvláště grammatikofraseologický. Vol. 4. Prague, 1884.
- Lägreid 1967 — H. Megiser. Slovenisch-Deutsch-Lateinisches Wörterbuch (Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes 7) / A. Lägreid (Ed.). Wiesbaden, 1967.
- LSJ — The Online Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon. www.tlg.uci.edu/ljsj/-eid=1&context=lsj. Accessed August 1, 2011.
- Machek 1968 — V. Machek. Etymologický slovník jazyka českého. Prague, 1968.

Megiser 1977 — H. Megiser. Thesaurus polyglottus, iz njega je slovensko besedje z latinskimi in nemskimi pomeni za slovensko-latinsko-nemski slovar (Razred za filološke in literarne vede, Classis II: Philologia et litterae, 32. Institut za slovenski jezik, 12) / J. Stabéj (Ed.). Ljubljana, 1977.

Meillet 1961 — A. Meillet. Études sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave. Vol. 2. 2nd ed. Paris, 1961.

Miklosich — F. Miklosich. Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum. 1862—1865. Reprint. Aalen, Germany, 1963.

OED — OED Online. 2011. [www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu](http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu). Accessed August 21, 2011.

Oliver 2008 — L. Oliver. Sick-maintenance in Anglo-Saxon Law // The Journal of English and Germanic Philology. 107. 2008. P. 303—326.

Olsen 2003 — B. A. Olsen. Fresh Shoots from a Vigorous Stem: IE *\*u<sub>h</sub>ró-* // Language in Time and Space: A Festschrift for Werner Winter on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday (Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 144) / Brigitte L. M. Bauer, G.-J. Pinault (Ed.). Berlin, 2003. P. 313—330.

Orel 2003 — V. Orel. A Handbook of Germanic Etymology. Leiden, 2003.

Pleteršnik — M. Pleteršnik. Slovensko-nemški slovar. 2 vols. Ljubljana, 1894.

Pokorny — J. Pokorny. Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bd. 1. Bern, 1959.

Polomé, Dexter 1997 — E. C. Polomé, M. R. Dexter. Fortune // Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture / Ed. J. P. Mallory and D. Q. Adams. Chicago, 1997. P. 211—212.

PSJČ — Příruční slovník jazyka českého. 8 vols. / O. Hujer et al. (eds.). Prague, 1935—1957.

RHSJ — Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika. 23 vols. / Đ. Daničić, et al. (Eds.). Zagreb, 1880—1976.

Rosa 2008 — V. J. Rosa. Thesaurus Linguae Bohemicae / Ed. D. Boudová et al. Praha, 2008. [bara.ujc.cas.cz/slovníky/rosa/rosafst263.html](http://bara.ujc.cas.cz/slovníky/rosa/rosafst263.html). Accessed December 1, 2011.

Schaeken 2000 — J. Schaeken. The 1229 Treaty between Smolensk, Riga and Gotland (version A). 2000. [www.schaeken.nl/lu/research/online/editions/1229/1229atxttuf.html](http://www.schaeken.nl/lu/research/online/editions/1229/1229atxttuf.html). Accessed August 1, 2011.

Schaeken 2011a — J. Schaeken. Don't Shoot the Messenger: A Pragmaphilological Approach to Birchbark Letter no. 497 from Novgorod // Russian Linguistics. 35. 2011. P. 1—11.

Schaeken 2011b — J. Schaeken. Sociolinguistic Variation in Novgorod Birchbark Documents: The Case of no. 907 and Other Letters. Russian Linguistics. 35. 2011. P. 351—359.

Shevelov 1965 — G. Y. Shevelov. A Prehistory of Slavic: The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic. New York, 1965.

Skok — P. Skok. Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika. T. I—III. Zagreb, 1971—1973.

SP — Słownik prasłowiański. 8 vols. // F. Slawski (Ed.). Wrocław, 1961—2001.

Szeftel 1963 — M. Szeftel. Documents de droit public relatifs à la Russie médiévale. Brussels, 1963.

Unbegaun 1958 — B. O. Unbegaun. Un parallèle sémantique greco-slave // Sybaris: Festschrift Hans Krahe zum 60. Geburtstag am 7. Februar, 1958. Wiesbaden, 1958. P. 173—176.



Vernadsky 1947 — Medieval Russian Laws / G. Vernadsky (trans.). New York, 1947.

Walde — A. Walde. Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen. Berlin, 1927—1932.

Watkins 1976 — C. Watkins. Sick-maintenance in Indo-European // *Ériu*. 27. 1976. P. 21—25.

Watkins 1985 — The American heritage dictionary of Indo-European roots / C. Watkins (ed.). Boston, 1985.

Zibrt 1906 — Č. Zibrt. Matouše Benešovského Philonoma Knížka slov českých vyložených, odkud svůj počátek mají, totiž jaký jest jejich rozum 1587 // *Český lid*. 15. 1906. S. 195—199.

Д. Э. КОЛЛИНС

**СИЛА В СУДЕБНОМ ДЕЛЕ: ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЯ  
НАРАХ LEGOMENON ДОУЖЕБОУ  
В НОВГОРОДСКОЙ БЕРЕСТЯНОЙ ГРАМОТЕ № 855**

В статье автор выдвигает предположение, что новгородская берестяная грамота № 855 была донесением судебного исполнителя, и предлагает новые интерпретации для последней фразы грамоты. Он предполагает, что глагол **испраоу** означал или 'я соберу', или 'я расследую/рассужу' и что при глаголе с такой семантикой **нарах legomenon доужебоу** может быть понят как термин, обозначающий либо денежный штраф, либо разновидность преступления. Оба значения выводятся из значения 'сила', которое устанавливается для корня *dug-* в результате сравнительной реконструкции. Автор показывает, что древнерусское законодательство апеллировало к понятию 'сила' при побоях, однако в других памятниках использовался термин **вѣкъ**. Тот факт, что и *dug-*, и *věk-* означали 'сила', позволяет интерпретировать **доужебоу** как еще один термин для 'штрафа за силу', платежа за нанесение ущерба 'силе' жертвы.

**Ключевые слова:** новгородские берестяные грамоты, гапакс **доужебоу**, значение др.-рус. **вѣкъ**.