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The course described here offers computer-based instruction (CBI) in the history of the Russian literary language. It is designed to follow an introductory CBI Slavic course. The object of the course is to introduce graduate students in Russian literature to the types of changes that language in general, and Russian literary language in particular, undergoes in time and to discuss how these changes vary over a large territory. The most important single limitation of the CBI system is the speed of presentation of the materials to the student, which prohibits the asking of questions. In addition, the course material itself presents certain limitations in that there are historical gaps in information availability, making programming difficult. The CBI portions of this course were offered for the first time to a class of five students during the spring quarter of 1973. On the final examination students were tested on: (1) subjects that had been lectured on and reinforced by supplementary reading; (2) subjects that had been lectured on and reinforced by CBI material; (3) subjects about which they had only read; and (4) CBI material not reinforced by lectures. The result demonstrated that the material presented in the CBI/lecture combination was absorbed the best, and generally the performance of the students was better than in the previous class, which had depended on lectures and reading alone. As a final assessment, it is concluded that the CBI material is pedagogically sound. Sample portions of the programmed lessons and tests are provided.
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Slavic 212, The History of the Russian Literary Language, is designed as a sequel to Professor Joseph A. Van Campen's computer-based Slavic 211, Introduction to Old Church Slavonic and Early Russian Texts. Computer-based instruction (CBI) portions of Slavic 212 were offered for the first time during the spring quarter of 1973.

1. The Students

Four of the five students enrolled in Slavic 212 had completed Slavic 211 during the previous quarter and were thus familiar with CBI. The fifth had studied Old Church Slavonic (OCS) at another institution and had to familiarize herself with the system during the early part of the course. All five students were primarily interested in Russian literature; as expected, they were somewhat disoriented at first because the subject matter of Slavic 212 has to do more with linguistics than literature, per se. However, as the students progressed, this became less of a problem.

2. Technical Aspects of CBI

This material is covered in considerable detail in Van Campen (1973, pp. 2-8).

1The research described in this report was supported by the Stanford University Progress Fund and National Science Foundation Grant NSF-GJ-443X.
3. The Course

The nature of the CBI system employed and the subject matter of Slavic 212 place certain limitations on what can and what cannot be programmed. Moreover, this year was the instructor's first experience with CBI and thus, somewhat modest goals were set at the outset. For these reasons, CBI was, and, for the present at least, must remain coupled with lectures for the teaching of the history of Russian. However, as I will show below, the role of the instructor/lecturer will be relatively minor in winter quarter 1974, when the revised course is offered.

The object of Slavic 212 is to introduce graduate students in Russian literature to the types of changes that language in general, and the Russian literary language in particular, undergoes in time, and to discuss how these changes vary over a large territory. In order to demonstrate this, I deal with the following subject matter:

1. General theoretical material on the effect of the passage of time on language;
2. Old Russian (OR), by which term is meant spoken and written Russian of the tenth and eleventh centuries;
3. The changes undergone by OR as a result of internal, evolutionary processes;
4. The nature of the interaction of OR and OCS in the formation of the Russian literary language;
5. Analysis of representative texts from various periods up to and including the seventeenth century.
Certain of the areas to be covered are readily amenable to programming for CBI. For example, since the teaching program itself was designed for language instruction, it was most efficient in teaching OR. Moreover, since OCS and OR represent no more than dialects of the same language, I was able to draw on the material in Slavic 211 as a basis for instruction in the morphology of OR. Five such lessons, on the noun, pronoun, adjective, numeral, and verb, were drawn up (see Appendix I). In addition to this material there is an introductory lesson on the differences between the OCS and OR orthographies. The design of these lessons is straightforward and the system is employed, albeit without audio, largely in the manner for which it was designed.

In addition to these lessons, two were composed that concern historical differences between the OR and OCS phonologies and syllable structure. Last, three lessons were drawn up that deal with evolutionary change in OR and Medieval Russian. These five were used to test the efficacy of a language-teaching system for the teaching of language history (see Appendix II).

4. Limitations Intrinsic to the System

One of the major differences between language and historical material is that the former permits the use of short description and query that, in turn, elicit short and completely predictable answers, whereas in teaching history more extensive lecturing is required, and the answers to the questions, far from a single predictable word, or perhaps two, become quite complicated and can be expressed in a variety of ways. With respect to description or lecturing, the most important, single
limitation imposed by the system is the speed of the Model 35 teletype, i.e., the speed of presentation of the material to the student.

At 10 characters per second, expansive lecturing must be kept to an absolute minimum. As a rule of thumb it was decided that, in order to maintain the students' attention, no more than six 70-character lines (less than 90 words) should be presented to the student without involving him directly in the instruction, i.e., without asking him a question. Note that these few words must contain the question asked as well as the lecture material. Within these limits it was found that a substantial portion of material on selected topics having to do with evolutionary change in OR could be successfully programmed. However, material on the complexities of interaction of OR with CR and general material on the nature of language change could not be programmed due to the speed of the teletypes.

The problem of the students' answers is annoying, but not crucial. The teaching program cannot analyze an answer; it can only match it against the string of characters that the instructor has programmed as being 'correct'. If, for instance, the answer to a question happens to be "14th century" and the student writes "17th century" or "14th cent.", etc., the response is treated as wrong. Thus, since all answers must be predetermined, heavy reliance on multiple-choice and true-false responses is required.

1. Limitations Intrinsic to the Material

The limitations imposed by the material itself, particularly given the bounds of the system, are in many cases considerable. First, the
historical record of the language is not complete; not everything of
interest or importance was recorded or otherwise preserved. Thus there
are factual gaps in many arguments, and, most regrettably, similar gaps
are occasionally found in the logic of some historical linguists. In a
normal classroom situation these factors create only minor problems;
however, in developing material for CBI they can take on crucial impor-
tance.

In teaching a language using CBI a basic, deductive logic can be
employed that is quite simple, for example:

In grammatical situation X, forms of set Y behave
in a certain Z manner.

Form A belongs to set Y.

Therefore, in situation X, form A behaves in a
Z manner.

Such an argument is convincing, and as we pointed out above, questions
based on it elicit short, predictable answers, e.g.,

Q: In what manner does A behave in situation X?
A: Z.

However, when discussing language change, given that a complete
argument can be found and that the logic employed in describing the
change is unflawed, we find that that change normally occurs in such
a way that a given language item will come under a variety of influences
in a given period. Which, if any, of these influences will have a last-
ing effect on the form is often difficult, if at all possible, to predict
a priori. Thus, if we are discussing a given process and wish to follow
its activity over a large number of forms and a considerable expanse of
time, the number of examples that will show the process in its 'pure' form will tend to be small. Yet this purity of logic and presentation is essential since the student cannot stop the computer and ask a question. The logic and progression of the explanation must not be merely sound; it must be inescapable. Note further that while the present subject matter is linguistic in nature, our students' demesne is literature. Thus forced out of familiar surroundings, they require especially clear exposition while they familiarize themselves with linguistic processes and terminology.

Once a logical and sequential thread of an argument is found, lesser competing processes can be described as corollaries to it. However, the time and effort that go into winnowing large amounts of historical information is considerable (see Appendix III).

The effect of all these limitations, those intrinsic to the system as well as to the material, was to put considerable demands upon the time of the Instructor and Professor Van Campen, without whose generous help the material could not have been prepared. Furthermore, there were certain elements of the course that simply could not be programmed. Nonetheless, this summer I expect to program the remaining changes that occurred in the 15th period (14 through fifteenth centuries). This represents the greatest share of change during the written history of the language. Fifteenth-century Russian is surprisingly 'modern' in form, at least in comparison with tenth-century OP.

In addition to this new material, I am organizing a convenient means of presenting texts for analysis on the teletype. With this new material a full two-thirds of Slavic II will be computer based. The only remaining
material to be covered independently in the lectures will be the intricacies of the interaction of OCS and OR and general material on the nature of language change in time and space. The demands put upon the instructor's time with this arrangement will be minor.

The implementation of the above assumes no changes in the present system. Given a faster teaching apparatus, most, if not all, of the remaining material could be programmed. But this may not be necessary. The use of comparatively slow hardware, while limiting the programming of certain material, requires a clarity and brevity of exposition and a degree of involvement of the student that is not likely to be achieved where its existence is not made imperative by circumstances. Moreover, even if the entire course could be programmed, a certain amount of the instructor's participation would be required for fielding questions and providing moral support for the students.

6. **Student Reaction**

The students' reaction to the programmed material and to the course as a whole has been favorable (see Appendix IV). There were some preliminary complaints, but by the third week of the quarter, perhaps not coincidentally after the rains stopped, the students became much more at ease with the lessons and the system and the material. After they finished the CBI section of the course, one 2-hour class section was given over to comments on the programmed instruction. Some very valuable suggestions were made: a glossary of all the terminology employed should be prepared, certain sections of one or two lessons could be made more clear, etc. But it was generally conceded that CBI was very helpful: its degree of
organization was singled out for praise, as was the fact that the material could be gone over, in private, as many times as the student wished.

Student complaints had to do with various subjects: frustration at dealing with a preprogrammed machine instead of a presumably more flexible human being. Occasionally the teletype would type one line on top of another. Students were somewhat put out at having to walk all the way over to the Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences, particularly during the rains. While one assumes that the students read the material, think about it, decide how to answer, and then type the answer, apparently this is not always so. The cognitive processes can be short-circuited to the extent that the visual stimulus of the teletype printout is answered not by a thought, but merely by a digital response. In other words, the answer to the question "What is the locative singular ending of the noun XXXX?" is not "the phoneme/grapheme, Y," but merely "right little finger to the lower row." The suggested solution was to include a quiz at the end of every lesson: this prospect will help maintain the students' full attention throughout the lesson. Last, a rather curious and somewhat disturbing circumstance arose with at least two of the students: rather than learn the material on the teletype, they would take a lesson and answer somewhat carelessly, without complete concentration. The primary object seemed to be merely to get a printout of the lesson material to be studied, not as CBI, but as a text at home. Note, these students performed as well as the others on the final examination.
7. Results of the Final Examination

The results of the final examination (see Appendix V) were encouraging. Reliance on CBI freed me to take up a wide range of subjects that I normally would have little or no time for during the nonprogrammed course. On the final examination the students were tested on subjects that I had lectured on and for which there was supplementary reading, on subjects about which they had only read, on subjects about which I had lectured and for which there was additional CBI material, and last, on CBI material that was not reinforced by lecture material. The students emerged strongest with regard to the lecture/CBI combination; they were also very strong on the material that was presented as CBI alone. The fact that they were able to absorb rather involved linguistic arguments that had been presented on the computer alone was most encouraging. My overall view of their performance is that, all things being equal, they learned more and with greater ease than did last year’s class, which depended on my lectures and the reading alone.

The grades awarded for the course were two A’s, two A-’s, and one B.

8. Assessment

I was somewhat skeptical of the project when I began. I thought that by working diligently and by coping imaginatively with every problem, I might be able to design the course material in such a way that the students would not lose anything for having been made the subjects of an experiment.

The results exceeded these modest expectations. The rigorous reorganization of the material required for the design of CBI served to
benefit student and instructor as well. But more importantly, student evaluations of the course material and the results of the final examination showed very clearly that the CBI approach to the material thus far programmed is pedagogically sound; it may even represent an improvement over last year's lecture format.

The limitations intrinsic to the subject matter combined with those of the system are such that I do not envision the programming of the entire course and the effective elimination of the instructor. But I think that this is just as well for a variety of reasons:

1. Class meetings with the instructor serve as an important forum for comments, questions, and complaints about the CBI.

2. The forced reliance of the system on precomposed answers allows the student no exercise of creativity; knowledge comes to be almost a conditioned reflex. It is only in the interchange of a discussion group that the material may be expanded upon, treated in an 'organic' manner.

3. The scope of the CBI material is inflexible; what is in the lesson is what is to be learned—no more, no less. Nonetheless, the basic, factual core of the course remains the same from year to year. It is this material that has been programmed already, or will be finished this summer. In addition to this, the exercises involving text analysis should not require change. The existence of this basic corpus and its availability to the student on an on-call basis will serve to drastically cut the amount of time required of the instructor of the course.

Finally, another bonus gained from the programming of Old Church Slavonic and part of the History of the Russian Literary Language is the establishment of a 'course library' that can be consulted by students.
Experience has taught us that, regardless of mode of teaching, students quickly forget OCS and OR; extensive review is necessary before the Ph.D. general examinations in this area. CBI in OCS and OR will be available to these students largely at their convenience for review. This material by itself should be an effective preparation for the students in this area. We will soon have an opportunity to test this supposition, since four of our graduate students are preparing to take general examinations in the near future. All four have requested use of the CBI material in Slavic 211 and 212 for review.
Sample portions of Lessons 755 and 758, pronoun and verb morphology, respectively.

Note: The student types the answer, here provided, in the spaces set off by underline marks.

**APPENDIX I**

**BEGIN 755**

**THE PRONOUN**

**THE SING**

We have already noted the difference between the OCS and Orus Nom 1st sing prn. OCS has...

**LR**

_ _A3%

**TE**

The Orus form has

A, initial 'A'
E, prothetic Jod

**SR**

_L E_

**TE**

The Orus 1st sing PRN is

**SR**

_L IA3%

**TE**

Note, IA was also common.

In the Dat-loc of the 2nd pers sing and the reflexive PRN, where OCS had 'E', Orus had 'O'.

Give the Orus form of OCS TE67

**LR**

_T0B5_

**TE**

Give the Orus Dat-loc reflex PRN

**LR**

_CO65_

**TE**

Note, the OCS forms also occurred in Orus.

If OCS had 'E' for Orus 'O' as above and if the OCS form of the Dat-loc of the 1st pers sing PRN was МъЊь, then we conclude that the Orus form was...

**LR**

_МъЊь_

**TE**

Note, МъЊь was also common.

Orus forms are attested in which the final Ь of the Dat-loc occurred also in the acc-gen. Thus TE67, CO65 could be

A, Dat loc Inst
E, Dat loc Acc Gen

**SR**

_L E_

**TE**

Given the absence of nasals in Orus, list the forms of OCS

**LR**

_MA _MA_

**TE**

However, even though A is written, the Orus V is not nasal. It is a fronted

**SR**

_L A_

**TE**

Give the Orus forms of OCS

**LR**

_CA _CA_

**LR**

_TA _TA_

**LR**

МъЊІор _МъЊІор_

**LR**

CO6OІор _CO6OІор_
THE PARADIGM OF THE 1ST AND 2ND SING PRN IS -- FILL IN THE 2ND PERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IST PERS</th>
<th>2ND PERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>IA?I, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>МЕЕЕ, МА</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>МЕЕЕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>МЪНЬ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>МЬНЮ ИО</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>МЪНЬ, МИ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE 1ST PLUR OCS HAS DATIVE

| LR | _HAMЬ_ |
| TE | 2ND PERS |
| LR | _BAMЬ_ |
| TE | ОРУС HAS THESE, BUT МЪ, БЫ RE ALSO POSS. THUS ОРУС МЪ CAN BE |
| SR | _E_ |
| TE | IF ОРУС БЫ CAN BE DAT AND CC, THEN ALL ITS POSSIBILITIES ARE |
| SR | _E_ |
| TE | THE REMAINING FORMS ARE THE SAME IN BOTH DIAL'S. |

THE LESSON CONTINUES
The verb

The Orus and Ocs verbs are similar. They have the same tenses, participles, moods, etc. But as elsewhere, there is some difference in the form that certain endings take. We already know that Ocs a corresponds to Orus

In the phonological level Ocs a equals Orus

However, in the noun and adj, on the morphological level Ocs a can give Orus

In the verb, however, Ocs a always gives Orus a.

Remember also the reflexes of original C plus Jod. Thus where Ocs has виёмм, Orus has

Give the Orus form of Ocs хожм

The в in Ocs wwhat represents

While in Orus wwoьт it represents

In addition to these correspondences, in the pres tense where Ocs has -тб in the 3rd pers Orus has -тб. Give the Orus form of Ocs

The only other essential difference in the pres is in the dual. Where Ocs has separate 2nd and 3rd pers. Orus does not. E.g. Ocs has 2nd pers

And third pers only bea_ete_

But Orus has the 2nd pers form in both the 2nd and third pers. Thus we have Orus

The remaining forms are the same in both dial’s, thus the pres tense bea- is

Sing

Ia3ё bea_owy_
NOTE, THE THIRD SING AND PLUR ALSO OCCURRED WITHOUT FINAL -ТБ. THUS, THEY, MASC, ARE LEADING COULD BE AS ABOVE OR

ОНИ БЕДАТБ.

HE LEADS COULD BE AS ABOVE, OR

ОНИ БЕДЕ.

GIVEN NO UNFORESEEN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ORUS AND OCS OTHER TENSES, ОНИ БЕДЕ COULD BE A, PRES OR IMPERF E, PRES OR AORIST

THE 1ST SING OF AN I-STEM, Е.G., МОЛИТА IS

_МолитаР

THIRD PLUR IS

_МолитаТ

THUS WE HAVE

SING

Иаа МолитаТ

1П МолитаУ

Онъ МолитаТ

DUAL

Б МолитаУ

Ва МолитаТ

Онъ МолитаТ

PLUR

Мь МолитаУ

Ва МолитаТ

Онъ МолитаТ

WHAT DO YOU SUPPOSE THE THIRD SING OF ААТИ IS IN ORUS?
We have -тъ in the mathematics also.

The remaining forms are the same in both dials.

Conjugate dati in orus

Sing

ла дацъ
ла тъта
ла онъ дацъ

Dual

ъ дабъ
ъ ба дакта
ъ она дакта

Plur

ъ лътъ
ъ бъ дакте
ъ она дакатъ

The lesson continues
APPENDIX II

The content of the eleven lessons programmed is:

751. Orthography, the differences between the OCS and OR phonologies and the respective writing systems.

752. Pleophony, the concept of rising sonority and the difference between its effect on so-called 'tort' groups in OR and OCS where metathesis occurs.

753. Syllabic synharmonism, the causes of the various 'palatalizations' and their different effects in OR and OCS.

754. The noun, OR noun morphology as opposed to that of OCS.

755. The pronoun, OR pronoun morphology as opposed to that of OCS.

756. The adjective, OR adjectival and participial morphology as opposed to that of OCS.

757. The numeral, OR numeral morphology and syntax as opposed to that of OCS.

758. The verb, OR verb morphology as opposed to that of OCS.

759. The fall of the 'jers', the loss of the reduced vowels and its effects upon OR phonology and morphology.

760. The loss of the dual, the effects of the loss of the singular/dual/plural grammatical distinction upon OR morphology and numeral syntax.

761. Changes in the declension system, the change from a declension system based on a variety of declension types to a system based on grammatical gender; the rise of the category of animation.
Sample portions of Lessons 759 and 760, the fall of the 'jers' and the loss of the dual, respectively. Note the considerable increase in the amount of narration and multiple-choice, true-false, etc., questions as opposed to the material in Lessons 755 and 758 (Appendix I).

RUS759

BEG 759

TE IN THE EARLIEST OCS TEXTS THE 'JERS' OR REDUCED VOWELS 'a', 'b' WERE
A, CLEARLY DISTINGUISHED
E, LOST IN CERTAIN POSITIONS

SR TE WHEREAS, IN EARLIEST ORUS 'a' AND 'b' WERE RETAINED
EVEN AT WORD-END, E.G., THE M-N INST SING AND
DAT PLUR ENDED IN A
A, VOWEL
E, CONSONANT

SR TE EVENTUALLY THE JERS FELL IN ORUS AS THEY HAD IN OCS.
THIS HAPPENED IN DIFFERENT ORUS DIAL'S AT DIFFERENT
TIMES. IT SEEMS TO HAVE STARTED IN THE SOUTH IN
THE XIITH CENT AND TO HAVE SPREAD THROUGHOUT ORUS
BY THE XIIITH CENT.

1 OR 'O', NOT ALL JERS 'FELL' OR CEASED TO BE PRN-CD.

SR TE SOME BECAME FULL V'S.
IF 'E' IS TO 'O' AS 'b' IS TO 'a', AND IF STRONG 'b'
GAVE 'E', THEN STRONG 'a' GAVE

SR TE RULE FOR VOCALIZATION VERSUS LOSS OF THE JERS.
GIVEN A SUCCESSION OF SYLLABLES CONTAINING JERS,
THEN, COUNTING FROM THE RIGHT, EVERY ODD-NUMBERED JER
IS WEAK, EVERY EVEN JER IS STRONG. ANY JER IN A SYLL
PRECEDING A SYLL WITH A FULL V IS WEAK. STRESSED JERS
ARE STRONG.

TYPE 'X' AFTER EACH WEAK AND 'C' AFTER EACH STRONG JER.

SR LE THIS GIVES _XEBHO_.
SR LE THIS GIVES _CHA_.

SR LE WEAK JERS WERE NOT PRN'D, THUS THEY WERE NORMALLY
NOT WRITTEN. HOWEVER, WEAK 'a' WAS RETAINED ORTHOGRAPHICALLY
AT WORD-END.

LE THIS GIVES _AUX_.
LE 'AUB' GIVES _AUX_
LE 'AUB' GIVES _AUX_), ETC.
TE WEAK 'b' WAS WRITTEN IN CERTAIN POSITIONS, ALWAYS AT WORD-END.
THUS, дънь gives _день_.

къназь gives _кназь_.

weak e was retained between two c's where the leftmost of the c's remained sharpened.

дъльба gives _дольба_.

бут дънь gives _дне_.

б was retained, although it was weak, where it occurred before a v. thus pre-fall _свинья_ became _свинья_.

note, the retention of e is particularly common after л.

thus _колокълникъ_ gives _колокълникъ_.

both jers are weak, i.e., not prn'cd, but were written, nonetheless.

there are exceptions to the vocalization rule. some involve analogy with other forms. e.g., лъска gives лъска.

and eventually лъска, щка with the devoicing of 'd' before voiceless 's'.

however, stressed jers are strong. thus, in the acc sing of лъска the stress moves to the 1st syll, cf., вода', во'ду.

thus, the jer in лъскои was a, strong e, weak _а_.

лъскои develops to _лъскои_.

whereas, assuming no devoicing of the 'd', the dat sing developed to _лъскъ_.

with eventual devoicing it developed to _лъскъ_.

with devoicing the loc plur became _лъскъ_.

on the other hand, the pre-fall gen plur is _лъскъ_.

which gives post-fall _лъскъ_.

a paradigm with changing stems would not do, so the stem of the acc sing was generalized for the whole paradigm.

likewise, the place name смольньскъ should have given _смольньскъ_.

but it took its stem from the oblique case-forms, i.e., the dat sing was смольньскъ which gave _смоловъскъ_.

which served as the model for the eventual nom sing, i.e., _смоловъскъ_.

...
GIVEN THAT MRUS ДЕРКАТЪ IS FROM ORUS ДЕРКАТИ AND БЛОХА FROM БЛЮХА, WE CAN CONCLUDE THAT JERS A, ALWAYS STRONG E, COULD BE STRONG OR WEAK

THUS, WHILE ТПРЪ GIVES _ТОПРъ_,
THE GEN SING DEVELOPS PROPERLY TO

AS OPPOSED TO THE GEN SING OF СЪНЪ WHICH GIVES

THUS, THE JER IN 'JER PLUS LIQUID' OR VICE-VERSA IS STRONG AS OPPOSED TO СЪНЪ, CНА WHERE THE JER IS WEAK IN THE GEN.
GIVE THE POST-FALL FORM OF THE FOLLOWING

ПЪРВЪ _ПЕРВЪ_
ВЪРХЪ _ВЕРХЪ_
СЛЪЗА _СЛЕЗА_
ВЪЛКЪ _ВОЛКЪ_
ВЪЛКА _ВОЛКА_

THE FALL OF JERS HAD SEVERAL MAJOR, LONG-REACHING EFFECTS ON THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE.
PRE-FALL ЛЪСЪ CONSISTS OF HOW MANY SYLLABLES?
ITS POST-FALL FORM HAS HOW MANY SYLLABLES?
THAT SYLLABLE IS OPEN OR CLOSED, 0 OR 4?
ASSUMING THAT THE FALL DID NOT ALTER THE PITCH OF THE С.’S, THEN A HAS HIGH OR LOW PITCH, 4 OR 0?
С HAS HIGH OR LOW PITCH, 4 OR 0?
THUS, POST-FALL ЛЪСЪ A, CONFORMS TO E, VIOLATES SYLLABIC SYNTHETISM
POST-FALL ЛЪСЪ CONSISTS OF ONE A, OPEN E, CLOSED SYLLABLE
E, XIV C.

THUS, XIV-CENT ORUS PHONOLOGY IS RADICALLY DIFFERENT FROM THAT OF THE XTH CENT AND STRIKINGLY SIMILAR TO THAT OF MRUS, SINCE AMONG OTHER THINGS, PHONETIC SHARPENING BECAME PHONEMIC.
A, SING POR 'HORN', OF ANIMAL
E, DUAL POR
O, PLUR ПОЗ
BECAUSE THE HORNS OF ANIMAL TEND TO COME IN PAIRS.
SAME QUESTION A, НЕСО 'HEAVEN'
E, НЕСЕБ
O, НЕСЕБЦА
SAME QUESTION A, ОВЬЧА 'SHEEP'
E, ОВЬЧИ
O, ОВЬЧЪ
IN GENERAL THE DUAL WILL HAVE OCCURRED MOST COMMONLY WITH PAIRED OBJECTS. AS IT WEAKENS, WE CAN EXPECT IT TO BE USED LESS AND LESS IN GENERAL AND LESS AND LESS CORRECTLY WITH A, НЕСО, ОВЬЧ
E, ПОР
THUS, THE FORM OF 'HORN', 'EYE', 'SHOULDER', ETC., MOST FREQUENTLY ASSOCIATED WITH THE CONCEPT 'MORE THAN
ONE BECOMES A, THE DUAL E, THE PLUR

AS THE DUAL IS TAKEN OVER SEMANTICALLY BY THE PLUR, THE GRAMMATICAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN DUAL AND PLUR BECOMES BLURRED, SINCE THEY BOTH DESIGNATE "MORE THAN ONE." AND WITH PAIRED OBJECTS BECOMES OBLITERATED. THIS CAN LEAD TO A, REINSTITUTION OF THE DUAL NUMBER E, USE OF THE DUAL FOR THE PLUR WITH PAIRED OBJECTS.


NOTE, THAT THIS IS NOT THE CASE IN ALL SLAVIC LNGS, IN SERBO-CROATIAN THE DAT-INST ENDING SPREAD.

THE SPREAD OF THE MASC DUAL N-A ENDING WAS REINFORCED BY THE FOLLOWING.

IN THE HARD FEM'S THE GEN SING WAS IN

THE NOM PLUR WAS

HOWEVER, THERE WAS A DIFFERENCE IN THESE ENDINGS WITH WORDS LIKE БОЯ, ХЕМА.
A, STRESS E, PHONETIC SHARPENING

IN THE SOFT FEM'S THE GEN SING WAS

THE NOM PLUR WAS

HOWEVER, WITH WORDS SUCH AS ЗЕМЛЯ THERE WAS, AGAIN, A DIFFERENCE IN STRESS.
IN THE 2-FOLD HARD NEUT'S THE GEN SING WAS IN

THE NOM PLUR WAS

THE SOFT NEUT'S HAD GEN SING, NOM PLUR

BUT IN WORDS SUCH AS СЕЛО, ПОЛЯ, ET AL. THERE WAS A DIFFERENCE IN STRESS, СЕЛА', СЕ'ЛА, ПО'ЛЯ, ПОЛЯ'.
T OR F, THE SAME IS TRUE OF HARD MASC's

THIS GEN SING AND NOM PLUR ARE THE SAME EXCEPT FOR STRESS
WITH CERTAIN FEM AND NEUT NOUNS, BUT NOT FOR HARD MASC'S
BECAUSE HARD MASC GEN SING IS IN

- A - 

BUT THE NOM PLUR IS IN

- N -

HENCE, THE NOM-ACC DUAL ENDING OF HARD MASC'S IS A
STRESSED

- A -

THUS, IF THAT SAME NOUN HAD AN UNSTRESSED GEN SING
ENDING, THE SPREAD OF THE N-A DUAL WOULD CAUSE IT TO CORRESPOND
TO THE ENDING-STRESS SHIFT OF THE OTHER DECLENSIONS, I.E.,
GEN SING AND NOM PLUR DIFFER ONLY IN
A, STRESS
E, HARD VERSUS SHAPED FINAL C

- A -

THUS, OLD DUAL N-A STRESSED A SPREAD TO NON-PAIRED OBJECTS,
LIKE ROPOZN, BUT ONLY WHERE THE GEN SING IS UNSTRESSED
NOTE, EXCEPTIONS ARE RARE, E.G.
A, РУКАВА
E, ГЛАЗА

- A -
These four questions pertain to your own interest and participation in the course:

1. Did you enjoy this course?
   (1) Much more than average (2) More than average (3) Average (4) Less than average  

2. Was the course presented at the appropriate intellectual level for you?
   (1) Too difficult (2) Appropriate (3) Too easy

3. How hard did you work in this course?
   (1) Extremely hard (2) Hard (3) Average (4) Not very hard

4. Do you feel that the material presented was worth learning?
   (1) Definitely (2) Yes (3) Maybe (4) No

Rate the lectures on the following:

5. Were clear and well organized:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

6. Were intellectually stimulating:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

7. In comparison with all other lecturers you have had at Stanford, how would you rate this lecturer?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

Rate the course assignments: (papers, problem-sets, readings)

8. Were they valuable in their own right?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

9. Were they well integrated with the lectures?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

Please identify:

[Blank lines]

Instructor's Name
Lectures

These four questions pertain to your own interest and participation in the course:

1. Did you enjoy this course?
   (1) Much more than average (2) More than average (3) Average (4) Less than average
   Answer: (3)

2. Was the course presented at the appropriate intellectual level for you?
   (1) Too difficult (2) Appropriate (3) Too easy
   Answer: (3)

3. How hard did you work in this course?
   (1) Extremely hard (2) Hard (3) Average (4) Not very hard
   Answer: (1)

4. Do you feel that the material presented was worth learning?
   (1) Definitely (2) Yes (3) Maybe (4) No
   Answer: (2)

Rate the lectures on the following:

5. Were clear and well organized:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor
   Answer: (2)

6. Were intellectually stimulating:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor
   Answer: (2)

7. In comparison with all other lecturers you have had at Stanford, how would you rate this lecturer?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor
   Answer: (2)

Rate the course assignments: (Papers, problem-sets, readings)

8. Were they valuable in their own right?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor
   Answer: (3)

9. Were they well integrated with the lectures?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor
   Answer: (2)

Please identify:

Course Department and Number

Instructor's Name
Lectures

These four questions pertain to your own interest and participation in the course:

1. Did you enjoy this course?
   (1) Much more than (2) More than (3) Average (4) Less than average
   average average average

2. Was the course presented at the appropriate intellectual level for you?
   (1) Too difficult (2) Appropriate (3) Too easy
   at the beginning

3. How hard did you work in this course?
   (1) Extremely hard (2) Hard (3) Average (4) Not very hard

4. Do you feel that the material presented was worth learning?
   (1) Definitely (2) Yes (3) Maybe (4) No

Rate the lectures on the following:

5. Were clear and well organized:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

6. Were intellectually stimulating:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

7. In comparison with all other lecturers you have had at Stanford, how would you rate this lecturer?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

Rate the course assignments: (Papers, problem-sets, readings)

8. Were they valuable in their own right?
   (1) outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

9. Were they well integrated with the lectures?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

Please identify:  
Course Department and Number

Instructor's Name
Lectures

These four questions pertain to your own interest and participation in the course:

1. Did you enjoy this course?
   (1) Much more than average (2) More than average (3) Average (4) Less than average (3)

2. Was the course presented at the appropriate intellectual level for you?
   (1) Too difficult (2) Appropriate (3) Too easy (2)

3. How hard did you work in this course?
   (1) Extremely hard (2) Hard (3) Average (4) Not very hard (2)

4. Do you feel that the material presented was worth learning?
   (1) Definitely (2) Yes (3) Maybe (4) No (1)

Rate the lectures on the following:

5. Were clear and well organized:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor (2)

6. Were intellectually stimulating:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor (1)

7. In comparison with all other lecturers you have had at Stanford, how would you rate this lecturer?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor (2)

Rate the course assignments: (Papers, problem-sets, readings)

8. Were they valuable in their own right?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor (2)

9. Were they well integrated with the lectures?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor (2)

Please identify: Slavics
Course Department and Number
Schurelach
Instructor's Name
Lectures

These four questions pertain to your own interest and participation in the course:

1. Did you enjoy this course?
   (1) Much more than  (2) More than  (3) Average  (4) Less than
   average       average     average
   Answer: (3)  

2. Was the course presented at the appropriate intellectual level for you?
   (1) Too difficult  (2) Appropriate  (3) Too easy
   Answer: (2)  

3. How hard did you work in this course?
   (1) Extremely hard  (2) Hard  (3) Average  (4) Not very hard
   Answer: (2)  

4. Do you feel that the material presented was worth learning?
   (1) Definitely  (2) Yes  (3) Maybe  (4) No
   Answer: (1)  

Rate the lectures on the following:

5. Were clear and well organized:
   (1) Outstanding  (2) Good  (3) Fair  (4) Poor
   Answer: (3)  

6. Were intellectually stimulating:
   (1) Outstanding  (2) Good  (3) Fair  (4) Poor
   Answer: (2)  

7. In comparison with all other lecturers you have had at Stanford, how would you rate this lecturer?
   (1) Outstanding  (2) Good  (3) Fair  (4) Poor
   Answer: (2)  

Rate the course assignments: (Papers, problem-sets, readings)

8. Were they valuable in their own right?
   (1) Outstanding  (2) Good  (3) Fair  (4) Poor
   Answer: (1)  

9. Were they well integrated with the lectures?
   (1) Outstanding  (2) Good  (3) Fair  (4) Poor
   Answer: (3)  

Please identify:

History of Russian Language
Course Department and Number

Instructor's Name
APPENDIX V

Final Examination

I. ½ hour:
Briefly describe Henning Anderson's theory of the acquisition of language by one generation from another.

II. (choice of one) Material from Levin, ½ hour:

1. Sketch the relationship of the "деловой" and/or "канцелярский язык" to Church Slavonic during the Muscovite period. Give the historical reasons for the nature of their interaction.

2. What arguments does Levin bring forth against the notion that the Russian literary language is historically, natively Russian?

3. Discuss the types and degrees of assimilation of the various types of Old Church Slavonicisms by the Russians in the Kievan period. Give examples.

III. Answer two of the following, ½ hour each:

1. Discuss the nature of the interaction of the o-, jo- and i-stems. What major phonological and morphological events and/or processes played a role in their interaction?

2. What is the relationship of metathesis and palinphony to the principle of "rising sonority"? Give examples.

3. What caused the palatalization of consonants, and how did it become phonemic in East Slavic?

4. Sketch the major phonological and morphological differences between OCS and Old Russian.

5. Indicate those forms in the following passage which are historically (in form, if not fact) Old Church Slavonicisms. Comment on the mixture of native East Slavic forms with the latter. Identify the passage according to epoch, genre, and style.

Я помню море пред грозой;  
Как я хваловал волнам,  
Бегучим бурной чередой  
С любовью лечь к ее ногам!  
Как я ждал тогда с волнами  
Комнутия младых неустами!  
Нет, никогда средь младых дней  
Кипарис молодости моей  
Я не ждал с таким мученьем  
Любить уста младых Армид,  
Нь-р розам пламенных ламп,  
Нь-р пергам, палыми томльень;  
П-т, некогда полны выражений  
Так не терзай душу мою!
IV. (One hour) Translate the following passage. Identify it as to period and genre. Comment on the underlined forms.

В си же времена бысть знамене на западъ, видаща превела, луча имущи аны кронава, въходящи с вечера по заходъ солнечный, и пребысть за 7 дній. Се же проникше не на добро, носемъ бо бялна усобицъ многихъ и пашестве поганичъ на Русскую землю, си бо видаща бо аны кронава, прошестви кронъ прелетъ. В си же времена бысть дніца прерыванъ в Сіонь, хъчесто же дніца выволожива рыболове ны неводъ, етоже позоровавъ до вечера, и накы яверговъ в воду; бысть бо сицъ на земля ему грамини удове, вного нелѣ кать крама ради.

* a body of water
1 to watch
2 members, characters
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