

RUSSIAN ANTHROPNOMY OF THE 18TH CENTURY ACCORDING  
TO THE CONFESSIONAL REGISTERS OF THE OPOCHETSKY UYEZD CHURCHES

MARIA STEPANOVA, SVETLANA MATSEVICH  
Pskov State University, Russia

*The text is devoted to Russian anthroponymy of the 18th century on the results of confessional registers research. Much attention is given to the origin of anthroponyms, canonical and unofficial forms usage, frequency, distribution of three-part form nomination, differentiation of estates nomination.*

**Introduction.** Experts in anthroponymy confidently ascertain that Russian anthroponymy changed significantly in the 18th century. Their opinion is based on a vast volume of information studied. The sources analyzed mostly contain male names.

Our research is based on the analysis of confessional registers, which are lists of parishioners who passed the sacrament of Confession and Eucharist. Confessional registers are one of the few sources that contain names of not only men, but those of women and children. The distribution of parishioners among different social estates allows us to determine the influence of social differences on the practice of nomination.

The definition of an anthroponymy includes any name a person can have, including a personal name, middle name and surname. Philologists and historians pay great attention to regional historical anthroponymy which allows us to represent an overall picture of the development of Russian anthroponymy. Among the most important tasks for the research in Russian anthroponymy there is the task of studying mass sources and compiling frequency dictionaries of names and surnames on their basis.

The selected time period is 1740 – 1799. It is characterized by the best preserved materials. At this time there was a three-part form of nomination and the fund of canonical names. The territorial scope of our study covers the area of the Voronetskaya volost' of the Opochetksy uyezd of the Pskov province. The focus of the study on this territory allows us to consider anthroponyms in the regional aspect.

**Goal and objectives formulation.** The goal of our research is to identify features of the anthroponyms on the territory of the Voronetskaya volost' of the Opochetksy uyezd in the 18th century. Achieving this goal implies the following objectives [1, p. 212 – 214]:

1. To reason the possibility of non-comparable data of confessional registers usage [2, p. 42 – 44];
2. To analyze the sources;
3. To identify the most popular names among the population of the Voronetskaya volost';
4. To identify and explain the usage of unofficial name forms;
5. To define the naming styles of various social groups;
6. To denote the role of personal preferences of the priests.

**Principles and methods of research.** The research is based on the usage of general historical principles and methods, as well as methods and specific techniques of statistics and onomastics. The principle of historicity is the first to be used in our research. It allows us to trace changes of ways of nomination and preferences of the 18th century population. The system principle assumes that all events and processes have cause-and-effect relations. The observed changes in anthroponymy are understood as a reflection of all-Russia trends. Achieving the principle of objectivity required involvement of archival documents and taking into account the subjectivity of the sources. The usage of comparative method is due to the necessity of analysis of similarities and differences between sets of anthroponyms of the parishes with 10-year time interval identification. The ideographic method helps to carry out the description of new trends in anthroponymy of the 18th century, to characterize the confessional registers as sources. It was also necessary to use the method of selective statistics to analyze mass sources. Calculating percentage allows us to identify names frequency. The use of qualitative methods is necessary to explain mathematical data. Also the specific methods of onomastic research were used. The method of textual analysis was used in the data collection. The genetic analysis of names was used to determine variants of names origin. Methods of classification of names, reconstruction of names and their forms were used to identify canonical and non-canonical forms. A special onomastic technique – the identification of onomastic corps of “pagan” and “Christian” names was also applied.

**Results of research.** A total of 226 male personal names and 59 female names were identified. The analysis of confessional registers of the Svyatogorsky monastery and the church of St. Paraskeva, the churches of the Resurrection and the church of St. George allows the researcher to reach a conclusion about the origin of anthroponyms. In the first half of the century the majority of names were of Greek-Latin and Hebrew origin. They came into the Russian language with the adoption of Christianity. One of the objectives of state policy and the Church was to eliminate pagan names, replace them by the names of Christian saints (usually Greek) and the names of biblical characters inconvenient for pronunciation. Greek and Latin names which were difficult to pronounce did not take root in the Russian language right away. Most Russian people continued to use pre-Christian names until the 17th century, but only in everyday life, because they were not recognized by the Church. Pre-Christian names disappeared from sources finally in the 18th century. That is why among female names the names of Greco-Latin origin account for 86% and of Hebrew origin - 7%. Among the male names 78% are Greek – Latin, 18% are Hebrew. Among other calendar names that occur there are the names of Vladimir and Boris which are of Slavic origin. Among female names it is necessary to note the names of Vera, Nadezhda and Liubov, which are literal translations of Greek names into Russian, but their use is but exceptional in the 18th century.

The usage of canonical and unofficial name forms is also revealed in the analyzed confessional registers. Unofficial forms were generated by the conversion of Christian names in accordance with Russian pronunciation. Gradually, some letters were removed or changed. The names often have several forms in the 18th century. For example, the canonical male name Josef has three forms: Osif, Osip, and Josip. Another feature appears in the confessional registers. The same sound could sometimes be written in various letters that led to mistakes even in church calendars [3, p. 95]. Different versions of the same calendar name may belong to members of the same family. The same person could be named by various versions in the confessional registers of different years as well. It brings the conclusion that rules of names writing in the 18th century actual practice are not well established. In the 18th century the parish clergy is characterized by lack of education that is also the cause of confusion in the calendar names writing. Unofficial forms of names were equally often used in the nomination of all estate population, including peasants, clergy and nobility. It can be argued that unofficial names were not perceived as colloquial forms suitable only for the lower strata, and full calendar forms were not used for the upper estate exclusively.

In the course of research we have identified the most common names of peasants in the confessional registers of 1740 – 1798 [4, 5] because peasants make the majority of parishioners. Among male and female names unofficial names prevail. Among the male names the most frequent are Ivan, Vasily, Pyotr, Grigory, Semyon, Mikhail, Gavriil, Fyodor and Yakov. Their predominance is explained by a large number of holidays in honor of John the Baptist, the Apostle John and Basil the Great. Among the female names the most common are Evdokia, Paraskeva, Anna, Irina, Maria, Matrona. The same rule is implemented partly for female names. The saints named Maria, Martha, Anna, Paraskeva have many holidays in the church calendar. But other common names such as Evdokia, Daria, Ksenia, Ekaterina, Vassa have only 1 – 2 honoring days. In some cases, when the celebration of several saints was on the same day, the choice of a name still existed. In such cases, as far as we see, preference was given to a familiar name.

It is often observed that several children in the same peasant's family are named by the same name. Besides, often the daughters received mother's name and the sons – their father's name. This could happen in the case of coincidence of the days of the memory of the saints and children's dates of birth. Experts also note the existence of a special belief or a superstition among the Russians, especially peasants, that those named by repeated names are endowed with good health [6, p. 97 – 98]. Probably, it is this tradition that affects the presence of a large number of children's names repetitions.

In addition, it should be noted that the use of male names is more diverse than that of female. We explain a considerable difference in the number of male and female names by a number of reasons. First, priests and preachers had been men since ancient times. Therefore, their names had been included into the calendar much more often than women's. Secondly, the dominant role of men in the family could have also had a certain influence on the calendar. It was the man who took part in public life. And being in a public environment, the man received the additional nomination.

The language preserved a large number of rare names (for example, Ulita, Fotinia, Christina, Carp, Tit, Juda). This is due to the choice of the name by the priest made in strict accordance with the church calendar. However, the option also existed if several saints were celebrated on one day [7, p. 77]. The names of children bap-

Linguistics, literature, philology

tized by a particular priest are in most cases the same, like those widely known throughout the parish. Therefore, the role of personal preferences of priests is not clearly determined.

The confessional registers of the Svyatogorsky monastery and the church of Paraskeva reveal the way of nomination for peasants and clergy. This is a two-part form, consisting of a personal name and a shortened middle name, formed from a personal name with suffixes -ov-, -ev- (Dementiy Petrov [8]). This way of nomination is used for the owners of the yards, their wives, widows, daughters-in-law. Only a personal name is used for children because the text of the register already contained the indication of their fathers.

The clergy used four variants to refer to the male nobleman. For most nobles the three-part form – personal name, shortened middle name with the word “son” and surname (Mikhail Fedorov son Bekleshev, Ivan Ivanov son Rumyantsov was used [9]). The second variant is a personal name, full middle name with the suffix -vich- and surname (Abraham Petrovich Hannibal, Maxim Dmitrievich Vyndomsky [10]). The three-part way of nomination is typical only for nobility. This gave the opportunity to specify the person, his or her father and connection to the ancestors via surname. A special feature is presented by middle names formed with the suffix -vich- for nobility. Besides, there is a two-part form, consisting of a personal name and a shortened middle name formed from the personal name (Jacov Ferapontov [11]) or of a personal name and surname (Gerasim Kotelnikov, Pavel Pastuhovsky, Parfen Naperstkov [12]). The nomination structure was not stable because the same person could be named by the priest in a different way.

There are multiple variants for the nomination of women – landowners. The first is a personal name and a middle name (Thekla Vasilieva [13]) or a middle name with the word “daughter” (the widow Paraskeva Nikiforova daughter [14]). The second is a personal name, a middle name with the word “daughter” and the name of the husband (Daria Voinova daughter Elagina [15]). There is also a variant containing the personal name, the middle name and the name of the husband with the word “wife” (Anna Ivanova wife Lvova [16]).

The examples reflect new changes in nomination that occurred in the 18th century: distribution of the full middle names and surnames for the nobility. There is a gradual differentiation of nomination structures for the upper and lower estates. However, what is characteristic for the use of anthroponyms in the language of the 18th century is the existence of different nomination structures, which are equally distributed.

**Conclusion.** The results of the analysis of confessional registers allow us to come to the conclusion about the non-canonical names elimination in the 18th century. The most common are informal names. It proves that church forms did not root in everyday Russian because of the inconvenience of pronunciation. The custom of naming people in accordance with the church calendars had a significant influence on the anthroponymic system. It contributed to the survival of the rarest names in the language. The 18th century developed the way of nomination, consisting of personal name and middle name for the peasantry and clergy. For nobility the use of the two-part and three-part formula with a surname and a full middle name remained.

Thus the results of our research prove that confessional registers are valuable sources of information for historical anthroponymy.

## REFERENCES

1. Stepanova, M.S. Anthroponyms of the Voronetskaya Volost' of the Opochetcky Uyezd (on the Basis of the XVIIIth Century Confessional Registers) / M.S. Stepanova // Молодежь – науке 2018 : материалы молодеж. науч.-практ. конф. Псков. гос. ун-та / Псков. гос. ун-т ; редкол. Л.Б. Воробьева [и др.]. – Псков, 2018. – Т. 4. – С. 212–214.
2. Степанова, М.С. Вопрос о сопоставимости данных исповедных росписей XVIII в. в антропонимическом исследовании (на примере Воронежской волости Опочецкого уезда Псковской губернии) / М.С. Степанова // Молодежь – науке 2018 : материалы молодеж. науч.-практ. конф. Псков. гос. ун-та / Псков. гос. ун-т ; редкол. Ю.В. Колпакова [и др.]. – Псков, 2018. – Т. 3. – Ч. 1. – С. 42–44.
3. Суперанская, А.В. Откуда пошло разнописание? Изменения форм календарных имен в XVI веке / А.В. Суперанская // Наука и жизнь / Правда. – 1990. – № 12. – С. 95–98.
4. Исповедные росписи Святогорского монастыря // Государственный архив Псковской области (ГАПО). – Ф. 39. Оп. 1. Д. 2500, 1657.
5. Исповедные росписи церквей погостов Опочецкого уезда // ГАПО. – Ф. 39. Оп. 1. Д. 1666, 2545, 2583, 2615, 2653.

6. Толстой, Н.И. Имя в контексте народной культуры / Н.И. Толстой, С.М. Толстая // Проблемы славянского языкознания : три доклада к XII Междунар. съезду славистов / под. ред. Н. Волочаевой. – М., 1998. – С. 88–125.
7. Суслова, А.В. О русских именах / А.В. Суслова, А.В. Суперанская. – Л. : Лениздат, 1991. – 220 с.
8. Исповедная роспись церкви Воскресения Христова пригорода Воронича // ГАПО. – Ф. 39. Оп. 1. Д. 1586. Л. 7.
9. Исповедные росписи церквей: Георгиевской, Воскресенской пригорода Воронича // ГАПО. – Ф. 39. Оп. 1. Д. 1581, 1597.
10. Исповедные росписи церквей: Воскресенской и Георгиевской // ГАПО. – Ф. 39. Оп. 1. Д. 1581, 1607.
11. Исповедная роспись церкви Воскресения Христова пригорода Воронича // ГАПО. – Ф. 39. Оп. 1. Д. 1581.
12. Исповедные росписи церквей: Георгиевской, Воскресенской пригорода Воронича // ГАПО. – Ф. 39. Оп. 1. Д. 1581, 1597.
13. Исповедные росписи церквей погостов Опочецкого уезда // ГАПО. – Ф. 39. Оп. 1. Д. 2614.
14. Исповедная роспись церкви Воскресения Христова пригорода Воронича // ГАПО. – Ф. 39. Оп. 1. Д. 1581.
15. Исповедная роспись церкви Воскресения Христова пригорода Воронича // ГАПО. – Ф. 39. Оп. 1. Д. 1581.
16. Исповедные росписи церквей погостов Опочецкого уезда // ГАПО. – Ф. 39. Оп. 1. Д. 2614.