

SAINT PETERSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

As a manuscript

CHEKINA Anastasia Artemovna

**ETIQUETTE FORMS AND FORMULAS OF FOLK SPEECH:
SEMANTICS, PRAGMATICS, FUNCTIONING (BASED ON THE
MATERIAL OF THE ARCHIVE "SPIRITUAL CULTURE OF THE
RUSSIAN NORTH IN FOLK LITERATURE")**

Scientific specialty 5.9.5. Russian language. Languages of the peoples of Russia

THESIS

for an academic degree
candidate of philological sciences

Translated from Russian

Supervisor:
Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Professor T.S. Sadova

Saint Petersburg
2024

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Chapter I. Etiquette of folk speech: statement of the problem	13
1.1. Ethnolinguistic aspect in linguistics	13
1.2. Small forms of folklore in ethnolinguistic light	18
1.3. Forms and formulas of oral text	22
1.4. Description of research material.....	30
1.5. Conclusions for Chapter I.....	33
Chapter II. Etiquette forms and formulas in everyday speech of a resident of the Russian North: functioning, pragmatics, linguistic specificity	35
2.1. Spheres of existence of EFF: thematic groups.....	35
2.2. Natural variability of folklore text: typology of possible variants.....	59
2.3. Dialogue form of traditional contact establishment: types of communicants	71
2.4. Etiquette forms and formulas of traditional communication: structural and semantic features	81
2.5. Obligatory nature of etiquette forms and formulas	112
2.6. Folklore-genre correlation of EFF	116
2.7. Conclusions on Chapter II.....	117
Conclusion	120
Sources and their abbreviations	123
References	124
Dictionaries	138
Application	140
Contexts that record etiquette forms and formulas of folk speech (based on materials from the SDK Archive)	140

Introduction

In modern linguistics, there is a persistent interest in the language of folklore as a special object of research: the specificity of this subsystem of the national language, noted in the works of the classics of Russian science (F.I. Buslaev, A.A. Potebnya, V.F. Miller), is today studied in various aspects and scientific directions. The language of individual oral poetic genres is actively studied: folk songs (E.B. Artemenko; M.A. Bobunova; A.T. Khrolenko; I.S. Klimas), proverbs and other small prose forms (G.L. Permyakov; Z.K. Tarlanov; M.L. Kovshova), spiritual poems (S.E. Nikitina, A.M. Petrov), bylichki and legends (O.A. Cherepanova; T.N. Bunchuk), omens and dream omens (V.K. Kharchenko; T.S. Sadova), benedictions (L.Yu. Zorina; O.V. Meshkova), etc. The features of the language of folklore are studied in connection with the reconstruction of the genre picture of the world (T.V. Tsivyan; A.T. Khrolenko; Yu.N. Ilyina, etc.), the language of different forms of Russian folklore is widely and systematically presented in the works of Russian ethnolinguists (N.I. Tolstoy; S.M. Tolstaya; E.L. Berezovich; O.B. Khristoforova, etc.).

This paper attempts to describe the language of folk etiquette as a stable system of small speech forms that reflects the traditional rules of speech culture and has certainly preserved archaic forms of pragmatically oriented communication.

It is quite obvious that in a rural society, which has special, culturally marked ideas about how one should behave in various situations, there is its own ethics, its own “oral ethical code” [cit. from: Sadova 2003: 26]. It is inevitable in the conditions of a full-fledged spiritual life, which, according to N.A. Berdyaev [Berdyaev 1993], is a system of moral values of the people, formed in specific historical and cultural conditions. This remark is extremely important for our work, since the material for the study was small texts functioning in a distinctive region of Russia – the Russian North.

As is well known, the Russian North is an almost terminological combination in modern folklore studies that has firmly entered into scientific use. Traditionally, “the Russian North is understood as the territory from the Urals to the Baltics, north

of the Volga. These are the Novgorod, Pskov, Leningrad, Arkhangelsk, Vologda, Murmansk, Kostroma, Vyatka, Perm regions, Karelia, the Komi Republics, some (northern) districts of the Tver and Yaroslavl regions” [Cherepanova 1986: 3]. Of course, the concept of the “Russian North” for these regions is in some sense conditional, since other peoples, primarily of Finno-Ugric origin, have lived here for a long time and, apparently, originally, and who rightfully consider themselves the aborigines of most of the named places. The name “Russian North” stems primarily from scientific interest in Russian spiritual culture, which, according to K.V. Chistov, it is here that it preserves its most pristine, archaic forms. Characterizing the ethnocultural uniqueness of this region, he also highlights "three main facts of this uniqueness:

1. This is a repository of archaic forms of culture of the Slavic past in general, and Russian in particular;
2. An environment in which traditional archaic elements are actively processed over a long period of time under the influence of both border (substrate) cultures, languages, and unchanging historical and social influences;
3. A unique ethnocultural space with a complex genesis, characterized by: a) integrity, b) harmony, c) organic connection with the geographical environment” [Chistov 1988: 3].

The above judgment by K.V. Chistov is very important for the work, since the entire collection of records from different times and different locations, related to the group of texts reflecting traditional rules of speech behavior, is accepted here as a system, conditioned by the noted cultural and historical integrity of a vast region with the common name “Russian North”.

Thus, **the material for** the dissertation research was the expedition records (over 300 thousand texts) of the archive “Spiritual Culture of the Russian North in Folk Literature” (hereinafter referred to as SDK) of the Department of Russian Language of St. Petersburg State University, made by students, postgraduates and teachers of the university from 1984 to 2024 during scientific expeditions under a special expeditionary program with an ethnolinguistic focus (the author of the

program is (Prof. of St. Petersburg State University O.A. Cherepanova). Almost 400 units of text records were selected for the study, recording the analyzed speech forms and stable formulas reproduced in specific everyday situations. They are found in different headings of the expedition classifier, the most relevant of which (for our work) are the sections "Economy", "Folklore", "Demonology", "Folk etiquette" and the subsections "Sowing and harvest", "Weaving", "Holidays".

In this dissertation research (in a broad sense) speech etiquette is considered, which, following N.I. Formanovskaya, is understood as “regulating rules of speech behavior, a system of nationally specific stereotypical, stable communication formulas accepted and prescribed by society for establishing contact between interlocutors, maintaining and interrupting contact in a chosen tonality” [Formanovskaya 2020: 8].

Folk speech etiquette is a complex cultural phenomenon that is often genetically linked to ritual or ceremony, understood in this work as synonyms, where "ritual precedes etiquette, and etiquette, in turn, is formed on the basis of ritual" [Bayburin 1990: 161]. It should be taken into account that the formulas under consideration exist in everyday speech, therefore their connection with traditional ritual, which is an archaic and to a certain extent "sacred" phenomenon, is not always transparent and clear today. As a result, the question of determining the "ritual" and actually "etiquette" of a particular speech formula often cannot be resolved unambiguously.

Thus, **etiquette forms and formulas (hereinafter referred to as EFF)** are designated as units of study. **Folk speech** — as a broad naming of traditional stable text units that perform an etiquette function in various culturally marked situations. It is obvious that **the formula** has a more stable character, it is reproduced as a whole, always retains the core lexical components (a word or a combination of words), and is often subject to minor transformations (variations) in oral usage in various regions of the Russian North. Such, for example, is the widespread wish when washing clothes *Belen'ko .../ Vam / tebe; Belen'ko stirat'; Beló na vode; Beló stirat' / myt'* etc.

In this case, it is necessary to take into account the folkloric specificity of most formulas, namely their property of “containing quanta of traditional cultural information” [Artemenko 2005: 99–108]. In other words, the essential difference between etiquette formulas of folk speech and the speech of a modern urban person is that the former are natural “evolutionary” facts of culture, their pragmatic role is not limited to purely communicative tasks (the beginning, maintenance, and completion of speech contact, for example), they are built into the life of society as the most important component of culture as a whole.

We call **etiquette speech forms** either stable speech units, recorded and, presumably, existing in a limited territory of the Russian North, or those that meaningfully and functionally fulfill the role of etiquette speech rules, but are expressed “freely”, without relying on the core components of the well-known formula, and sometimes even created by the speaker in its “likeness” in order to fill the “cultural gap”: «*Trud na pol'zu!*». «*Zdorov'e v ruki!*». «*Chistota v izbe!*» *Byvaet, i sam pridumaet.* (Ustreka, Moshensk., Novg., SDK-45, 1989)¹. In these cases, and above all, the function of these speech forms, clearly recognized by the bearers of traditional knowledge, their practical (cultural) obligation aimed at “recognizing one’s own” is taken into account.

In the context of discussions about the structural units of oral poetic speech, the term **folklore genre** requires a special reservation, which in the work is understood as a stable traditional form of a work of a specific functional assignment, in which etiquette formulas and forms can be “dressed”. In other words, in our case, forms and formulas can be equal to small speech folklore genres (benedictions, sentences, spells, sayings, proverbs and so on).

Thus, **the object of the study** is the forms and formulas of speech etiquette of the folk speech of the Russian North, their language and genre representation. **The subject** — semantics, pragmatics and ways of functioning of these texts in popular speech as units of traditional culture.

¹Hereinafter the following sequence of abbreviations of the record passport is adopted: name of the village / town, district, region, number of the expeditionary unit (if any), year.

The relevance of the dissertation research is seen, first of all, in the fact that its topic is built into the paradigm of linguafolklore studies and ethnolinguistics, relatively new but highly relevant interdisciplinary areas of modern Russian studies aimed at studying traditional speech forms/genres from the point of view of their reflection of the features of culture, management, everyday life and other spheres of human life, in our case – a resident of the Russian North. The work is carried out in the ethnolinguistic aspect, which presupposes a semiotic, in modern terminology — a multimodal [Zagidullina 2019: 181–188] — research method.

The relevance of the work is also connected with the study of special speech forms – stable, integral statements that have (in the broadest sense) an etiquette function, the source of which can be a ritual, taboo, as well as a system of traditional mythological ideas of a resident of the Russian North.

Working with unique field material, some of which will be introduced into scientific circulation for the first time (since it has not been published and is stored in the form of handwritten notes in the SDK Archive), as well as a linguistic study of speech etiquette, organically integrated into the traditional culture of the inhabitants of the Russian North, largely determine **the novelty of the research**.

The theoretical and methodological basis of the work is made up of studies that cover the main theoretical and practical issues touched upon in the dissertation: from the field of ethnolinguistics in various aspects — works by A.A. Potebnya, N.I. Tolstoy, S.M. Tolstaya, A.S. Gerd, E.L. Berezovich, O.A. Cherepanova and others; from the field of studying formulas in various aspects — works by M. Parry, A.B. Lord, A.N. Veselovsky, G.I. Maltsev, A.T. Khrolenko, A.V. Desnitskaya, and others; from the field of studying etiquette — studies by N.I. Formanovskaya, V.E. Goldin, V.G. Kostomarov, A.A. Akishina, I.A. Sternin, A.G. Balakai, A.K. Baiburin, and others; from the field of studying aspects of folk speech etiquette — works by L.Yu. Zorina, O.A. Cherepanova, V.N. Grishanova, and others; from the field of studying the specifics of the language of folklore, including small genres — works by G.L. Permyakov, V.N. Toporov, S.E. Nikitina,

A.T. Khrolenko, I.A. Ossovetsky, Z.K. Tarlanov, M.L. Kovshova, T.S. Sadova, and others.

The aim of the work is to study the linguistic features and cultural pragmatics of etiquette forms and formulas of folk speech in the ethnolinguistic aspect.

The following tasks are subordinated to achieving this goal:

1) To summarize the results of scientific understanding (in the works of famous researchers) of scientific topics, provisions, and concepts that are significant for the work: folklore formula, ethnolinguistics, folklore text/genre, specifics of folk etiquette.

2) To select and systematize speech units that perform an etiquette function in the context of traditional communication in the Russian North.

3) Describe the lexical components and grammatical features of the forms and formulas of speech etiquette of folk speech etiquette.

4) Determine the specificity of the etiquette functions of speech form in the context of traditional (conditionally folklore) communication.

5) Determine the stable and variable components of a complex of formulas on one topic.

The solution of the set tasks involves the use of a number of general scientific methods. First of all, the work will use **the descriptive method**, which involves the description and generalization of existing approaches to the study of speech etiquette in general and folk speech etiquette in particular. **The method of scientific observation** will be relevant for systematization and identification of stable situations in which one or another speech form or formula is used. When analyzing the content and meaning of the selected speech units, **the method of lexical-semantic analysis in the ethnolinguistic aspect** will be used, since (in a broad sense) the word in a situation of traditional communication acts as a fact of culture. In addition, the work assumes the use **of the method of syntactic analysis** of a speech segment of varying length (from a phrase to a sentence) to identify the core and peripheral zones of a stable formula. **The method of textual analysis** is used in

compiling a typology of variants of an etiquette formula and the form of a separate thematic group.

Research hypothesis: the texts of records of etiquette forms and formulas of folk speech are culturally marked and conditioned by the mythological ideas of a non-urban resident; the language of small speech forms demonstrates the evolution of purely pragmatic communication in the context of a mythological worldview in the direction of communication that is recognized and functions as ethically conditioned.

The theoretical significance of the dissertation lies in the development of a number of theoretical issues related to the linguistics of folklore text as a special type of text with the category of natural variability and genre marginality. In the ethnolinguistic aspect, the specificity of traditional (folklore) speech etiquette, its strong connection with the mythopoetics of "peasant everyday life" is substantiated. Theoretically significant are attempts at linguistic description of small speech forms of folklore, their systematization according to a number of features, identification of the initially pragmatic function of a separately presented speech form or formula and its transformation into a purely etiquette, conditionally symbolic function.

The practical significance of the dissertation lies in the possibility of using the research results in lexicography and development of a universal classifier of small forms of folklore. The conclusions about the invariant and variable zones of one "thematic bush" of etiquette formulas can be taken into account when developing the structure of the future corpus of texts stored in the SDK archive, when writing search programs for keywords and thematic blocks of the created corpus. The oral speech material introduced into circulation for the first time can be used in university lecture courses on ethnolinguistics, linguafolklore studies and speech culture, as well as in developing programs for educational field expeditions.

The structure of the work is traditional and includes an introduction, two chapters, a conclusion, a list of sources, literature and dictionaries. The appendix is a list of 395 text entries from the SDK Archive, which include analyzed speech etiquette formulas and forms.

Testing the work

The results of the research were presented in the form of reports at scientific conferences and forums:

- 1) The Second International St. Petersburg Historical Forum (St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg State University, October 2022);
- 2) LI International Philological Conference named after L.A. Verbitskaya (St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg State University, March 2023);
- 3) IX All-Russian Interuniversity Scientific and Methodological Conference (Peterhof, VI ZDV and VOSO, May 2023);
- 4) International scientific conference "Cognitive linguistics in the context of modern science" (Chelyabinsk, SUSU, September 2023);
- 5) VII International Scientific Seminar "Linguistic Regional Studies" (Donetsk, DonNU, November 2023);
- 6) Youth Forum "Cultural Code-2023" (St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg State University, November 2023);
- 7) Final forum of the professional competition of student expeditions "Rediscovering Russia" (Moscow, National Research University Higher School of Economics, November 2023);
- 8) Open scientific meeting dedicated to the birthday of B.A. Larin, "Larin Readings-2024" (St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg State University, January 2024);
- 9) LII International Philological Conference named after L.A. Verbitskaya (St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg State University, March 2024);
- 10) VIII International Symposium "Russian Grammar in Dynamics" (Nizhny Novgorod, N.A. Dobrolyubov Nizhny Novgorod State Linguistic University, October, 2024).

The main results of the dissertation research are reflected in 7 scientific articles, 4 of which were published in scientific indexed journals from the list recommended by the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Federation:

- 1) **Chekina A.A. Structural and semantic features of one ritual and etiquette formula of folk speech in a weaving situation // Scientific notes of**

Petrozavodsk State University. — 2023. — Vol. 45 (6). — Pp. 23–28. [Chekina 2023c].

2) **Chekina A.A. Etiquette of popular speech: dialogue form // Bulletin of Donetsk National University. Series D. Philology and Psychology. — No. 4, 2024. — P. 160–169. [Chekina 2024b].**

3) **Chekina A.A. Syntax of ritual and etiquette formulas of one pragmatics // Cognitive studies of language. — Tambov, 2023. — No. 3(54). — Pp. 320–325. [Chekina 2023a].**

4) **Sadova T.S., Chekina A.A. Paired folklore formulas // Cognitive linguistics in the context of modern science: materials of the International scientific conference. — Moscow: Tambov, 2023. — Pp. 635–637 (the author of the dissertation personally participates in 50%). [Sadova, Chekina 2023].**

5) **Chekina A.A. “Dedushka-domovoyushko, love my family”: ritual and etiquette formulas of addressing brownies in the regions of the Russian North // Bulletin of Donetsk National University. — Issue 3, 2023. — Pp. 119–125. [Chekina 2023d].**

6) **Chekina A.A. Syntax and pragmatics of one ritual-etiquette formula of folk speech // Language categories and units: syntagmatic aspect: materials of the fifteenth International scientific conference dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Russian language department. — Vladimir, 2023. — Pp. 502–510. [Chekina 2023b].**

7) **Chekina A.A. Harvest verdicts: linguistic features of ritual and etiquette texts (based on field records of expeditions to the Totemsky district of the Vologda region) // Russian North-2024. Problems of studying and preserving historical and cultural heritage: a collection of works from the VIII All-Russian scientific conference. — Vologda, 2024. — Pp. 180–185. [Chekina 2024a].**

Theses for the defense:

1) Traditional speech etiquette has specific features, determined by its cultural marking, often having deep mythopoetic roots. The modern bearer of traditional culture does not always realize the deep, mythological motivation of this or that

etiquette expression, however, the obligation (*it is accepted/supposed*) of their presence in speech is clearly recognized.

2) Etiquette and ritual in the context of studying stable formulas of folk speech represent a complex interconnected cultural whole, included in everyday communication, in the current state poorly distinguishing between the “ritual” and the “etiquette”, which testifies to the natural evolution of the functions of such expressions from the initially pragmatic, mythologized to purely cultural, symbolic, etiquette.

3) Etiquette forms and formulas of traditional communication have a complex of communicative functions (establishing contact, maintaining communication, influencing, etc.), the most important of which is the function of identifying the communicant on the scale of “friend or foe”.

4) Etiquette forms and formulas of folk speech initially and always represent a fragment of living dialogic speech, even in cases when the remark of one of the participants in the dialogue is not verbalized. Not only a person, but also a mythological character/ anthropomorphized natural phenomenon can act as communicants, sometimes not manifested.

5) Like any folklore, oral speech formula, the etiquette formula has various variants of speech implementations. Texts on the same topic, recorded in the same region, have invariant and variable zones. The vocabulary and syntax of the invariant zone ensure the stability of the text as a whole.

Chapter I. Etiquette of folk speech: statement of the problem

1.1. Ethnolinguistic aspect in linguistics

When writing this paragraph, materials from the published article of the author of the dissertation research were used [Chekina 2023c].

The issues of the interpenetration of language and culture are studied in various interdisciplinary sciences, including a special area of linguistics — ethnolinguistics. Ethnolinguistics “as a component of modern semiotics comes into contact with mythology, the history of culture, ethnic history, the theory of ethnogenesis, as well as with a number of other complex disciplines that focus on man (primarily “speaking man” — homo loquens) and ethnos” [Tolstoy 1995: 8]. The deep mythologically saturated archaic material of the folk speech etiquette of a rural resident of the Russian North is studied in this dissertation in an ethnolinguistic aspect.

Ethnolinguistics as a term and as a branch of linguistic science originated in the 1940s and is associated with the names of the American anthropologist F. Boas and the American linguist E. Sapir. The works in the field of studying stereotypical ideas of the Polish scientist E. Bartmiński [Bartmiński 2005: 33–38] and researchers of the Lublin school of ethnolinguistics are widely known. Issues of ethnolinguistic analysis of folk culture in Russia have become a subject of scientific interest for many Russian scientists: V.V. Ivanov, V.N. Toporov, N.I. Tolstoy, S.M. Tolstaya, T.A. Agapkina, L.N. Vinogradova, O.A. Cherepanova, A.S. Gerd, M.M. Kopylenko, and others².

A deep and comprehensive study of the interactions between ethnicity, language and culture was the result of the development of ideas by scientists who worked long before the formation of ethnolinguistics as an independent scientific field. Thus, V. von Humboldt consistently expressed ideas that were advanced for his time about the embodiment of the “spirit of the people” and “the individual worldview of the people” in language. Humboldt considered the “nation” to be “such

²See the bibliography.

a “form of individualization of the human spirit” that has a “linguistic” status” [Humboldt 2000: 9]. It should be noted that Humboldt categorically objected to the understanding of language as something mechanical and static; he wrote that “language” is always “in action” and is recreated in living speech. Three components participate equally in the developing linguistic process: the “spirit of the people”, the external form of language and the internal form of language. The comments on the recreation of language in each act of speech creation are especially relevant for our work, since the inevitability of variations in speech formulas in the conditions of traditional communication is accepted in it as an axiom.

Humboldt's ideas were extremely popular in Russian linguistics and were reflected in the works of many Russian scientists of the 19th century [F.I. Buslaev 1858; A.A. Potebnya 1860; A.N. Afanasyev 1864; I.I. Sreznevsky 1959] and many others, who later became the founders of various trends in linguistics and the humanities in general, to one degree or another reflecting the search for "points of intersection", "points of mutual influence", "points of interpenetration " of folk thought and the living word of the people.

The most important — within the framework of the studied problems — are the researches of A.A. Potebnya, for whom language is nothing other than the culture of the people embodied in the word in all the diversity of its expression. Following Humboldt, Potebnya sees in language not only an instrument reflecting culture, but, more importantly, at the same time a mechanism generating thought. Creative potential is, as it were, inherent in language: “Thought is manifested through language, and each act of speaking is a creative process” [Bayburin 1989: 5]. In this aspect, speech etiquette can be fully understood as a creative speech activity demonstrating the result of the “art of communication” [Bayburin, Toporkov 1990: 15].

In Potebnya’s philosophical concept, such categories as “people” and “nationality” are of great importance. For Potebnya, the people are the creators of language, while language is the product of the “national spirit”. At the same time, it is language that determines the national specificity of the people, in Potebnya’s

terms — “nationality”. The same thing happens in folk speech etiquette: the people are the creators of their language, their “oral ethical code” [cited from: Sadova 2003: 26].

It is obvious that depending on the cultural and historical features of the territory, the national language acquires inevitable dialectal features, as if fixing these features. In this work, attention is focused on the regions of the Russian North, where a unique folk speech etiquette is formed, often differing (sometimes significantly!) even within the same region, as evidenced by the records of our Archive, made at the same time in the villages of the same region: a) Arkhangel'sk Region, 1986: «*Kljov na udu!*» — *esli idjosh' na rybalku*. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986). «*Schastlivogo ulova!*» — *tak prigovarivali, kogda na rybalku provozhali*. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986); b) Vologda Region, 2023 : «*Poezzhaj s Bogom*» — *vsjo, kak hochesh', dal'she*. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023). «*Ni cheshujki ni hvosta!*». *A on tja dolzhen poslat': «K chjortu!*». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023). In such cases, formulaic synonymy takes place — a very common phenomenon within the framework of etiquette units that perform a similar pragmatic function.

Potebni's thought about the mutual influence of language and mythological consciousness is reflected in our material: for example, closely related words often become a source of so-called "etymological magic" ("the sun bathes on Ivan Kupala; if a child is born at sunset, he will cry" [Tolstoy 1995: 317-319]), and the language is replenished. The nominations that have arisen as a result of the reaction to various mythological representations are, for example, the names of "household spirits". The interaction of language, which is realized in the etiquette of folk speech, and mythological consciousness, which is reflected in the ritual component of village life, influences the formation of special stable etiquette speech units. This interaction is actively studied in the works of folklorists A.K. Baiburin and A.L. Toporkov; the

works of V.P. Levkovich and A.B. Goffman³, describing custom and ritual in the processes of social regulation, are also well known.

In this dissertation research, the issues of the functioning of the opposition “ritual — etiquette” and a number of semantic oppositions arising from it: “sacredness — everyday life”, “collectivity — individuality”, “symbolicity — non-symbolicity” are some of the key tasks of the theoretical part of the work.

Ritual and etiquette have a common characteristic: in both cases, it is an established order of speech behavior, a kind of ceremonial. Ritual presupposes the presence of tradition, the presence of that mythological, often already lost context, which is not characteristic of etiquette. In verbalized form, part of the ritual, losing its ancient archaic ethnocultural properties, is filled with new content, conventionally called etiquette. This is the complex interaction of the opposition "ritual - etiquette", from which a number of semantic oppositions follow:

1. In the context of the opposition “sacredness — everyday life”, it is necessary to take into account the obvious: ritual presupposes communication in special (even sacred) cases that entail a revolution, a “transition” from one state to another, for example, a change in the social role or status of the participants in the ritual, a change in the life of an entire group, etc. It follows from this that “ritual (even periodically repeated) is always an event, a certain *crisis period* (emphasis mine) — *A. Ch.* in the life of the collective” [Bayburin, Toporkov 1990: 161]. Etiquette regulates everyday life, everyday communication, not tied to global changes in the life of society.

2. In the context of the opposition “collectivity — individuality”, it is necessary to note that the latter implies attachment to a specific pragmatic situation, in which much depends on the behavior (including “ritual competence”) of an individual. One of the main differences between the social nature of ritual and etiquette is that ritual is oriented toward the collective, etiquette — toward individual communication of communicants in one specific situation.

³See the bibliography.

3. From the point of view of the opposition “symbolicity — non-symbolicity” when analyzing the EFF, it is taken into account that any ritual within the framework of which it is supposed to reproduce a stable etiquette formula has obvious symbolicity; it always symbolizes important events of the participants (housewarming, wedding, funeral). This is a kind of playful creative act, often performed by the participants “unconsciously, following cultural tradition” [Adonyeva 2005]. Its main function is symbolic. Etiquette has symbolicity to a lesser degree and primarily performs its main functions — phatic and pragmatic.

When considering the EFF in the ethnolinguistic aspect, attention is drawn to the semantic-symbolic potential of the lexical units of the formula. In addition to the lexical semantics proper, the components of the formula may have a special cultural semantics, i.e. the area of those “pragmatic, symbolic, cultural, encyclopedic, etc. “meanings” that are “built on” the lexical semantics and are actualized only in special, peripheral, secondary, poetic, metaphorical, and other “indirect” uses of the word” [Tolstoy 1995: 289]. In the archaic formula *Belen'ko myt'*, pronounced when meeting a housewife washing clothes, the word-sign “belenko” actualizes the sense of “cleanliness, freshness”, which is not always directly related to the color white. In the formula *Siden'ju vashemu!* — *Sidet' po-nashemu!* The core lexical component is filled with various connotative meanings depending on the thematic situation: 1. *Sidenie, sidet'* are understood in the meaning of 'to be in a state of inactivity or peace, rest' [MAS 1988: 90]. In Russian folk etiquette, this action is usually performed by people of the older generation. In this connection, the following context is found in the records of the SDK Archive: *Esli starushki sidjat, to im govorjat: «Siden'ju vashemu», a oni uzh otvechajut: «Sidet' po-nashemu»* (Ignatovo, Cherepov., Volog, SDK-41, 1987). This kind of activity of the older generation must certainly be marked by peace and tranquility. 2. In the lexemes *sidie, sit*, the semantics 'being worn, to be located on the figure (or parts of the body) in one way or another' [Ibid.] (a characteristic of the fabric from which clothes are sewn) is actualized in those cases when the formula with favorable semantics functions as a greeting to a woman engaged in the weaving process: *Esli tkachiha zatykala, a v jeto*

vremja kto zajdjot, to govori: «Siden'e vashemu!»). A ona i otvetit: «Sidet' po-nashemu!»). Gost' i sadilsja, chtob polotno horosho sadilos'. (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

A word, fixed in the EFF in a certain position, immersing itself in the sphere of everyday traditional communication, often based on mythological representation, thus turns into a cultural sign.

The thesis formulated by N.I. Tolstoy on the isomorphism of word, object and action as equivalent cultural signs in the context of ritual communication is of key importance for any research in the aspect of ethnolinguistics [Tolstoy 1995: 23], taking this relationship into account is also important for our research. Using the material of folklore and ritual oral texts of Polesie, N.I. Tolstoy and S.M. Tolstaya examine the processes of semiotization, ritualization and pragmaticalization of the rite, the phenomena of mythological and cultural semantics of the verbal sign, and the analysis of its archaic symbolic meaning. These processes testify to the “integrity” of culture, i.e. the semantic unity of all its forms and genres (language, ritual, beliefs, folk art)” and “are determined by a single picture of the world of a person who perceives and comprehends the world and creates culture” [Tolstaya 2002: 2], which is also obvious in the formation of the EFF.

1.2. Small forms of folklore in ethnolinguistic light

In the study of multi-genre folklore, special attention should be paid to its small speech forms: sayings, proverbs, adages, omens, charms, riddles, nursery rhymes, counting rhymes, teasers, etc., as they have been little studied in the ethnolinguistic aspect. Similar forms in their ontology are also close to etiquette forms and formulas of folk speech, which are the object of this dissertation research. According to formal features (text space, component mobility, genre marginality), these texts can be classified as small speech genres, which in the most general form are “stable, cliched speech segments generated by recurring situations (for example, forms of greeting, congratulations, telephone communication, etc.)” [Sadova 2003: 26]. Small speech genres are also characterized by “content homogeneity (message about one fact, one event, etc.), an extreme degree of compression, a standard form

(a monotonous, often cliched message structure, a limited, often given set of linguistic and stylistic means)” [Ivanov 2022: 902].

In modern linguistic folklore studies, small forms (genres) of folklore are actively studied in various aspects by a number of researchers.

The works of G.L. Permyakov are well known, who examined in detail proverbs, sayings, phraseological units and “a number of cliched linguistic forms representing a closed chain of sentences” [Permyakov 1970: 52], which he calls "superphrasal unities". These include "various kinds of fables, jokes, fables, riddles, fairy tales and some other texts that are used in a predetermined form" [Ibid.]. By the latter, Permyakov means various "economic, legal, medical sayings and signs" [Ibid.: 86], which seem to be close in their ontology to the etiquette forms and formulas of folk speech: *Hto chego rabotat, skazhut: «Bog na pomoch'!» A sejchas: «Trud na pol'zu!»* (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986); *I vot byla primeta: cherez reku moloka ne davat'. Esli s molokom idjot (zhenshhina), to govorit' nel'zja, ni stavit' nel'zja i po gostjam hodit' nel'zja s jetim molokom, poka po domu ne dojdjosh'. Moloko iz ruk v ruki ne peredajut. Jeto na korovu otrazhaetsja. S molokom shutki plohi.* (Bol'shoe Krotovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); *Nu, vot kapustu sadjat, dak govorjat: «Ne bud' golenasta, a bud' korenasta!».* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023). In these cases, “the concept of a small text form is to a certain extent conditional, since it is based, on the one hand, primarily on the linear volume of the text, and on the other, on its genre properties (form, content, linguistic and/or stylistic features)” [Ivanov 2022: 902].

The language of proverbs and sayings is most actively and comprehensively studied as the most structured and having a large collection fund of folklore texts. The works of Z.K. Tarlanov on the study of the syntax of proverbs are widely known, the initial thesis of which is the assertion that "the syntax of proverbs is the syntax of living folk speech of a certain period, brought to perfection" [Tarlanov 1999: 39]. This apt and very promising judgment for our study (on the perfection of the structure of a small phraseological unit) opens up the possibility of looking at the structure of an etiquette formula as something "systemic", as a kind of "matrix"

outside a specific act of speech, capable of being filled with lexical units characteristic of a given time and a given region. This does not change the function and general meaning of the formula.

Etiquette speech formations have a special syntax, where live spontaneous speech, which is unprepared, informal, uncodified, etc. (see, for example, [Lapteva 2007; Shvedova 1960]), is, however, combined with stable formulas that should be pronounced in a given situation. Often, such formulas represent dialogue structures: *Esli tkachiha zatykála, a v jeto vremja kto zajdjot, to govorili: «Siden'e vashemu!».* *A ona i otvetit: «Sidet' po-nashemu!».* *Gost' i sadilsja, chtob polotno horosho sadilos'.* (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987); *Pomnju, chto vot hozjajka esli tkjot, dak kto pridjot, da pozhelan'e: «Sto lokót na prishvicu».* *A hozjajka-to otvechala: «Sto rublej v karman».* (Bol'shoe Krotovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); *Kak ohotnik idjot v les, emu chjo govorjat? — «Ni puha ni pera!».* *On tozhe dolzhen skazat': «Idi ty k chjortu!».* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023).

Omens and dream omens are had been well studied in the linguafolkloristic aspect. In the works of T.S. Sadova [Sadova 2003; She 2021], linguistic features are identified that are primarily associated with the search for the "proto-form" of a small folklore genre text that certainly has ancient content. Discussions about the marginality of the genre form [Zemtsovsky 1985: 24–30; Levinton 1998: 56–71] of one "archaic content" are very important when studying its "fluidity" — thus, a sign can "transform" into both a prohibition and a fortune-telling maxim, it can also be presented in the form of a saying and (even) a proverb.

Similar evidence of marginality, for example, of the form of good wishes, can be traced in our material. Thus, the formula pronounced when planting a plant can be a conditionally symbolic sentence, or a pragmatically oriented spell with a specific pragmatic goal — to grow a good harvest: *Kogda sazhaesh' (kapustu), nado, chtob nikto tebja ne videl. Nado skazat': «Rasti, kapusta, gusta, golenasta i puzasta».* *Posle jetogo hlopnut' sebja tri raza po jagodicam* (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog, SDK-2000); *Nu, vot kapustu sadjat, dak govorjat: «Ne bud' golenasta, a bud' korenasta!»* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023); *Na kapustu prigovarivali: «Ne rodis'*

golenasta, a rodis' puzasta», — *chtoby kochan nalivalsja* (Nikol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023).

In the Moscow ethnolinguistic school, small forms of ritual poetry have been and are being actively studied: lexical and cultural-mythological features of ritual invitations, ritual dialogues, lamentations, fortune-telling (N.I. Tolstoy, S.M. Tolstaya, L.N. Vinogradova); symbolism of wedding ceremony texts (A.V. Gura), etc. The large-scale lexicographic project "Slavic Antiquities" is the result of many years of research carried out by ethnolinguistic scientists (from 1992 to 1996 — under the leadership of N.I. Tolstoy).

Forms of folk speech etiquette, due to their genre uncertainty and heterogeneity, are not very actively studied in modern linguistics, but there are informative scientific publications by L.Yu. Zorina [Zorina 2012], who mainly describes good wishes in the Vologda region. Of interest are the studies of V.V. Pleshakova [Pleshakova 1997], devoted to the study of good wishes as a special folklore speech genre. Indicative are individual notes by L.N. Vinogradova [Vinogradova 2016], O.A. Cherepanova [Cherepanova 1995: 169–176], O.V. Meshkova [Meshkova 2010: 69–72], V.N. Grishanova [Grishanova 1999: 324–336] and others, related to some linguistic and literary aspects of the etiquette of living folk speech.

The material of this dissertation has a number of specific features, covering both the formal and substantive characteristics of the texts studied: firstly, as already indicated, it represents field notes of different periods by philologists-Russianists of Leningrad State University / St. Petersburg State University, made in different regions of the Russian North under the program of an ethnolinguistic expedition. Secondly, taking as a basis (when selecting texts from a huge array of records) the thesis on the contact- establishing function of etiquette formulas and forms, we obtained a corpus of texts of different communicative pragmatics — from everyday household good wishes to ritual formulas of address and greeting, which are used not only in communication between people, but also between people and local spirits, plants, natural phenomena, "speech contacts" with which are not much

different from interpersonal ones. Thirdly, a number of texts included in our corpus are introduced into scientific circulation for the first time, since they have a manuscript expeditionary status that did not have a publication form, therefore the dissertation is provided with an appendix with a full list of texts subjected to linguistic analysis. Fourthly, the notes record some variations of stable formulas, which is of particular interest in connection with the question of the “boundaries of tradition” [Vinogradova 2016].

S.M. Tolstaya emphasizes that such oral texts have a synthetic nature, “an appeal to ritual, their blood connection with the ethnographic context and beliefs and, at the same time, a closeness to paremiology, phraseology, linguistic clichés, and, finally, a saturation with formal and semantic archaisms” [Tolstaya 2002: 2], which allows us to consider these “open” texts in various aspects.

1.3. Forms and formulas of oral text

Folklore texts, as is known, have a formulaic nature: “formulaicity in its various modifications is a direct manifestation of the canon in traditional culture” [Maltsev 1989: 6]. Folk speech etiquette includes forms and formulas of different formats and content, which are determined mainly by everyday obligations and traditional culture — both general ethnic and local. There are different points of view on the definition of forms and formulas in a folklore text.

Western European scholars M. Parry and A. Lord, studying the structure of the epic song, introduce the concept of “formula” and give the following definition: formula is “a group of words regularly encountered in the same metrical conditions and serving to express one or another meaning” [Parry 1930: 80]. Supplementing and continuing a more detailed development of Parry's theory, A. Lord examines the so-called “formula expression”, which is “a verse or hemistich constructed according to the model of a formula” [Lord 1960: 58]. According to Lord, formulas are “not the ossified clichés... they are capable of change and are indeed frequently highly productive of other and new formulas” [Ibid.], which is expressed in the high variability of the folklore formula as a whole.

In Russian science, formulas (as stable expressions with a special aesthetic-pragmatic task in the composition of a folklore text) attracted the attention of many linguists and philologists, since the obviousness of the repetition of a number of lexical-stylistic unities most typical for a specific genre was so indisputable that it often did not require separate conclusions (see [Buslaev 1861: 14–15]). However, a more detailed study of the issues of variability, component stability, origin, variability and “survivability” of a particular formula led to the need to study the formula as a constituent unit of a folklore text in more detail.

Thus, the Slovenian linguist F. Miklošič was one of the first to point out the “typical places” (a characteristic feature of the folklore style of the heroic epic), which were studied using the material of the Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian, Ukrainian and Russian epics” [Egorova 2016: 1]. In approximately the same direction, but using the material of bylinas, the “typical places” were comprehensively studied by the classics of Russian science A.F. Gilferding and V. Miller, who made a great contribution to the study of the “formula question” of the language of folklore. A.F. Gilferding identified two components in bylinas: “typical places, mostly of descriptive content, or containing speeches put into the mouths of heroes, and transitional places that connect typical places with each other and in which the course of action is narrated” [Gilferding 1949: 57].

The works of A.N. Veselovsky are well known. He studied in detail the stable forms and formulas of poetic and ritual texts, “traced the repetition of “commonplaces,” *topoi*, and unchanging formulas in the broad chronological and areal framework of literature” [Veselovsky 1989: 316]. His research was carried out in the historical and cultural aspect using literary methods.

Rosianu [Roshiyanu 1974], based on the material of fairy tales (mainly Romanian and some tales of Slavic, Western European and Eastern peoples), is taken into account. Examining the structure of traditional formulas, Rosianu “establishes invariant models according to which specific variants are realized. These models ultimately reflect the patterns that underlie traditional formulas” [Ibid.]. In this direction, the present study attempts to identify the invariant and variable zones of

the EFF in each thematic block, for which the methods of classifying formula variants used in folkloristic textology are used⁴.

In addition, traditional fairy-tale formulas were considered in the works of N.M. Gerasimova, N.M. Vedernikova, O.A. Davydova, G.Ya. Simina and some others⁵, offering various interpretations of the concept of a traditional formula. A definition that is structurally close to our material is offered by G.Ya. Simina, who notes that “these stable formulas represent a sentence or a group of sentences, rhythmically organized by external or internal rhyme, lexical repetitions” [Simina 1977: 110]: *Esli mesto gotovish', a kto chuzhoj i voshjol, to govorit: «Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!»*. *A ty otvechaesh': «Sto rublej v moshnu!»* (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

Traditional folklore formulas became the object of research by G.I. Maltsev, who saw in them “stable components of the traditional text — constant epithets, stable comparisons and tropes, “typical”, “commonplaces”, “moving passages”, thematic standards, stylistic clichés, figurative stereotypes, etc.”, which “formulate situations, images of characters, their feelings, actions, characteristics, speeches, depiction of nature, the passage of time, etc., down to the smallest stylistic details” [Maltsev 1989: 3]. Maltsev conducted an analysis of the features of the formulas of Russian non-ritual lyrics in the current folklore tradition, revealing their aesthetic specificity.

Certainly, historians, literary scholars and cultural scientists have made a serious contribution to the study of oral speech forms and formulas, whose comments are taken into account by the author of the dissertation. However, it should be emphasized that in this work this issue is considered from a linguistic point of view.

In this vein, the works of A. T. Khrolenko are noted [Khrolenko 1981: 3–16], who, using the material of Russian lyrical song, proposed the first linguistic (especially importantly, linguafolkloristic) description of types of phraseological

⁴See paragraph 2.2.

⁵See the bibliography.

units and a new concept of a formula. Khrolenko's research is also important from the point of view of his significant study of the semantics of the folklore word as a whole [Khrolenko 1992].

Fundamentally different from all previous linguistic studies is the linguistic research of P.P. Chervinsky, who considers form as a "grammatical structure of tradition, a sense of folklore semantics as a language." [Chervinsky 2011: 27] The scientist presents a specific view on the study of traditional formulas of song folklore.

Finally, the approach of G.L. Permyakov, who studied the totality of small forms of folklore and attempted to create a "general theory of clichés," seems relevant. In this case, he understands form very broadly, equating it with an "open" folklore genre capable of changing its genre status depending on contextual necessity. He identifies several forms: 1) part of a sentence (phraseologisms); 2) sentences (proverbs, sayings); 3) chains of sentences of varying length (fables, tales, anecdotes); dialogues (jokes, business forms) [Permyakov 1970: 103–104]. In structural terms, this theory can be partially applied to our material, with respect to the last two points: EFFs mainly represent sentences or chains of sentences (dialogical texts) in the function of greeting, gratitude, farewell, etc.: «*Belo stirat' (myt')!*» (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000); *A trud na pol'zu! — Spasibo. «Bog na pomoch'!»*. *Ran'she vsjo: «Bog na pomoch'» ved', a tut stal «trud-to»*. (Kobeljova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); *Rabotat kto, skazhut: «Torgovat' v pol'zu!»*. *A hto i otvetit: «Ne znam, mozhe pol'zy net, a delam»*. (Ust'-Pjoza, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).

All existing approaches to the study of oral speech forms and formulas highlight various aspects of the study of stable speech units of folk speech. However, a number of similar judgments are still obvious despite certain differences in terminology. Thus, the common features of the so-called "formulaic fact" are its "stereotypicality, stability, repeatability" [Maltsev 1989: 5]. This point of view is shared by the well-known researcher of Russian folklore I. A. Razumova [Razumova 1984], who calls formulas "formulaic stereotypes" and identifies the most common features: "1) *stability* , based on a rigid structure, syntactic and lexical- semantic

identity and, in most cases, on rhythmic-sound organization; 2) *stability* as constancy in the process of transmitting tradition, in other words, "the formula is preserved over time (at a certain stage in the existence of the genre) and is reproduced by different performers, is found in fairy tales on different plots, is repeated in the same text"; 3) *the integrity* of the meaning and significance contained in the stereotype" [Egorova 2016: 4]. These features are also characteristic of etiquette forms and formulas of popular speech.

The same "formulaic" phenomenon is called by researchers by different terms: "typical places" (A.F. Gilferding), "common place" (A.N. Veselovsky, P.G. Bogatyrev, E.M. Meletinsky, etc.), "formulaic expression" (A. Lord), "leitmotif" (P.G. Bogatyrev, L.A. Astafieva), "formulaic stereotype" (I.A. Razumova), and some others.

In this dissertation research, the units of the formula phenomenon are terminologically designated as etiquette folklore formulas (EFF) — as a broad naming of traditional stable text units that perform an etiquette function in various culturally marked situations. Thus, the etiquette formula in the work is understood as a stable, nationally specific unit of speech communication: «*S ljogkim parom!*» — *kto pomylsja. A kto ne pomylsja: «S budushhim!*» (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000). Etiquette form — as a partially stable (in terms of content), but free (in terms of expression) unit of speech etiquette, existing in the speech of a specific dialect speaker. In other words, it is a certain stable model of traditional content, capable of including new content, "claiming" to be traditional. For example, informants often say that they themselves come up with certain wishes, "speak in their own words", while preserving the general structural features of the traditional formula: «*Trud na pol'zu!*». «*Zdorov'e v ruki!*». «*Chistota v izbe!*» *Byvaet, i sam pridumaet.* (Ustreka, Moshensk., Novg., SDK-45, 1989); *Vsegda nuzhno poblagodarit'. «Spasibo, ban'ka milaja» — svoimi slovami. Vsegda govorju. «Oj ty umnica moja». So vsemi razgovarivaju: hot' teplica, kogo pohvalju, kogo porugaju* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

In any traditional society, as is known, a system of rules of conduct, rules of speech, rules of family existence, etc. is formed, often rooted in the mythological past — a unique and always culturally marked ethical code.

Ethics as a broad, comprehensive cultural phenomenon regulating the moral behavior of a person in society includes an important element — etiquette (from the French *étiquette* — label, inscription) as “an established order of behavior, forms of treatment somewhere” [MAS 1988: 769]. Knowledge of etiquette is necessary, since in society “it is considered important, significant and worthy to make a certain sign, a sign of respect and reverence, a sign of love and sympathy, etc.” [Berdyayev 1993: 213].

In a traditional society, the ethical sphere is sometimes quite difficult to define, since there are no established norms of behavior and communication recognized in the generally accepted sense. There is a system of special rules, regulations and prohibitions, which has a “high degree of regulation of the entire way of life: work, relations between the sexes, family and social roles, space, time, food, speech behavior, attitudes toward animals and plants, etc. are strictly regulated (and ritualized)” [Tolstaya 2000: 373]. These regulations in everyday communication are served, among other things, by a number of formulaic conditional-etiquette speech units.

The problem of the formulaic nature of speech units is considered in this study within the framework of the etiquette of popular speech.

The phenomena of speech etiquette and etiquette in general have been extensively studied in various aspects. The works of N. I. Formanovskaya [Formanovskaya 1989], V.G. Kostomarov [Kostomarov 1967: 56–62], A.A. Akishina (co-authored with N.I. Formanovskaya) [Akishina, Formanovskaya 1975], V. E. Goldin [Goldin 1978], I.A. Sternin [Sternin 1996], A.G. Balakai [Balakai 2002], V.I. Karasik [Karasik 2003], A.V. Zanadvorova [Zanadvorova 2003], N. G. Tyrnikova [Tyrnikova 2003] are devoted to both general cultural and purely linguistic issues of speech etiquette. In the cited works, the authors describe phenomena, first of all, of urban speech.

Folk speech etiquette is partly integrated into the general theory of speech etiquette and falls under the characteristics identified by I.A. Sternin: situationality, regulatory nature, consistency, and the presence of a communicative framework [Sternin 1996: 4–5]. However, the system of etiquette norms of peasant life still has its own fundamentally distinctive features. For example, in folk speech etiquette, “not only a person, but also virtually any other object that acquires human attributes in the act of communication can act as a partner in a communicative act. A kind of “total anthropomorphization” of nature occurs. Thus, the rules of etiquette can be observed not only in relation to another person, but also in relation to an animal, a tree, the earth, as well as the spirits of ancestors, characters of folk demonology, etc.” [Bayburin, Toporkov 1990: 7]. Such are, for example, a) appeals to house spirits, forest spirits, etc.: *Dedushka-domovejushka, pusti, poj, kormi, obuvaj, odevaj i obogrevaj. Ljubi i beregi.* (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Govorját, nádo idtí, výbrat' mésto, sprosít' hozjáina: «Hozjáin-lesovój, pustí menjá ne noch' nochevát', a vek vekovát'».* (Chjornaja, Bat., Novg., 1988); b) appeals to personified holidays: *V Egorij voz'mu ikonku i ves' dvor obojdu, i prigovarivaju: «Egorij-batjushka, sohrani moju skotinushku ot zlyh ljudej, ot zverej», a to dva remeshka postelju nakrest i zamok poveshu na pervuju dver' na dvor, togda korovushka budet doma derzhat'sja* (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987); c) appeals to plants: *Kidali nogoj-to cherez golovu, da — «Rasti, ljonók, bol'shoj da dolgoj», govorili, da vrode kak pesok brosalí, vrode kak pesok, pomnju vot, chto brosalí i govorili vsjo.* (Anfalovo, Cherep., Volog., SDK-38, 1987) and so on.

In the considered EFF, the elements of “ritualism” and “etiquette” are closely intertwined. This issue remains unresolved in modern science. On the one hand, the archaic mythological subtext is obvious, on the other hand, there is a clearly expressed “condensation of thought” [Grechko 1985: 177], the obscured meaning of the reproduced formula, forgotten by the modern dialect speaker. “*Belenko Vam!*” is said to a woman who is busy with washing. However, such etiquette formulas in speech are necessary and even obligatory in use in specific situations, since “a reference to the law of ancestors (“this is how they did it before”, “this is how the

ancestors established it”) is the main and universal way of motivating actions in a given system of behavior” [Bayburin 1985: 12]. It is interesting that in this case, “the question “why this way and not otherwise?” is of no importance, since the whole point of tradition is precisely to do as it was done “the first time” during the “first deeds”. Such a universal motivation for actions is a consequence of such a combination of diachrony and synchrony, in which the past (myth or mythologized tradition) acts as an explanation of the present, and sometimes the future” [Levada 1965: 111]. Apparently, a dialect speaker intuitively reproduces only those formulas that seem familiar to him, that suggest something to him precisely because of their traditional nature: “those formulas, images, plots that do not suggest anything to us at the given time, do not respond to our demand for figurative idealization, die out or are forgotten; those whose suggestiveness is fuller and more varied and lasts longer are retained in memory and updated” [Ibid.: 58].

Stable folklore formulas and their variability are always conditioned by tradition [Chistov 2005]. A.N. Veselovsky noted that "these are the frames in which thought is accustomed to work and without which it cannot do" [Veselovsky 1989: 74]. Moreover, "these frames wear out; their vitality depends on our ability to suggest new content to them and on their capacity" [Ibid.]. Dialect speakers in such cases often invent new oral speech forms themselves, focusing on the traditional structure of an already established, accepted speech etiquette formula. For example, it is customary to thank each other for a service or help well rendered. In rural society, anthropomorphized natural phenomena, such as a forest, can often act as such assistants that need to be thanked: *Nado, govorjat, v les zajti dak na 4 storony poklonit'sja i poprosit', kak govoritsja: «Les-batjushka, a zemlja-matushka, daj...».* *I vyjti, i spasibo skazat'* (Kolodozero, Pudozh., Karelija, SDK-2006); household items, for example, a bathhouse: *Vsegda nuzhno poblagodarit'. «Spasibo, ban'ka milaja» — svoimi slovami. Vsegda govorju* (Nikol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023). As you can see, the semantic proposition of the forms in these cases does not change, only their structure changes in accordance with the cultural ideas of the dialect speaker. "Formality" as such is preserved in this case in the intention of the

addresser (to express gratitude), which is expressed in the lexical content of the etiquette — in this case — form.

Thus, the forms and formulas of oral etiquette text retain the characteristics of stability, sustainability, integrity (according to I.A. Razumova) and repeatability. All four features clearly characterize the functioning of etiquette formulas as stable units of speech culture. The feature of stability is not observed in those cases where a different interpretation of the structure and meaning of speech expression is noted, which is noticeably manifested in etiquette forms. However, both are formed within the framework of tradition, which allows us to conclude about the universal stability of EFF and their fixation in the consciousness of the inhabitant of the Russian North.

1.4. Description of research material

Russian Russian Language Department of St. Petersburg State University field records of expeditions made by students, graduate students and university teachers from 1984 to 2024 during scientific expeditions under a special expedition program of ethnolinguistic orientation, in the amount of almost 400 units, recording the analyzed effects reproduced in specific everyday situations of a resident of the Russian North, serve as the main material of the dissertation research. It is necessary to clarify that, following T.A. Bernshtam and K.V. Chistov, the Russian North is understood as a vast “historical and geographical area” [Bernshtam, Chistov 1992: 3–6], which “includes Arkhangelsk, Novgorod, Pskov, Vologda, Leningrad, Tver, parts of Yaroslavl, Kostroma and Perm regions, the Republic of Karelia and Komi” [Melnikova 2017: 18].

The speech forms and formulas under study are found in different sections of the expedition classifier, the most relevant of which are the sections "Folk etiquette", "Economy", "Folklore", "Demonology" and the subsections "Sowing and harvest", "Weaving", "Holidays", recorded mainly in the Arkhangelsk, Vologda and Novgorod regions. Contexts recorded in the Leningrad and Tver regions and the Republic of Karelia are involved.

All the studied forms of folk speech that perform an etiquette function are considered in the work in a complex cultural ritual-etiquette unity and are classified according to several criteria.

The first criterion for classification is the characteristic of the degree of stability of the existence of a particular form in speech and its fixation in the consciousness of the dialect speaker. In this case, stability can be expressed both in the grammatical structure of the form and in its content. In this case, EFF are divided into etiquette formulas (stable units) and etiquette forms (stable in content, but free in expression).

The etiquette of folk speech is a complexly structured cultural whole, often genetically linked to a rite (ritual). From the point of view of ethnographers and culturologists, etiquette “separated from customs and rites comparatively late; in folk culture, it is often very difficult or even impossible to separate the sphere of etiquette behavior from ritual behavior with a sufficient degree of certainty” [Vinogradova 2000: 325]. In this regard, folk speech etiquette includes not only formulas for communication between people, but also, for example, appeals to characters of folk demonology (often appearing in ritual actions), in particular — house spirits, who also take a direct part in the life and everyday life of the village. Obviously, this is a special type of mythologized communication, which is not regulated by the etiquette of modern urban speech. From the above, **the second criterion for classification** naturally follows — the correlation of the studied speech forms with the ritual, as a result of which they can be divided into proper etiquette (forms and formulas of greeting, farewell, gratitude, etc.) and ritual-etiquette (forms and formulas of addressing a mythological patron, prohibitions, etc.). At the same time, EFF are almost always situationally conditioned, in connection with which they can be divided into thematic blocks that reflect the everyday life of a villager and build pragmatically oriented communication. Our material covers 16 such blocks-situations, which, in turn, can be combined into two groups: **I. Labor, management, trade:** 1) Labor (*Trud na pol'zu! Bog v pomoch'! Privet trudu!*); 2) Weaving (*Sto lokot na prishvicu!*); 3) Fishing (*Kljov na udu! Ni cheshujki ni*

hvosta! — K chjortu!); 4) Hunting (Ni puha ni pera! — K chjortu!); 5) Washing (Belen'ko myt'! Belo na vode!); 6) Milking a cow (More pod korovoj! Reka moloka! More do kolena!); 7) Cooking (Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!); 8) Gardening (I na nishhego, i na zavidushhego! Ne bud' golenasta, a bud' korenasta!); 9) Collecting gifts from the forest (Daj Bog gribov na polnuju korzinu!). **II. Home, road, person:** 1) Meal (*Chaj da sahar! Hleb da sol'!*); 2) Bathhouse (*S ljogkim parom! Par v banju! Bozh'ja blagodat'!*); 3) Road (*Schastlivogo puti! V dal'njuju dorogu!*); 4) Home (*Mir vashemu domu!*); 5) Sneeze, cough, yawn (*Bud' zdrav! Schastliv bud'!*); 6) Sleep (*Mat' pered snom molitvu uchila menja govorit': «Lozhus' so Hristom, / Nagrazhdajus' krestom. / Tam angely stojat / Moju dushu storozhat». Tak tri raza).*

III. Holidays.

At the same time, some thematic blocks can be classified according to gender and age characteristics: some situations relate only to the world of men (hunting, fishing), some — exclusively to the sphere of women's activities (washing, cooking), but there are universal ones (work, harvest, etc.).

The considered etiquette speech forms according to formal features can take one or another folklore-genre form. However, as is known, in folk speech one genre can easily be built into another, and that in turn — into a third, therefore the “genre” classification, especially of small folklore forms, is often given very conditionally. This question remains naturally open for folklorists to this day. In this connection, **the third criterion** for classifying etiquette forms (specific recording) of folk speech is their correlation with a certain speech (folklore) genre. The studied forms can be a good wish, a sign, a proverb, a sentence, a spell, etc.

As can be seen, the studied material allows us to create a detailed classification of all EFF, which are characterized in the dissertation according to the three described criteria: 1) stability of grammatical and substantive form; 2) ritual-etiquette correlation; 3) folklore-genre correlation.

1.5. Conclusions for Chapter I

1. In modern science, ethnolinguistics is a relevant linguistic direction that studies the interpenetration of language and culture in archaic forms. EFF are considered in this dissertation research in ethnolinguistic and linguafolkloristic aspects, taking into account 3 main level codes: verbal, actional and subject. In the case of our material, it is obvious that etiquette formulas in the conditions of traditional communication act as units of spiritual culture.

2. In the linguistic analysis of the EFF, the specific cultural opposition “ritual — etiquette” and a number of semantic oppositions associated with it are taken into account: “sacredness — everyday life”, “collectivity — individuality”, “symbolicity — non-symbolicity”.

3. 3. The main terms of the study are ‘etiquette forms and formulas of folk speech (EFF)’, ‘etiquette formula’, ‘etiquette form’, ‘folklore genre’. EFF is considered in this paper as a broad naming of traditional stable textual units that perform contact-establishing function in various culturally marked situations. In this case, an **etiquette formula** is a stable, nationally specific unit of speech etiquette, which is widespread and has largely lost its mythological or other archaic basis, retaining in its structure the core lexical components (a word or a combination of words). **Etiquette forms** are stable speech units recorded and, presumably, existing in a limited territory of the Russian North, or such units that substantively and functionally fulfil the role of etiquette speech rules, but are expressed ‘freely’, without reliance on the nuclear components of the well-known formula. In the context of the discussion of the structural units of folk speech, the term **folklore genre**, which is understood in this paper as a stable traditional form of a work of a specific functional assignment, in which EFFs can be ‘clothed’, requires a special reservation.

4. EFFs have stability, sustainability, integrity and repeatability, which allows them to function within the framework of tradition. At the same time, the sign of stability, expressing the "rigidity" of the structural-semantic construction, may

not be observed in etiquette forms of various functions (greeting, gratitude, farewell) due to the interpretation of the dialect speaker, which has a high variability.

5. The research material consists of about 400 units of text records from the Archive of the SDK of the Russian Language Department of St. Petersburg State University, recording the analyzed EFF, determined by the everyday reality of a resident of the Russian North.

6. EFF are classified according to three main criteria: 1) stability of grammatical and substantive form; 2) ritual-etiquette correlation; 3) folklore-genre correlation. During the analysis, 16 thematic situationally conditioned blocks are taken into account.

**Chapter II. Etiquette forms and formulas in everyday
speech of a resident of the Russian North: functioning, pragmatics,
linguistic specificity**

EFF in the context of traditional communication represent a complex of speech culture units, determined by the historical and cultural space of the regions of the Russian North and the multi-temporal characteristics of the collected field notes (1984–2024). Taking into account the format of the field notes (handwritten; printed; using recording equipment), which were carried out by students, postgraduates and teachers of the Russian Language Department of St. Petersburg State University (LSU), the ethnolinguistic focus of the expedition program requires a number of reservations in connection with the upcoming analysis of specific texts:

a) the basis of the thematic classification of the EFF is the questionnaire program “Spiritual Culture of the Russian North in Folk Literature”, according to which the material was collected;

b) thematic classification represents the distribution of texts according to the spheres of their practical existence, which largely determines the consideration of their communicative function;

c) the linguistic specificity of all forms (both non-ritual and ritual) of everyday communication of a person within the framework of the so-called traditional communication, i.e. culturally marked, is analyzed, taking into account the different types of communicants (person + person, person + mythological character, etc.) in their main contact-establishing (pragmatic) function.

2.1. Spheres of existence of EFF: thematic groups

In rural society, in everyday traditional communication, EFF function in almost all everyday spheres of an inhabitant of the Russian North. According to the questionnaire, divided into thematic headings, the analyzed speech segments are found: in the section "Farm" and its subsections "Weaving", "Home. Yard", "Cattle"; in the section "Nature" and its subsection "Plants"; in independent sections "Demonology", "Folklore", "Calendar", "Folk Etiquette", which makes up the bulk of the classifier. These sections are the basis for the thematic classification of EFF,

which can be presented in the form of table 1. All EFF can be divided into **proper etiquette (SEFF)** and **ritual-etiquette (REFF)** (in situations *Home, Forest, Gardening, Holidays*), collected in several thematic blocks-situations, which in turn are distributed into three groups: **I. Work, management, trade. II. Home, road, man. III. Holidays.**

I. Labor, management, trade

In the presented group, EFFs related to the performance of various types of work or trades are analyzed, taking into account gender characteristics. In the village, exclusively female activities (weaving, cooking, washing) and male ones (fishing, hunting, chopping firewood) are traditionally distinguished.

Work

The material of this study contains a wide range of EFFs related to a person performing some kind of work. L.Yu. Zorina, for example, calls such formulas “labor good wishes” [Zorina 2012: 31]: *Bog v pomoshh'! Trud na pol'zu! Pomogaj Bog!* etc. Indeed, often these universal formulas perform the function of greeting with the semantics of good wishes, which a dialect speaker pronounces upon a chance meeting on the street with a person busy with some kind of work (field work, chopping wood, washing, etc.): *Esli pashet ili zhnjot, govorili jamu — kto skazhet: «Bog pomoch'!» ili «Trud na pol'zu!»*. (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991); *Dak jeto vseгда govorili. Jeto koda drova koljat, ja grju: «Nu, Bog pomogat tebe?» — «Pomogaet»*. (Ostankovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024); или же приветствует трудящегося в доме (ткачество, приготовление пищи и под.): *A nekotory prigovarivali: «Trud na pol'zu!» — kogda v dom vhodili, esli tkjot kto*. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

As can be seen, contexts often mention a specific type of work, in which it is desirable to use the "labor" etiquette formula. But there are also contexts when such a universal formula is pronounced without specifying the subject of the "labor" situation, which is indicated by the verb *rabotaet* in the impersonal construction: *Bog pomoch' vam! — esli rabotaet*. (Staroruss., Novg., SDK-54, 1994); or the verbal noun *rabotaet*. in the position of a predicate: *Chelovek za rabotoj — «Bog*

pomoshh'!» — *govorjat* (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997); or in the position of a circumstance in combination with the definitive pronoun “any”: «*Trud na pol'zu!*» — *govorili pri ljuboj rabote*. (Ignatovo, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

Such EFFs can be divided into two large groups based on the presence of a nuclear lexical component: “God” and “labor”:

EFF with the nuclear component "God":

Bog na pomoch' / Bog na pomoshch' / Bog na pomoc' / Boh na pomoshh'! (20)
Bog v pomoshh'! (7) / *Bez Boga ne do poroga!* (2) / *Bog pomoshh'* (2) / *Bozh'ja pomoshh(ch)!* (2) / *Pomogaj Bog!* / *Pomogi vam Bog!* (5)

EFF with the nuclear component "labor":

Trud v pol'zu! (4) / *Trud na pol'zu!* (9) / *Privet trudu!* (2) / *Slava trudu!* (1)
Uspeh trudu! (1)

There are also those that differ in their lexical composition and are found in isolated contexts: *Delo v pol'zu!* / *Torgovat' v pol'zu!* / *Uspeh v rabote!* and some others.

In total, our material contains 83 uses of "labor" EFFs. This is the largest quantitative group.

As has already been said, the material contains a fairly wide group of contexts in which EFFs are used in accordance with the specific theme of a “labor” situation, which is usually indicated by the semantic predicate at: *Zdorovalis': «Sto lokot na prishvicu!»* — *esli tkjot. Otvechat: «Spasibo», — da i vsjo.* (*Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985*); *Esli kto-nibud' bel'jo poloshhet, a ty mimo idjosh', podojdjosh' i skazhesh': «Belén'ko poloshhi!».* *A tebe i otvetjat: «Spasibo!»* (*Srednie Chud'i, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987*). Such formulas have a special linguistic specificity, reflecting the largely mythologized dialectal consciousness of the speaker and listener. They should be considered as separate, full-fledged groups.

Weaving

Weaving as a special type of women's craft is associated with mythological ideas about "the creation of human life, society and the Cosmos based on the idea of

bringing harmony to chaos, transforming the natural into the cultural" [Valentsova 2012: 278]. The weaving process is accompanied by special "magic spells at all stages of this craft, including sowing, weeding, harvesting fibrous plants, their primary processing, processing the finished fiber into thread (spinning), preparing the threads into fabric (winding and warping), the actual weaving and processing the fabric (bleaching)" [Pavlova 1993: 170–183]. From the entire ritual complex of etiquette formulas-sentences, our material records only those that are pronounced as good wishes to the weaver engaged in the weaving process. Specific EFFs may differ in their structure, but usually they are dialogic greeting texts that suggest various options for a response: *Speh tebe za stav (staf)! (1) / Speh za krjosnami! (1) / Sto lokot na prishvicu! (5) — Sto zhenihov pod okoshko! (1) Spasibo! (1) Sto rublej v karman! (2) / Siden'e vashemu! — Sidet' po-nashemu! (1)*. The SDK material contains 8 usages.

Washing and rinsing clothes

Another exclusively female activity, which can be accompanied by greeting EFF. The formula has many different variations, both phonetic and lexical, and even grammatical:

Bélén'ko! (6) / Belen'ke tebe! / (1) Belen'ko vam! / (1) Belen'ko poloshhi! (1) / Nabelo Bog na pomoch'! / Nabelo, Bog na pomoc'! (3) / Belo stirat' (myt')! (1) / Nabelo koryto! (1) / Pomogaj Bog! (3) / Belo na vode! (2) — Spasibo! (3).

The SDK material contains 16 uses. As the materials of expeditions of recent years show, the situation of washing or rinsing clothes on the street / in the river is no longer relevant, which is natural for modern realities.

Milking a cow

A special ritual action is accompanied by greeting EFFs in dialogue form: *More moloka! (1) / More pod korovoj! (2) / More pod korovu! (1) (— Daj Bog bole! (1) / More do kolena! (1) (— Reka moloka! (2) Vedro moloka! (1).*

In addition, there are a number of etiquette -verbal prohibitions associated with ritualized objects used in the process of milking a cow: *milk, milk pail*, which are also included in the system of folk etiquette as a mandatory element:

1. *S molokom idjosh' — ne zdorovajsja. Postav', dak togda zdorovajsja, idu s molokom i uzh molchu.* (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985).
2. *Doja korovu, dak ne zdorovajuca, i s molokom pojdjosh' — tozhe.* (Zasur'e, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).
3. *S podojnikom idjosh' da s molokom — zdorovat'sja nel'zja. Postavish' moloko, da i zdorovash'sja, chtoby ne izurochil kto.* (Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985).
4. *Idu s podojnikom, dak molchu, postavlju, potom zdorovajus'.* (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).
5. *Govrja nel'zja govorit', kogda doja. Vot i ne govorish'.* Gorushka, (Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985).
6. *Idjosh' s podojnikom so dvora, skorej moloko stavish', potom zdorovaessja, a s molokom pozdorovalas' — «Pus' Bog proshhaet nas greshnyh», - skazhesh'.* (Gora, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).
7. *Doja korovu, dak ne zdorovajutsja, s molokom pojdjosh' — tozhe.* (Sluda, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).
8. *Nel'zja koda moloko nesjosh', postav' ego, togda zdorovassja, a s molokom — ne zdorovassja. S podojnikom idjosh' — tozhy ne govori nicho, poka ne postavish', ne zanesesh', tak-ot chto hosh' butte, idi mimo, ne razgovarivaj.* (Sura, Pin., Arh., SDK-21, 1985).
9. *Vo hleve ne zdorovajsja, so skotinoj kody zhivjosh', goni, vo dvor ne puskaj nikogda nikogo, nel'zja puskat' nikogo ko skotu.* (Sura, Pin., Arh., SDK-21, 1985).
10. *I vot byla primeta: cherez reku moloka ne davat'. Esli s molokom idjot (zhenshhina), to govorit' nel'zja, ni stavit' nel'zja i po gostjam hodit' nel'zja s jetim molokom, poka po domu ne dojdjosh'. Moloko iz ruk v ruki ne peredajut. Jeto na korovu otrazhaetsja. S molokom shutki plohi.* (Bol'shoe Krotovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

A total of 16 uses were recorded in the SDK material. The last years of expeditions (early 21st century) did not record the use of such EFFs due to the reduction of livestock breeding in agriculture.

Cooking

Our material provides only 3 contexts of this thematic block, recording the use of one etiquette formula: *Raneshni vremena ne taki byli — teper' poshjol v magazin i kupil hleba-to, kogda ja devkoj byla, hlebushko sami pekli, vkusnoj byl, vot postavish' kvashonku i vyzhidaesh' vremechko-to, akot' gost' vojdjot, skazhet: «Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!», chtoby hleb vkusnyj byl.* (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987); *Kogda kvashnju zameshivajut, ran'she govorili: «Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!».* (Iskra, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987); *Esli testo gotovish', a kto chuzhoj i voshjol, to govorit: «Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!».* *A ty otvechaesh': «Sto rublej v moshnu!».* (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987). It is significant that all contexts were recorded at the same time (Vologda region, 1987). In subsequent years, practically no contexts describing a similar situation were recorded in expedition records.

Horticulture

In the subject of gardening, the widest diversity of OEFF is observed in the function of addressing vegetable crops (onions, potatoes, cabbage), cultivated plants (flax, rye), etc. In some regions of the Russian North, a special system of OEFF is noted. In our material, the Vologda and Yaroslavl regions are clearly represented.

Vyvoditsja na nishhego, na pishhego! (1) / Ne rodish' golenasta, a rodish' puzasta! (2) / Ne bud' golenasta, a bud' korenasta! (1) / Ne bud' golenista, a bud' korenista! (1) / I na nishhego, i na zavidushhego! (1) / Rasti s Bogom dlja sebja i dlja ljudej! (1) / Rodish', kartoshka! Vetka — v ogloblju, kartoshka — v koleso (1) / Rasti, kartoshka, po kolesu, a pljotka — po oglobe! (1) / Rasti, kapusta, gusta, golenasta i puzasta! (1) / Rasti golovasta, ne golenasta! (1) / Rasti na nishhih, na pishhih (pischih), na vseh kreshhjonyh ljudej! (1) / Rasti sochnaja, kruglaja (o kapuste) (1) / Rasti, vejsja, na uhod ne nadejsja! (1) / Rasti s Bogom! (1) / Rasti s golovu! (3)

Gardening remains a popular occupation in the modern village. Our material records 25 uses of such formulas. The material also contains actional formulas that have no verbal accompaniment.

Forest

Visiting the forest requires following special instructions. The forest takes on anthropomorphic features, in connection with which a person in the forest must follow the rules of etiquette, including speech, in connection with which the EFF are used. Before entering the forest, you need to greet it: «*Zdravstvuj, les!*» (Troica, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024); *in case of successful mushroom or berry picking, you need to thank: Hodish' i govorish': «Daj Bog gribov na polnuju korzinu!».* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023). *Esli poshla v les ne blagoslovjas', to zabludish'sja. Kak vhidish' v les, skazat' nado: «Gospodi, blagoslovi».* (Dubr., Cherep., Volog., SDK-39, 1987). *Krestjatsja i govorjat: «Dobryj hozjain, pomogi nam nabrat' jagod i gribov!».* (Novosjolki, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

The forest as a sacred, 'alien', other-worldly space is associated with some 'forest' prohibitions, which must be strictly fulfilled in order not to cause trouble: *V lesu-to lesha. To skazhut: «Ponesi tebja leshij!».* *Tak jeto skazala, i ushli s koncom nashi vsjo-to. Nel'zja leshakat'sja v lesu-to.* (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007).

In total, 15 uses of etiquette forms were recorded in the SDK material.

The SDK material records a variety of curses and abusive expressions containing nominations of the forest owner in their structure. These speech formulas are evidence of anti-etiquette, which is opposed to all EFF.

Fishing

One of the male occupations, which has many special signs, prohibitions and sentences:

Kljov na udu! (3) / Schastlivogo ulova! (1) / Ni cheshujki ni hvosta! (1) — K chjortu! (1) / Ni hvosta ni cheshui! (1) — Spasibo! (1) / Ni ryby, ni hvosta! (1) — Idi k chjortu! (1) / Ni cheshui ni hvosta! (1) / Pomogi, Gospodi! (1) / Kljuj, rybka, bol'shaja i malen'kaja! (1) / Chelovek ishhet gde luchshe, a ryba — gde glubzhe (1)

/ *Mel' pus' budet glubinoj (1)* A humorous, but certainly taboo- like, invocation (the so-called reverse spell):

Utonesh' — ne prihodi! (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

The SDK material contains 13 different usages.

Hunting

Another male activity has several ritualized EFFs: *Ni puha ni pera! (4) / Pomogi tebe Bozhe! (1) / Schastljivoj ohoty! (1) Objazatel'nyj otvet: K chjortu! / K chjortu (3 raza)! Idi ty k chjortu! Da idi ty k chjortu!*

Joking: *Ni v kogo ne streljaj i sam ne zastrelis'!* (Ostankovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

In the SDK material there are 10 uses of this formula.

II. House, road, man

The group presents thematic situations, in the center of which on a person and his life at home/on the road. In some cases, etiquette guidelines are combined with mythological (ritual) ideas, inherent in the Russian village cultural space since ancient times, which is manifested in the structural and semantic features of ritual and etiquette forms and formulas.

Meal

The meal, as a rule, is at home, accompanied by greeting EFF with good-wishing semantics: *Zajdjosh', a tam obedajut, skazhesh': «Hleb s sol'ju». A skazhut: «Lob s mozol'ju». «Hleb da sol', em da svoj». (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985); Kogda edjat, to zahodjat i govorjat: «Hleba ist'!». A otvechajut: «Spasibo!». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986); Privetstvovali: «Hleb da sol'!» Dobra pora, kogda edjat. Obedajut. Chaj p'jut da skazhut: «Chaj da sahar!». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986). Moreover, a clear distinction is characteristic between two sub-situations: tea drinking and lunch.*

Nuclear component "tea":

Chaj s saharom! Caj s saharom! (7) Answer (1): «Spasibo». Answer (1): «Chaju pit'!». Answer (1): «S saharom, so vsem!» / Chaj da sahar! (1) / Prijatnogo appetita! (1)

Nuclear component "bread":

Hleb s sol'ju! (4) Answer (1): «Spasibo!» Answer (1): «Hleb ist'». A skazhut (1): «Lob s mozol'ju». Hleb da sol', em da svoj. / Hleba ist'! (1) Answer (1): «Spasibo!» / «Hleb da sol'!» (1) «Hleb-sol'!» (1)

In the SDK material there are only 20 uses (general).

Road

The road as a real object and the most important mythological space associated with man is served by an extensive system of EFFs, both geographically and culturally marked (see [Shchepanskaya 2003]). In our material, a large number of “road” formulas, for example, are recorded in various localities of the Lyubimsky district of the Yaroslavl region: *Perekreshhu i: «Otkuda ushjol, tuda i vernis'!»* (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024); *Gladkoj dorogi! Schastlivogo puti!* (Troica, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024); *Angela-Hranitelja! (Ljubim, Jarosl., SDK-2024); Gospodi, pomogi!* (Ljubim, Jarosl., SDK-2024); *S Bogom!* (Ermakovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024); *Ni gvozdja ni zhezla!* (Ermakovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

Frequency stable formulas:

Schastlivyj put' (1) / Schastlivogo puti (3) / Skatert'ju doroga (1) / dorozhka (2) (+/-) / V dal'njuju dorogu (1) / Dolgih let zhizni (1) / Mir doroge! (1) / S Bogom! (1) / Ni gvozdja ni zhezla! (1) / V dobryj put'! (1) / Dobrogo puti! (1) / Bog s nim! (1) / Angela-Hranitelja! (1)

Etiquette “road” forms can be represented by various speech “amulets”: prayer-crosses, prayer-spells, appeals (to the Guardian Angel; saints; house spirit) [Shchepanskaya 2003: 95–97]. Our material contains a variety of variants of such protective texts:

1. / *Chto govorjat pered dal'nej dorogoj? / V les poshla: «Ogradi menja, Gospodi, svoim zhivotvorjashhim krestom». I tri raza perekrestitsja. Ili: «Gospodi, blagoslovi menja v put'-dorozhku». I nichego ploho nja budet.* (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997).

2. *Schastlivogo puti, vsjo, da pust' vas Bog beregjet! Na dorozhku posidet'*. (Shotogorka, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

3. */U kogo nado prosit'sja, kogda v les idjosh'/?/ U Boga, u Angela svoego. U kazhdogo svoj Angel, vot ty govorish': «Angel moj, pojdjom so mnoj, ty vpered, ja pozadi. Nikola Chudotvorec, dorozhku osveti, rabomu Bozh'emu (nazyvaesh' svojom imja) i amin'». I vsjo, idjosh', i s toboj vsjo budet v porjadke.* (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

4. *Vot skazhut, pojdjosh' v dorogu, nikogda ne nado govorit': «Oj, ja sejchas bystro dojdu». Nado idti, skazhut: «Ladno, pojdjom s Bogom, tam Nikola Chudotvorec, tam Georgij Pobedonosec, dajte schastljivoj, horashej dorogi doйти do domu».* (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

5. */A zachem krest nosjat?/ Óberezh, ja kogda kudy poedu, tak eshho bumazhna ikonka est', presvjataja Bozh'ja Mat' Bogorodica s soboj, pojdu skazhu: «Beregi menja, hrani menja, na dorogah, na pereput'jah».* (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

In total, the SDK material records 30 uses of forms and formulas, most of them are isolated (*Chas vam dobryj!*); with minimal variability (*Schastlivyj put' / puti! Dobrogo puti!*).

Home

The house as a conceptualized space symbolizing peace, security, and family well-being is associated with many signs, beliefs, customs, and rituals. In folklore tradition, the house is opposed to the road in the opposition “one’s own — someone else’s” [Cherepanova 2005: 174], where the house is always one’s own, closed, almost sacred space, and the road is someone else’s, open, unknown, distant, dangerous.

In situations (ritual and non-ritual) associated with the home, various EFFs are used, for example, in the function of greeting someone entering the house: *Ran'she v dom prihodili, perekreshhivajutsja, u poroga stojat i govorjat: «Mir domu!».* *Jim otvechajut: «Prinimaem mir!».* (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000); *Kogda zahodjat v dom, govorjat: «Mir vashemu domu!»* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., SDK-

ORZ-2023). *Ili vhodjat, govorjat: «S angelom!»*. (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000). There are few such greeting formulas in our material.

It is no coincidence that most EFF are associated with a specific place in the house — the threshold. The threshold is a boundary dividing space into “one’s own” and “someone else’s,” it is “the place where many family rituals are performed, aimed at driving out evil, unclean spirits that have come from outside” [Plotnikova 2008: 173]. Basically, the SDK material records variants of OEF appeals to the house spirit in the ritual situation of moving to a new house — a housewarming:

1. *Domovika prosit' nado: «Vot budem zhit', da ja, da muzh, da eshhjo kto tam, nas beregi da hrani, da»*. [*A iz starogo domu ne zovut domovogo?*] *Net, v novyj dom zahodish', tut i hozjain novyj i vsjo po-novomu. My v novyj dom zahodili, k nam kto idjot, ohapku drov nesjot, naprimer, kto deneg skol'ko mozhet polozhit' — nemnozhko, kto ikonku prinesjot. Jeto chtoby zhilos' v dome*. (Trufanova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008);

2. *Domovoj i sejchas est', prosit'sja nado: «Dedushka-domozhirushko, babushka-domozhórushka, pusti na podvor'ice skotinku uspokoit', samim da pozhit', bezo vsjakoj pritti (pritchi), chtoby ploho ne bylo. Chto vo dvore, to i v dome — vsjo domovoj, on dom i hozjajstvo hranit*. (Pirinem', Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

3. *Hlebca otrezh' kusocek, v ugol polozhi — i skazhi: «Hozjain-dvorovoj, primi podarochek, chtob korova domoj hodila»*. (Chjornaja, Bat., Novg., 1988).

4. *«Dedushko-domozhirushko, pusti nas pozhit'» - mama jeto govorila. Snachala poklonilas' na vse chetyre ugla i skazala*. (Shotogorka, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

5. *«Dedushka-domovoj, pusti nas na postoj, steli nam mjadko, steli nam gladko, na menja, neradivuju hozjajushku, ne nadejsja! Amin', amin', amin'. Tri raza*. (Shotogorka, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

In total, the SDK material records 50 uses.

Bathhouse

Special etiquette speech prescriptions are associated with the bathhouse as a special sacred space of the household territory. Speech situations are divided into:

a) entering the bathhouse: *V bajnu kto idjot, nado skazat': «Par v bajnu vam», a ottuda: «S legkim parom».* (Zabolot'e, Tver., Ostash., SDK-1991); b) time to wash: *Smoj, voda, vsja hudoba! Daj Bog tebe zdorov'ja!* (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991); c) leaving the bathhouse (formulas "after the bathhouse"): *Bozh'ja blagodat! S ljogkim parom!* (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024). The EFFs used in these situations are semantically well-wishing.

The material notes contexts where etiquette forms with the function of gratitude to the bathhouse are used: *«Spasibo, ban'ka milaja» — svoimi slovami. Vsegda govorju. «Oj ty umnica moja».* So vsemi razgovarivaju: *hot' teplica, kogo pohvalju, kogo porugaju. Odna, s kem-to razgovarivat' nado.* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023); *«Spasibo, banja, za pomyvku!»* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023); *ili hozjaina bani: «Spasibo, hozjain, za parnu bainku!» — tak nado govorit', kak v bane vymoish'sja* (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986); *obrashhenie k bane: «Tebe, bainko, chistota, a nam — legota!»* (Vigora, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007).

The SDK material records only 10 uses.

Sneezing, yawning, coughing

The material also contains EFFs that are used in special situations associated with various human physiological processes (sneezing, yawning, coughing, etc.). Our material records only 13 such uses: *Kody chelovek chihnul, govorili: «Bud' zdrav!».* *Levyj glaz cheshetsja — k slezam, a pravij — k radosti.* (Sluda, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985); *Chihnjosh' esli, govorjat: «Schastliv bud'!».* (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986); *Esli chihnul: «Bud' zdorov za sto korov!».* (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986); *Kogda zamuchit, chihat i chihat, emu govorjat: «Spica v nos!».* *A on otvechaet: «Spasibo na mjagkoj zatyckhe!».* (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Esli spotknulsja, govorjat: «Voz'mi soboj!».* (Kovrig, Ljubytin., Novg., SDK-36, 1986); *Spotknulsja: «Bog s tobój!»* (Saharovo, Rzhensk., Tver., SDK-1991); *Zakashljalsja, kto-to speshit, a tovarishh emu: «Chto zh tak jeto ty, Hristos s tobój!»* (Saharovo, Rzhensk., Tver., SDK-1991). / *Chto polagaetsja govorit', kogda chelovek zevaet? / «Len'-pozevota vsja na Fedota, s Fedota na Jakova, s Jakova na*

vsjakogo». (Zakokur'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986). In all the presented cases, the EFFs are of a benevolent nature.

Dream

In the questionnaire, which is the basis of the thematic classification of EFF, in the section “Folk etiquette” there is a question: “What words were spoken before going to bed?”, in connection with which our material records some EFF related to the situation of getting ready for bed:

Mat' pered snom molitvu uchila menja govorit':

«Lozhus' so Hristom,

Nagrazhdajus' krestom.

Tam angely stojat

Moju dushu storozhat».

Tak tri raza. (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Tversk., SDK-60, 1997).

Roditeli govorili, chtob my na noch' molitvu chitali «Otche nash».

(Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Tversk., SDK-60, 1997).

Son plohoj nel'zja rasskazyvat'. Nado perevernut' podushku i skazat': «Kuda noch', tuda i son». (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997).

As a rule, these verbal rules are taught from childhood. A special ritual of pronouncing EFF before going to bed, the implementation of which is of a recommendatory nature, contains protective semantics. The SDK records an insignificant number of EFF related to this situation, but getting ready for bed is a major part of a person's daily life, so they should also be paid attention to.

III. Holidays

This thematic group mainly includes OEFF appeals to personalized holidays:

1. *A uzh sejal kazhdoj sam, sam i prigovarival: «A vot Borisov den', Borisa i Gleba, narodi, Gospodi, hleba» — jeto vesnoj, a potom uzhe blagodarjat, jeto shestogo avgusta, narodil, gospodi, kormu i hleba, a vot tam gde-to govorjat sovsem ne tak, po-svoemu.* (Shejno, Cherep., Volog., SDK-38, 1987).

2. *Pridem, byvalo, so starichkom-to, sjadem, posidim v pole na meshochki s hlebom (zernom), Bogu pomolimsja. Govorili: «Urodi, Gospodi, horoshego*

hlebca, na nishhovo bratija, na vseh pravoslavnyh hristijan». Esli malen'kie (rebjata) es' i s malen'kimi hodjat, byvalo, i teh uchat: perekrestis' Gospodu, Bogu molis', shtoby Gospodu hlebca urodiv na vseh pravoslavnyh hristian. Hozjajka brosit v zemlju pervu gorsku na polose, potom malen'kie, a potom Hozjain i pojdet zasevat', a my s robjatami pojdem domoj. (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).

3. *Batjushka-Pokrov, daj horoshuju svekrov'!* (Iskra, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987).

4. *Pokrov, pokroj zemlju snezhkom, a menja — zhenishkom!* (Iskra, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987).

5. *Na Rozhdestvo ran'she-to korovushki iz testa delali, da i ne tol'ko korovushek i ovechek, i loshadej, i kur, i ryb — vsjaku vsjachinu nadelajut, rebjatischki soberutsja i koljadovat' idut i govorjat: «Koljada-Koljada, dedushka da babushka, podajte po korovushke ovseca», skazhesh' tak, vot tebe i ot dadut — kto korovushku, kto loshadku, kto chego. (Srednie Chud'i, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).*

6. *V Egorij voz'mu ikonku i ves' dvor obojdu, i prigovarivaju: «Egorij-batjushka, sohrani moju skotinushku ot zlyh ljudej, ot zverej», a to dva remeshka postelju nakrest i zamok poveshu na pervuju dver' na dvor, togda korovushka budet doma derzhat'sja. (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).*

They mainly take the form of sentences and are used with a request to ensure well-being in the household and increase the harvest. For this, as can be seen, such forms take the form of a dialogized sentence, where an obligatory part is an appeal to a personified holiday: a) by the name of the saint to whom the holiday is dedicated (*Yegoriy, Boris and Gleb*); b) by its name (*Pokrov, Kolyada*); its personification, moreover, as an older person (which is manifested in the semantics of the lexemes (*batyushka, dedushka, babushka*), to whom special respect and reverence are usually given. There are few such contexts in our material, but they help to create a complete picture of the cultural features of traditional etiquette communication associated with calendar holidays.

There are also speech expressions that are difficult to classify thematically or are represented by isolated contexts (a wish for a wedding: «*Skol'ko na hmele shishechek, stol'ko u vas rebjatishechek!*» (Chjornaja, Bat., Novg., SDK-1988); a curse: «*Daj bog, chtob emu schast'ja ne bylo!*» (*obmanul kto-to*) (Grigor'ev, Bat., Novg., SDK-1988); an appeal to a field: “*Tebe, poljushko, — chistota, a nam — legota!*» (Vigora, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007), but are important for a general understanding of the thematic diversity of the system of folk speech etiquette of a resident of the Russian North.

Table 1. Thematic classification of EFF (based on materials from the SDK)

EFF				
Topic	SEFF	Unit	OEFF	Unit
I. Labor, management, trade				
Work	Formulas: <i>Bog na / v pomoshh'! Bez Boga ne do poroga!</i>	74		
	<i>Bog pomoshh'! Bozh'ja pomoshh'! Pomogaj Bog! Pomogi vam Bog! Trud na / v pol'zu! Privet trudu! Slava trudu! Uspeh trudu! Uspeh (tebe) v rabote (rabota)!</i>			
	Forms: <i>Zdorov'e v ruki! Chistota v izbe!</i>			
Weaving	Formulas: <i>Speh tebe za stav! (Spasibo! Sto zhenihov pod okoshko!) Sto lokot na prishvicu! (Sto rubej v karman!) Speh za krjosnami! Siden'e vashemu! (Sidet' po-nashemu!)</i>	8		

Continuation of table 1

Washing	Formulas: <i>Bélén'ko! Belen'ko Vam / tebe! Belen'ko poloshhi! Nabelo Bog na pomoch'! Belo stirat' (myt')! Nabelo koryto! Pomogaj Bog! Belo na vode! (Spasibo!)</i>	15		
Milking a cow	<i>More moloka! More pod korovoj! More pod korovu! Vedro moloka! More do kolena! (Daj Bog bole! Reka moloka!)</i>	6	<i>Prohibitions</i>	10
Cooking	<i>Sporyn'ja v kvashnju! (Sto rublej v moshnu!)</i>	3		
Horticulture			<i>Ne rodís' golenasta, a rodís' puzasta! Ne bud' golenasta, a bud' korenasta! Ne bud' golenista, a bud' korenista! I na nishhego, i na zavidushhego! Rasti s Bogom dlja sebja i dlja ljudej! Rasti s Bogom! Rodís', kartoshka, vetka — v ogloblju, kartoshka — v koleso! Rasti, kartoshka, po kolesu, a pljotka — po oglobe! Rasti, kapusta, gusta, golenasta i puzasta! Rasti golovasta, ne golenasta! Rasti na nishhih, na pishhih (pischih), na vseh kreshhjonyh ljudej! Vyvoditsja na nishhego, na pishhego! Rasti sochnaja, kruglaja! Rasti s golovu! Rasti,</i>	25

Continuation of table 1

			<i>vejsja, na uhod ne nadejsja!</i>	
Forest			Formulas: <i>Gospodi, blagoslovi!</i> Forms: <i>Zdravstvuj, les! Duh lesa, spasibo tebe! Daj Bog gribov na polnuju korzinu! Dobryj hozjain, pomogi nam nabrat' jagod i gribov!</i>	15
Hunting	Formulas: <i>K chjortu!) Pomogi tebe Bozhe! Schastljivoj ohoty! (Spasibo!)</i>	10		
	Forms: <i>Ni v kogo ne streljaj i sam ne zastrelis'! (jester)</i>			
Fishing	Formulas: <i>Kljov na udu! Schastlivogo ulova! Ni cheshujki ni hvosta! (K chjortu!) Ni hvosta ni cheshui! (Spasibo!) Ni ryby ni hvosta! (Idi k chjortu!) Ni cheshui ni hvosta!</i>	13		
	Forms: <i>Pomogi, Gospodi! Chelovek ishhet gde luchshe, a ryba — gde glubzhe! Mel' pus' budet glubinoj! Poezzhaj s Bogom! Utonesh' — ne prihodi! (jester)</i>			

Continuation of table 1

II. Home, road, man				
Meal	Formulas: <i>Chaj s saharom! (Spasibo! Chaju pit'! S saharom, so vsem!) Chaj da sahar! (Spasibo!) Prijatnogo appetita! (Hleb ist'!) Hleb s sol'ju! (Lob s mozol'ju! Hleb da sol', em da svoj!) Hleba ist'! (Spasibo!) Hleb da sol'! Hleb-sol'!</i>	24		
	Forms: <i>Prijatno vam kushat', hleb i sol'! Angela k trapeze!</i>			
Bathhouse	Formulas: <i>S ljogkim parom! Gospodi, blagoslovi! Par v bane! Bozh'ja blagodat'! Smoj, voda, vsja hudoba! Daj Bog tebe zdorov'ja!</i>	7	Formula: <i>Tebe, bainko, chistota, a nam — legota!</i>	3
			Forms: <i>Spasibo, banja, za pomyvku! Spasibo, hozjain, za parnu bainku!</i>	
Road	Formulas: <i>Schastlivyj put'! Schastlivogo puti! Horoshuju put'! Skatert'ju doroga / dorozhka! V dal'njuju dorogu! Dolgih let zhizni! Mir doroge! S Bogom! Ni gvozdja ni zhezla! V dobryj put'! Dobrogo puti! Schastlivo (tebe)! Chas vam dobryj! Daj Bog vam svjatoj chas! Daj vam Bog vsego dobrogo! Bog s nim! Pust' vas Bog</i>	30		

Continuation of table 1

	<i>berezhjot! Angela-hranitelja!</i>			
Home	Formulas: <i>Mir (vashemu) domu! (Prinimaem mir!) S angelom!</i>	3	<i>Appeals to the brownies (dialogued sentences)</i>	50
Sneezing, yawning, coughing	Forms: <i>Bud' zdrav! Bud'/te zdorov/y! Schastliv bud'! Spica v nos da para kolos! Dve osi razodralo i tvoi nozdri! Spica v nos! (Spasibo na dobroj / mjagkoj zatychke!) Bud' zdorov za stokorov!</i>	13		
Getting ready for bed			<i>Prayers before bed</i>	10
III. Holidays			<i>Appeals to personalized holidays (dialogized sentences)</i>	6

As can be seen from the description of the thematic block-situations, EFF are divided into SEFF and OEFF, which perform the main phatic (contact-establishing) function. SEFF act as greetings proper, greetings with favorable semantics, gratitude, farewells with the semantics of blessing, etc. OEFF are presented in the material: a) appeals to a mythological character or divine patron in the function of begging, appeasing or asking for patronage; b) appeals to anthropomorphized natural phenomena / plants; c) prohibitions (in the forest; in the bathhouse); d) some abusive expressions representing the area of anti-etiquette. In total, about 400 contexts are analyzed in the work.

A complex, often interconnected cultural phenomenon, in which "ritual (*rite* — *A.Ch.*) precedes etiquette, and etiquette, in turn, is formed on the basis of ritual" [Bayburin, Toporkov 1990: 161], should be considered with certain reservations. The category of "etiquette" in all cases of using EFF is nominatively

conditional: it serves to designate the fact of establishing contact between communicants in the corresponding communicative-pragmatic situation, and has the category of obligation. As the material shows, this can be a chance meeting on the street or greeting the hosts in the house, which requires compliance with the rules of speech etiquette. The category of "ritualism" creates an archaic cultural background for communication and designates the boundaries of the transition of EFF from a ritual context to an etiquette one. In these cases, OEFF are the verbal part of a ritual complex (the ritual of moving from an old house to a new one, the ritual of rooting new cattle in the house, the ritual of planting plants, etc.). The ritual and sacredness of such texts are closely connected with the etiquette setting — “it is customary to say so”, and — it is obligatory. Often the “performers” no longer know exactly why it is necessary to perform this creative act (for example, “act out” a dialogue with a brownie), — everything happens within the framework of tradition.

Then the property of isomorphism of a word, object and action is actualized, which presupposes the obligatory performance of a speech act, since its failure to perform can have real negative consequences: the harvest will not grow, life in a new house will not work out, it will not be possible to independently find a way out of the forest, etc. The cultural sign, which the OEFF becomes in such cases, acquires important pragmatic features.

An important function performed by the EFF is the identification of a person within the framework of the general cultural opposition “one’s own — another’s” and a number of ensuing semantic oppositions, each of which “is based on an assessment: the positive is opposed to the negative, the good — the bad” [Tolstaya 2015: 236], etc. Such semantic oppositions, as S.M. Tolstaya notes, are “one of the main mechanisms of the substantive plan of a cultural tradition, organizing, ordering and structuring a set of units of the symbolic language of a culture, determining the main parameters of symbolization and assessment of the realities of the external world and the person himself” [Tolstaya 2004: 557] , which characterizes the functioning of the EFF to the fullest extent.

In each semantic opposition, the left component is usually filled with positive semantics, the right — with negative. Within the opposition “one’s own — another’s”, in connection with our material, it seems necessary to take into account the oppositions “good — bad”, “righteous — sinful”, “human — inhuman”, “alive — dead”, “internal — external”.

"Good - Bad"

Knowledge of special EFF containing lexical components that have cultural semantics, the ability to use them correctly in a thematic situation characterizes the communicant as "one of our own", "good". The greeting-blessing formula must be used in a dialogue with a person who is busy with some business. Thus, the addresser wishes the addressee successful work and a good outcome of the case. Ignorance or failure to use these formulas in time identifies a person as "foreign", "not one of our own", ignorant, i.e. poorly proficient in the generally accepted etiquette norm, which often leads to misunderstanding and the so-called "speech revenge": *Net, nu my vseгда: «Trud na pol'zu» — «Spasibo, spasibo». Vsegda govorim: «Trud na pol'zu» i «Spasibo». Potomu chto kak zhe — tebe govorjat, a ty ne otvetish'? Nado otvetit': «Spasibo».* (Ostankovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024). For traditional communication, the moment of the obligatory pronunciation of such a formula and its function of influence become more important, otherwise the work (or any other action) of the addressee will not succeed or will succeed poorly.

"Righteous - sinful"

In the ethics of rural society, a major role is played by the religious (Christian) component. God as the supreme being, possessing the highest power, is presented as the main patron and assistant in all everyday spheres, which is often reflected in the lexical content of the EFF (*Бог на помощь! Помогай Бог! Божья благодать!* etc.). The rural way of life, directing a person to a righteous life, should be marked by a rule expressed in the etiquette formula-proverb: "Without God, not even to the threshold!" Failure to comply with this rule borders on a "crime" that violates "the balance of the world and threatens negative consequences for the world and for man"

[Tolstaya 2000: 374]. As a result, a person falls into the realm of the "sinful", i.e. "foreign", not accepting the general prescriptions of life of a rural society.

In popular belief, "sin is anything that contradicts the norm and entails a reaction from nature (or a higher power)" [Ibid.]. "Punishment" for violating this norm is actualized in EFF-prohibitions, when a person involuntarily reproduces taboo words, for example, in the forest: *Da nel'zja-nel'zja jeto slovo govorit'-to, schitaetsja, chto jeto greh bol'shoj, leshakat'sja-to. Govorjat, luchshe matjuknut'sja, chem leshaknut'sja.* (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007). *V lesu-to znaju, chto leshij, no slovo «leshij» nel'zja upominat', kogda idjosh' kuda-to. I govorjat, detej vot slovom «leshij» nel'zja rugat'. Ot tak ved' vseгда zapreshheno.* (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007). It is obvious that in the situation of visiting the forest there is a strict order not to mention the forest master (who belongs to the mythological spirits, to the realm of the supernatural) with an unkind word, which is indicated by the modal words- prohibitives (nel'zja-nel'zja, greh bol'shoj, leshakat'sja-to, vseгда zapreshheno). Failure to comply with these rules equates a person with "not-one's own", "foreign", close to the evil spirit, which he allows himself to call by "name".

A similar prohibition applies to the mention of other spirits (for example, the devil), representing a non-human, often evil principle: *Rugat'sja nel'zja, mnogie rugajutsja chjortom — upasi Bozhe — nel'zja ego pominat'!* (Hotjazh, Novg., Nogv., SDK-54, 1994). *V bane leshachiha ved' est' u nas. Obderiha i leshachiha — kto kak nazywaet. No obderiha bol'she, potomu chto nel'zja govorit' u nas, ni chertyhat'sja, ni leshakat'sja. «Obderiha» — pravil'no govorit' nado, potomu chto nado vsjo govorit' s Bozh'im slovom.* (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007).

From the contexts it is clear that the area of the "sinful" (*one must neither curse nor swear*) is always opposed to the area of the "righteous" (*one must speak everything with God's word*) just as a person who uses "sinful" words is identified as a "stranger", and a person who observes the rules of prohibition is identified as "one of our own", "righteous", which is very characteristic of traditional society.

"Human — non-human"

This semantic opposition is manifested in the process of "communication" between a person (as "one of our own") and a mythological character (as "another"), which is demonstrated in the OEF. The interaction of a person with a "non-human" (a house spirit, a yard spirit, a forest spirit) has the goal of equating the positions of the communicants, i.e. to turn the "non-one of ours" into "one of ours", which turns out to be quite possible with the help of the correct use of the formula-address: *Dedushka-domovejushka, **pusti**, poj, kormi, obuvaj, odevaj i obogrevaj. Ljubi i beregi.* (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Hlebca otrezh' kusoček, v ugol položhi — i skazhi: «Hozjain-dvorovoj, **primi podaroček**, chtob korova domoj hodila».* (Chjornaja, Bat., Novg., 1988); *Govorjat, nado idti, vybrat' mesto, sprosit' hozjaina: «Hozjain-lesovoj, **pusti** menja ne noch' nochevat', a vek vekovat'».* (Chjornaja, Bat., Novg., 1988). The motives for asking and appeasement must be expressed in the formula without fail (here — in the grammatical form of the imperative *let go, accept*, etc.), otherwise the interaction between the person and the mythological character "on equal terms" will not happen, in connection with which the person will expect a number of unpleasant consequences (cattle death, "bad" life in the house, etc.): *Kogda idjosh' v dom, nado skazat': «Dedushko, pusti na prozhivanie».* *A ja vot ne prosilas', mne i govorjat: ty tak i zhivjosh' ploho, chto ne poprosilas'.* (Nemnjuga, Pinezh., Arh., SDK-1984); *Jagyshok roditsja, nad' prositsja, ne poprosish'sja — tak propadjot. «Dedushko-domovejushko, primaj movo Borjushku, na menja lentjajushku, ne nadejsja, poj, kormi dosyta».* (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

When considering this semantic opposition, it is important that not only is a mythological character "alien" to a person, but vice versa: from the position of a mythological character, a person is perceived as "alien", since if a person does not comply with the norms of behavior, the situation begins to play out according to the "rules" of the mythological character, which is expressed in lexical formulas (the brownie "torments" the cattle, "strangles" the owners of the house at night; the forest one "does not allow them to leave" the forest, etc.). Only with their correct

interaction do these positions become equivalent, which allows the “human” and the “non-human” to correctly identify each other.

"Alive - Dead"

In everyday life in the village, the opposition “life — death” is of no small importance, which is partially reflected in the SDK material recording the EFF. Thus, the primary prohibition is on greeting in a house where a deceased person is: *Nel'zja zdorovat'sja, koda v dome pokojnik. Nehorosho zhe, koda v dome pokojnik! Vhodish' — a ty zdorov'ja zhelaesh' hozjaevam.* (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986). The prohibition is obvious: the greeting formula contains the semantics of a wish for health (be it “Hello!” or any other, functioning directly in traditional communication), which a person should not pronounce if he wants to remain “one of our own” for those around him.

"Internal - External"

The semantic opposition, which in the material of the SDK is actualized at the level of spatial relations “house - road” and correlates with the positions of communicants, acting in the opposition “host - guest”. In this case, the first component will always mean “one of our own”, since it refers to the space of the house, and the second is always “foreign”, since it belongs to the space of the road, arriving from outside. Only the space of the threshold can unite them, having stepped over which the guest has the opportunity to become (at least temporarily) “one of ours”. This is facilitated, among other things, by pragmatically correct and timely use by the guest of the etiquette formula, conditioned by the thematic situation (*Chaj da sahar!* — greeting of people in the house drinking tea; *Speh za kresnami!* — greeting of the weaver; *Mir vashemu domu!* — general greeting of the household) and special (in some cases even sacred) behavior of the host in relation to the guest (see, for example, [Shchepanskaya 2003]).

Thus, identification on the scale of the general cultural opposition “one's own - another's” can be considered within the framework of several semantic oppositions, in which the left component, always positively colored, belongs to the category of “one's own” (“one's own” means “good”, “righteous”, “human”, “alive”, “internal”),

and the right component, negatively colored, belongs to the category of "another's" ("another's" means "bad", "sinful", "inhuman", "dead", "external"). In the case of the semantic opposition "human — inhuman", the positions of both sides can be interchangeable, equivalent if a person observes the ethical norms that exist in a traditional society.

Thus, in all thematic blocks-situations (main and optional) EFF act as SEFF and OEFF with the consolidation of the status of conventionality of the category of "etiquette", which coexists in a complex interaction with the category of "ritualism". EFF cover all spheres of rural life of a resident of the Russian North, taking into account the factors of obligatory nature, identification and self-identification of communicants, taking different roles when interacting with different types of communicants (person / mythological character) within the opposition "friend - foe", performing the main pragmatic function of establishing contact in order to maintain the chosen (usually benevolent) tonality of communication.

2.2. Natural variability of folklore text: typology of possible variants

The texts of small forms of folklore, as has been emphasized more than once, are characterized by natural variability, which is the most important condition for the creation of a common group of texts of one thematic block.

Taking into account the research of D.S. Likhachev, B.N. Putilov, K.V. Chistov, S.N. Azbelev, T.G. Ivanova in the field of folkloristic textology, in the work it is possible to analyze individual groups of stable etiquette formulas of one theme, highlighting in the structure of each formula an invariant zone and a variable zone. When compiling a textological typology, the terms "invariant", "variant", "edition", "version", "version" are used:

An invariant is “an abstract designation of the same entity (for example, the same unit) in abstraction from its specific modifications —variants” [Solntsev 1990: 114–115].

Variant - “the type of work that it has at each specific moment of oral transmission” [Likhachev 1964: 15].

A version is “one or another type of text that arose spontaneously, as a result of multiple rewritings of the text in a certain environment, locality, or country. In such cases, the text inevitably accumulates local features of the language or language characteristics characteristic of a certain population environment” [Ibid.: 14–15], which make it possible to single out versions of oral etiquette texts in a separate region of the Russian North on this basis.

Edition is “a type of text of a work that has qualitative differences from other types of its texts” [Azbelev 1966: 277]. In our case, edition of a text is the reworking of a text within the boundaries of one region of the Russian North.

A version (group of variants) is “a type of text whose qualitative differences from other types of texts are such that they border on being transformed into another work” [Ibid.].

“Text in folklore, as folklorists claim, is the verbal embodiment of a variant” [Likhachev 1964: 15], which is confirmed at the level of the multi-variant etiquette formulas studied in the work.

In most cases, it is the grammatical form that can be considered an invariant zone. In the grammatical structure of a separate etiquette formula, the invariant zone also includes symbolic words that have cultural semantics.

WORK

Etiquette formulas with a nuclear component "God":

Formula 1: *Bog pomoshh'!*

Invariant: *Bog (v/na) pomoshh' (vam/tebe)!*

Variants (fonet. + gramm.): *Bog na pomoch'!* (6) / *Bog na pomoshh'!* (2) / *Bog na pomoc'!* (2) // *Bog v pomoshh'!* (7) / *Bog (v/u) pomoch'!* (2) // *Bog pomoshh' (tebe - 2)!* (6)

Variants (gramm.): *Pomogaj Bog!* (9) / *Pomogi tebe, Bozhe!* (1) *Pomogi vam Bog!* (1) // *Bozh'ja pomoshh'!* (2)

Formula 2: *Bez Boga ni do poroga!* (3)

In this subgroup, the common lexical component *God stands out*, which in some variants can be replaced by the noun in the vocative case *Bozhe* or take the

form of the possessive-relative adjective *bozhiy* [Erofeeva 2009: 51—54] . The second obligatory lexical component can be expressed by the verbal noun *pomoshch'* or directly by the verb *pomoshch'*, expressed by a different aspectual category in the imperative form (*pomogay, pomogi*).

The SDK material contains a context that records the etiquette form presented as a question-answer structure: *Dak jeto vseгда govorili. Jeto koda drova koljat, ja grju: «Nu, Bog pomogat tebe?» — «Pomogaet». (Ostankovo, Ljubimsk., Jarosl., SDK-2024)*. This example confirms the stability of the lexical invariant zone even at the level of a "freely" expressed etiquette speech unit.

Thus, semantically important components create a stable invariant zone of the formula ("God helps"). The variation zone includes phonetic and grammatical features of the formula, which change depending on the place, time, addressee and subject of the situation, which can be designated (*koda drovaya kolyat , li ke tkto, gegda yasera*, etc.) or not designated.

Etiquette formulas with a nuclear component "labor":

Formula 1: *Trud (na/v) pol'zu!*

Invariant: *Trud (na/v) pol'zu!*

Variants: *Trud na pol'zu! (18) // Trud v pol'zu! (4)*

Red. (Arh.): *Delo v pol'zu! (1)*

Formula 2: *Privet trudu!*

Invariant: *<...> trudu!*

Variants: *Privet trudu! (2) Slava trudu! (2)*

Formula 3: *Uspeh trudu! (1)*

Invariant: *Uspeh trudu / rabota!*

Red. (Tver.): *Uspeh tjabe rabota! (1)*

Red. (Novg.): *Uspeh v rabote! (1)*

The invariant zone is represented by the lexical components “labor”, “benefit” and “success”. The last component belongs to the zone of editions of the formula *Success of labor!* and represents single contexts fixed in specific areas.

In general, for universal “labor” formulas of good wishes, the invariant zone turns out to be the grammatical structure of an elliptical sentence with optative semantics: <Pust' budet> *Bog v pomoshh' / Bozh'ja pomoshh' / Trud na pol'zu* and etc.

WEAVING

Formula 1: *Speh tebe za stav!*

Invariant: *Speh za <nominacija tkackogo stanka>!*

Izvod: *Speh tebe za stav! (Novg.)*

Izvod: *Speh za kresnami! (Volog.)*

Formula 2: *Sto lokot na prishvicu!*

Formula 3 (otvetnaja replika): *Sto zhenihov pod okoshko!*

Formula 4 (otvetnaja replika): *Sto rubelej v karman!*

Invariant: **chisl. sto + ob. v R.p. + predlog mesta + ob. mesta v V.p.**

Variants: *Sto rubelej v karman! (2)*

Red. (Volog.): *Sto rubelej v moshnu! (3)* — in a cooking situation acts as a response (see below).

The invariant zone of the etiquette formula used in the weaving situation is the grammatical structure, which is the same for all types of formulas: num *sto* + noun in the genitive case with partitive meaning + preposition of place + noun of object in the venomous case. Only the lexemes-nominations of different parts of the loom or its dialectal name change, on the basis of which the following versions are distinguished: *Speh tebe za stav! (Novg.); Speh za kresnami! (Volog.)*.

The stable lexical component in formulas 1-3 is the numeral “hundred”, which in small folklore genres often has a “generalized meaning of a large quantity” [Tolstaya 2012: 546] and is an intensifier word in etiquette formulas expressiveness” [Balakai 2001: 504]. For example, this property of the word is manifested in the formula in the situation of sneezing: *Bud' zdorov za sto korov!*

COOKING

Спорынья в kvashnju! — Sto rubelej v moshnu!

The only formula in this thematic block presented in the SDK material. The formula of the initiating remark (*Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!*) has a similar grammatical structure to the formulas of the previous theme (*Speh za stav! — when weaving*). The formula of the response remark is identical in its structural and semantic features to the response remark when weaving and, apparently, can be an edition of such a text *Sto rublej v karman! — pri tkachestve. Sto rublej v moshnu! (3) — pri zameshivanii testa*).

WASHING

Formula 1: *Belen'ko!*

Invariant: *Belen'ko (/vam / tebe)!*

Variants: *Belen'ko! (6) / Belen'ko vam! (1) / Belen'ko tebe! (2)*

Red. (Volog.): *Belen'ko poloshhi! (1)*

Red. (Volog.): *Belo myt' (stirat')! (1)*

Formula 2: *Belo na vode! (1)*

Formula 3: *Nabelo koryto! (1)*

Formula 4: *Nabelo, Bog na pomoshh'! (2)*

A common stable component is obvious in all variants and editions of all types of formulas: words of the category of state with the root *bel-* (*belenko, belo, nableo*). *The lexical components of the semantic field "Washing" (trough, water, wash, wash, rinse, etc.) fall into the zone of variation .*

MILKING A COW

Formula 1: *More pod korovu!*

Invariant: *More pod korov(u/oj)!*

Variant: *More pod korovu! (1) More pod korovoj! (1)*

Red. (Arh.): *More do kolena! (1)*

Formula 2: *More moloka!*

Invariant: *<mnogo> moloka!*

Izvod: *More moloka! (Volog.)*

Izvod: *Vjadro moloka! (Novg.) (1)*

Formula 3: *Vedrom!*

Formula 4 (otvetnaja replika): *Reka moloka!*

Common lexical components that fall into the invariant zone: a) commonly used vocabulary semantically related to the process of milking a cow: *milk, cow*; b) intensifier words in the meaning of 'a lot' *sea (up to the knee); bucket, vedrom* in the meaning of 'a Russian measure of liquids, equal to 1/40 of a barrel (about 12 l)' [MAS 1985: 145], i.e. that which metaphorically characterizes a large quantity. Based on the latter, the following versions are distinguished: *More moloka!* (Volog.); *Vjadro moloka!* (Novg.).

HORTICULTURE**Formula 1:** *Ne bud' golenasta, a bud' korenasta!*

Invariant: *Ne (rodis' / bud' golenasta / golenista), a (rodis' / bud' korenasta / korenista // puzasta)!*

Variants: *Ne rodis' golenasta, a rodis' puzasta!* (2) / *Ne bud' golenasta, a bud' korenasta!* (1) / *Ne bud' golenista, a bud' korenista!* (1)

Version (gruppa Variantov): *Rasti golovasta, ne golenasta!* (1) / *Rasti, kapusta, gusta, golenasta i puzasta!* (1) / *Rasti sochnaja, kruglaja (o kapuste)!* (1)

Formula 2: *Rasti s Bogom!*

Invariant: *Rasti s Bogom!*

Variants: *Rasti s Bogom!* (1) *Rasti s Bogom dlja sebja i dlja ljudej!* (1)

Formula 3: *I na nishhego, i na pishhego!*

Invariant: *I na nishhego, i na pishhego!*

Variants: *Vyvoditsja na nishhego, na pishhego!* (1) / *Rasti na nishhah, na pishhah (pishhah), na vseh kreshhjonyh ljudej!* (1)

Izvod (Vol.): *I na nishhego, i na zavidushhego!* (1)

Formula 4. *Rasti, kartoshka, po kolesu, a vetka — po ogloble!*

Invariant: *Rasti, kartoshka, po kolesu, a pljotka (/vetka) — (po/v) oglobl(e/ju)!* (1)

Variants: *Rodis', kartoshka! Vetka — v ogloblju, kartoshka — v koleso!* (1) / *Rasti, kartoshka, po kolesu, a pljotka — po ogloble!* (1)

Formula 5: *Rasti, vejsja, na uhod ne nadejsja!* (1)

Formula 6: *Rasti s golovu!* (3)

The invariant zone of etiquette formulas in the situation of gardening is the grammatical structure of the formula, which is an imperative statement constructed in the form of: a) opposition (*Don't be a golenista, but be a root-bearer!*); b) statements (*Grow big-headed, not long-legged! <Grow> both on the poor and on the envious!*). In formula 1 — the most frequent — the stable lexical components are imperative verbs meaning 'to increase, to become bigger, taller, longer': *be born, grow, be*; short adjectives characterizing the quality of the plant are repeated: *golenast (golenista), stocky (korenista), pot-bellied, golenast*. For formula 3, such a stable component is the lexemes denoting the social role of people: *beggars, pishchie*. In the Vologda Oblast version, there is a variant using the word *zavidushchiy*.

The variable zone is the nomination of the vegetable crop that is used in a particular situation (*cabbage, potato, onion*), and some components that are fixed only in the structure of a specific formula.

HUNTING**Formula 1: *Ni puha ni pera!* (5)***K chertu!***Formula 2: *Schastlivoj ohoty!*****FISHING****Formula 1: *Kljov na udu!* (3)****Formula 2: *Ni cheshujki ni hvosta!*****Invariant: *Ni cheshujki ni hvosta!***

Variant: *Ni cheshui ni hvosta!* (2) *Ni hvosta ni cheshui!* (1) *Ni ryby ni hvosta!* (1)

Formula 3: *Schastlivogo ulova!* (1)

These two thematic blocks-situations of men's activities should be considered as a unity, since the same structure of formulas is noted, falling into the invariant zone: a) the form of a phraseological combination with repeating particles *ni...ni...* (*Ni puha ni pera! Ni hvosta ni cheshui!*); to this group we can also include the "road"

modern good wishes found in the material of the SDK, — *Ni zhezla ni gvozdja!*); b) the form of an elliptical construction with the adjective happy (*Schastlivogo ulova! Schastlivoj ohoty!*). The zone of variation includes lexemes associated with the theme of the formula (hunting *puh, per'ja, ohota*; fisheries — *ryba, cheshuja, hvost, ulov*).

TRAPEZA

Jetiketnye formuly s jadernym komponentom «chaj»:

Formula 1: *Chaj da sahar!*

Invariant: *Chaj (s/da) sahar(om)!*

Variants: *Chaj s saharom! (7) / Chaj da sahar! (1)*

Jetiketnye formuly s jadernym komponentom «hleb»:

Formula 1: *Hleb da sol!*

Invariant: *Hleb (da/i/s) sol'(ju)!*

Variants: *Hleb da sol! (5) / Hleb i sol! (2) / Hleb s sol'ju! (5) / Hleb-sol! (1)*

Version (gruppa Variantov): *Prijatno kushat! Hleb da sol! (1) Prijatno vam kushat', hleb i sol! (1)*

Formula 2: *Prijatnyj appetit! (1)*

Formula 3: *Angela k trapeze! (1)*

The invariant zone of frequency formulas is the grammatical structure of a sentence with homogeneous members expressed by nouns that correlate in meaning with the topic of the situation (tea drinking or lunch): *tea (bread) and/or sugar (salt)*. There is a construction with the instrumental case: *tea (bread) with sugar (salt)*.

BATH

Formulas: *S ljogkim parom! (4) / Gospodi, blagoslovi! (2) / Par v bane! (1) / Par v bajnu vam! (1) / Bozh'ja blagodat! (1)*

The formulas form completely different texts, however, one repeating lexical component is noted, corresponding in meaning to the situation of visiting a bathhouse (*steam*).

ROAD

Formula 1: *Schastlivyj put! (1)*

Invariant: *Schastlivyj / dobryj / horoshij put'!*

Variants: *Schastlivyj put'! (1) Schastlivogo puti! (2) Horoshuju put'! (1) V dobryj put'! (1) Dobrogo puti! (1)*

Formula 2: *Schastlivo!*

Invariant: *Schastlivo!*

Variants: *Schastlivo! (2) Schastlivo tebe! (1)*

Formula 3: *Chas vam dobryj!*

Invariant: *Chas vam dobryj!*

Variants: *Chas vam dobryj! (1) / Daj Bog vam svjatoj chas! (1)*

Version (gruppa Variantov): *Daj vam Bog vsego dobrogo! (1) Pust' vas Bog berezhjot! (1)*

Formula 4: *Skatert'ju doroga / dorozhka! (2)*

Edinichnye formuly: *Angela-hranitelja! (1) V dal'njuju dorogu! (1) Mir doroge! (1) Dolgih let zhizni! (1) S Bogom! (1) Bog s nim! (1) Ni gvozdja ni zhezla! (1)*

Etiquette formulas related to the road situation almost always form single variants, so it is quite difficult to determine the invariant zone. The grammatical structure (almost all formulas are elliptical sentences) and some lexical components that stand out in the most frequent formulas can be called stable. Usually these are adjectives with positive semantics: *happy, kind, good (path / hour)* and the interjection *happily*. In general, all farewell formulas, like most etiquette formulas, are interjectional utterances.

SNEEZE

Formula 1: *Bud' zdorov!*

Invariant: *Bud'/te zdorov/y (schastliv)!*

Variants: *Bud'te zdorovy! (1) Bud' zdrav! (1) Bud' zdorov za sto korov! (1) Schastliv bud'! (1) Bud' zdorov da schastliv!*

Formula 2: *Spica v nos!*

Invariant: *Spica v nos!*

Variants: *Spica v nos da para kolos! Dve osi razodralo i tvoi nozdri! (1) / Spica v nos! (1) (Spasibo na dobroj / mjagkoj zatychke!)*

The invariant zone includes the linking verb "to be" in the future tense and the short adjective " *healthy*". In some variants, the lexeme " *schastliv* " is encountered, or a contaminated formula is formed: *Be healthy and happy!*

In some regions of the Russian North (our material presents the Arkhangelsk region) there is a dialectal good wish *Spike in the nose!* in various variations. The vocabulary of this formula metaphorically relates to the situation of sneezing (*spike, pair of ears of corn, plug*) and is a kind of utterance-spell, which is pronounced in order to stop or prevent the sneezing process.

HOME (greeting situation at the threshold of the house)

Formula 1: *Mir domu!*

Invariant: *Mir (vashemu) domu! (2)*

Variants: *Mir domu! (1) Mir vashemu domu! (1)*

Formuly 2: *S angelom! (1)*

The invariant zone of the formula includes the lexical components "world", "home". The zone of variation is determined by the personal pronoun (or its absence), which expresses the focus on the addressee.

HOME (the situation of moving to a new house / taking root in a new house of cattle)

The invariant zone in such formulas is the model: <nomination of a mythological character> + verb in imp. *let / accept /... .*

Dedushka-domovejushka, poljubi u menja pestronushka, poj, kormi, droti. / Dedushko-domozhirovoshko, pusti skotinku postojat', ne much', poljubi! / Dedushko-domohozjajushko, poljubi moju skotinushku! / «Dedushko-domovejushko, primi moih detucek, obogrevaj, obuvaj, odevaj, na dobry dela ih nastavljaj, etc.

The lexical components may vary, but they are always names of the house spirit, expressed by diminutives, emphasizing the respectful semantics, and an obligatory imperative verb, expressing the pleading semantics.

The formulas-appeals to the forest spirit have a similar structure (*Hozjain-lesovoj, pusti menja ne noch' nochevat', a vek vekovat'!*).

When analyzing all variants of etiquette formulas for each thematic block, it was possible to compile a "bush" of variants. In them, the following were distinguished: an invariant zone, including a grammatical form and symbolic words, and a variable zone, suggesting various variations at the lexical, grammatical and even phonetic levels. The selection of these zones allows us to trace the formation of a single prototext, going back to a separate "bush" of variants of an etiquette formula of one topic. The typology of variants is variants, revisions, editions, versions and independent formulas.

In many thematic blocks, it was possible to identify recurring lexemes that create cross-cutting motifs and are a kind of "bonds" that allow us to derive a common invariant folklore text, which can be a kind of prototext to many oral texts that perform a conventional etiquette function in traditional communication in the regions of the Russian North. A collection of such common symbolic words is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. List of keywords-symbols included in the invariant zone of oral etiquette texts (based on materials from the SDK)

Key words-symbols	Topic	Formula
<i>Bog / Bozhe / Bozh'ja</i>	Work	<i>Bog na / v pomoshh'! Bez Boga ne do poroga! Bog pomoshh'! Bozh'ja pomoshh'! Pomogaj Bog! Pomogi vam Bog!</i>
	Washing	<i>Nabelo, Bog na pomoshh'! Pomogaj Bog!</i>
	Fishing	<i>Poezzhaj s Bogom!</i>
	Milking a cow	<i>Daj Bog bole!</i>
	Road	<i>Bog s nim! S Bogom! Presvjataja mat'-Bogorodica vpered, Isus Hristos szadi, Angely po krajam, Chto Isusu Hristu, To i nam!</i>

Continuation of table 2

	Horticulture	<i>Rasti s Bogom!</i>
	Hunting	<i>Pomogi tebe Bozhe! Idi s Bogom, daj Bog tebe pomoch'!</i>
	Meal	<i>Bog na pomoshh'!</i>
	Forest	<i>Daj Bog gribov na polnuju korzinu!</i>
	Bathhouse	<i>Smoj, voda, vsja hudoba! Daj Bog tebe zdorov'ja! Bozh'ja blagodat'!</i>
<i>Angel</i>	Road	<i>Angela-hranitelja! Angel moj, idi so mnoj, ty vperedi — ja za tobaj!</i>
	Meal	<i>Angela k trapeze!</i>
	Entering someone else's house	<i>S angelom!</i>
<i>Pomogat' / pomoch' / pomoshh'</i>	Work	<i>Bog v pomoshh'! Pomogaj Bog!</i>
	Washing	<i>Nabelo, Bog na pomoshh'!</i>
	Meal	<i>Pmogaj Bog!</i>
	Hunting	<i>Pomogi tebe Bozhe! Idi s Bogom, daj Bog tebe pomoch'!</i>
	Visiting the forest	<i>Dobryj hozjain, pomogi nam nabrat' jagod i gribov!</i>
<i>Belo / belen'ko / belyj</i>	Washing	<i>Bélén'ko! Belen'ko Vam / tebe! Belen'ko poloshhi! Nabelo Bog na pomoch'! Belo stirat' (myt')! Nabelo koryto! Pomogaj Bog! Belo na vode! (Spasibo!)</i>
	Washing the floor	<i>Nabelo koryto!</i>
	Meeting	<i>Lebed' belaja!</i>
<i>Sto</i>	Cooking	<i>Sto rublej v moshnu!</i>
	Weaving	<i>Sto lokot na prishvicu! Sto rublej v karman! Sto zhenihov pod okoshko!</i>
	Sneeze	<i>Bud' zdorov za sto korov!</i>
<i>Schastlivyj</i>	Hunting	<i>Schastljivoj ohoty!</i>
	Fishing	<i>Schastlivogo ulova!</i>
	Road	<i>Schastlivogo puti! Schastlivo!</i>

Continuation of table 2

	Sneeze	<i>Schastliv bud'! Bud' zdorov da schastliv!</i>
--	--------	--

All formulas are elliptical statements that are embedded in a dialogue structure, recognized as an invariant characteristic of the existence of folk etiquette as a whole.

2.3. Dialogue form of traditional contact establishment: types of communicants

When writing this paragraph, materials from the published article of the author of the dissertation research were used [Chekina 2024b].

Most of the EFF analyzed in the work take the form of a dialogue, characteristic of oral communication. Dialogical speech usually represents an exchange of “utterances-replicas, the linguistic composition of which is influenced by direct perception, activating the role of the addressee in the speech activity of the addresser” [Vinokur 1990: 135]. Dialogue is determined by the presence of one topic (in our material — the presence of a specific thematic block-situation).

It is quite obvious that etiquette dialogue occupies a special place in folk speech. Researcher of Vologda dialectal good wishes L.Yu. Zorina suggests to designate this phenomenon the term “dialogue unity”, which is understood as “a block, a unity consisting of a stimulus replica and a response replica” [Zorina 2012: 29]. Some researchers, for example, M.L. Kovshova, use the generally accepted term “question-answer structure” [Kovshova 2022: 146], but it is obvious that such a designation is not entirely relevant for etiquette dialogue, since etiquette dialogue in traditional communication rarely begins with a question replica, except in cases where ritual dialogue is meant, which is discussed in detail in the works of N.I. Tolstoy [Tolstoy 2003: 313–410], S.M. Tolstaya and L.N. Vinogradova [Tolstaya 2015: 166–197].

In this dissertation research, it is possible to designate the dialogue form of etiquette folk speech as a dialogic text characterized by semantic integrity (the presence of one theme), grammatical coherence, relative completeness (the fact of

establishing contact), the certainty of the social and communicative roles of the participants in communication, situational conditioning and cultural marking.

Dialogue is, first of all, a type of text that is distinguished by fundamental structural features. At the level of dialogic text (interview recording), it is clear that in almost all communicative-pragmatic situations, two subjects of speaking are designated: S 1 and S 2. However, in the conditions of field recording, the evidential potential of the utterance (indication of the source of information) is important and, as a consequence, the appearance of a third subject of speaking: S 3 (narrator), who does not participate in a specific situation, but often comments on it, thereby fulfilling a hermeneutic function. Direct participants in communication (S1 and S2) pronounce lines according to the rules of traditional etiquette, which is regulated by situationality and regulativity. These lines, which is quite natural for oral speech, are short elliptical statements: *Bog v pomoshh'! Kljov na udu! Belen'ko! Schastlivogo puti! Hleb da sol!* etc. The imperative, or more precisely, “desirable” semantics [Shakhmatov 1941: 448], pragmatically justified in this case, is created by a set of grammatical means that are customary for live communication. The stimulus replica is most often expressed by an elliptical utterance with the general optative meaning of “let it be as I say and do,” in the pragmatic meaning of “as is characteristic of the person (persons), as the person (persons) does, acts” [Russian Grammar 1980]. The response replica can be presented in different variants, or may be absent altogether. In this regard, according to its structure, the etiquette dialogic text can be presented in several types.

Dialogue-"thank you". Often the replica-reaction in the analyzed constructions is the generally accepted answer "thank you": *Kogda edjat, to zahodjat i govorjat: «Hleba ist'!»*. *A otvechajut: «Spasibo!»*. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986); *Chihnul razok, skazhut: «Zhivite bogato, bud'te zdorovy!»*. *Otvechash': «Spasibo!»* (Lampožnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986). *A chihnjot': «Bud'te zdorovy!»*. — *«Spasibo» — otvechaet'*. (Saharovo, Rzhensk., Tver., SDK-1991). *Zdorovalis': «Sto lokot na prishvicu!» — esli tkjot. Otvechat: «Spasibo», - da i vsjo.* (Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985). *Esli kto-nibud' bel'jo poloshhet, a ty mimo*

idjosh', podojdjosh' i skazhesh': «Belén'ko poloshhi!». *A tebe i otvetjat: «Spasibo!»* (Srednie Chud'i, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987). *Nu, vot tam chelovek rabotaet, sejchas, pravda, oni tak ne govoryat, idjot sosed, on dolzhen skazat': «Pomogaj Bog...!»* *A on dolzhen skazat': «Spasibo!»*. (Novyj posjolok, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999). *As the most common, it can be used in almost any situation of everyday speech communication. In some cases, the answer may be more detailed, specifying what they are thanking for, and often humorous, for example, in a sneezing situation: Kogda zamuchit, chihat i chihat, emu govoryat: «Spica v nos!»*. *A on otvechaet: «Spasibo na mjagkoj zatyckhe!»*. (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Chihat, chihat, nadoest. Govorili emu: «Spica v nos da para kolos!»*. *Ot otvechal: «Spasibo na dobroj zatyckhe!»*. (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

Dialogue constructor. This type etiquette dialogue has a similar structure, but the response to the stimulus remark is a rhymed or rhythmic response remark. The connection of remark in this case is carried out “through parallelism, uniformity of structure” [Zherebilo 2010: 92]: *Zajdjosh', a tam obedajut, skazhesh': «Hleb s sol'ju»*. *A skazhut: «Lob s mozol'ju»*. *Hleb da sol', em da svoj*. (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985); *Kogdy tkjo sidit, skazhe: «Sto lokot na prishvicu!»*. *A ona, kak devka, otvetit: «Sto zhenihov pod okoshko!»*. (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985); *Esli tkachiha zatykala, a v jeto vremja kto zajdjot, to govoryli: «Siden'e vashemu!»*. *A ona i otvetit: «Sidet' po-nashemu!»*. *Gost' i sadilsja, chtob polotno horosho sadilos'*. (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987); *Esli mesto gotovish', a kto chuzhoj i voshjol, to govorit: «Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!»*. *A ty otvechaesh': «Sto rublej v moshnu!»*. (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987); *«Bog v pomoshh'!»*. *Otvet: «Bog da Bog, da i sam bud' neploh'!»*. (Nikol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023), *ili «Bog v pomoshh'!»*. *Otvet: «Bog da Bog, da i sam by pomog'!»*. (Ljubim, Jarosl., SDK-2024).

In such a dialogue, the lines fit into each other like puzzles, and not at the semantic level (since the etiquette proposition does not change), but at the grammatical level, first of all. In other words, these puzzle lines are connected by “grammatical” and “sound inertia” [Tolstaya 2015: 328–329], where the response

line is mirrored, both structurally and sound-wise, which, among other things, ensures the rhythm and euphony of dialogic speech: *Your seat! — Sit in our way!*

Grammatical inertia can be expressed in “stringing together identical grammatical forms of a noun or verb and is usually combined within the framework of grammatical parallelism with word-formation, syntactic and other types of stringing” [Tolstaya 2015: 327]: *Sto lokot na prishvicu! — Sto zhenihov pod okoshko! (chisl. + sushh. R.P. + sushh. V.P.); Hleb s sol'ju — Lob s mozol'ju! (sushh. + sushh. Tv. P.); Sporyn'ja v kvashnju! — Sto rublej v moshnu! (sushh. V.P. + sushh. V.P.)*. As can be seen, the structure of the combined lines of one etiquette dialogue grammatically reflect each other. These same lines are interconnected, as already noted, by sound inertia, as indicated by the consonance of the endings of some words: *vashemu — po-nashemu; v kvashnju — v moshnu; s sol'ju — s mozol'ju*.

In spell texts, such an organization is pragmatically motivated: the rhythmic repetition of spell formulas is a strong influence on the source of various kinds of danger. It is quite possible that these techniques in etiquette dialogues (especially if they are close to ritual dialogues) have a similar pragmatic potential. However, it seems that in etiquette perception, such constructions serve to aestheticize the dialogue and its rapid reproducibility, often in a humorous form.

Chain dialogue. In a dialogic text of this type, the stimulus replica and the reaction replica are connected by semantic interpenetration of lexemes: *Esli zahodish' v dom, a tam korovu dojat, to nado skazat': «More pod korovoj», a hozjajka otvechaet: «Reka moloka». (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987); Ran'she v dom prihodili, perekreshhivajutsja, u poroga stojat i govorjat: «Mir domu!». Jim otvechajut: «Prinimaem mir!». (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).*

It is obvious that both lines repeat each other with the help of one lexeme (world — world) or lexemes of one lexical-semantic group (sea — river), which strengthens the semantic connection of the etiquette formula-good wishes with the response formula. So, for example, in the situation of milking a cow, the hostess is wished a large amount of milk. It is with this that the word itself is associated —

“sea” in the meaning of 'a huge quantity, an extraordinary abundance of something'. In the mythopoetic tradition of the Slavs, the sea appears as a symbol of boundless space, infinity, its enormous size — all this in the meaning of 'a lot' [Belova, Vinogradova 2004: 299]. “River” in turn is designated as 'a continuously moving stream of something'. The semantics of the word-symbol “river” is determined by such properties as “rapid flow, mobility, spatial extent, sinuosity (curvature of the riverbed)” [Vinogradova 2008: 416]. In this case, the connection of the words-symbols has a partitive pragmatic meaning: the housewife is wished to receive an abundance of milk from the cow (*mope*), but on the condition that the “flow” of milk will be smooth and fast (*peka*).

So, Etiquette dialogue can be divided into several types according to its textual form, distinguishing them according to the peculiarities of the functioning of the response, which is provided by the material of the SDK Archive: “thank you” dialogues, constructor dialogues, chain dialogues.

The existence of a verbalized response makes it possible to speak of a "pragmatically correct dialogue" [Baranov, Kreidlin: 96], where sequentially arranged responses are united by one topic and imply friendly interpersonal contact. However, the absence of such a response ("zero response") does not contradict the characteristics of a dialogic text, and such a construction can also be considered a dialogue. The records of the SDK Archive contain dialogues of various types, some without a verbalized response, but, of course, implying it, since implicitly, in the conditions of traditional communication, a response is assumed. Such etiquette dialogues are inherent in the same everyday situations: «*Byt' zdorov da schastliv!*». (Kimzha, Mez., Arh., SDK-28, 1986); *Bog na pomoch'!* (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007); *Dak trud na pol'zu govorjat!* (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); «*Schastlivyy put'!*» (*pered dal'nej dorogoj*). (Grigor'ev, Bat., Novg., SDK-1988); *Esli edjat — «Hleb da sol'!*». *Kogda chaj p'jut: «Chaj s saharom». A to — «Pomogaj Bog»*. (Zasur'e, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985). In such cases, a grateful response to a good wish is most likely assumed.

In addition, the material allows us to examine a very special type of fairly common etiquette dialogue, close to a ritual one: *Na ohotu poj djosh', tebe skazhut: «Ni puha ni pera!»*. *Ty emu otvechaesh': «K chjortu! K chjortu! K chjortu!»*. *Tri raza objazatel'no*. (Lampožnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Kak ohotnik idjot v les, emu chjo govorjat? — «Ni puha ni pera!»*. *On tozhe dolzhen skazat': «Idi ty k chjortu!»*. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023). As we can see, in the speech situation of going hunting, a deep mythological component of the verbal organization of the dialogue is manifested, namely — “the pragmatics of denial” [Tolstaya 2015: 343], embedded in the first line of the dialogue “*break a leg*”. This line is incantatory, performing one of the most important functions of denial in spells and incantations — “the magical destruction of evil forces” [Ibid.]. This is confirmed by the response “*K chertu!*”, the utterance of which implies protection from evil forces for the person going hunting. Since the forest is a sacred habitat of various evil spirits (leshy, devil, Baba Yaga, etc. — see [Cherepanova 1983]), then a person, usually baptized, had to renounce his faith in order to safely be in this space and successfully obtain prey (the very same “fluff and feathers”), which is why in such a case the hunter must answer: *K chertu!*, in order to show the spirit of the forest his renunciation of Christianity [Zelenin 1929].

A dialogue with the pragmatics of denial is reproduced in a similar situation of going fishing: *Ni cheshujki ni hvosta! A on tja dolzhen poslat': «K chjortu!»*. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023). In all variants of such a dialogue, there is a modality of obligation (*must say, must send*), in one case even with a symbolic numerical expression (*three times necessarily*), — as is known, the number three is sacred in folk mythological consciousness. It is quite acceptable, in our opinion, to call this type of etiquette dialogue a ritualized dialogue.

In etiquette dialogue within the framework of traditional communication, communicants are related according to the type: a) person + person; b) person + mythological patron; c) person + vegetable crop.

Man + man

The addressee (S 1) in a dialogic text can be a "guest", "stranger" or - most often - a generalized "someone" who happens to be passing by or unexpectedly drops in for a visit (in the case of a rural area, everyone is freely allowed to enter the house if the doors / gate are not locked): *Esli tkachiha zatykala, a v jeto vremja kto zajdjot, to govorili: «Siden'e vashemu!»*. *A ona i otvetit: «Sidet' po-nashemu!»*. **Gost' i sadilsja, chtob polotno horosho sadilos'**. (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987); *Esli mesto gotovish', a kto chuzhoj i voshjol, to govorit: «Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!»*. *A ty otvechaesh': «Sto rublej v moshnu!»*. (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987); *Kogda idjosh', kto-to rabotat, ty emu govori: «Trud v pol'zu!»*. *Ili: «Bog na pomoch'!»*. *On otvechaet: «Spasibo»*. (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986). *The first remark by function, as a rule, is a greeting with a benevolent semantics: Zorovalis': «Sto lokot na prishvicu!» — esli tkjot. Otvechat: «Spasibo», — da i vsjo*. (Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).

The stimulus replica is usually “assigned” to a generalized person, which is expressed in the structure of a generalized-personal construction, which denotes an action directed at a wide range of performers, where the verb can be expressed by “a) the form of the 2nd person singular of the future tense (*you will say*); b) the form 3rd person plural present tense (*they say*); c) in the 2nd person singular imperative mood: (*say*)” [Tarlanov 1999: 185]: *Esli hto prjadjot, vojdjosh' skazhesh': «Sto lokot na prishvicu!»*. *Ona otvetit: «Sto rublej v karman!»*. (Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985); *A koda korovu doish', govorjat sustrechajas': «More pod korovu!»*. *Otvechaesh': «Davaj Bog bole!»*. (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991). *Kak idjosh', da chaj p'jut, skazhi: «Chaj s saharom!»*. *A obedajut-to, dak: «Hleb s sol'ju!»*. *A hozjain: «Spasibo»*. (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985).

Often, indefinite-personal constructions are used (*they said*) or even impersonal modal-authorizing constructions (*one can say, one must say*): *Esli zahodish' v dom, a tam korovu dojat, to nado skazat': «More pod korovoj», a hozjajka otvechaet: «Reka moloka»*. (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987); *«V dal'njuju dorogu» — blizkie govorili. «Dolgih let zhizni!»*. *«Schastlivogo puti!»*.

(Vjazovija, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997); «*S ljogkim parom!*» — *govorili*. (Fomino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

The replica-reaction is also “impersonal” (*they dine, they drink, he answers*), it can be addressed to anyone. In our materials, the narrators — in an attempt to describe a typical, usual situation for them — designate (any/every) subject of the action with an indefinite pronoun or a noun with a generalized meaning: *someone* works, *a person* works, you catch up with *someone*, etc.

The addressee, the “respondent” (S 2), has a more diverse palette of roles, expressed in lexical nominations: a) an indication of the role in the house (*master / mistress*); b) an indication of the degree of closeness / kinship (*neighbor, acquaintance / stranger, close*); c) an indication of the type of activity (*hunter / fisherman / weaver*); d) a generalized indication with a verb and an indefinite pronoun (*who spins / who works*).

In a dialogic text of this type, there is direct interaction between the human communicants — both lines are expressed verbally and represent a stable etiquette formula (form) in the function of greeting, gratitude, farewell, etc.

Man + mythological patron (man + brownie, man + forest, man + field, etc.)

A special category of "dialogues" that form quasi-communication is presented primarily in the form of addresses. Address as a unit of speech etiquette is actualized in traditional communication in a special way, this was partially written about at different times by V.N. Grishanova, L.Yu. Zorina, O.A. Cherepanova ⁶and other scientists. However, many of them considered the issues of formulaicity folk speech etiquette expressions, first of all, in the projection of the problem of their structural organization in the conditions of communication between people, rightly believing that speech etiquette is a vivid indicator of the culturally marked speech experience of a specific community of people. Unlike urban etiquette, where people directly act as communicants, in the etiquette of folk speech, as is known, “not only a person,

⁶See the bibliography.

but also almost any other object that acquires human attributes in the act of communication can act as a partner in a communicative act. A kind of “total anthropomorphization” of nature occurs. Thus, the rules of etiquette can be observed not only in relation to another person, but also in relation to an animal, a tree, the earth, as well as the spirits of ancestors, characters of folk demonology, etc. "[Bayburin, Toporkov 1990: 7].

The dialogue between a person and a mythological patron (*domovoi*, *yard*, *forest*, *field*) has a more complex structure. The role of S 1 is played by *the host* (*mistress*), *neighbor*, but more often it is a familiar generalized "someone": «*Dedushka-domozhirushko, hrani menja, sberegi*» — *i vsjo. V hlev skotinu zavedjosh' — tozhe prosish'sja. Ona (sosedka) vsjo moloko v chetyre ugla lila. Podoit nemnozhko korovu i l'jot v chetyre ugla.* (Mar'ina, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); *Hozjain da hozjajka-to, koshka, i poprositsja v dom u dedushki i domodedushki: «Dedushko-domovoj, pusti pozhit'».* (Mar'ina, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008). *In some contexts S 1 and S 3 are presented by a single subject of speech: Prosilis' vot s zhivotinoj, ili vot zahozhu ja v novyj dom da v novyj ili kuda-to na kvartiru, i nado kak-to prosit'sja: «Dedushko-atamanushko, pusti nas tam s korovushkoj ili s ovechkaj, ili s kem li» — vot tak vot. Kakie slova tol'ko govorili vot jeti, jeti vse govorjat.* (Kobeljovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); *Poshli syn da nevestka v novyj dom, ja vzjala hleba, soli, krupki. Zashla: «Dedushko-domovejushko, primi moih detucek, obogrevaj, obuvaj, odevaj, na dobry dela ih nastavljaj».* (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986). *Appeals to personified holidays have a similar structure, as indicated by the predicate in a definitely personal construction: V Egorij voz'mu ikonku i ves' dvor obojdu, i prigovarivaju: «Egorij-batjushka, sohrani moju skotinushku ot zlyh ljudej, ot zverej», a to dva remeshka postelju nakrest i zamok poveshu na pervuju dver' na dvor, togda korovushka budet doma derzhat'sja* (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

In most cases of such dialogues S 3 indicates a generalized (non-specific) subject of speech, which is also confirmed by the functioning of the predicate in the sentence: a) an indefinite-personal construction *Esli skotinu pokupali, domoj veli i*

govorjat: «Batjushka-dvorovoj, pojdjom so mnoj». *A esli na novo mesto: «Pojdjom zhit', da nam sluzhit'»*. (Stupino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987); *b) an impersonal construction with an infinitive and a modal word: Govorjat, nado idti, vybrat' mesto, sprosit' hozjaina: «Hozjain-lesovoj, pusti menja ne noch' nochevat', a vek vekovat'»*. (Chjornaja, Bat., Novg., 1988); *c) I skazhi, chto: «Batjushka-polevoj, otpusti moju korovushku domoj»*, — *i vsjo*. (Krasnyj Bereg, Volog., Volog., SDK-2005).

With all this, it is clear that S 2 is not clearly expressed, there is only an indication of its name, it can be *duh lesa, hozjain-lesovoj, les / batjushka-polevoj / batjushka-dvorovoj / dedushka-domozhirushko, babushka-domozhórushka, dedushka-domovejushka, matushka-domoviha, hozjain-domohozjajushka, dedushko-atamanushko, hozjain (hozjajushka), dedushka-domovidushko, babushko Solomnidushko, dedushka-domovinushka, babushka-domovina, dedushka-domovoj*, etc. (see [Cherepanova 1983]).

In this case, appeals perform appellative, influencing and symbolic functions. Pragmatically correct dialogue does not occur here, since the mythological character cannot give a verbal answer. Such a dialogic text in this case takes the form of a **dialogized sentence**, reproduced within the framework of a once forgotten ritual.

Dialogued sentences also function within the framework of quasi-communication according to the “**person + vegetable crop**” model, where the OEFF function in the form of ritualized appeals *Vot Valja kogda sazhaet chto v ogorode, govorit: «Rasti s Bogom dlja sebja i dlja ljudej!»*. (Iskra, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987); *Nu, vot kapustu sadjat, dak govorjat: «Ne bud' golenasta, a bud' korenasta!»*. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023); *Kogda ogorod sazhaju, govorju: «Rasti, vejsja, na uhod ne nadejsja!»* (Troica, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

A dialogic text in traditional communication is characterized by a set of fundamental discursive features. On the one hand, it is close to the general scientific understanding of the term “dialogic unity”, which “is ensured by the presence of one topic, agreement or disagreement of the interlocutors. D.e. — a sequence of interconnected remarks, united by: 1) the accumulation of information on a given topic; 2) the motivation of forms (*modality, addressability* — A.Ch.); 3) cohesion,

reliance on the previous or subsequent remarks” [Zherebilo 2010: 92]. On the other hand, for an etiquette dialogic text it is fundamentally important that each remark is dependent, forced, since there is a strong connection with the speaking situation, the types of communicants (person, mythological patron) and the cultural-mythological context that determines the everyday life of the participant in the communication, in contrast to “quick conversation on everyday or business topics,” in which “the components do not have a special assignment” [Yakubinsky 1986: 27]. The addressee and the addressee in a dialogic text have a clear idea of what literally (with minor variations) needs to be said in a given situation.

Dialogic text in traditional communication is rarely constructed in the form of a question-and-answer structure. Such structures are rare in our material: *Откуда ты такая явилась? — Из тех ворот, откуда весь народ.* (Твер. Осташк. СДК-1991). Characteristic for etiquette dialogue is the presence of an affirmative remark-exclamation in the function of greeting (*The sea under the cow!*), blessing (*God help!*), farewell (*Have a nice trip!*), etc., to which follows a corresponding affirmative answer (*Thank you!*). Dialogue in these cases is always reproduced within the framework of one thematic situation.

As can be seen, speech folk etiquette is represented by the form of a dialogic text, which presupposes the establishment of contact between people, between a person and a mythological patron, between a person and a vegetable crop. These dialogues are obligatory, since etiquette and, in some cases, the surviving "fragments" of the ritual require it. All the lines of the etiquette (ritual-etiquette) dialogue are semantically interdependent, grammatically designed and pragmatically oriented.

2.4. Etiquette forms and formulas of traditional communication: structural and semantic features

Properly Etiquette Forms and Formulas (SEFF)

When writing this subsection, materials from published articles by the author of the dissertation research were used [Chekina 2023 a, b].

The etiquette of popular speech, as has already been noted, is an integral system of culturally significant EFF. Each formula reflects the everyday life of people living in rural areas, which still retains the remnants of archaic mythological knowledge. This is primarily embodied verbally, as indicated by the lexical design of the formulas; actionally, since each formula is related to a real action that is performed by a participant in communication; objectively, since often the communicative-pragmatic situation is associated with a specific ritualized object with the help of which the action is performed. All this together turns any EFF into a cultural sign that contains symbolic semantics and performs an etiquette (pragmatic) function.

The results of observations show that SEFFs function in three main types: greeting formulas (establishing contact), gratitude formulas (maintaining contact), and farewell formulas (interrupting contact). Basically, we are talking about communication according to the “person + person” model, but in some cases (when gratitude formulas function), the “person + mythological patron” model becomes relevant.

GREETINGS

In the process of establishing contact between communicants for the "initiation of communication" [Shchepanskaya 2003: 230] SEFF mainly function as greetings themselves: *Da, so vsemi zdorovalis'. Kto-to idet, da, neznakomyj: «Zdravstvujte». Zabytoe kakoe-to, v gorode zhe ne tak.* (Fomino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024); *(Starshim): Zdravstvujte! Shapochku snimali, klanjalis'.* (Rakomo, Novg., Nogv., SDK-54, 1994); *Ran'she k starichkam ne tak otnosilis'. Kak vstretjat na ulice starika, dak vsjo govorjat: «Zdras'te, Vashe stepenstvo!».* (Kisovo, Volog. Cherep., SDK-40, 1987). Such contexts in our material are few in number, but that is what makes them interesting: a clear connection with the "old" tradition can be traced, which is evident from some lexemes (*earlier, forgotten some*). It is noted that greetings were mainly given to older people, and younger people should always greet first. At the same time, informants in interviews often say that in the village it is customary to greet everyone: both acquaintances and strangers (in comparison

with the urban environment, "in the city it is not like that"). This is confirmed by N.I. Formanovskaya, who points out that in village society it is customary "to greet even strangers, sending them a sign of goodwill" [Formanovskaya 1989: 46].

The rest of the material records special greetings that lexically mark the situation requiring the pronunciation of a particular SEFF: *Zdorovalis'*: «*Sto lokot na prishvicu!*» — *esli tkjot. Otvechat: «Spasibo», — da i vsjo.* (Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985); *Privetstvovali: «Hleb da sol'!*» *Dobra pora, kogda edjat. Obedajut. Chaj p'jut da skazhut: «Chaj da sahar!*». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986); *Esli starushki sidjat, to im govorjat: «Siden'ju vashemu!*». *A oni uzht otvechajut: «Sidet' po-nashemu!*». (Ignatovo, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987). The SRNG indicates that an expression similar to the latter is a greeting: "Peace to your seat! Greeting to the seated elderly people" [SRNG 2004: 282]. Almost always they are constructed in the form of a dialogic text, which actualizes the fact of contact establishment.

There are also completely unique etiquette forms that have no variations and are fixed in a specific region, in a specific year: *V nekotoryh derevnjah oni (zhenshhiny) ne zdorovajutsja, a govorjat: «Lebed' belaja!» (i pri jetom klanjajutsja).* (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000). The greeting has a precise identification: "this is an affectionate address to a young and pleasant woman" [Zorina 2012: 102]. The stable folklore image is easy to read — *the swan* has "strongly expressed feminine symbolism" [Gura 1997: 679], especially in song folklore it is associated with the image of a young and beautiful "swan bride" [Ibid.: 680]. Next to the epithet (*swan*), the phrase *white* acquires the meaning of purity and beauty (like the white plumage of a swan). Various formulas with the component "swan" are used, for example, in Vologda dialects as good wishes when washing clothes, where the semantics of "cleanliness, whiteness", with which the swan is associated, is quite clearly manifested.

Another single context is a question-answer structure: *Otkuda ty takaja javilas'?* — *Iz teh vorot, otkuda ves' narod.* (Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991). The etiquette formula of the meeting characterizes a woman who identifies herself with "all the people", i.e. who is a part of the village society on an equal basis with all its

other representatives. This formula is essentially a proverb that emphasizes the social equality and unity of all people. The National Corpus of the Russian Language (NCRY) records one context from the beginning of the 20th century, where this expression appears: *Vtoroe chado — tvoj quasikrestnik Anton, nezakonnyj meshhanin g. Novgoroda, sluzhit v tipografii dobrogo gospodina Suvorina naborshhikom, ves'ma dovolen svojim polozheniem, perezhivaet 18-j god vyhoda iz teh vorot, otkuda ves' narod carja pochitaet, k roditelju (za neimeniem materi) pitaet samye druzhestvennyye chuvstva i Potockogo ne priznaet v silu degeneracii, unasledovannoj ot Anny Ivanovny.* [Al. P. Chehov. Pis'ma Antonu Pavlovichu Chehovu (1903)]. However, there is an assumption that the proverb was known earlier; it can be found on the Internet in the form of a joke or toast dating back to the “times of Pushkin”: — *Ja p'ju za zdravie vorot / Otkuda ja i ves' narod! — Ja p'ju za zdravie kljucha / Chto otkryvaet sgorjacha / Zamok zavetnyh teh vorot / Otkuda ja i ves' narod!* Such a multi-genre “festivity” of the formula indicates its folklore potential. In our case, the formula performs the etiquette function of greeting, while preserving its cultural meaning.

The most relevant among the SEFF are greetings-blessings reproduced in various situations of the everyday work of the Russian peasant. Often such SEFF are presented in the form of a dialogue-“thank you”: *A trud na pol'zu! — Spasibo. «Bog na pomoch'!».* *Ran'she vsjo: «Bog na pomoch'» ved', a tut stal «trud-to».* (Kobeljova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); *«Bo(h) na pomoc'!» — «Spasibo!» da i vsjo. Zajdjosh' — hozjajka moet, dak: «Nabelo, Bog na pomoc'!».* (Bol'shoe Krotovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

The most common “labor” SEFF *Labor for good!* and *God help!* are well-known in various phonetic and grammatical variants and are fixed in the dictionary. We focus on the “specific” formulas that are characteristic only of a specific type of work:

Weaving: *Speh tebe za stav! (Otv: Spasibo! Sto zhenihov pod okoshko!) Speh za krjosnami! Sto lokot na prishvicu! (Otv: Sto rubelej v karman!).*

Cooking: *Sporyn'ja v kvashnju! (Otv: Sto rubelej v moshnu!).*

Washing and rinsing clothes: *Bélén'ko! Belen'ko Vam / tebe! Belen'ko poloshhi! Nabelo Bog na pomoch'! Belo stirat' / myt'! Nabelo koryto! Pomogaj Bog! Belo na vode! (Otvét: Spasibo!).*

Milking a cow: *More moloka! More pod korovoj! More pod korovu! Vedro moloka! More do kolena! (Otvét: Daj Bog bole! Reka moloka!).*

The considered etiquette expressions take the form of elliptical constructions with auspicious semantics. As is known, a wish is “an expression of a wish for good, health, etc. addressed to the listener, where the listener is simultaneously the beneficiary of the wish and the subject of the desired situation” [Bondarko 1990: 181]. If we conditionally reconstruct the stimulus replica of any formula, we get a familiar auspicious construction: *<Pust' budet> more pod korovoj! <Zhelaju> speh tebe za stav! <Pust' budet> belen'ko! <Pust' budet> sporyn'ja v kvashnju!* Optic semantics can be expressed explicitly: *speh* ('success, good luck'); *more moloka / do kolena* (meaning 'a lot'), *sporyn'ja* ('success, good luck in some matter'); or implicitly: *belo / belen'ko / nabelo* (i.e. 'clean, fresh'), from which it becomes clear what exactly is desired for the hostess (the situations presented are typical for women).

In general, the syntax of the language of folklore, as follows from a number of special studies ⁷of individual oral poetic texts, is characterized by specific features, often conditioned by the ontological connection of these texts with living oral speech. For example, Z.K. Tarlanov points out that “the syntax of proverbs is always the syntax of living folk speech of a certain period, brought to perfection” [Tarlanov 1999: 39]. And further — he asserts: “The syntax of proverbs and the syntax of living folk speech are things of the same plane, equivalent” [Ibid.]. When qualifying the general structure of small speech forms of folk speech, in particular — EFF, which have different origins, but perform the most important functions of traditional communication, this position is entirely fair.

⁷See the bibliography.

The lexical composition of the formula directly depends on the situation in which it is reproduced. Symbolic objects are mentioned, with the help of which the action is performed: a) in weaving: *stav*, *krosna* (variants of the names of a home weaving loom), *Prishvitsa* (same as sewing 'the front shaft in a weaving loom for strengthening the warp threads and winding the finished fabric' [SRNG 1998: 66]); b) when washing: *trough*, *water*; c) when milking a cow: *milk*, *bucket*; d) when kneading dough: *kvashnya* ('wooden tub for leavening dough' [SRNG 1977: 164]), etc.

Such types of women's activities **as weaving and cooking** are accompanied by formulas similar in their structural and semantic features, presented in the form of a dialogue constructor: *Kogda tkut, tak govorili: «Speh tebe za stav!»*. (Kovrig, Ljubytin., Novg., SDK-36, 1986); *Kogdy tkjo sidit, skazhe: «Sto lokot na prishvicu!»*. *A ona, kak devka, otvetit: «Sto zhenihov pod okoshko!»*. (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985); *Koli za rabotoj sidish', prjadjosh' znachit, vot gost'-to idjot, pridjot, tak skazhet: «Speh za krjosnami!»*. (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987); *Esli hto prjadjot, vojdjosh' skazhesh': «Sto lokot na prishvicu!»*. *Ona otvetit: «Sto rublej v karman!»*. (Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985); *Esli mesto gotovish', a kto chuzhoj i voshjol, to govorit: «Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!»*. *A ty otvechaesh': «Sto rublej v moshnu!»*. (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

These formulas of good wishes, as already noted, go back to one prototext, on the basis of which they are distinguished grammatical invariant zone of the formula (*Speh tebe za stav! Speh za kresnami! Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!*) and the lexical zone of variation (*Sto rublej v karman! Sto rublej v moshnu!*).

The formulas of both the greeting and the response to it are already traditional elliptical constructions with a two-part structure: the left part contains the main meaning of the good wishes, what exactly is wished for the hostess (*haste, ergot, a hundred lokot, a hundred grooms, a hundred rubles*), the right part indicates the object that should ensure a successful outcome of the matter (*za stav, za kresnyami, na prichvitsa*) or the place where the result of successful work should be (*pod*

okonsko, v kartom, v smoshnu). The repeating quantitative component "sto" (*lokot, grooms, rubles*) is characteristic. The dialectal form of the plural R.p. from the noun "lokot" is noted, which in this formula actualizes the meaning 'c is a tarin measure of length, equal to approximately 0.5 m.' [MAS 1986: 198].

There is an observation [Zorina 2012: 68] that *a hundred suitors under the window* can act as a formula for the good wishes themselves, and not as a response to them, as presented in the SDK material. And in this case, such a wish to the hostess can be expressed by someone from the female circle, since women are more concerned with creating a family, and the wish for *a hundred rubles in the pocket / purse* - by a man, since it is he who is busy providing the family with material goods.

In general, such greetings and good wishes, containing dialect words and phrases, reflect the color of the speech etiquette of the Russian North and classify them as unique, close to folklore texts, which are distinguished by "the stability of existence, the use of traditional folklore motifs," as well as "the ability for poetic improvement (rhyme, parallelism, metaphorization, etc.) and recognition in a given cultural environment" [Sadova 2004: 141] by communicants.

Another of the most important block-situations associated with women's household chores is **washing or rinsing clothes**: *Esli bel'jo poloshhesh', a idjot kto, dak skazhet: «Belén'ko!»*. *A ty otvetish': «Spasibo!» i dal'she rabotaesh'*. (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-1987); *Kogda poloshhesh' bel'jo v vode, a vdrug kto-to prohodit mimo, dak on skazat' dolzhen: «Beló na vode!»*, *a ty i otvetish': «Spasibo!»*. (Srednie Chud'i, Cherep., Volog., SDK-1987); *A idjosh', i vdrug bel'jo poloshhut, govorjat: «Belen'ko» ili «Belen'ko Vam»*. *Tak voobshhe slyhivala ja s junyh let.* (Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1999); *Zdravstvuj-to, hudo govorili, a ran'she dak: «Pomogaj bog»*. *Stirali, dak skazhut: «Nábelo, Bog ná pomoch'»*. (Zasur'e, Arh, Pinega, SDK-1985).

The action, as you can see, usually takes place on the street, i.e. a woman is washing clothes in the river. In general, the material from the SDK Archives gives the following variants of this formula: *Belen'ko.../Vam/tebe / Belen'ko poloshhi / Beló na vode / Belo stirat' / myt' / Nabelo, Bog na pomoshh'*.

Assuming a form of oral communication, these formulas represent syntactic constructions of colloquial speech, which in its most general form is characterized by fragmentation, understatement, but at the same time — content capacity (*Belen'ko! Belo na vode!*). Obviously, we have before us an example of an elliptical construction, the peculiarity of which is “the elimination of the verb component, which is not compensated for by the context or situation” [Akimova 2009: 138]. For example, A.A. Shakhmatov attributed such constructions to incomplete sentences without a verb (absence of a predicate) and called them violated [Shakhmatov 1941: 30—31], which is quite typical for the syntax of living speech. It is important that “the elimination of the verbal predicate does not prevent the independent functioning of the sentence in this case” [Akimova 2009: 138], i.e. Oral communication does not suffer from this, especially since it is traditionally ritualized and built on traditional speech formulas and symbols.

The archaic greeting formula when washing/rinsing clothes retains the ancient semantics contained in the root *-bel* presented in different variants of the words of the category of state: *white, white, fair*.

Etymologically, the root *bel-* is related in many languages, where it means approximately the same thing. The Fasmer dictionary states: " *bel, bela, belo*, Ukrainian: білий, Old Slavonic бѣль, Bulgarian: бял, Serbo-Croatian : бѐ , бијѐла, Slovenian: bћl, Czech : bílý, Polish: biały, Upper Sorbian, Lower Sorbian: běly. Originally related to Old Ind. bhālam "**shine**" (*here and further italics mine* — *A.Ch.*), bhāti "**shines, shines**", Greek. π εφήσεται "will appear" (from φαίνω from *φάνιω), π έφη έφάνη (Hesychios), lit. boiúoti "**to cast white, to turn white**" Itsh bāls "pale, faded", lit. balas "**white**", Greek φαλός λευκός (Hesychios), φάλιος "**light, white**", Cymric bal "white-faced", Alb. ballë "forehead", Old Norse bál "fire", further Lith. balà "swamp", báltas "**white**" [Vasmer 1987]. As you can see, the main meaning of the etymon is 'to shine, to glow, to sparkle, to cast a white sheen, to turn white; bright, white'.

This is confirmed by the text of the article in the comparative etymological dictionary of O.N. Trubachev: " *albus, candidus* 'white' (SJS), Bulgarian. бял,

dialect. бел, бел **'white; transparent, clean'** (Mladenov BTR; Georgiev) 'white' (Plet . I, 17), dialect. bela f. — about a sheep (Sasel, Ramovs 101), Czech. bily, adj **'white, light'**, bile v ocich 'thorn', slvts. biely **'white', 'light', 'gray'** (SSJ I, 94), Upper Sorbian bely 'white' (Pfuhl 13-14), Lower Sorbian bely **'white, bright, clear', 'clean'** (Muka St. I, 28), Polish Vole, adj. masculine 'white' (Polanski — Sehnert 44), Polish biały 'white '); white neuter 'dawn, early morning' (bonfire, Filin 2, 216), Old Ukrainian б ѣ ый **'white', 'clean', 'gray'** (Timchenko I, 172), white (Arch. South-Western Region. I, 1, 183-1583, Timchenko I, 90), Ukrainian б і лий **'white', 'clean'** (Grinchenko I, 64), blr. bely 'white'. Old Slavic. * b ě l ь is quite close to the reconstructed Celtic. * belos **'bright, shining'**, cf. Gaulish Belenus, an epithet of Apollo (see W. Prellwitz BB XXII, 1897, 80; Pokorny I, 119)" [ESSYA 1975, Issue 2: 79]. However, the "new" meaning of the root *bel-* is also noticeable here. — white, i.e. 'clean, transparent'.

In the Dictionary of Russian Mentality (SRM), V.V. Kolesov gives the following interpretation, which is important for our discussion: white is 'devoid of its own color and any color impurities, and therefore retaining its original shine and purity'. This color is "to a greater extent inherent in the world around a person than in the person himself, who easily becomes covered in dirt and loses *his whiteness*" [SRM 2014, Vol. 1: 36]. In addition, in his works on historical lexicology, V.V. Kolesov (see [Kolesov 1986; Ibid. 2004]) notes that white is in its original meaning 'shiny, transparent', i.e. invisible. But the meaning 'clean' developed rather late (1583) and became secondary, recorded in our records of the late 20th — early 21st centuries.

As is known, A.A. Potebnya also wrote about the symbolism of white (in relation to red), linking the meaning of the word-color with the magical and mythological meanings of the phenomena that it called: "As white, so the prototype of the word *bright, ardent*, from light and fire (Yarilo, a solar holiday) passes to white color (*ardent wax*), desire and love (*rage, mlr .ardent, passionate*)" [Potebnya 2000: 28]. The epithet *ardent* is used here in the meaning of 'white, shiny, bright' [Ibid.]. It is interesting that Potebnya notes the special cultural semantics of the color

white — love and beauty. " Although the meaning of beauty could have been formed here without the mediation of the color white, directly from the light — fire, nevertheless whiteness is a symbol of beauty", which should be kept in mind in relation to the pragmatic situation of washing / rinsing linen under consideration. "In the detective case about fortune tellers (17th century, see Zabelin, 486, 487), a spell has been preserved that was pronounced when burning the collars of shirts: "As white as the shirt on the body, so would the husband be before the wife" or "so bright would the husband be". From this it is clear that white = nice." So, "the meaning of white comes from the fact that it is a symbol of love: to wash *white* means to love" [Potebnya 2000: 28].

It can be assumed that in our greeting-blessing the hostess is wished to *wash white / wash* with the wish to wash not only, " radiantly ", "brilliantly" cleanly, transparently, but also beautifully, with love, because the hostess usually washes *linen* (as is customary) for the whole family, i.e. for those who are dear to her. Here we can see an inseparable harmonious connection of ideas about benefit and beauty, i.e. pragmatic (the hostess is wished to wash cleanly) and aesthetic (the hostess is wished to wash beautifully, with love), which is very characteristic of the etiquette formula, which is embedded in its cultural semantics in the folklore context.

The diminutive-palatable suffix also attracts attention.suffix — *еньк* in the most common formula *Belenko!* is also noteworthy as a formant indicating a certain intimacy of the everyday situation, i.e. the speaker's desire to win over the addressee of the remark. L. Yu. Zorina notes in this good wish "the strengthening of the wish due to the expression that is brought in by the suffix -еньк- , cf. in folk speech: *blizenko, malenko, kruglenko, chistenko* " [Zorina 2012: 130].

The grammatical variability of the words of the categories of state used in the formula has three main forms: *belenko, belo, nabelo*. In the "Dictionary of Russian Folk Dialects" the forms "belenko" and "nabelo" are noted separately: *Belenko (/belo)* — clean [SRNG 1966: 211]. *Nabelo* — in combinations: 'Nabelo bely - very white; belo nabelo - very clean' [SRNG 1983: 111]. It is characteristic that in cases of tautological composition of words, one part appears in the meaning 'very'.

L. Yu. Zorina compares the good wish *Nabelo!* with stable combinations: strong-strong, belo-nabelo, i.e. 'very, extremely strong, white' [Zorina 2012: 28]. These also include the paired folklore formulas “belym-belo”, “chernym-chno”, “ranym-rano”, etc (on the recursive variation of paired formulas see, e.g., [Sadova, Chekina 2023]). In the language of folklore, such phrases are quite common — they actualize the intensification of the meaning contained in the semantics of the word. V.V. Vinogradov wrote: “Various constructions with pleonastic or tautological repetition of the stems of nouns or adjectives (like instrumental intensification) usually lead to the formation of adverbs. In them, the real meaning of the word is absorbed by the function of emotional intensification” [Vinogradov 1947: 382–383]. In our case, only one part of such a combination is used (*Nabelo!*), functioning as an independent elliptical sentence, while in the usual form it is part of a complex composite (*bely-nabelo*).

The syntactic structure of the formula takes into account the variants of optional elements that characterize: a) an indication of the addressee (the pronoun *You / you*); b) an indication of the action expressed by the imperative in the traditional form of the second person (*rinse*) or in the form of the infinitive (*wash , wash*) with an intensification of the wish to wash cleanly, efficiently; c) an indication of the place expressed by the preposition *na* and a noun in the prepositional case *vode*, emphasizing the situational determinacy of the good wish (when washing clothes).

As the analysis shows, the formula of greeting the hostess in the situation of washing/rinsing the laundry is quite stable, which is confirmed by the number of contexts, its fixation in dictionaries and variability. This formula is, perhaps, the most archaic, which is reflected in both the semantics and grammatical form. In the collection of the famous folklorist S.V. Maksimov "Winged Words" this formula is recorded in the context of cultural realities of the late 19th century: *Na reke b'et val'kom propoloskannoe bel'e mladshaja nevestka iz sosednej izby: «belen'ko!» — uslyshit i ona korotkoe privetstvie.* [C. V. Maksimov. Krylatye slova (1899)]. Our material shows that the formula was actively used by the inhabitants of the Russian

North at the end of the 20th century, and only one context dates back to 2000: «*Belo stirat' (myt')!*» (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000). All this suggests that the formula is being erased from the memory of dialect speakers, becoming a cultural and historical element that the modern villager almost no longer remembers.

SEFF also serve another, no less important female occupation in the village — milking the cow. In our material, there are several variations of this formula: *More pod korovoj* (2) / *More moloka* (1) / *Vedro moloka* (1) / *Vedrom (tebe)* (2) / *Vedrom tebe, Bog pomoshh'* (1) *Reka moloka (tol'ko kak otvet)* (2).

The formulas under consideration can be designated as constructions with unrealized valence (*More pod korovoj!*). This can be explained by the peculiarities of oral conversational speech — on the one hand,— on the other — by the situation in which the participants in the dialogue do not need to be explained the rules of the given communication, since they possess this knowledge subconsciously.

The formulas under consideration take the form of a chain dialogue: *Esli zahodish' v dom, a tam korovu dojat, to nado skazat': «More pod korovoj», a hozhajka otvechaet: «Reka moloka»*. (Skovjatino, Cherepov., Volog., SDK-1987). As can be seen, with zero participation of the verb, which is typical for elliptical constructions, the subject of the action is the word-symbol — "sea", which is pronounced in the well-wishing function: the hostess is wished a sea of milk. In the actual absence of a predicate, the predicativity is still felt - through the lexical and semantic fullness of the formula, which in terms of content actualizes the intention to wish the hostess a successful outcome of the matter. Consequently, this wish is associated with the pragmatic meaning of milking a cow — getting a large amount of milk from it.

The use of such symbolic words indicates not only a large amount of milk, but also the milking process itself, and all of this in a symbolic meaning, assigned to a syntactic construction. I.A. Ossovetsky attributed such formulas to “poetic phraseology” [Ossovetsky 1975: 71–73], which “represents artistic lexical-syntactic unities of varying degrees of generalization” [Ibid.]. It can include “stable syntactic constructions with symbolic words and with a given expression” [Ibid.], which is

also observed in our etiquette greeting formula, pronounced in the situation of milking a cow.

"Labor" etiquette forms, which informants pronounce "in their own words", reflect the meaning of generally accepted etiquette formulas, thereby preserving their pragmatic function « *Trud na pol'zu!*». «*Zdorov'e v ruki!*». «*Chistota v izbe!*» *Byvaet, i sam pridumaet.* (Ustreka, Moshensk., Novg., SDK-45, 1989). It is important that in cases of pronouncing a greeting EFF, this speech act is a mandatory act, only after which one can begin a normal everyday conversation.

There is also a so-called verbal prohibition, a "prohibition" on greetings ("word taboo") in the system of speech etiquette. Situations in which it is strictly forbidden to greet are deeply ritualized and are connected with magical actions: *Idjosh' s podojnikom so dvora, skorej moloko stavish', potom zdorovaessja, a s molokom pozdorovalas' — «Pus' Bog proshhaet nas greshnyh», — skazhesh'.* (Gora, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985); *Doja korovu, dak ne zdorovajutsja, s molokom pojdjosh' — tozhe.* (Sluda, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985); *Nel'zja koda moloko nesjosh', postav' ego, togda zdorovassja, a s molokom — ne zdorovassja. S podojnikom idjosh' — tozhy ne govori nicho, poka ne postavish', ne zanesesh', tak-ot chto hosh' butte, idi mimo, ne razgovarivaj.* (Sura, Pin., Arh., SDK-21, 1985); *Vo hleve ne zdorovajsja, so skotinoj kody zhivjosh', goni, vo dvor ne puskaj nikogda nikogo, nel'zja puskat' nikogo ko skotu.* (Sura, Pin., Arh., SDK-21, 1985); *I vot byla primeta: cherez reku moloka ne davat'. Esli s molokom idjot (zhenshhina), to govorit' nel'zja, ni stavit' nel'zja i po gostjam hodit' nel'zja s jetim molokom, poka po domu ne dojdjosh'. Moloko iz ruk v ruki ne peredajut. Jeto na korovu otrazhaetsja. S molokom shutki plohi.* (Bol'shoe Krotovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008). In the Russian cultural and speech space, it is noted that "language prohibitions could be complete (for example, silence) and partial"[Vinogradova, Tolstaya 1999: 273]. For protective purposes, many speech etiquette situations could be subject to prohibition: "it is forbidden to greet (for example, when sowing; in a house where a dead person is, etc.), to respond to a greeting, or in general to "respond" or thank (for example, a healer after a spell-casting session); swearing and cursing (especially addressed to children) are subject

to strong prohibitions” [Ibid.] which is confirmed by our material: *Rugat'sja nel'zja, mnogie rugajutsja chjortom — upasi Bozhe — nel'zja ego pominat'!* (Hotjazh, Novg., Nogv., SDK-54, 1994).

In such situations, a non-verbal etiquette situation occurs: communicants with a common cultural background understand in which cases it is not customary to pronounce a formula of good wishes as a greeting. If this action is not performed, it is considered necessary to ask forgiveness from the divine powers for not observing strict ritual rules: *Idjosh' s podojnikom so dvora, skorej moloko stavish', potom zdorovaessja, a s molokom pozdorovalas' — «Pus' Bog proshhaet nas greshnyh», skazhesh'.* (Gora, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).

Thus, the functioning of the EFF in the form of greetings proper (Hello!) and greetings with benevolent semantics (*Trud na pol'zu! Sporyn'ja v kvashnju! More moloka! Belen'ko! etc.*) demonstrates the stability of the SEFF in all thematic situations of folk speech etiquette of all regions of the Russian North.

GRATITUDE

A greeting-blessing is almost always in unity with a formula-gratitude. Most often it is the usual "thank you" (from "God save you"), but there are also more detailed responses, which often themselves turn into an etiquette form: *Trud na pol'zu! — Spasibo! No nezhelatel'no takoj pol'zy (esli privetstvuemyj zanjat tjazhelym, bessmyslennym trudom).* (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000); — *Spasibo! — Na zdorov'e! Svoja sila v rot nosila!* (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991); *Kak iz-za stola vstanut da «spasibo» skazhut, tak i govorish': «Chem bogaty, tem i rady!»* (Vjatka, Tver, Ostashk., SDK-1991). The latter has a very specific genre characteristic — a proverb (see [Dahl 1862]), that reflects morality and folk wisdom. It is a two-part structure of a complex sentence, the parts of which are connected by a double conjunction “than — that”, which is quite typical for proverbs [Tarlanov 1999]. Its meaning is based on the positive semantics of the utterance and functions as an “address that invites the guest to use what the hosts have in their house (treats, etc.)” [MAS 1985: 101]. It is usually pronounced after the end of a meal. In an etiquette situation, such use indicates that the etiquette formula belongs to the sphere

of folk knowledge, which is inextricably linked with folk speech etiquette. Such contexts are rare, but their functioning integrates EFF into the system of small speech genres and gives the right to analyze them from the point of view of the language of folklore.

Often in the actual etiquette forms that people pronounce arbitrarily, various expressions of gratitude are encountered: a) мифологическим персонажам: *Nu, kak: «Dedushka-domozhirushka, pusti v dom. Spasibo tebe, chto vsjo sohranil v dome»*. (Mar'ina, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); *Duh lesa, spasibo tebe!* (Fomino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024); b) *Bogu: U menja Sashka-brat priezzhal ran'she s Moskvy, tak pojdem s nim v les. On podhodit k lesu, stoit minutu, chto-to shepchet. Chego stoish'? — govorju. Ja, govorit, meditiruju. Ja, govorit, proshu u Boga, sprashivaju u lesa: «Bozhen'ka, svodi menja v tvoj les za darami». Kogda vyhodit, govorit: «Spasibo». Vse vremena govoril on: «Spasibo, Bozhen'ka, tebe, chto ne zrja shodili»*. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023); v) *bane: Govorjat, nado ostavljat' vody, chtoby jetot, kak ego, banshhik-to, mog pomyt'sja. Vsegda nuzhno poblagodarit'. «Spasibo, ban'ka milaja» — svoimi slovami. Vsegda govorku. «Oj ty umnica moja». So vsemi razgovarivaju: hot' teplica, kogo pohvalju, kogo porugaju. Odna, s kem-to razgovarivat' nado*. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023); *Spasibo, banja, za pomyvku!* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023). Such sacred verbal speech etiquette is performed as mandatory.

PARTING

Maintaining speech contact usually ends with its interruption, i.e. the end of communication. The last remark, which implies an act of farewell, can be represented by a number of different SEFFs, which are divided into farewells-wishes for a long journey (road farewells) and farewells proper.

The road in the cultural tradition is opposed to the home — “one’s own” space — as “foreign”, unknown, full of dangers: “home — outside the home”. The road as a conceptualized space is associated with many signs, beliefs, rituals, prohibitions and, of course, etiquette expressions. On the road, where the alienation from home is most strongly felt, a person needs special protection, in connection

with which a variety of EFF is recorded in the function of blessing, more often with favorable semantics: a) farewells-wishes for a long journey (road farewells): *Schastlivyj put'!* (*Schastlivogo puti!*) *Daj Bog vam horoshuju put'!* (*V) dobryj put'!* *Dobrogo puti!* *Skatert'ju doroga / dorozhka!* *V dal'nju dorogu!* *Mir doroge!* (*Idi /te / poezhaj / podi*) *s Bogom!* *Bez Boga ne do poroga!* b) sobstvenno proshhanija: *S Bogom!* *Pust' vas Bog berezhot!* *Dolgih let zhizni!* *Bud'te zdorovy!* *Schastlivo (tebe)!* *Chas vam dobryj!* *Daj Bog vam svjatoj chas!* *Daj vam Bog vsego dobrogo!* *Angela-hranitelja!* The second group has a contaminated meaning: EFFs can perform both the function of proper farewells and road farewells.

Field notes record “road” etiquette formulas in the form of a short remark addressed to the addressee. They are mainly elliptical constructions expressed by names in the genitive (less often in the accusative) according to the formula adj. genitive (v.p.) + noun genitive (v.p.): *Schastlivogo puti!* (*Schastlivyj put'!*) *Dobrogo puti!* (*V) dobryj put'*. The latter includes a variant with a preposition denoting direction.

The context in which grammatical features differ from the literary norm is curious: *Daj Bog vam horoshuju put'!* Perhaps this is a dialectal peculiarity of the perception of the word "path" in the feminine gender. Or there is an unconscious confusion with another word-symbol of the feminine gender that is similar in semantics — "road". It is characteristic that the epithet with positive semantics is used only in combination with the word-symbol "path". It is almost never found with "road" or is found with a neutral epithet: *V dal'nju dorogu!*

The ambivalent semantics of a fairly common road wish is considered: Provozhali kuda, tak govorili: «*Skatert'ju tebe dorozhka!*». (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Tversk., SDK-60, 1997); «*Skatert'ju doroga*» — *ploho. Ne v dobryj put'*. (Davydovo, Ostashk., Tver., SDK-1993).

It is interesting that both records were made in the same area, but in different years. And the later version of the formula (1997) reflects the ancient meaning of this formula: Skatert'ju tebe dorozhka! — a wish for a good, smooth path, like the

tablecloth itself, and the earlier one (1993) already records a more modern meaning, with negative semantics.

In the Slavic cultural space, a tablecloth is a symbol of a meal — it is always laid on the table. In folklore, a self-assembled tablecloth often appears as a magical object, “which can feed and water its owner at any time and in any place, all you have to do is unfold the tablecloth and say a spell” [Yasinskaya 2012: 12]. In riddles, for example, it is a “symbolic designation of a field, a road” [Ibid.], which is also actualized in the etiquette road formula.

Over time, as you can see, the formula turned into an unfavorable, ironic one, with the meaning of wishing *for an unlucky path*. The modern meaning reflects only negative semantics, and the past archaic positive semantics have been almost completely erased from the cultural memory of dialect speakers. The NKRY contains contexts from 19th century fiction that reflect the shade of meaning 'go away, go away': [*Kubyrkina (zhen)*] *Noga moja u vas ne budet! Skatert'ju doroga!* [*Dar'ja Semenovna (zhen)*] *A dochka vasha za nashego zheniha ne vyjdet... ne vyjdet!* [V.A. Sollogub. *Beda ot nezhnogo serdca* (1856)]; — *A esli on poljubit druguju? — Skatert'ju doroga, — otvechala Elena, pozhimaja plechami. — Jeto vashi pravila?* [A.F. Pisemskij. *Vzbalamuchennoe more* (1863)]; *Ved' tvoe delo molodoe, ne to chto nashe, starikovskoe: na vse chetyre storony skatert'ju doroga. Gljazhu ja na tebjia i dumaju: zdorov, molod, — skatert'ju doroga na vse chetyre storony...* [D.N. Mamin-Sibirjak. *Privalovskie milliony* (1883)].

Folklorist S.V. Maksimov emphasizes the irony of this formula — *S Bogom — so Hristom! progovoril on i udaril po loshadjam. — Skatert'ju doroga! podgovoril kto-to so storony. — Buerakom put'! — podshutila razbitnaja devushka iz gostivshih i ugoshhavshihsja prjah.* [C. V. Maksimov. *Krylatye slova* (1899)].

Such contexts are also found in the 20th century: *Sam, vish', vazhnaja ptica! Nu, i skatert'ju doroga! Dver' zakrylas'.* [V.P. Avenarius. *Shkola zhizni velikogo jumorista* (1899)]. *V ego tone javno slyshalos': «skatert'ju doroga».* [M.A. Aldanov. *Begstvo* (1930)]. All this confirms the stability and use of this formula with negative semantics.

The considered stable etiquette formulas can be classified by their core component, which are conceptual words containing deep semantics characteristic of the Russian cultural space: a) path: *Schastlivyj put'!* (*Schastlivogo puti!*) *Daj Bog vam horoshuju put'!* (*V dobryj put'!* *Dobrogo puti!*) b) road: *Skatert'ju doroga / dorozhka!* *V dal'nju dorogu!* *Mir doroge!* c) God and divine patrons: (*Idi / te / poezhaj / podi*) *s Bogom!* *Bez Boga ne do poroga!* *S Bogom!* *Pust' vas Bog berezhjot!* *Daj Bog vam svjatoj chas!* *Daj vam Bog vsego dobrogo!* *Angela-hranitelja!*

In terms of structure, etiquette “road” forms are presented in our material by various speech “amulets”: prayer-crosses, prayer-spells, prayer-appeals (to a guardian angel; saints; house spirit) [Shchepanskaya 2003]. There are many variations of such protective texts:

1. Prayers-crosses: *A na robotu idjosh'*: «*Presvjataja mat'-Bogorodica vperedi / Isus Hristos szadi/ Angely po krajam / Chto Isusu Hristu / To i nam*». (Zujovo, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999). In such texts, the speaker seems to draw a verbal cross, which by definition should protect the traveler on the road. Moreover, many contexts reflect the fixation of lexical indicators marking the symbol of the cross as the main amulet on the road: *V les poshla*: «*Ogradi menja, Gospodi, svoim zhivotvorjashhim krestom*». *I tri raza perekrestitsja. Ili*: «*Gospodi, blagoslovi menja v put'-dorozhku*». *I nichego ploho nja budet*. (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997); *Kreshhus' krestom i pojdu so Hristom!* (Alehovshhina, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999); *Perekreshhu i*: «*Otkuda ushjol, tuda i vernis'!*» (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

2. Prayers-spells: *U kogo nado prosit'sja, kogda v les idjosh'?* / *U Boga, u Angela svoego. U kazhdogo svoj Angel, vot ty govorish'*: «*Angel moj, pojdjom so mnoj, ty vperedi, ja pozadi. Nikola Chudotvorec, dorozhku osveti, rabomu Bozh'emu (nazyvaesh' svojom imja) i amin'*». *I vsjo, idjosh', i s toboj vsjo budet v porjadke*. (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); *Dak vot vyjdjosh' i govori, perekrestis' i skazhi*: «*Spasi, Gospodi, ot gada plyvuchego, ot zverja beguchjova*». *Vot tak i skazhi*. (Igokinichi, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999);

3. Prayers-appeals: *Óberezh, ja kogda kudy poedu, tak eshhjo bumazhna ikonka est', presvjataja Bozh'ja Mat' Bogorodica s soboj, pojdu skazhu: «Beregi menja, hrani menja, na dorogah, na pereput'jah».* (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008). Similar EFFs, performing an appellative function, often rhymed, can be addressed to: a) angelu (*Angel moj, idi so mnoj: ty vpered, ja — za toboj*), b) bozh'emu pokrovitelju (*Bog, blagoslovi!*); v) Bogorodice: *Vot skazhut, pojdjosh' v dorogu, nikogda ne nado govorit': «Oj, ja sejchas bystro dojdu». Nado idti, skazhut: «Ladno, pojdjom s Bogom, tam Nikola Chudotvorec, tam Georgij Pobedonosec, dajte schastljivoj, horashej dorogi dojt do domu».* (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); g) dazhe domovomu: *Ja vot vyhozhu s domu i govorju: «Dobryj domovoj, pojdjom so mnoj». I idu spokojno.* (Novosjolki, Lodejnopól., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

At the same time All "Road" EFFs can be divided into 2 groups by the type of direction of the wish to the addressee: 1) the wish is addressed to another person: *V dal'nju dorogu» — blizkie govorili. «Dolgh let zhizni!». «Schastlivogo puti!».* (Vjazovija, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997); 2) the wish is directed at the speaker himself: *V les poshla: «Ogradi menja, Gospodi, svoim zhivotvorjashhim krestom». I tri raza perekrestitsja. Ili: «Gospodi, blagoslovi menja v put'-dorozhku». I nichego ploho nja budet.* (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997).

The second group is dialogized sentences — a “dialogue” with higher powers, otherworldly beings who must provide protection to the traveler and keep him safe on the road. In this case, informants can vary the components of the EFF, but it is important that the protective semantics of the etiquette form is preserved: *Ogradi menja, Gospodi, svoim zhivotvorjashhim krestom! Gospodi, blagoslovi menja v put'-dorozhku! Sohrani menja, Gospod', da bud' so mnoj, i Angel Hranitel' nad golovoj!*

The abundance of references to divine patrons and angels in road EFFs is quite explainable by the cultural semantics (deep mythological) of the road as a dangerous, unknown, alien space.

"Road" formulas are a key component of the EFF system of living folk speech. They function as farewells, amulets, blessings. Along with the concept of "home", they reflect an important element of the opposition "one's own — someone else's",

personifying the latter component. It can be assumed that the greater variability of formulas (almost every formula in our material is unique) reflects the personal ("creative beginning") attitude of the person seeing off to the person being seen off, since informants usually talk about what they wish for their loved ones.

For road formulas aimed "at oneself," it turns out that their multi-genre and multi-theme nature (prayers-conspiracies, prayers-crosses, prayers-appeals) is a characteristic feature.

Thus, SEFF represent the main layer of EFF of traditional communication: from the initiation of communication (formulas of greetings proper, greetings-good wishes) through maintaining contact (formulas of gratitude) to its interruption (formulas of farewell, road formulas). From the standpoint of ethnolinguistics, SEFF contain the remnants of mythological cultural semantics, which is partly still preserved in the consciousness of the dialect speaker, but is often reproduced automatically, without understanding its deep meaning. This is also reflected in the process of creative creation of a special etiquette form, which can be characteristic of only one recipient or group of people. It is important in this case that the semantics and intention of the newly created speech segment are preserved, as in a stable etiquette formula. All forms and formulas represent an indirect, symbolic meaning, conditioned by the thematic situation and expressed verbally (semantics of words), actionally (the action during which the EFF is pronounced) and objectively (a ritualized object-symbol, for example, a cross in farewell formulas). SEFF is an obligatory element of the cultural code of dialect speakers in all regions of the Russian North.

Ritual and etiquette formulas and forms: structural and semantic features

When writing this subsection of the dissertation, materials from published articles by the author of the dissertation research are used [Chekina 2023g, 2024a].

SEFF border on OEFF — their interrelation is determined by one cultural-speech space and one pragmatic function. As already noted, under conditions of long-term existence in changing cultural-historical circumstances, a natural process

of “deritualization” of the formula, its secularization or everydayization” occurs [Tolstoy 1995], as a result of which a mechanism of transformation of a once ritual formula (which informants no longer remember) into a ritual-etiquette and actually etiquette formula is observed. The complex cultural interaction of ritual and etiquette allows us to consider the process of “erasing” from the memory of the dialect speaker the deep semantics of the EFF used by them, but at the same time reproducing automatically in an implicit form. These considerations give the right to single out a special group of etiquette maxims — OEFF as evidence of a constant unity, absorbing the rules of etiquette — on the one hand, and the prescriptions of a once existing ritual — on the other.

The OEFF primarily includes formulas in the function of addressing mythological patrons of different status (domovoi, forest, field, etc.). The most representative group is communication according to the model "**man + domovoi**".

Situation 1. Entering a new house / leaving an old house for a new one / housewarming: *Dedushka-domovejushka, pusti, poj, kormi, obuvaj, odevaj i obogrevaj. Ljubi i beregi* (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Poklonish'sja v chetyre ugla i skazhesh': «Dedushka-domovejushka, poj, kormi, na menja, hozjajushka, ne nadejsja»* (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Poshli syn da nevestka v novyj dom, ja vzjala hleba, soli, krupki. Zashla: «Dedushko-domovejushko, primi moih detucek, obogrevaj, obuvaj, odevaj, na dobry dela ih nastavlaj»*. *Oboshla po uglam* (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986); *V novyj dom petuha da koshku nosili, chtoby nochevat' veselej. Dak vot govorili: «Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti nas na podvor'ice»* (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

Moving into a new house, housewarming is one of the key everyday rituals, “designed to ensure a prosperous life for the family in a new place” [Uzeneva 2004: 412]. It is known that the ritual “implies communication in special (even sacred) cases that entail a revolution, a “transition” from one state to another, for example, a change in the social role or status of the participants in the ritual, a change in the life of an entire group, etc.” [Chekina 2023b: 24]. Moving into a new house is an event that in rural tradition implied a specific action — the newlyweds’

housewarming. However, at present, this phenomenon can also be called everyday, which is required by etiquette, because moving into a new house can happen at any time and for any reason. Nevertheless, an important element of this ritual among the Slavs is and remains to this day the “relocation” of the brownie from the old house to the new one. The house spirit as a mythological character absorbs the functions of the owner and patron of the house, the "house penate ". It is no coincidence that in all records we find the address "grandfather" (less often to the house spirit - "grandmother") — the house spirit is addressed as a representative of the elders of the clan, family, traditionally extremely respected.

The brownie should be given due attention and even respect. Therefore, according to the ritual, one must address the brownie, invite him along, ask for permission and patronage before settling in a new place. At this point, the etiquette function of such a formula-address begins to operate, since this condition is mandatory, it is a symbolic sign of greeting and identification of the existing mythological owner, without whom life in the house is impossible. Often, this formula is pronounced by dialect speakers as if "automatically", according to a once established order, the original essence of which is already known to few: *Dedushko-domovejko, poljubi moju semejushku!* (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); [Kogda vhodjat iz staroga doma v novyj] *Poklonis' u vorot i skazhi: «Dedushka-domohozjajushko, pojdjom s nami»* (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Dedushka-domovejushka, pusti, poj, kormi, obuvaj, odevaj i obogrevaj. Ljubi i beregi!* (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

As you can see, such formulas-appeals are built according to the same scheme: an appeal expressed by an application in a vocative (respectful, respectful) form (*dedushka-domovejushko(a)/domovejko/domohozjajushko*), + a request expressed by a verb in the imperative form and having various “petitionary” positive semantics (*pusti / poj (ot slova «poit'») / kormi / (po)ljubi / beregi, etc.*). Often there is a description of an etiquette symbolic gesture — one must bow (*v chetyre ugla / u vorot*) before entering the house and addressing the domovoy.

At the level of everyday communication, one immediately feels an affectionate, kind attitude towards the mythological owner, as indicated by the diminutive names of the brownie with diminutive formants *-yushk* (*-ushk*), *-eyk*: *domoveyko*, *domoveyushko*, *domokhozyayushko*. The brownie is asked to love, protect, warm the new family in the new house, so that they live peacefully and joyfully, most importantly — in harmony with the owner-brownie. It is curious that in some cases at the end of the formula there appears a component of denial of the “authority” of the hostess entering the house, expressed by an imperative with the particle *не* (*ne nadejsja*), which speaks of complete trust in the mythological owner of the house: *Poklonish'sja v chetyre ugla i skazhesh'*: «*Dedushka-domovejushka, poj, kormi, na menja, hozjajushka, ne nadejsja*» (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Kogda rebenok roditsja, zanosili v izbu, vse ugly krestili da prigovarivali*: «*Dedushko-domovejushko, pri mládina raba bozh'ja, obuvaj, odevaj, zolotoj lapochkoj glad', da na hozjaev ne nadejsja*». (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986); «*Dedushka-domovoj, pusti nas na postoj, steli nam mjadko, steli nam gladko, na menja, neradivuju hozjajushku, ne nadejsja! Amin', amin', amin'. Tri raza*. (Shotogorka, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

It is interesting that the same motif was encountered in the expedition to the Yaroslavl region in 2024, but in a dialogized sentence for the harvest, recorded in the village of Troitsa, Lyubimsky district: Kogda ogorod sazhaju, govorju: «Rasti, vejsja, na uhod ne nadejsja!» (Troica, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024). This gives the right to speculate on the stability of such a motive in different thematic situations.

Compliance with the rules of etiquette is mandatory. From the context it becomes obvious that "violation of etiquette in relation to a person to the home penates" [Cherepanova 1996: 136] can cause the brownie to be hostile to the owners of the house or their livestock. Often the informants themselves explain what can happen: *U dedushka domovogo prosit'sja nado v novyj dom. Ne poprosish'sja — ono budet pugat', hodit' po domu noc'ju. Skazhut: «Dedushka menja segodnja vydavil, jeto ne k dobru»*. *Kogda davit, sprosit' nado: k dobru li k lihu*. (Kevrola, Pinezh., Arh., SDK-1984); *Dedushko-domovoj es'. Kogda v novyj dom pereedesh'*,

nado prosit'sja, poklanjajsja: «Dedushko-domovoj, pusti!». Poklanjajsja. *Ne poprosish'sja — tak govorja, budet pugat'. Noch'ju hodit po domu, chuesh', chto hodit, a védet'-to ne védeshi.* (Kevrola, Pinezh., Arh., SDK-1984); *Kogda idjosh' v dom, nado skazat': «Dedushko, pusti na prozhivanie».* *A ja vot ne prosilas', mne i govorjat: ty tak i zhivjosh' ploho, chto ne poprosilas'.* (Nemnjuga, Pinezh., Arh., SDK-1984).

It is obvious that failure to observe etiquette leads to some globally bad event, as evidenced by the lexical content of the formula, in particular words with negative semantics: verbs in the predicate position — home *will be to scare*, the brownie *presses / squeezed out* (meaning 'to strangle'), brownie *mucil / tormented* (cattle); nouns in the phraseological unit in the prepositional-case form (D.p.) — *not for good*, in the obligatory question to the brownie in the prepositional-case form (D.p.) — *for good or for evil*; adverb — *you still live badly*. Sometimes the brownie was addressed directly with a request “not to frighten and not to torment”, verbalizing their thoughts, since it was believed that the word already contains a certain “magical power”: *Vot ty prishla domoj i govorish': «Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti menja na podvor'e, hozjajushko, ne pugaj i menja ne zadevaj».* (Timoshhel'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).

Situation 2. Entering a new house/barn with livestock: Skotinusshku zavodjat: «Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti na podvorice», esli vo svoj hlev vezut (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986); *«Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti pozhit', da ty ne obizhaj, da skotinu ne trevozh'»* (Petrovo, Mez., Arh., SDK-30, 1986); *«Dedushka-domovejushko, poj, kormi, po shersti glad'»* (Petrovo, Mez., Arh., SDK-30, 1986); *A skotinu zavodili, ja slyhala: «Dedushko-domovejushko, voz'mi moju skotinusshku, primi, poj, kormi i ljubi».* *Morochili sami sebe* (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986); *Dedushka-domovejushka, poljubi u menja pestronushka* ('klichka pjestroj korovy' [Cherepanova 1983: 318]), *poj, kormi, droti* (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Dedushko-domozhirovoshko, pusti skotinku postojat', ne much', poljubi!* (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Dedushko-domohozjajushko, poljubi*

moju skotinusshku. Skotinku — na poly, a sam — pod poly (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

In the traditions of rural residents of the Russian North, “when buying and bringing new livestock into the house, it is imperative to ‘ask’ the house spirit. If this is not done, he may not accept the livestock” [Chereanova 1996: 137], i.e. the livestock will not take root in the house, will get sick, etc. This also shows the etiquette of the formula-address, since there is a symbolic obligation of the verbal statement. It can be compared with the ‘ritual’ of greeting in ordinary, everyday communication: if you do not greet a familiar person, he may ‘not accept’ it, i.e. be upset, perceive it as a negative verbal gesture, which will result in a communicative failure. Metaphorically, the same communicative failure will befall a person in verbal interaction with the house spirit.

Attention is drawn to the large number of house names in the formulas under consideration. All nominations (*domovoyushko, domokhozyayushko, domozhirushko*) are motivated, first of all, by the function of the mythological owner of the house. For example, the nomination *domozhiru / domozhirushko / domozhirovoshko* often "coincides with the name of the owner of the house: *domozhir* 'wealthy owner' and 'house spirit'. Grammatically, the formulas are constructed according to the same scheme: appeal + request. The main thematic blocks of the request when bringing cattle into the barn: 1) let in; 2) do not offend / do not disturb; 3) stroke the fur / love. At the same time, it is important to ask the house spirit to stay alone, so that he would be an invisible protective spirit of the house: *Dedushko-domohozhajushko, poljubi moju skotinusshku. Skotinku — na poly, a sam — pod poly* (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

Folklore speech often has a special poetic quality, expressiveness and beauty. For the aestheticization of speech and for ease of memorization, the formulas under consideration often have a rhythm-forming, rhymed structure: «*Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti na podvor'e, navsegda, vot te dom, da trava, da rodima storona*» (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986). «*Dedushka-domovoj, poru bozh'ju skotinku pusti na podvor'ice, poj, kormi sytjohon'ko, po dvoru vodi gladjohon'ko*».

(Kevrola, Pinezh., Arh., SDK-1984). The word forms of folk poetic speech with the help of suffixes of subjective evaluation give a special sound to such formulas (*podvoritse, sytekhonko, gladekhonko*). The use of these forms also expresses the relationship of the human host to the host-domovoi, whom they are trying to respect in this way, show respect and ask for the same attitude from the domovoi.

Thus, as a result of the analysis of a number of contexts, it becomes obvious that the use of such formulas-addresses is still connected with the mythological consciousness of rural residents and rituals, but this connection is reduced, weakened in favor of symbolic etiquette. They do it this way, they say it this way, because “it is accepted” in rural society — this knowledge is passed down from generation to generation, but at present, in everyday communication, a person can no longer explain the deep sacred content of this verbal ritual. This indicates that these weakly ritualized formulas still remain in the living communication of dialect speakers, they are important and obligatory in their own way, but more as a fixed etiquette expression.

A special type of OEFF is quasi-communication according to the model: “**person + vegetable crop**”, which relates to gardening.

Growing plants is one of the main rituals that is still supported by villagers. Planting vegetables (cabbage, onions, potatoes) is one of the stages of such a ritual, accompanied by verbal sentences: *Na kapustu prigovarivali: «Ne rodish' golenasta, a rodish' puzasta»*, — *chtoby kochan nalivalsja*. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023); *Luk kogda sadjat i jeto govorjat: «I na nishhego, i na zavidushhego!»*. *Chtoby hvatilo i na nishhego, i na zavidushhego!* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023); *Rasti, kartoshka, po kolesu, a pljotka — po ogloble!* (Ljubim, Jarosl., SDK-2024).

Traditionally, vegetable crops of different types are planted on certain calendar holidays. For example, cabbage was planted on the day of John the Baptist (Ivan Golovaty), often guided by etymological magic: *Расту головаста, не голенаста! (1) Расту с голову! (3)*. In Russian tradition, onions were planted on St. Luke's Day, etc.

Such OEFFs are presented in the form of an address to a plant, as indicated by imperative verbs: *to grow, (not) be born, not be*. The entire construction of such formulas is a predicate, where the verb (“to be born,” “to be”) is used twice, which creates, on the one hand, a special rhythm of the sentence, and on the other, it doubles the meaningful constant of the small text, which is connected with mythological ideas about the earth: “the earth” is likened to a mother. In other words, the earth as “a symbol of the female fruit-bearing principle; as the progenitor and nurse of all living things” [Belova, Vinogradova, Toporkov 1999: 315] gives birth to a harvest — an important element of the villager’s life.

The structure of the formula is usually built according to the model "not X, but Y": «*Ne rodis' golenasta, a rodis' puzasta!*». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023); *Nu, vot kapustu sadjat, dak govorjat: «Ne bud' golenasta, a bud' korenasta!»* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023); «*Rasti golovasta, ne golenasta!*» (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000). Thus, a binary opposition is formed, consisting of contextual antonymous lexemes: *golenasta* — *puzasta*, *golenasta* — *korenasta*, *golovasta* — *golenasta*. How It is clear that the short adjective *golenasta* with the semantics of 'bare, empty, weak' is a permanent member of the opposition. The cultural semantics of the main component of the formula (*golenasta*) is determined by the semantics of the peripheral one (*golasta*, *puzyasta*, *koresta*). Thus, in the opposition *golenasta* — *puzyasta* the seme ‘thin, frail, thin’ becomes manifest; in the opposition *golenasta* — *puzyasta* the seme ‘weak, fragile’; in the opposition *golasta* — *golenasta* — the seme ‘small, not great’. Depending on the position of the ‘positive’ lexeme, the place of the ‘negative’ is determined. Thus, in formulas beginning with negation, the right component contains positive semantics, and the left one — negative. In formulas that begin affirmatively it is the other way around. The opposition “left — right” in this case is integrated into the general cultural opposition “friend — foe”, where they are related to the categories “good — bad” accordingly.

The semantics of such EFF is reflected in the short forms of adjectives, presented by different phonetic variants: *golenasta* / *golenista*, *korenasta* / *korenista*,

puzyasta. The Dictionary of Russian Folk Dialects gives several interpretations of the word *golenasty* (*golenisty*): 1. 'Thin' 2. 'No branches, twigs below (high from the ground)' [SRNG 1970: 290]. The word *korenasty* / *korenisty* means 'with large strong roots' [SRNG 1978: 316]. It becomes obvious that the sentence formula contains the meaning of the 'birth' of a good, rich, healthy, large harvest. This is indicated by additional characteristics mentioned by the informant — *that the head of cabbage should* most likely fill with color, i.e. ripen, be juicy and ripe.

Of particular note is the adjective *puzastyj*: «*Ne rodish' golenasta, a rodish' puzasta!*». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023). The SRNG has only one variant — *pot-bellied*, which has two meanings: 1. <only in fem.> 'Pregnant'. 2. 'Solid, important, stately' [SRNG 1999: 113]. Obviously, both of these meanings (in the context of the previous remarks) are metaphorically appropriate, since, as indicated, "the birth of the harvest" is associated with ideas about the fruitful mother earth. One should also pay attention to the shape of the cabbage — it is desired to be *pot-bellied*, i.e. with a big "belly", round and large. In addition, all of these adjectives contain the suffix — *ast*, "characterized by an intensely expressed external feature, called a motivating word" [Russian Grammar 1980, Vol. 1]: "*Grow big-headed, not golenasta!*" (Totma, Totem., Vologda, SDK-2000).

In summary, it can be emphasized that the above formula is isomorphic: the "ritual" of planting cabbage combines three mandatory components that are taken into account in the ethnolinguistic analysis of any cultural text: verbal (the structure of the formula, its pronunciation), actional (the process of planting), and objective (cabbage as one of the main traditional vegetable crops). At the same time, the sentence is pronounced almost "automatically", i.e. today it functions as a kind of etiquette element of everyday speech, since the informants from whom this material was recorded universally emphasized that they were "taught this way".

The context found in the SDK Archives, recorded during the 2000 expedition, turns out to be representative: *Kogda sazhaesh' (kapustu), nado, chtob nikto tebjá ne videl. Nado skazat': «Rasti, kapusta, gusta, golenasta i puzasta». Posle jetogo hlopnut' sebja tri raza po jagodicam* (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog, SDK-2000). In this

case, the main attention is paid to the actional component of the sentencing situation. As it turned out, this action (slapping the buttocks) is associated with ancient ritual representations, and on a vast Slavic territory: "so that the heads of cabbage would grow large, tight and white, they resorted to partial or complete nudity: women and girls (in rare cases, men) ran along the furrows with their hair loose, without skirts or completely naked (Northern Russian, Siberian). Ukrainian women planted cabbage in a white shirt, exposing their bottoms so that the cabbage would be white, firm and round (Chernigov). In the Pinchowa region (Kielce Voivodeship), the person planting cabbage would squat down on the ground with his bottom and say: "Niech beda. such upy, yak moje d.» [Let there be fruits like my z]»[Usacheva 1999: 458]. In our context, the informant reports that after planting, one must *slap oneself three times on the buttocks*. Obviously, the correlation of cabbage fruits with buttocks has ancient ideological roots — the search for an analogy between external natural phenomena and the human body and, as a consequence, the idea of the integrity of the universe as such.

The traditional quantitative code of this action can also be traced — it is necessary to repeat it three times. All this confirms that such a formula still refers to rituals, despite its obvious weakening of ritual functions in modern village life.

Another type of formula that is pronounced when planting cabbage or onions is curious — "one of the most ancient cultivated plants" [Usacheva 2004: 140]: *govorili: «Vyvoditsja na nishhego, na pishhego...» <...> — «Na pishhego» — jeto chto takoe? — Pust' dazhe i na sytogo, i na golodnogo!* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023).

This formula-sentence also represents an imperative construction, which the informants themselves often explain, filling in the omitted fragments of the "original" text of the sentence: *so that there would be enough for both the beggar and the envious! Even if it is for the well-fed and the hungry!* It is quite obvious that here a request is being completed: [to grow so that *there is enough* [for everyone], i.e. they want there to be a lot of it.

The lexemes of the “restored” text, by their characteristic phonetic appearance ($t + j \rightarrow u$), allow them to be attributed to book vocabulary and qualified as Old Church Slavonicisms: *beggar*, *envious*, *pishchei* (*pishchii*). Such marked sound features can be found in the structure of participles and adjectives, often used in the texts of spells (*tosku- toskuschuyu*; *midnight*; *about the sick*, etc.). By their incantatory (here — commercial) function, the sentences under consideration are very close to spells.

SRNG gives a single meaning to the word *zavidushchiy*, i.e. 'attractive' [SRNG 1972: 315]. This is in contrast to the definition *beggar*, which acquires a semantic connotation of unattractiveness — 'thin, skinny' [SRNG 1986: 252].

The word *pishchy* (scribe) is a curious word that is difficult to interpret: «*Rasti na nishhih, na pishhih (pishih), na vseh kreshhjonyh ljudej!*». (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog, SDK-2000). Dialectal dictionaries do not record it in such vocalization. Agreeing with the opinion of E.L. Berezovich and V.S. Kuchko [Berezovich, Kuchko 2018: 65], we can assume that this occasional word “appeared in the “rhyme” to *beggar*, i.e. as a result of the word-formation alignment of the elements of the enumerative series, a kind of lexical inertia characteristic of magical speech” [Ibid.] . The internal form of the word *pishchei* clearly correlates with the word *pishcha* (*food*), "at the same time, in the minds of the bearers of the tradition, *piskaie* has no lexical meaning" [Ibid.]. Researchers give some examples of the interpretation of the word *piskaie* by informants-residents of the Vologda region, which confirms this connection and deduces several meanings of the word: " *piskaie* is either one who collects (begs for) food (here *piskaie* synonymous with *a beggar*), or the one who has it (as opposed to *a beggar*), or the one who eats it (a guest who needs to be treated), or the one who needs food (all people)" [Ibid.]. As a result, in the given context, the formula has a pragmatic meaning and applies to all social roles of people: let there be a lot of harvest, so that there is enough for all the poor, the needy and the rich people, whom God always helps, since in the popular imagination God's blessing is the most important spiritual component.

According to N.I. Tolstoy, “all folk culture is dialectal, since all its phenomena and forms function in the form of variants, territorial and intra-dialectal variants with an unequal degree of difference” [Tolstoy 1995: 20]. All the considered variants of the formulas of the sentences on the harvest have deep archaic roots, which are obvious and clearly imprinted in the lexical composition of the formula. However, they still do not cease to perform a conditional-etiquette function, since they are pronounced in everyday life (during planting), today — already practically unconsciously. The loss of the mythological, archaic root of these and similar sentences is obvious, however, the obligation to pronounce them during a specific action, the attachment of these text forms to this everyday (everyday) event — are preserved, which testifies to their cultural non-randomness.

Thus, the OEFF are presented by various communicative situations implying interaction of communicants according to the model of "person + mythological patron" and "person + vegetable crop". They still retain a close connection with the once stable ritual (housewarming; planting plants, etc.), but the verbal component of this ritual is already moving into the category of etiquette, i.e. symbolic performance of traditional actions (including verbal ones) without cultural inclusion in the mythological archaic context. This is also evidenced by the reproduction of similar formulas by informants living in an urban environment (for example, in Totma): *Sazhajut red'ku, nachinajut krichat' da serdit' cheloveka, chtob red'ka gor'kaja byla.* (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000); *«Rodis', kartoshka. Vetka v ogloblju, kartoshka — v koleso».* (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000); *Kogda sazhaesh' (kapustu), nado, chtob nikto tebja ne videl. Nado skazat': «Rasti, kapusta, gusta, golenasta i puzasta».* *Posle jetogo hlopnut' sebja tri raza po jagodicam.* (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000). The OEFF represent an important layer of the entire EEF system, which actualizes and confirms the connection between the categories of "etiquette" and "ritualism" within the framework of traditional communication.

When analyzing all EFFs, common lexical and grammatical features were identified, with the help of which speech units of culture perform pragmatic and symbolic functions:

1) thematic vocabulary: a) religious (*God, Angel, Lord, St. Nicholas the Wonderworker, Virgin Mary, saint (corner), icon, cross*, etc.); b) vocabulary of work activities (*labor, work, business, benefit* ; in weaving — *to weave, kresna , prishvitsa, byordo*; in washing clothes — *to wash, to wash, linen*, etc.); c) vocabulary of food (*milk, sugar, tea, salt, potatoes, onions, cabbage*, etc.); d) vocabulary of everyday life (*bucket, trough, krosna, byordo* , etc.);

2) vocabulary by area of use: a) common (*labor, tea, bread, sugar, milk, cow, house, cabbage, potato*); dialect vocabulary (*spekh, ergot, stav, prishvitsa, kresna, kvashnya, zavidushchiy, pishchei, vyadro, tkyo, droti* and so on.);

1) imperative (optative) semantics in elliptical constructions, expressed: a) explicitly — by imperative verbs with the negative particle *He* / without it (in addresses to mythological characters — *pusti (zhit', perenochevat' i pod.)*, *primi, (na)poj, kormi, (po)ljubi, beregi, glad', obuvaj, odevaj, nastavljaj, voz'mi, droti, ne much', ne nadejsja, ne obizhaj, ne trevozh'*; *v obrashhenijah k rastenijam — (ne) rasti, (ne) bud', (ne) rodis'*)); b) *nejavlenno* — *<Pust' budet> trud na pol'zu! <Zhelaju> schastlivogo puti! <Chtob byl> mir vashemu domu!*

3) dialogue structure of all EFFs (thank you dialogues; constructor dialogues, chain dialogues).

2.5. Obligatory nature of etiquette forms and formulas

The category of etiquette within the framework of traditional communication is largely conditioned by the category of obligatory nature, since etiquette by definition assumes mandatory compliance with the rules of speech behavior: *Esli kto-to rabotaet, nado skazat'*: «*Bog v pomoshh'!*». *Nado bylo objazatel'no zdorovat'sja. A to malen'kih za ushi taskali, mozhno bylo i oglohnut'*. (Vjazovija, Ostashk., Selizhar., SDK-59, 1997). In the process of communication according to the "person + person" model, there is an obligatory exchange of etiquette remarks, which disposes to positive, friendly interaction between communicants. Often in our contexts, the obligatory nature of the reproduction of the EFF is expressed explicitly, with the help of modal words and verbs, mainly with the modality of obligation: *Esli zahodish' v dom, a tam korovu dojat, to nado skazat'*: «*More pod korovoj*», a

hozjajka otvechaet: «Reka moloka». (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987); *Nu, vot tam chelovek rabotaet, sejchas, pravda, oni tak ne govornjat, idjot sosed, on dolzhen skazat': «Pomogaj Bog...!» A on dolzhen skazat': «Spasibo!».* (Novyj posjolok, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999); *Kak ohotnik idjot v les, emu chjo govornjat? — «Ni puha ni pera!».* *On tozhe dolzhen skazat': «Idi ty k chjortu!».* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023). — *Trud na pol'zu! <...> «Trud na pol'zu» mozžno bylo skazat', i my do sih por <...> esli kto-to tam blizkij rabotaet, tak skazhesh' chego, jeto ne greshno ved'.* — *A chto otvetit' nuzhno na jeto? — «Spasibo» skazhut.* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

Obligatory nature is also characteristic of less stable etiquette forms, in cases where informants perform a speech act “in their own words”: *Vsegda nuzhno poblagodarit'. «Spasibo, ban'ka milaja» — svoimi slovami. Vsegda govornju. «Oj ty umnica moja».* *So vsemi razgovarivaju: hot' teplica, kogo pohvalju, kogo porugaju. Odna, s kem-to razgovarivat' nado.* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023). As can be seen, the obligatory nature of the reproduction of the EFF is observed in a wide variety of pragmatic situations. Moreover, this applies to the entire dialogic text: in the preposition to the stimulus remark (*it is necessary to greet, it is necessary to say, it is necessary to say*) and in the postposition to the reaction remark (*it is necessary to answer, it is necessary to say*). The informants themselves often note that a mandatory condition is a response to, for example, the said etiquette greeting formula: *Net, nu my vsegda: «Trud na pol'zu» — «Spasibo, spasibo».* *Vsegda govornim «Trud na pol'zu» i «Spasibo».* *Potomu chto kak zhe — tebe govornjat, a ty ne otvetish'? Nado otvetit': «Spasibo».* (Ostankovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024). This "gesture" regulates the establishment of contact, with the help of which it is determined whether the communicants are within the framework of the same cultural and etiquette tradition or not: *Net, nu my vsegda: «Trud na pol'zu» — «Spasibo, spasibo».* *Vsegda govornim «Trud na pol'zu» i «Spasibo».* *Potomu chto kak zhe — tebe govornjat, a ty ne otvetish'? Nado otvetit': «Spasibo».* (Ostankovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024). *It becomes obvious that any violation of the rules of speech etiquette in the generally accepted sense is considered a disrespectful sign, which*

ultimately leads to misunderstanding, resentment, and in some cases the so-called "speech revenge": «Bog v pomoshh'!» — Kto otvetit, a est' ljudi, kotorye — net. Idjosh', pozdorovaesh'sja — vdrug ne otvetil, vdrug chelovek ne pozdorovalsja — nu i ja s toboj tozhe zavtra ne pozdorovajus'. (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

In traditional communication, the timely, obligatory use of speech EFF is due to the fact that failure to comply with these verbal rules can lead to real negative consequences (the harvest will not rise, the work will not be successful, etc.). This becomes most important and obvious in quasi-communication, which is based on a ritual that once existed, where, as a rule, "the word is identified with the action" [Tsivyan 1993: 112]: *«Dedushko-domozhirushko, pusti na podvor'ice» - i korovu zavodish' ili ovcu tam tozhe. Vsjo nado prosit'sja, koshku dazhe, i pochapat' nad', v pechku tozhe poprosit'sja, lapkami o pechku. (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008). Domovika prosit' nado: «Vot budem zhit', da ja, da muzh, da eshhjo kto tam, nas beregi da hrani, da». (Trufanova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); Domovoj dolzhen byt' v kazhdom dome. Kogda v dom zahodish', nado poprosit'sja u domovogo, chtob on tebja pustil v dom zhit': «Dedushka-domovoj, pusti takih-to v dom zhit'». (Mar'ina, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); Hozjainom nazyyvaem dak a vsjo. Dak jeto vsjo, esli, naprimer, poshjol v les za jagodami, dak nado perekrestit'sja, chtob tebe den' hodit', i vsjo — ty uzh budesh' so spokoem hodit'. Nado, govorjat, v les zajti dak na 4 storony poklonit'sja i poprosit', kak govoritsja: «Les-batjushka, a zemlja-matushka, daj, nu jeto». I vyjti, i spasibo skazat'. (Kolodozero, Pudozh., Karelija, SDK-2006).*

Characteristic of such communicative-pragmatic situations is the lexical content of the formula, expressing the modality of obligation: *one must ask, one must ask, one must ask, etc.* In this case, a very specific verbal action (speech act) is performed — a request that must be made without fail.

In a gardening situation, the obligation to pronounce the formula-sentence has clear pragmatic goals — the influencing power of the word can have a beneficial effect on the future harvest: *Kogda sazhaesh' (kapustu), nado, chtob nikto tebja ne videl. Nado skazat': «Rasti, kapusta, gusta, golenasta i puzasta». Posle jetogo*

hlopnut' sebja tri raza po jagodicam. (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000). *Objazatel'no: nu, vot kapustu sadjat, dak govorjat: «Ne bud' golenasta, a bud' korenasta!».* (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023). *In this case, the formula-sentence performs a magical function.*

The category of obligatory nature is most obviously expressed in prohibitions, which are defined with the help of the modal word "not allowed": S molokom idjosh' — nel'zja zdorovat'sja. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986); *Vstretish'sja s kem, moloko ili vodu nesjosh', nel'zja razgovarivat' s nim.* (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986). *Prohibitory semantics is manifested in the prohibition of verbal action, which is also included in the system of speech etiquette. Situations in this case can be very different: Kogda gadaesh'-to, molchat' nado, ni s kem ne razgovarivaj, kto by ni zagovoril, molchi.* (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986); *Nel'zja zdorovat'sja, koda v dome pokojnik. Nehorosho zhe, koda v dome pokojnik. Vhodish', a ty zdorov'ja zhelaesh' hozjaevam.* (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986); *Byl sluchaj so mnoj. Idjot starushka, Nikolaevnoj zvali. Kricu: «Nikolaevna, zdravstvuj! Pogodi!».* *A ona molchit, ja snova ej krichu. Ostanovilas' ona, vylila vodu, chto s reki nesla, so mnoj pozdorovalas'.* *Ponjala ja, chto ona nesla molchanu vodu, a togda razgovarivat' nel'zja.* (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986). All of them are aimed at achieving a pragmatic goal through a form of ritual behavior — silence. Almost all such prohibitions are part of a ritual complex (fortune telling, funerals, a ritual with silent water).

Most EFF are determined by the category of obligatory nature, which is typical for speech etiquette in traditional communication, but in many cases the contexts emphasize that this or that phrase *is said, will be said, usually said* (which is expressed in vague-personal and generalized-personal constructions), because “it is accepted” in the speech tradition, without specifying the degree of obligatory reproduction of the formula: *Chihnjosh' esli, govorjat: «Schastliv bud'!».* (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986); *Kogdy tkjo sedit, skazhe: «Sto lokot na prishvicu!».* *A ona, kak devka, otvetit: «Sto zhenihov pod okoshko!».* (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985); *«Bog na pomoch'» — kto kak skazhet. Teper'-to govorjat: «Priyatno vam*

kushat', hleb i sol'). (Grigor'ev, Bat., Novg., SDK-1988); «*Chaj s saharom!*» — *skazhesh', a otvetja: «Chaju pit'!*»). (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

Thus, the category of obligatory nature, which can be expressed both explicitly and implicitly, is fundamental in the system of EFF of traditional society. It is directly connected with successful communication, which presupposes the achievement of specific pragmatic goals of communicants, determined by the realities of rural life. Obligatory nature determines the basic modality of EFF — the degree of possibility and necessity of reproducing a particular EFF, and in general — the etiquette dialogic text.

2.6. Folklore-genre correlation of EFF

As the analysis of the material shows, the majority of EFF (more often SEFF) take the form of good wishes, which is understood as “a text containing a wish for good” from one person to another, or “an utterance with the communicative task of wishing some good to someone” [Pleshakova 2008: 355]. Another part of EFF (more often OEFF) are sentences, which are “short ritual-magical texts pronounced as an accompaniment to practical and ritual actions and ritualized situations” [Agapkina, Sedakova 2008: 272].

Along with good wishes and sentences, approximately 8% (30 contexts) of the EFF are related to a specific small speech folklore genre, such as: a) **a conspiracy**: *Dak vot vyjdjosh' i govori, perekrestis' i skazhi: «Spasi, Gospodi, ot gada plyvuchego, ot zverja beguchjova».* *Vot tak i skazhi.* (Igokinichi, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999); *Kogda sazhaesh' (kapustu), nado, chtob nikto tebja ne videl. Nado skazat': «Rasti, kapusta, gusta, golenasta i puzasta».* *Posle jetogo hlopnut' sebja tri raza po jagodicam* (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog, SDK-2000); b) **a prayer**: *U Boga, u Angela svoego. U kazhdogo svoj Angel, vot ty govorish': «Angel moj, pojdjom so mnoj, ty vpered, ja pozadi. Nikola Chudotvorec, dorozhku osveti, rabomu Bozh'emu (nazyvaesh' svojom imja) i amin'».* *I vsjo, idjosh', i s toboj vsjo budet v porjadke.* (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008); c) **proverb**: — *Spasibo!* — *Na zdorov'e! Svoja sila v rot nosila!* (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991); *Otkuda ty takaja javilas'?* — *Iz teh vorot, otkuda ves' narod.* (Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991). *Kak*

iz-za stola vstanut, da «spasibo» skazhut, tak i govorish': «Chem bogaty, tem i rady!» (Vjatka, Tver, Ostashk., D-226, 1991); d) **a omen** *U menja dak, konechno, takaja primeta. Vot skazhut: «Kuda poshla?»*. Nu i vsjo, ni v put' znachit. S kakoj cel'ju shla — budesh' obratno vozrashhat'sja, nicho ne poluchitsja. Vot uzhe mnogo raz proverjala, obkudyvali znachit. Da: «Kuda poshla?». Devchonki otvechajut: «Na kudykinu goru». Kogda kto idjot, tak nikogo ne prosjat «kuda poshla». A — «Daljoko li? Daljoko li poshla?» (Ust'e, Ust'-Kubensk., Volog., SDK-2005); d) a tabu: *Podi, da ne vstrecaj nikogo, da ne zdorovajsja. Slova portjaca. «Ja cherez reku idu, slova nesu»*. (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985). *Idjosh' s podojnikom so dvora, skorej moloko stavish', potom zdorovaessja, a s molokom pozdorovalas' — «Pus' Bog proshhaet nas greshnyh», skazhesh'*. (Gora, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).

In our case, all genre varieties operate according to the rules of speech etiquette — they perform the functions of greetings, thanksgivings, parting words, blessings, farewells, etc., thereby actualizing the etiquette -symbolic semantics and strengthening their metaphorical (“secondary”) meaning. Genres in this case only correspond in form to their discursive features, and their semantic load works on the etiquette and phatic functions, on establishing and maintaining contact between communicants.

2.7. Conclusions on Chapter II

1. Etiquette forms and formulas (EFF) in everyday communication of residents of the Russian North represent a developed system of speech maxims, related to 16 thematic blocks-situations, identified according to the SDK questionnaire.

2. EFFs as proper etiquette forms and formulas (SEFF) and ritual-etiquette forms and formulas (OEFF) perform the functions of proper greetings, greetings-good wishes, thanksgivings, blessings, farewells on the road and proper farewells.

3. Most of the EFFs were recorded in the Arkhangelsk and Vologda regions from 1984 to 2023 (approximately 250 contexts, manifested in all 16 thematic blocks-situations), the rest - in the Novgorod, Leningrad, Tver and

Yaroslavl regions (approximately 150 contexts). It is characteristic that OEFFs are almost not recorded in the Yaroslavl and Tver regions.

4. In terms of structure, EFFs are mainly presented in the form of a dialogic text, characterized by semantic integrity (the presence of one theme), grammatical coherence, relative completeness (the fact of establishing contact), certainty of the social and communicative roles of the participants in communication, situational conditioning and cultural marking.

5. Etiquette dialogic text is classified into several types, distinguished by the features of the functioning of the response, which is provided by the material of the SDK Archive: "thank you" dialogues, constructor dialogues, chain dialogues.

6. Etiquette dialogue presupposes pragmatic interaction of communicants according to three main models: person + person, person + mythological patron, person + vegetable crop. The last two models represent dialogized sentences operating within the framework of quasi-communication.

7. The category of "etiquette" in all cases of using the EFF is nominatively conditional: it serves to designate the fact of establishing contact between communicants in the corresponding communicative-pragmatic situation. The category of "ritualism" in such cases regulates the archaic cultural background of communication, which determines the regulatory positions of potential communicants and designates the boundaries of the transformation of a ritual formula into a ritual-etiquette and etiquette formula proper.

8. EFFs retain cultural semantics, which is expressed verbally — in the lexical design of formulas; actionally, since each formula is related to a real action; often the communicative-pragmatic situation is associated with a specific ritualized object (crosses, stav — in weaving; bucket — in milking a cow; cross — in situations related to the road, etc.).

9. Some EFFs retain archaic semantics, almost completely erased from the memory of a modern dialect speaker (*Belen'ko! Vyvoditsja i na nishhego, i na pishhego! Skatert'ju doroga!* — in a positive sense).

10. Some EFFs are related to specific small speech folklore genres (proverbs, prohibitions, signs, prayers, spells), “subordinating” themselves to the laws of their functioning.

11. When the EFF functions in all spheres of rural life, the factors of obligation (as a fundamental etiquette category), identification and self-identification of communicants, who take on different roles within the framework of the opposition “friend — foe”, are taken into account.

12. The stable etiquette formulas of each thematic block form a “bush” of variants, in which, by means of textual analysis, it is possible to single out an invariant zone (grammatical structure, lexical components) and a variable zone, which in turn can be presented in the form of versions (groups of variants), revisions (formulas reflecting characteristic dialectal features) and editions (formulas reflecting minor “plot” changes within the text recorded in one locality). The isolated zones allow one to recreate in each thematic block its own prototext, which is a reconstructed source for all formulas of the “bush” of a given pragmatics.

Conclusion

Speech etiquette in traditional culture is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, which, on the one hand, is integrated into the system of generally accepted speech etiquette, and on the other hand, has fundamentally important differences:

1) In the traditional sphere of communication there are a number of special rules and regulations that often “turn out to be genetically closely linked to ritual practice or to stereotypes of mythological thinking” [Vinogradova 2000: 325], which is expressed primarily in the dialogue structure of ritual-etiquette forms and formulas. Etiquette forms and formulas themselves also manifest this connection in vocabulary, which often has cultural semantics.

2) Traditional society is characterized by a “very high degree of regulation of the entire way of life” [Tolstaya 2000: 273]. Speech etiquette behavior is regulated by a system of special rules, prohibitions, and prescriptions. In this system of normative guidelines, there is almost no distinction between “the rules governing a person’s attitude to nature and the rules governing relations between people” [Ibid.], which is also evident at the level of etiquette speech expressions, so it is entirely justified, in our opinion, to classify as etiquette formulas of greeting, farewell, and establishing speech contact, addressed to mythologized characters.

3) The etiquette of folk speech is characterized by "fundamental dialogicity." The communication partner is often not only a person, but also a mythological character (in formulas-appeals to house spirits, forest spirits, etc.) or an anthropomorphized natural phenomenon (in formulas-appeals when planting plants/vegetable crops).

4) Etiquette expressions perform a number of communicative functions, the most important of which is the function of identification on the scale of "one's own — another's" within the semantic oppositions of "good — bad", "righteous — sinful", "human — non-human", "alive — dead", "internal — external", the left component of which always contains a positive assessment, the right - a negative one. In the case of the semantic opposition "human — non-human", the positions of

both sides can be equivalent if a person observes ethical norms that regulate the rules of communication between a person and a mythological character.

5) Etiquette forms and formulas in traditional communication perform pragmatic and symbolic functions, which implies their obligatory use in specific pragmatic situations. Their non-fulfillment entails real consequences, often quite dramatic, therefore the obligatory nature of these statements in popular communication, in addition to the signs of behavioral (decent — indecent) prescription, has a clear pragmatic component.

6) The genre marginality of the folk speech expressions under consideration is obvious. The functions of greetings, farewells, and wishes can be close to incantations (*Bog v pomoshh'! Schastliv bud'!*), while others represent a question complex (*Daleko li poshla? Zdorovo li zhivetsja?*), others gravitate towards proverbial maxims (*Chem bogaty, tem i rady! Hleb-sol' za stol!*), etc.

The actual linguistic description of almost 400 units of texts made it possible to identify their lexical and grammatical features

2) The following topical thematic groups of multi-part-of- speech vocabulary are noted in the corpus of texts under consideration: a) vocabulary of the religious sphere (*God, Angel, Lord, faith, St. Nicholas the Wonderworker, Mother of God, saint (corner), icon, etc.*); b) vocabulary of work activity (*labor, work, delo, uspeh*); in weaving — *to weave, kresna, prichvitsa, byordo*; in washing linen — *to wash, linen, etc.*); c) vocabulary of food (*tea, bread, sugar, milk, cabbage, potatoes, etc.*); d) vocabulary of everyday life (*bucket, kresna, byordo, etc.*) .

3) As expected, dialectal vocabulary is presented in our texts, often in dialectal word forms (*spekh, stav, prishvitsa, kresna, kvashnya, pischey, vyadro, tkyo, droti* and so on.);

4) In the formulas of spell-like semantics, imperative and optative modality are expressed: a) explicitly — by imperative verbs with the negative particle *ne* / without it (primarily in addresses to mythological characters — *pusti (zhit', perenochevat' i pod.), primi, (na)poj, kormi, (po)ljubi, beregi, glad', obuvaj, odevaj, nastavljaj, voz'mi, droti, ne much', ne nadejsja, ne obizhaj, ne trevozh'*; *v*

obrashhenijah k rastenijam — (ne) rasti, (ne) bud', (ne) rodis'')); b) nejavlenno — <Pust' budet> trud na pol'zu! <Zhelaju> schastlivogo puti! <Chtob byl> mir vashemu domu!;

5) The dialogue structure of all EFFs is obvious (thank you dialogues; constructor dialogues, chain dialogues).

Using the methods of folkloristic textual criticism, an attempt was made in the work to compile a typology of possible variants of a number of formulas of one theme. Variability as one of the essential features of any folklore text is also present in the speech functioning of the forms and formulas under consideration. A comparison of specific records of etiquette formulas of one theme showed that almost every thematic "bush" of variants has its own invariant zone (stable vocabulary, stable grammatical structure) and a zone of active variation. The core, invariant zone ensures textual integrity and functional constancy of traditional formulas of speech etiquette.

The Russian North as a unique repository of archaic forms of Slavic culture today demonstrates specific ethnocultural facts, embodied, among other things, in the system of small forms of folklore; it is no coincidence that in one of her articles on the problems and prospects of modern ethnolinguistics S.M. Tolstaya speaks of the importance of studying small forms of traditional speech culture — signs, sayings, etiquette units, etc. [Tolstaya 2002: 7]. Deep features of the northern dialect culture are noticeable, which are expressed in a number of the texts under consideration (*Speh za kresnami! Lebed' belaja! — Volog.; Speh za stav! — Novg.*). Variants of formulas-appeals to the domovoi recorded in the Arkhangelsk region in the last century possess textual diversity and lexical richness. These are also the "road" formulas recorded in the Yaroslavl region in 2024 during a scientific expedition under the program "Spiritual Culture of the Russian North in Folk Literature". The possibility of involving more extensive material in the study of the specifics of folk speech etiquette allows us to talk about the prospects and inexhaustibility of the topic of this dissertation research.

Sources and their abbreviations

- NKRY — National Corpus of the Russian Language [electronic resource] // <https://ruscorpora.ru/new/>.
- SDK — Archive "Spiritual Culture of the Russian North in Folk Literature" of the Department of Russian Language, St. Petersburg State University.

References

1. Agapkina T.A., Vinogradova L.N. Blagopozhelanie: Ritual i tekst // Slavjanskij i balkanskij fol'klor: verovanija, tekst, ritual / otv. red. N.I. Tolstoj. — M.: Nauka, 1994. — S. 168–208. (In Russian)
2. Agapkina T.A., Sedakova I.A. Prigovory // Slavjanske drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheski slovar': v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 2008. — T.4. — S. 272. (In Russian)
3. Adon'eva C.B. Ritual, on zhe — obrjad. Razgovor ob opredelenijah // Personal-Miks, 2007. Vyp. 6. [Jelektronnyj resurs] // http://folk.ru/Research/adonyeva_ritual_2007.php (data obrashhenija: 16.01.2024). (In Russian)
4. Azbelev S.N. Osnovnye ponjatija tekstologii v primenenii k fol'klornomu materialu // Principy tekstologičeskogo izučenija fol'klora / otv. red. B.N. Putilov. — M.–L.: Nauka, 1966. — S. 260–302. (In Russian)
5. Akishina A.A., Formanovskaja N.I. Russkij rechevoj jetiket. — M.: Russkij jazyk, 1975. — 183 s. (In Russian)
6. Artemenko E.B. Fol'klornaja formula i ustnopojetičeskaja tradicija // Problemy izučenija zhivogo russkogo slova na rubezhe tysjacheletij. Ch. II. — Voronezh: VGPU, 2005. — S. 99–108. (In Russian)
7. Astaf'eva L.A. Sjuzhet i stil' bylin: avtoref. dis. ... doktora filologičeskikh nauk: 10.01.09. — Moskva, 1993. — 36 s. (In Russian)
8. Afanas'ev A.N. Skazka i mif. — Voronezh: tip. V. Gol'dshtejna, 1864. — 82 s. (In Russian)
9. Bajburin A.K. Jetničeskie stereotipy povedenija. — L.: Nauka, 1985. — 330 s. (In Russian)
10. Bajburin A.K. Ritual v tradicionnoj kul'ture. Strkuturno-semantičeskij analiz vostočnoslavjanskikh obrjadov. — SPb: Nauka, 1993. — 237 s. (In Russian)
11. Bajburin A.K. A.A. Potebnja: filosofija jazyka i mifa // Slovo i mif. — M.: Pravda, 1989. — S. 3–10. (In Russian)

12. Bajburin A.K., Toporkov A.L. U istokov jetiketa. — L.: Nauka, 1990. — 165 s. (In Russian)
13. Balakaj A.G. Russkij rechevoj jetiket i principy ego leksikograficheskogo opisanija: avto-ref. dis. ... dokt. filol. nauk. — Orjol, 2002. — 40 s. (In Russian)
14. Baranov A.N., Krejdlin G.E. Illokutivnoe vynuzhdenie v strukture dialoga // Voprosy jazykoznanija, 1992. — № 2. — S. 84–99.
15. Bartmin'skij, E. Nekotorye spornye problemy jetnolingvistiki // Jazykovej obraz mira: ocherki po jetnolingvistike: per. s pol. — M.: Indrik, 2005. — S. 33–38. (In Russian)
16. Belova O.V., Vinogradova L.N. More // Slavjanskije drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheskij slovar': v 5 t. M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 2004. — T.3. — S. 299. (In Russian)
17. Belova O.V., Vinogradova L.N., Toporkov A.L. Zemlja // Slavjanskije drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheskij slovar': v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 1999. — T. 2. — S. 315. (In Russian)
18. Berdjaev N.A. O naznachenii cheloveka. — M.: Sovremennye zapiski, 1993. — 383 s. (In Russian)
19. Berezovich E.L. Jazyk i tradicionnaja kul'tura: Jetnolingvisticheskie issledovanija. M.: Indrik, 2007. — 602 s. (In Russian)
20. Berezovich E.L., Kuchko V.S. «Na nishhego, na pishhego...»: paremiologija i leksika russkogo severa ob obil'nom urozhae. Jetnolingvisticheskie zametki // Tradicionnaja kul'tura. — M., 2018. — T. 19. — № 5. — S. 63–71. (In Russian)
21. Bernshtam T.A. Vvedenie // Russkij Sever: k probleme lokal'nyh grupp. — SPb.: MAJe RAN, 1995. — S. 3–12. (In Russian)
22. Bernshtam T.A., Chistov K. V. Ot redaktorov // Russkij Sever: arealy i kul'turnye tradicii. — SPb.: Nauka, 1992. — S. 3–6. (In Russian)
23. Bobunova M.A., Hrolenko A.T. Slovar' jazyka russkogo fol'klora: leksika byliny. — Kursk: Kur. gos. ped un-t, 2006. — 314 s. (In Russian)

24. Bogatyrev P.G. Voprosy teorii narodnogo iskusstva. — M.: Iskusstvo, 1971. — 511 s. (In Russian)
25. Bondarko A.V. Teorija funkcional'noj grammatiki. Temporal'nost'. Modal'nost'. — L.: Nauka, 1990. (In Russian)
26. Bunchuk T.N. Konceptual'nyj analiz tekstov tradicionnoj kul'tury (Teksty Vita herbae / rei i kumuljativ. skazki; aktual. slova-koncepty): dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. — SPb: S.-Peterb. gos. un-t., 2003. — 25 s. (In Russian)
27. Buslaev F.I. Istoricheskie ocherki narodnoj slovesnosti i iskusstva: v 2 t. M., SPb.: Obshhestvennaja pol'za, 1861. — T. I. — 662 s. (In Russian)
28. Buslaev F.I. Opyt istoricheskoj grammatiki russkogo jazyka: uchebnoe posobie dlja prepodavatelej. — M., 1858. — Ch. I. Jetimologija. — 244 s. (In Russian)
29. Valencova M.M. Tkachestvo // Slavjanskie drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheskiy slovar': v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 2012. — T. 5. — S. 278. (In Russian)
30. Vedernikova N.M. Russkaja narodnaja skazka. — M.: Nauka, 1975. — 142 s. (In Russian)
31. Veselovskij A.N. Istoricheskaja pojetika. — M.: Vysshaja shkola, 1989. — 410 s. (In Russian)
32. Vinogradov V.V. Russkij jazyk: grammaticeskoe uchenie o slove. — M–L.: Uchpedgiz, 1947. — 783 s. (In Russian)
33. Vinogradova L.N. Mifologicheskij aspekt slavjanskoj fol'klornoj tradicii. — M.: Indrik, 2016. — 384 s. (In Russian)
34. Vinogradova L.N. Novobrachnaja v dome muzha: stereotipy jetiketnogo i ritual'nogo povedenija // Logicheskij analiz jazyka. Jazyk jetiki. — M.: Jazyki ruskoj kul'tury, 2000. — S. 325–332. (In Russian)
35. Vinogradova L.N. Reka // Slavjanskie drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheskiy slovar': v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 2008. — T.4. — S. 416.

36. Vinogradova L.N., Tolstaja S.M. Zaprety // Slavjanskije drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheski slovar': v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshhenija», 1999. — T.2. — S. 273. (In Russian)
37. Vinogradova L.N., Tolstaja S.M. Ritual'nye priglasenija mifologičeskikh personazhej na rozhdestvenskij uzhin: struktura teksta // Slavjanskoe i balkanskoe jazykoznanie: struktura malyh fol'klornyh tekstov: sb. statej / In-t slavjanovedenija i balkanistiki RAN; otv. red. S.M. Tolstaja, T.V. Civ'jan. — M.: Nauka, 1993. — S. 60–82. (In Russian)
38. Vinokur T.G. Dialogičeskaja rech' // Lingvisticheski jenciklopedičeskij slovar' / Pod red. V.N. Jarcevoj. — M.: Sovetskaja jenciklopedija, 1990. — S. 135. (In Russian)
39. Gerasimova N.M. Formuly ruskoj volshebnoj skazki // Sovetskaja jetnografija. — M., 1978. — № 5. — S. 18–28. (In Russian)
40. Gerd A.S. Vvedenie v jetnolingvistiku. — SPb: Izd-vo S.-Peterb. un-ta, 2005. — 456 s. (In Russian)
41. Gil'ferding A.F. Onezhskie byliny. — M.; L.: Izd-vo Akad. nauk SSSR, 1949. — 4 izd. T.I. — 810 s. (In Russian)
42. Gol'din V.E. Jetiket i rech'. — Saratov: Izd-vo Saratovskogo un-ta, 1978. — 112 s. (In Russian)
43. Gofman A.B., Levkovich V.P. Obyčaj kak forma social'noj reguljaciji // Sovetskaja jetnografija, 1973. — 14–20. (In Russian)
44. Grechko V, A. Semantičeskaja terminologija A. A. Potebni kak sistema // Naukova spadshhina O.O. Potebni i suchasna filologija. — Kiïv, 1985. S. 167–168. (In Russian)
45. Grishanova V.N. Obrashhenie v govore kak otrazhenie mentaliteta ego nositelej // Slavjanskij al'manah. — M., 1999. — S. 324–336. (In Russian)
46. Grishanova V.N. Rechevoj jetiket govora kak jelement narodnoj kul'tury // Slavjanskij al'manah. — M., 1998. — S.307–312. (In Russian)
47. Gumbol'dt V. fon. Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniju: per. s nem. / pod obshh. red. G.V. Ramishvili. — M.: Progress, 2000. — 396 s. (In Russian)

48. Gura A.V. Brak i svad'ba v slavjanskoj narodnoj kul'ture: Semantika i simbolika. — M.: Indrik, 2012. — 936 s. (In Russian)
49. Gura A.V. Simvolika zhivotnyh v slavjanskoj narodnoj tradicii. — M.: Indrik, 1997. — 912 s. (In Russian)
50. Davydova O.A. Postojannye jepitety — jelement var'irovanija pojeticheskikh formul (na materiale russkikh volshebnyh skazok) // Issledovanie po istoricheskoj semantike. Kaliningrad, 1980. — S. 125–130. (In Russian)
51. Dal' V.I. Poslovicy i pogovorki russkogo naroda. — M.: V universitetskoj tipografii, 1862. — 1095 s. (In Russian)
52. Egorova O.A. Tradicionnye formuly kak znakovaja harakteristika fol'klornogo proizvedenija // Aktual'nye problemy gumanitarnyh i estestvennyh nauk. — M.: Nauch.-inform. izd. centr i red. zhurn. «Aktual'nye problemy gumanitarnyh i estestvennyh nauk», 2016. — T. 1. — T. 9(1). — S. 270–274. (In Russian)
53. Erofeeva I.V. Leksiko-grammaticheskie osobennosti prilagatel'nogo bozhii v letopisnom tekste // Vestnik Vjatskogo gos. un-ta. Istorija jazyka. Dialektologija., 2009. — S. 51–54. (In Russian)
54. Zagidullina M.V. Mul'timodal'nost': k voprosu o terminologicheskoj opredelennosti // Teorija zhurnalistiki i voprosy metodov mediaissledovanij. Cheljabinsk, 2019. — S. 181–188. (In Russian)
55. Znadvorova A.V. Rechevoe obshhenie v malyh social'nyh gruppah (na primere sem'i) // Sovremennyj russkij jazyk. Social'naja i funkcional'naja differenciacija. — M., 2003. — S. 381–402. (In Russian)
56. Zelenin D.K. Tabu slov u narodov vostochnoj Evropy i severnoj Azii. — L.: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1929. — 151 s. (In Russian)
57. Zemcovskij I.I. K teorii zhanra v fol'klоре // Artes populares, Edited by Vilmos Voigt. Budapest, 1985. — S. 24–30. (In Russian)
58. Zorina L.Ju. Vologodskie dialektnye blagopozhelanija v kontekste narodnoj kul'tury. — Vologda: VPGU, 2012. (In Russian)

59. Zorina L.Ju. Vologodskie blagopozhelanija pripolevyh rabotah / L.Ju. Zorina // Russkaja rech' v sovremennyh paradigmah lingvistiki. Materialy Mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii. Pskov, 22-24 aprelja 2010 g. — Pskov: PGPU, 2010. — Ch. 1. — S. 74–78. (In Russian)
60. Zorina L.Ju. Vologodskie dialektnye blagopozhelanija v situacii doenija korovy // Severnorusskie govory / otv. red. A.S. Gerd. — SPb., 2012. — S. 131–149. (In Russian)
61. Zorina L.Ju. Russkie dialektnye blagopozhelanija v situacijah l'novodstva, prjadenija i tkachestva // Vestnik KGU im. N.A. Nekrasova, 2012. — № 5. — S. 68–75. (In Russian)
62. Ivanov E.E. Aforizm v krugu malyh tekstovyh form v ustnom, pis'mennom i jelektronnom diskursah // Vestnik Rossijskogo universiteta družby narodov. Serija: Teorija jazyka. Semiotika. Semantika, 2022. — T. 13. — № 4. — S. 898–924. (In Russian)
63. Ivanov V.V., Toporov V.N. Invariant i transformacii v mifologicheskikh i fol'klornyh tekstah // Tipologicheskie issledovanija po fol'kloru: sbornik statej pamjati Vladimira Jakovlevicha Proppa (1895-1970). — M., 1975. — S. 44–76. (In Russian)
64. Ivanova T.G. Specifika fol'kloristicheskoj tekstologii // Russkij fol'klor. Tom 26. Problemy tekstologii fol'klora. — L., 1991. — S. 5–21. (In Russian)
65. Il'ina Ju.N. Severnorusskie pohoronno-pominal'nye prichitanija: lingvokognitivnyj aspekt: avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. SPb: S.-Peterb. gos. un-t., 2008. — 26 s. (In Russian)
66. Karasik V.I. Rechevoe povedenie i tipy jazykovyh lichnostej // Massovaja kul'tura na rubezhe XX-XXI vekov: Chelovek i ego diskurs. — M.: Azbukovnik, 2003. — S. 56–77. (In Russian)
67. Klimas I.S. Jadro fol'klornogo leksikona. — Kursk: Kur. gos. ped un-t, 2000. — 95 s. (In Russian)

68. Kovshova M.L. Lingvokul'turologicheskij analiz idiom, zagadok, poslovic i pogovorok. Antroponimicheskij kod kul'tury. — M.: LENAND, 2022. — 400 s. (In Russian)
69. Kolesov V.V. Mir cheloveka v slove Drevnej Rusi. — L.: Izd-vo Leningradskogo un-ta, 1988. — 312 s. (In Russian)
70. Kolesov V.V. Slovo i delo: iz istorii russkih slov. — SPb.: Izd-vo S.-Peterb. un-ta, 2004. — 701 s. (In Russian)
71. Kostomarov V.G. Russkij rechevoj jetiket // Russkij jazyk za rubezhom. — M., 1967. — № 1. — S. 56–62. (In Russian)
72. Kopylenko M.M. Osnovy jetnolingvistiki. — Almaty: Evrazija, 1995. — 178 s. (In Russian)
73. Kul'tura Russkogo Severa / otv. red. K.V. Chistov. — L.: Nauka, 1988. — 185 s. (In Russian)
74. Lapteva O.A. Normativnost' nekodificirovannoj literaturnoj rechi // Sintaksis i norma. — M., 1974. — S. 5–42. (In Russian)
75. Levada Ju.A. Social'naja priroda religii. — M.: Nauka, 1965. — 263 s. (In Russian)
76. Levinton G.A. Zamechanija o zhanrovom prostranstve russkogo fol'klora // Sud'by tradicionnoj kul'tury. Sbornik statej i materialov pamjati Larisy Ivlevoj. — SPb., 1998. — S. 56–71. (In Russian)
77. Levkovich V.P. Obychaj i ritual kak sposoby social'noj reguljaciji povedenija // Psihologicheskie problemy social'noj reguljaciji povedenija. — M., 1976. — S. 212–236. (In Russian)
78. Lihachev D.S. Tekstologija: kratkij ocherk. — M.–L.: Nauka, 1964. — 106 s. (In Russian)
79. Maksimov S.V. Krylatye slova. — M.: Gos. izd-vo hud. lit-ry., 1955. — 448 s. (In Russian)
80. Mal'cev G.I. Tradicionnye formuly russkoj neobrjadovoj liriki. — L.: Nauka, 1989. — 172 s. (In Russian)

81. Malye formy fol'klora. Sbornik statej pamjati G.L. Permjakova. — M.: «Vostochnaja literatura» RAN, 1995. — 384 s. (In Russian)
82. Meletinskij E.M. Pojetika mifa. — M.: «Vostochnaja literatura» RAN, 2000. — 407 s. (In Russian)
83. Mel'nikova E.A. «Zdes' russkij duh...»: k istorii Russkogo Severa na simbolicheskoj karte voobrazhaemoj Rossii // Russkij Sever: utopii i mobil'nosti. Tezisy dokladov IV nauchnyh chtenij pamjati K.V. Chistova. — SPb., 2017. S. 6–22. (In Russian)
84. Meshkova O.V. Tipy blagopozhelanij v tradicionnom russkom rodil'no-krestil'nom obrjade // Vestnik Cheljabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2010. — № 34. — Vyp. 49. — S. 69–72. (In Russian)
85. Mikloshich F. Izobrazitel'nye sredstva slavjanskogo jeposa: Drevnosti: Tr. Slav. komissii Mosk. arheolog. o-va. — M., 1895. — 34 s. (In Russian)
86. Miller V.F. Oчерki russkoj narodnoj slovesnosti. M.: tip. t-va I.D. Sytina, 1897. — T.I. — 464 s. (In Russian)
87. Nikitina S.E. Chelovek i socium v narodnyh konfessional'nyh tekstah (leksikograficheskiy aspekt). — M.: IJaz RAN, 2009. — 354 s. (In Russian)
88. Ossoveckij I.A. O jazyke russkogo tradicionnogo fol'klora // Voprosy jazykoznaniya. — 1975. № 5. — S. 71–73. (In Russian)
89. Pavlova M.R. Magicheskie prigovory v tkachestve // Slavjanskoe i balkanskoe jazykoznanie: struktura malyh fol'klornyh tekstov: sb. statej / In-t slavjanovedenija i balkanistiki RAN; otv. red. S.M. Tolstaja, T.V. Civ'jan. — M.: Nauka, 1993. — S. 170–183. (In Russian)
90. Permjakov G.I. Ot pogovorki do skazki. — M.: Nauka, 1970. — 243 s. (In Russian)
91. Petrov A.M. Sintaksis russkih duhovnyh stihov. — Petrozavodsk: Karel'skij nauchnyj centr, 2012. — 164 s. (In Russian)
92. Pleshakova V.V. Blagopozhelanie kak fol'klorno-rechevoj zhanr // Jetnolingvistika teksta. Semiotika malyh form fol'klora. I. Tezisy i predvaritel'nye materialy k simpoziumu. — M., 1988. — S. 94–95. (In Russian)

93. Pleshakova V.V. Russkie blagopozhelanija: Opyt tipologii i istorii: avtoref. dis. ...kand. filol. nauk. — M., 1997. — 19 s. (In Russian)
94. Plotnikova A.A. Porog // Slavjanskije drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheski slovar': v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 2008. T.4. — S. 173. (In Russian)
95. Potebnja A.A. Mysl' i jazyk. — M.: Labirint, 1999. — 269 s. (In Russian)
96. Potebnja A.A. O nekotoryh simvolah v slavjanskoj narodnoj poezii. — Har'kov: Univ. tip., 1860. — 155 s. (In Russian)
97. Potebnja. A.A. Ob#jasnenie malorusskikh i srodnyh narodnyh pesen. Ch.2. Koljadki i shhedrovki. — Varshava: tip. M. Zemkevicha, 1887. — 810 s. (In Russian)
98. Potebnja A.A. Teoreticheskaja pojetika. — M.: Vysshaja shkola, 1990. — 342 s. (In Russian)
99. Putilov B.N. Fol'klor i narodnaja kul'tura. — SPb.: Nauka, 1994. — 235 s. (In Russian)
100. Razumova I.A. Povestvovatel'nyj stereotip v russkoj volshebnoj skazke. Diss. ...kand. filol. nauk. — L., 1984. — 214 s. (In Russian)
101. Roshijanu N. Tradicionnye formy skazki. — M.: Nauka, 1974. — 216 s. (In Russian)
102. Sadova T.S. Narodnaja primeta kak tekst: lingvisticheski aspekt. — SPb.: Izd-vo S.-Peterb. un-ta, 2003. — 212 s. (In Russian)
103. Sadova T.S. Snogadanija i rasskazy o snah v russkom rechevom obihode: lingvisticheskie zametki. — SPb.: Izd-vo S.-Peterb. un-ta, 2021. — 144 s. (In Russian)
104. Sadova T.S., Chekina A.A. Parnye fol'klornye formuly // Kognitivnaja lingvistika v kontekste sovremennoj nauki: materialy Mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii. — Moskva: Tambov, 2023. — № 4(55). — S. 635–637. (In Russian)

105. Simina G.Ja. Jazykovye sredstva jekspressii v narodnyh skazkah // Jazyk zhanrov russkogo fol'klora. — Petrozavodsk, 1977. — S. 102–113. (In Russian)
106. Sintaksis sovremennogo russkogo jazyka: uchebnik dlja vysshih uchebnyh zavedenij Rossijskoj Federacii / G.N. Akimova, S.V. Vjatkina, V.P. Kazakov, D.V. Rudnev; pod red. S.V. Vjatkinov. — SPb., 2009. — 347 s. (In Russian)
107. Solncev V.M. Variativnost' // Lingvisticheski jenciklopedičeski slovar' / Pod red. V.N. Jarcevoj. — M.: Sovetskaja jenciklopedija, 1990. — S. 114–115. (In Russian)
108. Sreznevskij I.I. Mysli ob istorii russkogo jazyka (Chitano na akte Imperatorskogo S.-Peterburgskogo universiteta, 8 fevralja 1849 goda). — M., 1959. — 133 s. (In Russian)
109. Sternin I.A. Russkij rechevoj jetiket. — Voronezh: VOIPKRO, 1996. — 124 s. (In Russian)
110. Sjepir Je. Jazyk. — M.; L.: Socjkgiz, 1934. — 223 s. (In Russian)
111. Tarlanov Z.K. Russkie poslovicy: sintaksis i pojetika. — Petrozavodsk: PetrGU, 1999. — 449 s. (In Russian)
112. Tolstaja S.M. Moskovskaja shkola jetnolingvistiki // Opera Slavica, 2002. — Vyp. 2 (2). — S. 1–9. (In Russian)
113. Tolstaja S.M. Obraz mira v tekste i rituale. — M.: Russkij fond sodejstvija obrazovaniju i nauke, 2015. — 528 s. (In Russian)
114. Tolstaja S.M. Oppozicii semanticheskie // Slavjanske drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheski slovar': v 5 t., — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 2004. — T.3. — S. 557. (In Russian)
115. Tolstaja S.M. Prestuplenie i nakazanie v svete mifologii // Logičeski analiz jazyka. Jazyk jetiki. — M., 2000. — S. 373–380. (In Russian)
116. Tolstaja S.M. Chisla // Slavjanske drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheski slovar' v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 2012. — T. 5. — S. 546. (In Russian)

117. Tolstoj N.I. Arhaicheskij ritual-dialog // Oчерki slavjanskogo jazykoznanija. — M.: Indrik, 2003. — S. 313–410. (In Russian)
118. Tolstoj N.I. Bog // Slavjanskije drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheskij slovar' v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 1995. — T. 1. — S. 202. (In Russian)
119. Tolstoj N.I. Jazyk i narodnaja kul'tura: Oчерki po slavjanskoj mifologii i jetnolingvistike. — M.: Indrik, 1995. — 512 s. (In Russian)
120. Tolstye N.I. i S.M. Slavjanskaja jetnolingvistika: voprosy teorii. — M.: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN, 2013. — 240 s. (In Russian)
121. Toporov V.N. O drevneindijskoj zagovornoj tradicii // Malye formy fol'klora. Sbornik statej pamjati G.L. Permjakova. — M.: «Vostochnaja literatura» RAN, 1995. — S. 8–105. (In Russian)
122. Tyrnikova N.G. Obshee i specificheskoe nacional'noe v rechevom jetikete (na materiale russkogo i anglijskogo jazykov): avtoref. dis. ... kand. fil. nauk. — Saratov, 2003. — 143 s. (In Russian)
123. Uznaval E.S. Novosel'e // Slavjanskije drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheskij slovar': v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 2004. — T.3. — S. 412. (In Russian)
124. Usacheva V.V. Kapusta // Slavjanskije drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheskij slovar': v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 1999. — T. 2. — S. 458. (In Russian)
125. Usacheva V.V. Luk // Slavjanskije drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheskij slovar': v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 2004. — T. 3. — S. 140. (In Russian)
126. Farmakovskaja N.I. Rechevoj jetiket i kul'tura obshhenija. — M.: Vysshaja shkola, 1989. — 156 s. (In Russian)
127. Formanovskaja N.I. Russkij rechevoj jetiket: lingvisticheskij i metodicheskij aspekty. — M.: LENAND, 2020. — 160 s. (In Russian)
128. Harchenko V.K. Jazyk narodnoj primety // Russkij jazyk v shkole. — 1992 — № 1 — S. 78–82. (In Russian)

129. Hristoforova O.B. Logika tolkovanij: Fol'klor i modelirovanie povedenija v arhaicheskikh kul'turah. — M.: Rossijsk. gos. gumanit. un-t, 1998. — 80 s. (In Russian)
130. Hrolenko A.T. Pojeticheskaja frazeologija russoj narodnoj liricheskoj pesni. — Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezhskogo un-ta, 1981. — 163 s. (In Russian)
131. Hrolenko A.T. Semantika fol'klornogo slova. — Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezhskogo un-ta, 1992. — 140 s. (In Russian)
132. Civ'jan T.V. Lingvisticheskie osnovy balkanskoj modeli mira. — M.: Nauka, 1990. — 207 s. (In Russian)
133. Civ'jan T.V. Model' mira i ejo lingvisticheskie osnovy. — M.: LIBROKOM, 2009. — 279 s. (In Russian)
134. Civ'jan T.V. O roli slova v tekste magicheskogo dejstvija // Slavjanskoe i balkanskoe jazykoznanie: struktura malyh fol'klornyh tekstov: sb. statej / In-t slavjanovedenija i balkanistiki RAN; otv. red. S.M. Tolstaja, T.V. Civ'jan. — M.: Nauka, 1993 — S. 111–121. (In Russian)
135. Chekina A.A. Sintaksis obrjadovo-jetiketnyh formul odnoj pragmatiki // Kognitivnye issledovanija jazyka. — Tambov, 2023a. — № 3(54). — S. 320–325. (In Russian)
136. Chekina A.A. Sintaksis i pragmatika odnoj obrjadovo-jetiketnoj formuly narodnoj rechi // Jazykovye kategorii i edinicy: sintagmaticeskij aspekt: materialy pjatnadcatoj Mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii, posvjashhennoj 70-letiju kafedry russkogo jazyka. — Vladimir, 2023b. — S. 502–510. (In Russian)
137. Chekina A.A. Strukturno-semanticheskie osobennosti odnoj obrjadovo-jetiketnoj formuly narodnoj rechi v situacii tkachestva // Uchenye zapiski Petrozavodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Petrozavodsk, 2023v. — T. 45 (6). — S. 23–28. (In Russian)
138. Chekina A.A. «Dedushko-domovejushko, poljubi moju semejushku»: obrjadovo-jetiketnye formuly obrashhenija k domovym v regionah Russkogo Severa // Vestnik Doneckogo nacional'nogo universiteta. — Vyp. 3., 2023g. — S. 119–125. (In Russian)

139. Chekina A.A. Prigovory na urozhaj: lingvisticheskie osobennosti obrjadovo-jetiketnyh tekstov (po materialam polevyh zapisej jekspedicij v Totemskij rajon Vologodskoj oblasti) // Russkij Sever-2024. Problemy izuchenija i sohraneniya istoriko-kul'turnogo nasledija: sbornik rabot VIII Vserossijskoj nauchnoj konferencii. — Vologda, 2024a. — S. 180–185. (In Russian)
140. Chekina A.A. Jetiket narodnoj rechi: dialogovaja forma // Vestnik Doneckogo nacional'nogo universiteta. Serija D. Filologija i psihologija. — № 4, 2024b. — S. 160–169. (In Russian)
141. Chervinskij P.P. Semanticheskij jazyk fol'klornoj tradicii. — Ternopol': Krok, 2011. — 228 s. (In Russian)
142. Cherepanova O.A. Kul'turnaja pamjat' v drevnem i novom slove. — SPb.: Izd-vo S.-Peterb. un-ta, 2005. — 331 s. (In Russian)
143. Cherepanova O.A. Mifologicheskaja leksika Russkogo Severa. — L.: Izd-vo Leningradskogo un-ta, 1983. — 169 s. (In Russian)
144. Cherepanova O.A. Mifologicheskie rasskazy i legendy Russkogo Severa. — SPb.: Izd-vo S.-Peterb. un-ta, 1996. — 212 s. (In Russian)
145. Cherepanova O.A. Obshhenarodnye i regional'nye formuly rechevogo jetiketa: komplimentarnye obrashhenija // Voprosy regional'noj leksikologii i onomastiki: sb. nauch. trudov / otv. red. L.G. Jackevich. — Vologda, 1995. — S. 169–176. (In Russian)
146. Chistov K.V. Fol'klor. Tradicija. Tekst: sb. st. / K.V. Chistov. — M.: OGI, 2005. — 272 s.
147. Shahmatov A.A. Sintaksis russkogo jazyka. — M.: Uchpedgiz, 1941. — 624 s. (In Russian)
148. Shvedova N.Ju. Očerki po sintaksisu russkoj razgovornoj rechi. — M.: Akademija nauk SSSR, 1960. — 377 s. (In Russian)
149. Shhepanskaja T.B. Kul'tura dorogi v russkoj miforitual'noj tradicii XIX—XX vv. — M., 2003. — 528 s. (In Russian)
150. Jakubinskij L.P. O dialogicheskoj rechi // Jazyk i ego funkcionirovanie: Izbrannye raboty. — M., 1986. — S. 17–58. (In Russian)

151. Jasinskaja M.V. Skatert' // Slavjanskije drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheski slovar': v 5 t. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 2012. — T.5. — S. 12. (In Russian)
152. Lord A.B. The Singer of Tales. — Cambridge Mass.: Harvard univ. press, 1960. — 552 p.
153. Parry M. Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. I. Homer and Homeric Style. — Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 1930. — V.41. — 50 p.

Dictionaries

154. Balakaj A.G. Slovar' russkogo rechevogo jetiketa. — M.: Ast-Press, 2001. — 672 s.
155. Zherebilo T.V. Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov. — Nazran', 2010. — 486 s.
156. SRM — Kolesov V.V., Kolesova D.V., Haritonov A.A. Slovar' russoj mental'nosti: v 2 t. — SPb., 2014.
157. Lingvisticheskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar' / pod red. V.N. Jarcevoj. M., 1990. — URL: <http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/598a.html> (data obrashhenija: 24.11.2024).
158. MAS — Slovar' russkogo jazyka v chetyreh tomah. Tom I. A–J. Izd. tret'e stereotip. / Gl. red. A.P. Evgen'eva. — M.: Russkij jazyk, 1981. — 699 s.
159. MAS — Slovar' russkogo jazyka v chetyreh tomah. — Tom II. K–O. Izd. tret'e stereotip. / Gl. red. A.P. Evgen'eva. — M.: Russkij jazyk, 1986. — 736 s.
160. MAS — Slovar' russkogo jazyka v chetyreh tomah. Tom IV. S–Ja. Izd. tret'e sterotip. / Gl. red. A.P. Evgen'eva. — M.: Russkij jazyk, 1988. — 790 s.
161. Russkaja grammatika. Tom I. / Gl. red. N.Ju. Shvedova. — M.: Nauka, 1980. — 783 s.
162. SRNG — Slovar' russkikh narodnyh govorov: v 49 vyp. Vyp. 2 / gl. red. F.P. Filin. — L.: Nauka, 1966. — 317 s.
163. SRNG — Slovar' russkikh narodnyh govorov: v 49 vyp. Vyp. 6 / gl. red. F.P. Filin. — L.: Nauka, 1970. — 360 s.
164. SRNG — Slovar' russkikh narodnyh govorov: v 49 vyp. Vyp. 9 / gl. red. F.P. Sorokoletov. — L.: Nauka, 1972. — 364 s.
165. SRNG — Slovar' russkikh narodnyh govorov: v 49 vyp. Vyp. 11 / gl. red. F.P. Filin. — L.: Nauka, 1976. — 364 s.
166. SRNG — Slovar' russkikh narodnyh govorov: v 49 vyp. Vyp. 13 / gl. red. F.P. Filin. — L.: Nauka, 1977. — 359 s.

167. SRNG — Slovar' russkih narodnyh govorov: v 49 vyp. Vyp. 14 / gl. red. F.P. Filin. — L.: Nauka, 1978. — 376 s.
168. SRNG — Slovar' russkih narodnyh govorov: v 49 vyp. Vyp. 19 / gl. red. F.P. Filin. — L.: Nauka, 1983. — 360 s.
169. SRNG — Slovar' russkih narodnyh govorov: v 49 vyp. Vyp. 21 / gl. red. F.P. Filin. — L.: Nauka, 1986. — 360 s.
170. SRNG — Slovar' russkih narodnyh govorov: v 49 vyp. Vyp. 32 / gl. red. F.P. Sorokoletov. — SPb.: Nauka, 1998. — 272 s.
171. SRNG — Slovar' russkih narodnyh govorov: v 49 vyp. Vyp. 37 / gl. red. F.P. Sorokoletov. — SPb.: Nauka, 2004. — 416 s.
172. Slavjanskie drevnosti. Jetnolingvisticheskiy slovar': v 5-ti tt. / pod obshh. red. N. I. Tolstogo. — M.: «Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija», 1995—2012.
173. Fasmer M. Jetimologicheskiy slovar' russkogo jazyka: v 4 t. — M: Progress, 1987.
174. JeSSJa — Jetimologicheskiy slovar' slavjanskih jazykov / pod red. chlena-korrespondenta AN SSSR O.N. Trubachjova. — M.: Nauka, 1975. — Vyp. 2. — 238 s.

Application

Contexts that record etiquette forms and formulas of folk speech (based on materials from the SDK Archive)

Labor

1. Esli kto-to rabotaet, nado skazat': «Bog v pomoshh'!». Nado bylo objazatel'no zdorovat'sja. A to malen'kih za ushi taskali, mozhno bylo i oglohnut'. (Vjazovija, Ostashk., Selizhar., SDK-59, 1997).
2. «Bog v pomoshh'!» — «Bog da Bog, da i sam by pomog!» (Fomino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).
3. Eshhe govorili: «Bog-to Bog, da i sam by pomog». Jeto shutka takaja. «Bog v pomoshh'» objazatel'no govorili. [A otvechat' objazatel'no?] «Spasibo» govorili. (Fomino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).
4. «Bog v pomoshh'!» — govorili. (Raslovo-Monastyrskoe, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).
5. Nu, vot tam chelovek rabotaet, sejchas, pravda, oni tak ne govorjat, idjot sosed, on dolzhen skazat': «Pomogaj Bog...!» A on dolzhen skazat', skazat': «Spasibo!». (Novyj posjelok, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).
6. Dak jeto vseгда govorili. Jeto koda drova koljat, ja grju: «Nu, Bog pomogat tebe?» — «Pomogaet». (Ostankovo, Ljubimsk., Jarosl., SDK-2024).
7. Net, nu my vseгда: «Trud na pol'zu» — «Spasibo, spasibo». Vseгда govorim «Trud na pol'zu» i «Spasibo». Potomu chto kak zhe — tebe govorjat, a ty ne otvetish'? Nado otvetit': «Spasibo». (Ostankovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).
8. «Nu horosho, delo v pol'zu!». Rabotat kto, skazhut: «Torgovat' v pol'zu!». A hto i otvetit: «Ne znam, mozhe pol'zy net, a delam». (Ust'-Pjoza, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).
9. Pered nachalom vsjakogo dela pomolis' myslenno: «Gospodi, blagoslovi». Po okonchanii zhe: «Slava tebe, Gospodi». (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997).
10. Kogda idjosh', kto-to rabotat, ty emu govori: «Trud v pol'zu!». Ili: «Bog na pomoch'!». Ot otvechaet: «Spasibo». (Lampozhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

11. Kogdy kto rabotal, govorili: «Bog na pomoch'!». Oni otvechali: «Spasibo!». (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).
12. «Bog na pomoshhch'!» ili «Bozh'ja pomoshhch'!» — govorili, a teper' govorjat: «Trud na pol'zu!». (Kimzha, Mez., Arh., SDK-28, 1986).
13. Ran'she kto delaet čto, vsjo skazhut: «Bog na pomoshh'!». A teper' govorjat: «Trud na pol'zu!». (Ust'-Pjoza, Mez., Arh., SDK-32, 1986).
14. «Trud na pol'zu!» — govorili pri ljuboj rabote (Ignatovo, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).
15. Trud na pol'zu, Ljoshja! Bog pomoshh'! (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991).
16. Ja zhnu, ty skazhi: «Bog pomoch' vam!». Ja skazhu: «Spasibo!». (Zabolot'e, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991).
17. Esli pashet ili zhnjot, govorili jamu — kto skazhet: «Bog pomoch'!» ili «Trud na pol'zu!». (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991).
18. Bog pomoch' vam! — esli rabotaet. (Staroruss., Novg., SDK-54, 1994).
19. Kogda tkjosh', kto zajdjot, — «Bog pomoshh'», govorit. (Chjornaja, Grigor'ev, Bat, Novg., SDK-, 1988).
20. Ja mimo idu, ona rabotaet: «Bog pomoch'! Slyshish' aj ne?» - «Slyshu, tjoťja Manja! — dal'she idu. (Rakomo, Novg., Novg., SDK-54, 1994).
21. — Trud na pol'zu! <...> «Trud na pol'zu» možno bylo skazat', i my do sih por <...> esli kto-to tam blizkij rabotaet, tak skazhesh' čego, jeto ne greshno ved'. — A čto otvetit' nuzhno na jeto? — «Spasibo» skazhut. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).
22. «Trud na pol'zu!». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).
23. «Bog v pomoshh'!» <...> Jeto odno i to zhe: «Trud na pol'zu!» i «Bog v pomoshh'!». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).
24. Govorjat: «Daj by Bog sejat' v kaftanah, a zhat' jachmen' v odnih sarafanah, čtoby teplo bylo». (Kimzha, Mez., Arh., SDK-28, 1986).

25. Esli kto-to rabotaet, nado skazat': «Bog v pomoshh'!». Nado bylo objazatel'no zdorovat'sja. A to malen'kih za ushi taskali, mozhno bylo i oglohnut'. (Vjazovija, Ostashk., Selizhar., SDK-59, 1997).

26. Chelovek za rabotoj — «Bog pomoshh'!» — govorjat. (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997).

27. Pered nachalom vsjakogo dela pomolis' myslenno: «Gospodi, blagoslovi». Po okonchanii zhe: «Slava tebe, Gospodi». (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997).

28. «Trud na pol'zu!». «Spasibo! No nezhelatel'no takoj pol'zy» (esli privetstvuemyj zanjat tjazhelym, bessmyslennym trudom). (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).

29. Pomogaj Bog! Trud v pol'zu! (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).

30. «Pomogaj Bog!» ili «Bozh'ja pomoshh'!» Vsjo ravno, chto govorit' (i starym, i molodym) (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).

31. Ljudi, konechno, rabotali, nu chto skazat', a obychai tak nas vospityvali, ne znali, no vsjo ravno: «Bez Boga ni do poroga!». No uzhe ne to delo, shhas uzhe bol'she stalo vot jetogo, religii. No ja lichno kreshhjona, ja malen'kaja eshho... krestili dak. A moi deti ne kreshhjony, shhas vot stali krestit'sja, a tak — nekreshhjonymi pjatero ih, nikto nekreshhjonym byli iz detej. (Karshevo, Pudozh., Karelija, SDK-2006).

32. Pomogi vam Bog! — govorjat starym. Trud na pol'zu! — govorjat molodym. (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).

33. Pomogaj Bog! (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

34. Bog v pomoshh'! Truda na pol'zu! (Ljubim, Jarosl., SDK-2024).

35. Bez Boga ni do poroga! (Fomino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

36. Trud na pol'zu! (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007).

37. Bog na pomoch'! (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007).

38. Dak trud na pol'zu govorjat! (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

39. Trud v pol'zu! (Shotogorka, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

40. Kartoshku, tam, tozhe kopaish', tak — «Bog pomoshh' tebe!». (Novosjolok., Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).
41. «Nejmáh» — jeto, vrode, kak pozhelanie takoe dobroe, kak: «Pomogaj Bog!». (Igokinichi, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).
42. Ran'she skazhut rabotu nachinat', vsjo prosjatsja li chego-to: «Kuz'ma-to, Bog remeslennyj, posobi, pomogi, hitrim, mudrim sluh poshli, ko mne bez sluha sam zagljani». Jeto vot tozhe chego-to delat', nachinat' delo takaja navrode molitvy vot dak. Da, vot chego idjosh' kuda, byvalo, kogdy, vot v les pojdjosh', ne zabludit'sja chtob, potihon'ku tam blagoslovjas'. (Pirinem', Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).
43. Kogda rabotajut, govorjat: «Privet trudu!» (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).
44. Trud v pol'zu! (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).
45. Slava trudu! (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).
46. Privet trudu! (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).
47. «Bog v pomoshh'!». Otv: «Bog da Bog, da i sam bud' neploh!». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).
48. «Bog v pomoshh'!». Otv: «Bog da Bog, da i sam by pomog!» (govorili v shutku) (Ljubim, Jarosl., SDK-2024).
49. A moja mat' vseгда nachinala rabotat' s takimi slovami: «Dem'jan-kos'jan, pridi ko mne s sem'ju docherjam». I vsjo u nejo sportsja, a kosit' idu: «Gospodi, blagoslovi». (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).
50. [tkjot] Bog v pomoch'! (Saharovo Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).
51. Uspeh trudu! (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).
52. Uspeh tjabe rabota! (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).
53. Bog v pomoshh'! — Spasibo govorili. (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).
54. [stroit] Bog u pomoch'! A teper' bol'she: «Zdravstvujte!» (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).
55. «Trud na pol'zu!». «Zdorov'e v ruki!». «Chistota v izbe!» Byvaet, i sam pridumaet. (Ustreka, Moshensk., Novg., SDK-45, 1989).

Weaving

56. A nekotory prigovarivali: «Trud na pol'zu!» — kogda v dom vhodili, esli tkjot kto. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

57. Kogda tkut, tak govorili: «Speh tebe za stav!». (Kovrig, Ljubytin., Novg., SDK-36, 1986).

58. Kogdy tkjo sidit, skazhe: «Sto lokot na prishvicu!». A ona, kak devka, otvetit: «Sto zhenihov pod okoshko!». (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985).

59. Koli za rabotoj sidish', prjadjosh' znachit, vot gost'-to idjot, pridjot, tak skazhet: «Speh za krjosnami!». (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

60. Esli tkachiha zatykala, a v jeto vremja kto zajdjot, to govorili: «Siden'e vashemu!». A ona i otvetit: «Sidet' po-nashemu!». Gost' i sadilsja, chtob polotno horosho sadilos'. (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

61. Zdrovalis': «Sto lokot na prishvicu!» — esli tkjot. Otvechat: «Spasibo», — da i vsjo. (Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).

62. Esli hto prjadjot, vojdjosh' skazhesh': «Sto lokot na prishvicu!». Ona otvetit: «Sto rublej v karman!». (Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).

63. Kogda tkjosh', kto zajdjot, — «Bog pomoshh'», govorit. (Chjornaja, Grigor'ev, Bat, Novg., SDK-1988).

64. Pomnju, chto vot hozjajka esli tkjot, dak kto pridjot, da pozhelan'e: «Sto lokót na prishvicu». A hozjajka-to otvechala: «Sto rublej v karman». (Bol'shoe Krotovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

65. Sto lokot na prishvicu. Jeto kotorym nadevaetsja polotno na tkano-to jeto prishvica. A jeto bjordo, kotorym hlopajut-to, u tkackogo stanka-to. A ot bjordy do prishvicy — jeto nazyvaetsja lokot. Kak edinica izmerenija. (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007).

Washing and rinsing clothes

66. Kogda kto stiraet, govorjat: «Belén'ko!». (Stupino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987).

67. Koli bel'jo poloshhesh', to skazhut: «Belén'ko!» (Ignatovo, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

68. Esli kto-nibud' bel'jo poloshhet, a ty mimo idjosh', podojdjosh' i skazhesh': «Belén'ko poloshhi!». A tebe i otvetjat: «Spasibo!» (Srednie Chud'i, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

69. Stiraet — Belén'ko tebe! (Staroruss., Novg., SDK-54, 1994).

70. Nabelo Bog na pomoch'! Nu, to es' chistomu bel'ju slava! (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007).

71. «Bog na pomoc'!» — «Spasibo!» — da i vsjo. Zajdjosh' — hozjajka moet, dak: «Nabelo, Bog na pomoc'!». (Bol'shoe Krotovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

72. Esli ja prishla na prud, a vy poloshhshhite, govorju: «Belén'ko!». (Iskra, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987).

73. «Zdravstvuj-to» — hudo govorili, a ran'she — dak: «Pomogaj Bog!». Stirali — dak skazhut: «Nabelo, Bog na pomoch'!». (Zasur'e, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).

74. «Belo stirat' (myt')!» (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).

75. Bel'jo mojut — tak «Belen'ke tebe!» — govorili. (Kovrig, Ljubytin., Novg., SDK-36, 1986).

76. A stirali: «Nabelo koryto!». Ili skazhut: «Pomogaj Bog!». (Petrovo, Mez., Arh., SDK-30, 1986).

77. Esli bel'jo poloshhesh', a idjot kto, dak skazhet: «Belén'ko!». A ty otvetish': «Spasibo!» i dal'she rabotaesh'. (Srednie Chud'i, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

78. Kogda poloshhesh' bel'jo v vode, a vdrug kto-to prohodit mimo, dak on skazat' dolzhen: «Belo na vode!», a ty i otvetish': «Spasibo!». (Srednie Chud'i, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

79. Ja stiraju, tak idut i govorjat: «Oj, Lida, belén'ko!». «Belén'ka» — eta znachit: «Daj, Bog, zdorov'ja!». Idjosh' kuda: «Bud' zdorova! Kuda otpravilas'-to?». Ja govorju: «Da vot otpravilas' tam, v magazin». «Oj, daj, Bog, tebe udachi!» — ili tam chto-nibud' takoe. Kartoshku, tam, tozhe kopaish', tak — «Bog pomoshh' tebe!». (Novosjolok., Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

80. «Bog pomoch'!». «Belén'ko!». (Alehovshhina, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

81. Cheloveku, zanimajushhemusja stirkoy, govorili: «Belén'ka vam!». (Igokinichi, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

Milking a cow

82. Esli dojat — «More moloka!». (Iskra, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987).

83. Esli zahodish' v dom, a tam korovu dojat, to nado skazat': «More pod korovoj», a hozjajka otvechaet: «Reka moloka». (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

84. Esli hozjajka v hlevu doit korovu, a zashjol kto-to, to on skazat' dolzhen: «More pod korovoj», a hozjajka-to otvechaet: «Reka moloka». (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

85. Kak korovu doit kto, s nim ne zdorovat'sja nad', a skazat': «More do kolena!», chtob moloka bol'she nadoit' emu, more celo. (Ostrov, Pin., Arh., SDK-1985).

86. A koda korovu doish', govorjat sustrechajas': «More pod korovu!». Otvechaesh': «Davaj Bog bole!». (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).

87. Korovu doit — «Vjadro moloka!» (Staroruss., Novg., SDK-54, 1994).

88. Korovushku doit hozjajka, govorili: «Vedrom», chtob ej nadoit' vedro (Grivy, Starorus., Novg., 1990).

89. /Kogda zahodili k porosenku, chto-nibud' govorili emu?/ Net. My, kak pozhenilis', otec nam korovu privel srazu, vyrastili oni ee. Pervyj raz kogda dojat korovu (kogda otelilas' ona pervyj raz, pervyj telok — tak govorjat) tak prigovarivajut: «Kak jeti stroki lezhali tiho i spokojno, tak i ty stoj tiho i spokojno», — chtoby ona ne ljagalas', kak govoritsja. A porosenka kogda nesli domoj, prigovarivali: «Kak na kosti mjaso, a na mjaso salo», — chtoby porosenok ros zhirnym i zdorovym. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023)

90. S podojnikom idjosh', to ne zdorovajutsja s toboj hozjajki. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-28, 1986).

91. Hozjajku s podojnikom vstretish', to ne zdorovajutsja. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-28, 1986).
92. Kogda pokojnik lezhit v dome, to ne stuchat'sja da ne zdorovajutsja. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-28, 1986).
93. Kogda v dome-to pokojnik, to ne zdorovaesh'sja. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).
94. S molokom idjosh' — nel'zja zdorovat'sja. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).
95. Vstretish'sja s kem, moloko ili vodu nesjosh', nel'zja razgovarivat' s nim. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).
96. Kogda gadaesh'-to, molchat' nado, ni s kem ne razgovarivaj, kto by ni zagovoril, molchi. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).
97. Moloko nesesh' cherez dorogu komu, zdorovat'sja nel'zja ni s kem. (Ust'-Pjoza, Mez., Arh., SDK-28, 1986).
98. Jeto-to bylo, s podojnikom idi, uzh ne zdorovajsja, polozhesh', da uzh zdorovajsja. Ne zdorovatsja oni. A nynce netu bol'she. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
99. Kogda s molokom vstrechajut, ty uzh ne govori nichego. I ona tebe nichego ne skazhet. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
100. Idjot zhenshhina s molokom, to ne zdorovaetsja. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
101. Kogdy s podojnikom shli, ne zdorovalis'. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
102. Govorjat, idjot zhenshhina s podojnikom da ne ragovarivat. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
103. Moloko nadoila, idi v dom, srazu nesi ego v zapech'e. S chuzhimi ne govori. Mogut oprikosit' moloko, vsjaki ljudi est'. Skazhet: «Oj, moloko-to u tebjia parno, slivok dast!». Smotrish', a vsjo naoborot. (Lampozhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

104. S molokom idjosh' — ne zdorovajsja. Postav', dak togda zdorovajsja, idu s molokom i uzh molchu. Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985.

105. Doja korovu, dak ne zdorovajuca, i s molokom pojdjosh' — tozhe. (Zasur'e, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985). korova

106. S podojnikom idjosh' da s molokom — zdorovat'sja nel'zja. Postavish' moloko, da i zdorovash'sja, chtoby ne izurochil kto. Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985.

107. Idu s podojnikom, dak molchu, postavlju, potom zdorovajus'. Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985.

108. Govrja nel'zja govrit', kogda doja. Vot i ne govorish'. Gorushka, (Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985).

109. Idjosh' s podojnikom so dvora, skorej moloko stavish', potom zdorovaessja, a s molokom pozdorovalas' — «Pus' Bog proshhaet nas greshnyh», — skazhesh'. Gora, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985.

110. Doja korovu, dak ne zdorovajutsja, s molokom pojdjosh' — tozhe. (Sluda, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).

111. Nel'zja koda moloko nesjosh', postav' ego, togda zdorovassja, a s molokom — ne zdorovassja. S podojnikom idjosh' — tozhy ne govori nicho, poka ne postavish', ne zanesesh', tak-ot chto hosh' butte, idi mimo, ne razgovarivaj. (Sura, Pin., Arh., SDK-21, 1985).

112. I vot byla primeta: cherez reku moloka ne davat'. Esli s molokom idjot (zhenshhina), to govorit' nel'zja, ni stavit' nel'zja i po gostjam hodit' nel'zja s jetim molokom, poka po domu ne dojdjosh'. Moloko iz ruk v ruki ne peredajut. Jeto na korovu otrazhaetsja. S molokom shutki plohi. (Bol'shoe Krotovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

113. Tam hodili nekotorym, govorjat, sho nado na reku hodit'-to za vodoj, nazad-to idti — dak i ni s kem ne razgovarivat'. I vot jetu vodu tozhe v banju, i vot jeti babushki tozhe myli. Mama, kotory hodili, — govorjat, molchat' nado i ni s kem ne razgovarivat'. (Pirinem', Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

114. Esli podoila korovu, idjosh' s molokom v komnatu, a tam postoronnie ljudi, v zasolnysh, zapec'e moloko postav', potom uzhdz dorovajsja, a to korova tvoja moloka sbavit. (Ust'-Pjoza, Mez., Arh., SDK-28, 1986).

115. Moloko nesesh' v dom, ne zdorovaesh'sja, poka ne prinesem. (Kimzha, Mez., Arh., SDK-28, 1986).

Cooking

116. Raneshni vremena ne taki byli, teper' poshjol v magazin i kupil hleba-to, kogda ja devkoj byla, hlebushko sami pekli, vkusnoj byl, vot postavish' kvashonku i vyzhidaesh' vremechko-to, akot' gost' vojdjot, skazhet: «Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!», chtoby hleb vkusnyj byl. (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

117. Kogda kvashnju zameshivajut, ran'she govorili: «Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!». (Iskra, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987).

118. Esli mesto gotovish', a kto chuzhoj i voshjol, to govorit: «Sporyn'ja v kvashnju!». A ty otvechaesh': «Sto rubej v moshnu!». (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

Horticulture

119. Pro kapustu slyshal, sazhaju kogda: «Rasti sochnaja, kruglaja». (Ust'e, Ust'-Kuben. Volog., SDK-2005).

120. Rasti s golovu! (Troica, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

121. Rasti s Bogom! (Krutik, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

122. Rasti s Bogom! (Ermakovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

123. Rasti, vejsja, na uhod ne nadejsja! (Troica, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

124. Szhajut red'ku, nachinajut krichat' da serdit' cheloveka, chtob red'ka gor'kaja byla. (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000).

125. Koudy vyrashhivaesh' tykvu, nel'zja peredvigat' plet'. (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000).

126. Polozhu nazjomu kuchu, tak i Bogu ne kuchus' (ne zhalujus'). (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000).

127. A kogda davala rassadu, vot mnogie ne dajut, chto-to róstjat, horosho rastjot zdes', i s sosedjami, druž'jami ne deljatsja, a u nas mama govorila: esli dobrom otdat' ne bojsja, chto unesut, mol, esli budesh' davat' tak u tebjja ne budet rodit'sja, porodu unesut, ona vot jeto menja uchila: «Ne bojsja, porodu ne unesut» — govori tri raza. Komu dajosh': «Daju blagoslovjas', chtob u tebjja vzoshlo, i u menja roslo. Amin'». Tri raza. A kto berjot, tot dolzhen skazat': «Beru blagoslovjas', chtob u tebjja roslo, i u menja vzoshlo». Amin'. (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

128. /Luk, kogda peredaete, chto govorite?/ Svoju polovinu ty beri, a moju mne ostav'. Govorjat, chto esli ty beresh' s chuzhogo ogoroda, to nado, chtoby ne iz ruk v ruki, a chtoby na zemlju postavil i s zemli vzjal. Takoe est' eshhe pover'e. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

129. Chego-to, ne znaju. <...> Ja sazhu... tak, da pust' tam chego-to, govorili. Vyvoditsja na nizshego, na pisshego... <...> — «Na pisshego» — jeto chto takoe? Pust' dazhe i na sytogo, i na golodnogo. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

130. /Ogorod sazhali ran'she? Mozhet, est' kakie-nibud' prigovory pri posadke?/ Konečno, sazhali. I sejchas sadim. Ogorodom, možhno skazat', i zhivem. Na kapustu prigovarivali: «Ne rodis' golenasta, a rodis' puzasta», — chtoby kochan nalivalsja. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

131. Nu, vot kapustu sadjat, dak govorjat: «Ne bud' golenasta, a bud' korenasta!». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

132. Kogda sadjat kapustu, govorjat: «Ne bud' golenista, a bud' korenista!». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

133. «Ne rodis' golenasta, a rodis' puzasta!». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

134. Luk kogda sadjat i jeto govorjat: «I na nishhego, i na zavidushhego!». Chtoby hvatilo i na nishhego, i na zavidushhego! (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

135. Vot Valja kogda sazhaet chto v ogorode, govorit: «Rasti s Bogom dlja sebja i dlja ljudej!». (Iskra, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987).

136. Sazhajut red'ku, nachinajut krichat' da serdit' cheloveka, chtob red'ka gor'kaja byla. (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000).

137. «Rodis', kartoshka. Vetka v ogloblju, kartoshka — v koleso». (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000).

138. Nu nachinaete polot': «Blagoslovi vas Bog, detki!». (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000).

139. Kogda sazhaesh' (kapustu), nado, chtob nikto tebja ne videl. Nado skazat': «Rasti, kapusta, gusta, golenasta i puzasta». Posle jetogo hlopnut' sebja tri raza po jagodicam. (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000).

140. Koudy vyrashhivaesh' tykvu, nel'zja peredvigat' plet'. (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000).

141. «Rasti golovasta, ne golenasta!» (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000).

142. «Rasti na nishhah, na pishhah (pishhah), na vseh kreshhjonyh ljudej!». (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000).

143. Polozhu nazjomu kuchu, tak i Bogu ne kuchus' (ne zhalujus'). (Tot'ma, Totem., Volog., SDK-2000).

144. Pro kapustu slyshal, sazhajut kogda: «Rasti sochnaja, kruglaja». (Ust'e, Ust'-Kuben. Volog., SDK-2005).

145. A kogda davala rassadu, vot mnogie ne dajut, chto-to róstjat, horosho rastjot zdes', i s sosedjami, druž'jami ne deljatsja, a u nas mama govorila: esli dobrom otdat' ne bojsja, chto unesut, mol, esli budesh' davat', tak u tebja ne budet rodit'sja, porodu unesut, ona vot jeto menja uchila: «Ne bojsja, porodu ne unesut» — govori 3 raza. Komu dajosh': «Daju blagoslovjas', chtob u tebja vzoshlo, i u menja roslo. Amin'». Tri raza. A kto berjot, tot dolzhen skazat': «Beru blagoslovjas', chtob u tebja roslo, i u menja vzoshlo». Amin'. (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

146. Ty, jablon'ka, rosti, a ty, matushka zashla, hozjainu kladi davaj». (Chjornaja, Grigor'evo, Bat., Novg., 1988). ogorod

147. Na Voznesen'e, na sed'moj nedele ot Pashi — jajca varili, svarjat i idut na pole, i rebjatishki i vzroslye, vzroslye i skazhut: «Bros'te jajca cherez golovu, chtoby rozh' horosha urodilas'». I kogda jajca-to brosjut, govorjat: «Rasti-rasti,

papon'ka, vyshe ogoroda, kolos — po sazhenе, volos — po pjadene, zerno — po jaichnomu zhéltysyu». (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-38, 1987).

148. Na Voznesen'e, na sed'moj nedele ot Pashi, jajca varili, svarjat i idut na pole, i rebjatishki, i vzroslye, vzroslye i skazhut: «Brosajte jajca cherez golovu, chtoby rozh' horosha urodilas'». I kogda jajca-to brosjut, govorjat: «Rosti-rosti, papon'ka, vyshe ogoroda, kolos — posazhéne, volos — popjádene, zerno po-jaichnomu zhjoltysyu. (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-38, 1987).

149. Kogda rozh' sejali, to brali s soboj na pole jajca, jajca-to vverh podbrosjat i prigovarivajut: «Rozhkovina-rozhkovina, podi k nashemu ovinu». (Srednie Chud'i, Cherep., Volog., SDK-38, 1987).

150. Konchat vsjo zhat' i zhnut samyj poslednij snop, potom prinesut ego domoj, postavjat v svjatoj ugol, votknut v nego serpy i skazhut: «Zhnivo-zhnivo, verni moju silu», a snop-to poslednij borodoj zvali. (Srednie Chud'i, Cherep., Volog., SDK-38, 1987).

151. Znali kuda sejat', ljon ros ne na vysokom meste — na nizkom: «Rasti bol'shoj i malen'koj». Jeto kody ljon sejali, tak prigovarivali. (Shejno, Cherep., Volog., SDK-38, 1987).

152. Kidali nogoj-to cherez golovu, da — «Rasti, ljonók, bol'shoj da dolgoj», govorili, da vrode kak pesok brojali, vrode kak pesok, pomnju vot, chto brojali i govorili vsjo. (Anfalovo, Cherep., Volog., SDK-38, 1987)

153. Na Voznesenie rozh' budet kolosit'sja, navarim jajca i vse pojdjom na pole vse hodili, mushshiny i zhenshshiny, vot cherez golovushku jajca-to i brojali: «Jarovína-jarovína, pojdi k nashemu ovinu. Ovin treshhit, popad'ja-to vereshhit. Rasti, kolos, popjadéni, a volos — posazhéne. Rasti, papon'ka, vyshe ogoroda». (Shejno, Cherep., Volog., SDK-38, 1987).

Visiting the forest

154. Kto-to prositsja, kto-to net: «Zdravstvuj, les! Proshhaj, les!» — jeto kak oberesh'. (Chjoshegora, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

155. Dedushka-hozjain, zdravstvujte, lisichki-sestrichki, medvedi, zajchiki, idu ja v les za gribami, hrani Gospodi Iisuse. (Pirinem', Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

156. Ljudi mirskie, ljudi vsjakie es', hozjaeva lesnye, pustite na podvor'ice! (Bol'shoe Krotovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

157. I u nas tjotushka govorila: «Prihodish' v les: krasna devica, ne lenis', speloj jagodke poklonis', a ne spelu ne zbiraj, ptice-zverju ostavljaj, ne ty odna u Boga». A kogda iz lesu vyhodish', opjat' klanjaesh'sja: «Spasibo, dedushko-borovejushko, pohodila, gribki-jagodki posobirala, teper' nazad dorozhku mne pokazhi». (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

158. Zdravstvuj, les! (Troica, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

159. Duh lesa, spasibo tebe! (Fomino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

160. /Chtoby v les zajti, nuzhno chto-to skazat'/? Ran'she, po-moemu... pro kleshnej, vot kleshhi, govorili... «Ja v les, a kleshh na les, ja v les, a kleshh na les» — tri raza. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

161. Kogda idut za gribami v les, govorjat: «Daj Bog gribov na polnuju korzinu!» (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

162. Govorjat, nado idti, vybrat' mesto, sprosit' hozjaina: «Hozjain-lesovoj, pusti menja ne noch' nochevat', a vek vekovat'». (Chjornaja, Bat., Novg., 1988).

163. /Nuzhno chto-to govorit', kogda idesh' za jagodami/? Ne znaju, ja tak govorila: «Gospodi, blagoslovi» i vsjo. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

164. /A est' primery o sbore jagod/? U nas takogo net. U menja Sashka-brat priezzhal ran'she s Moskvyy, tak pojdem s nim v les. On podhodit k lesu, stoit minutu, chto-to shepchet. Chego stoish'? — govorju. Ja, govorit, meditiruju. Ja, govorit, proshu u Boga, sprashivaju u lesa: «Bozhen'ka, svodi menja v tvoj les za darami». Kogda vyhodit, govorit: «Spasibo». Vse vremja govoril on: «Spasibo, Bozhen'ka, tebe, chto ne zrja shodili». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

165. Hodish' i govorish': «Daj Bog gribov na polnuju korzinu!» (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

166. V lesu-to lesa. To skazhut: «Ponesi tebja leshij!». Tak jeto skazala, i ushli s koncom nashi vsjo-to. Nel'zja leshakat'sja v lesu-to. (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007).

167. Esli poshla v les ne blagoslovjas', to zabludish'sja. Kak vhodish' v les, skazat' nado: «Gospodi, blagoslovi». (Dubr., Cherep., Volog., SDK-39, 1987).

168. Krestjatsja i govorjat: «Dobryj hozjain, pomogi nam nabrat' jagod i gribov!». (Novosjolki, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

169. Hozjainom nazyvaem dak a vsjo. Dak jeto vsjo, esli, naprimer, poshjol v les za jagodami, dak nado perekrestit'sja, chtob tebe den' hodit', i vsjo — ty uz budesh' so spokoem hodit'. Nado, govorjat, v les zajti dak na 4 storony poklonit'sja i poprosit', kak govoritsja: «Les-batjushka, a zemlja-matushka, daj, nu jeto». I vyjti, i spasibo skazat'. (Kolodozero, Pudozh., Karelija, SDK-2006).

170. Pojdut v les dak chtob ne rugalis', a to, mol, leshij-to jetot voz'mjot. U nas vot byl sluchaj, so mnoj uchilsja paren' v shkole, i vot on ushjol v les, ushjol rubit' drov, topor u nego, bit' drov, topor u nego tut, rukavicy na pen'ke, a sam — ischez, tak i ne nashli ego, bessledno. (Kolodozero, Pudozh., Jakushovo, SDK-2006).

171. Duh lesa, spasibo tebe! (Fomino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

172. V lesu-to znaju, chtob leshij, no slovo «leshij» nel'zja upominat', kogda idjosh' kuda-to. I govorjat, detej vot slovom «leshij» nel'zja rugat'. Ot tak ved' vseгда zapreshheno. (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007).

173. V bane leshachiha ved' est' u nas. Obderiha i leshachiha — kto kak nazyvaet. No obderiha bol'she, potomu chtob nel'zja govorit' u nas, ni chertyhat'sja, ni leshakat'sja. «Obderiha» — pravil'no govorit' nado, potomu chtob nado vsjo govorit' s Bozh'im slovom. (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007).

174. Da nel'zja-nel'zja jeto slovo govorit'-to, schitaetsja, chtob jeto greh bol'shoj, leshakat'sja-to. Govorjat, luchshe matjuknut'sja, chem leshaknut'sja. (Jorkino, Pin., Arh., SDK-2007).

175. Rugat'sja nel'zja, mnogie rugajutsja chjortom — upasi Bozhe — nel'zja ego pominat'! (Hotjash, Novg., Nogv., SDK-54, 1994).

176. Nel'zja [leshakat'sja], i chjort tozhy ne govori nikogda. Naklichesh', naverno, na sebja bedu. Ili «poshjol k chjortu» skazhut — tozhy nel'zja govorit'. (Pirinem', Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

177. [V lesu est' hozjain?] Est', konečno. Nel'zja leshakat'sja v lesu. Govorili, čto budesh' hodit' vkrug da okolo. Leshakat'sja nel'zja — luchshy matjukom. (Chjoshegora, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

178. Odna babul'ka govorila: luchshe matjugnut'sja, chem leshaknut'sja. (Shotogorka, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

Hunting

179. Kak ohotnik idjot v les, emu chjo govorjat? — «Ni puha ni pera!». On tozhe dolzhen skazat': «Idi ty k chjortu!». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023).

180. Na ohotu pojdjosh', tebe skazhut: «Ni puha ni pera!». Ty emu otvechaesh': «K chjortu! K chjortu! K chjortu!». Tri raza objazatel'no. (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

181. «Rybka da rjabki, poterjaj den'gi!». Eto rjabki est' rjabky takie — ptica. Nu, rjabchik nazyvaetsja obyknovenno. Ran'she hodili obyčno, stavili silki da vsjo na etu vot. A rybka da eta ryba. A hto skazhet: «Rybka da gribkí!». «Za gribami ved' tozhe pobegaesh'!» (Igokinichi, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

182. Kto poshjol na ohotu — zhelaesh' udachi. A vot v starinu govorili: «Esli komara mnogo — promysel budjot». Tak zhelaesh' komarika v sosedi. (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

183. Ohoty v nashih mestah i ne bylo. Pozhelaesh' komu: «Vernis' horosho. Meshok, chtob bol'shoj». Vot i vsjo. (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

184. Esli na ohotu idjosh', emu govorjat: «Ni puha ni pera», a on dolzhen otvechat': «Idi ty k chjortu». (Vol'naja Gorka, Bat., Novg., SDK-1988).

185. Na ohotu kogda chelovek idjot, vsjo govorjat: «Pomogi tebe Bozhe! Ni puha ni pera!». (Novosjolok, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

186. Ni puha ni pera! — K chjortu! (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).

187. Idi s Bogom, daj Bog tebe pomoch'! (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).

188. «Ni v kogo ne streljaj i sam ne zastrelis'!» (Ostankovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

Fishing

189. «Zdravstvuj, — skazhut, — uspeh v rabote!». Za rybinoj pojduť, tak govorili; «Kljov na udu!». (Kovrig, Ljubytin., Novg., SDK-36, 1986).
190. Kto udit — «Kljov na udu!». (Zasur'e, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).
191. «Kljov na udu!» — esli idjosh' na rybalku. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).
192. «Schastlivogo ulova!» - tak prigovarivali, kogda na rybalku provozhali. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).
193. «Poezzhaj s Bogom». Vsjo, kak hochesh', dal'she. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023).
194. «Ni cheshujki ni hvosta!». A on tja dolzhen poslat': «K chjortu!». (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog, ORZ-SDK, 2023).
195. «Ni cheshui ni hvosta!» — Idi k chjortu! (Krutik, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).
196. «Ni hvosta ni cheshui!» — Spasibo! (Ermakovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).
197. Govorili: «Kljuj, rybka, bol'shaja i malen'kaja!». (Karpina gora, Lodejnopool., Len., SDK-62, 1999).
198. Slyhala, vot kak na rybalku pojdjosh', zhenshinu vstretish' — luchshe vorachivajsja domoj, kljovu ne budet. (Trufanova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).
199. Cheloveku, idushhemu na rybalku, govorili: «Chelovek ishhet gde luchshe, a ryba — gde glubzhe». «Mel' pus' budet glubinoj». (Igokinichi, Lodejnopool., Len., SDK-62, 1999).
200. Ni hvosta ni cheshui! (Ermakovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

Meal

201. Kak idjosh', da chaj p'jut, skazhi: «Chaj s saharom!». A obedajut-to, dak: «Hleb s sol'ju!». A hozjain: «Spasibo». (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985).
202. Zajdjosh', a tam obedajut, skazhesh': «Hleb s sol'ju». A skazhut: «Lob s mozol'ju». «Hleb da sol', em da svoj». (Priluk, Pin., Arh., SDK-23, 1985)

203. «Chaj s saharom!» — skazhesh', a otvetja: «Chaju pit'!». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
204. Kogda edjat, to zahodjat i govorjat: «Hleba ist'!». A otvechajut: «Spasibo!». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
205. Privetstvovali: «Hleb da sol'!» Dobra pora, kogda edjat. Obedajut. Chaj p'jut da skazhut: «Chaj da sahar!». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
206. Esli chaj p'jut: «Priyatnyj appetit!». A kushajut, to «Hleb-sol'!». «Chaj s saharom!», govorjat. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
207. Edjat, obedajut li chto li, zajdjot chelovek, skazhut: «Hleb s sol'ju!». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
208. Esli edjat — «Hleb da sol'!». (Zasur'e, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).
209. Kogda chaj p'jut: «Chaj s saharom». A to — «Pomogaj Bog». (Zasur'e, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).
210. Zajdut, ty chaj p'josh', skazhut: «Chaj s saharom!». (Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).
211. A edjat esli, to — «Hleb s sol'ju!». A otvetja: «Hleb ist'!». (Gorushka, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).
212. «Hleb s sol'ju!» — obedali, a chaj p'jut: «Caj s saharom!». (Arh., SDK-30, 1986).
213. Kto caj p'jot, ty zajdjosh', govorjat: «Caj s saharom!». «S saharom, so vsem!» — otvecam. (Ust'-Pjoza, Mez., Arh., SDK-32, 1986).
214. «Bog na pomoch'», — kto kak skazhet. Teper'-to govorjat: «Priyatno vam kushat', hleb i sol'!». (Grigor'evo, Bat., Novg., SDK-1988).
215. Kak vojdjosh', a tam za stolom sidjat, govorjat: «Priyatno vam kushat'! Hleb da sol' vam!» (Vjatka, Tver, Ostashk., D-226, 1991).
216. Hleb i sol'! (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).
217. Hleb da sol'! (Ostankovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).
218. Angela k trapeze! (Troica, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

Bathroom

219. /A vecherom v banju mozhno?/ Govorjat, posle vos'mi vechera vrede ne nado, a byvaet, chto i temno idesh', kak s raboty spravish'sja, tak i idesh' moesh'sja. Govorjat, nado ostavljat' vody, chtoby jetot, kak ego, banshnik-to, mog pomyt'sja. Vsegda nuzhno poblagodarit'. «Spasibo, ban'ka milaja» — svoimi slovami. Vsegda govorju. «Oj ty umnica moja». So vsemi razgovarivaju: hot' teplica, kogo pohvalju, kogo porugaju. Odná, s kem-to razgovarivat' nado. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

220. A iz bani chelovek vyjdet, nado skazat': «S ljogkim parom!». (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991).

221. Smoj, voda, vsja hudoba! Daj Bog tebe zdorov'ja! (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991).

222. Kak s gogolja voda, tak s Natashi vsja hudoba! (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991).

223. S ljogkim parom, detki! (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991).

224. V bajnu kto idjot, nado skazat': «Par v bajnu vam», a ottuda: «S legkim parom» (Zabolot'e, Tver, Ostashk., SDK-1991).

225. «S ljogkim parom!» — kto pomylsja. A kto ne pomylsja: «S budushhim!». (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).

226. «Gospodi, blagoslovi! S ljogkim parom!». «Spasibo, banja, za pomyvku!» (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

227. Serkov (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

228. S ljogkim parom! (posle bani). Zhar'sja venikom! (pered banej). (Ostankovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

229. «S legkim parom» govoreli. [A chto otvetit' nuzhno?]. «Spasibo» govoreli. Vsegda doma stojal uzhe na stole chaj, vsem po stakanchiku. (Fomino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

230. Gospodi, blagoslovi! (Fomino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

231. Bozh'ja blagodat'! S ljogkim parom! (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

232. Par v bane! (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

Road

233. / Chto govorjat pered dal'nej dorogoj?/ V les poshla: «Ogradi menja, Gospodu, svojim zhivotvorjashhim krestom». I tri raza perekrestitsja. Ili: «Gospodi, blagoslovi menja v put'-dorozhku». I nichego ploho nja budet. (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997).

234. «Schastlivyj put'!» (pered dal'nej dorogoj). (Grigor'ev, Bat., Novg., SDK-1988).

235. Daj Bog vam horoshuju put', devochki! (Tver, Ostashk., D-226, 1991).

236. Nu ladno — chas vam dobryj! Idite, kogda vernjotes'. (Vetka, Tver, Ostashk., D-226, 1991).

237. Esli idjosh' da nagonjaesh' kogo-nibud', skazhesh': «Mir doroge!». A tebe «spasibo» otvetjat (Srednie Chud'i, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

238. Schastlivogo puti, vsjo, da pust' vas Bog beregjet! Na dorozhku posidet'. (Shotogorka, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

239. Schastlivo tebe! S Bogom! Dobryj put'! Bud'te zdorovy! (Rakomo, Novg., Novg., SDK-54, 1994).

240. /U kogo nado prosit'sja, kogda v les idjosh'/?/ U Boga, u Angela svoego. U kazhdogo svoj Angel, vot ty govorish': «Angel moj, pojdjom so mnoj, ty vperedu, ja pozadi. Nikola Chudotvorec, dorozhku osveti, rabomu Bozh'emu (nazyvaesh' svojom imja) i amin'». I vsjo, idjosh', i s toboj vsjo budet v porjadke. (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

241. Vot skazhut, pojdjosh' v dorogu, nikogda ne nado govorit': «Oj, ja sejchas bystro dojdu». Nado idti, skazhut: «Ladno, pojdjom s Bogom, tam Nikola Chudotvorec, tam Georgij Pobedonosec, dajte schastljivoj, horashej dorogi dojt do domu». (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

242. /A zACHEM krest nosjat?/ Óberezh, ja kogda kudy poedu, tak eshho bumazhna ikonka est', presvjataja Bozh'ja Mat' Bogorodica s soboj, pojdu skazhu: «Beregi menja, hrani menja, na dorogah, na pereput'jah». (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

243. A v dorogu objazatel'no chitali na hleb, na sol', i gde-to zashivali krosku, zashivali voskresnu-tu, chestnomu-tu krestu, hleb s sol'ju, i kroshechku, i kakuju-to trjapochku, i v odezhdu zashivali, jeto v armiju otpravljali, kuda-to. Esli kuda-to edesh' v put', prosish' Gospoda: «Sohrani menja, Gospod', da bud' so mnoj, i Angel Hranitel' nad golovoj». (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

244. / A u cheloveka angel est'/? Govorjat, chto es', tak vot govorjat: « V dal'njuju dorogu!». Kuda-to vot ty, naprimer, poehala, poshla iz domu, i pred porogom govorish': «Angel moj, Hranitel' moj, ty vpered, ja za tobom» — i poshjol. Slyshala eshho, naverno, eshho doma slyshala, sho vot poshjol-poehal tebja provozhajut, i chelovek szadu vyhodit i kofshikom ili kruzhkoj vodoj szadu plesnjot vsled, tipa kak po vode, kak po maslu poshjol, chtoby kak horoshij put', chto li, byla. (Trufanova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

245. Provozhali kuda, tak govorili: «Skatert'ju tebe dorozhka!». (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Tversk., SDK-60, 1997).

246. «Skatert'ju doroga» — ploho. Ne v dobryj put' (Davydovo, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1993).

247. /Chto nuzhno skazat' pred vyhodom iz doma?/ Ja vot vyhozhu s domu i govorju: «Dobryj domovoj, pojdjom so mnoj», i idu spokojno. (Novosjolki, Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

248. Idjosh' kuda: «Bud' zdorova! Kuda otpravilas'-to?». Ja govorju: «Da vot otpravilas' tam, v magazin». «Oj, daj, Bog, tebe udachi!» - ili tam chto-nibud' takoe. (Novosjolok., Lodejnopol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

249. «V dal'njuju dorogu» — blizkie govorili. «Dolgih let zhizni!». «Schastlivogo puti!». (Vjazovija, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997).

250. Esli chelovek otpravljalsja v dal'nij put', soberut stol, posidjat na dorozhku, vot i vsjo naputstvie. (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997).

251. U menja dak, konechno, takaja primeta. Vot skazhut: «Kuda poshla?». Nu i vsjo, ni v put' znachit. S kakoj cel'ju shla — budesh' obratno vozhazhat'sja, nicho ne poluchitsja. Vot uzhe mnogo raz proverjala, obkudyvali znachit. Da: «Kuda

poshla?». Devchonki otvechajut: «Na kudykinu goru». Kogda kto idjot, tak nikogo ne prosjat «kuda poshla». A — «Daljoko li? Daljoko li poshla?» (Ust'e, Ust'-Kubensk., Volog., SDK-2005).

252. A pered snom vsjo Bogu kakoe zhelanie, a u dal'njuju dorogu provozhajut: sadjatsja na divan, pomolchat', Bogu pomoljatsja, prosjat' proshhenija «Prosti menja greshnogo». (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).

253. Esli kuda idjot chelovek, dak ne rugajte, ne proklinajte, a pozhelajte puti hoshego, vot rugalis'...(Alehovshhina, Lodejropol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

254. A na robotu idjosh': «Presvjataja mat'-Bogorodica vpered i / Isus Hristos szadi/ Angely po krajam / Chto Isusu Hristu / To i nam». (Zujovo, Lodejropol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

255. «Kreshhus' krestom i pojdu so Hristom!». (Alehovshhina, Lodejropol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

256. Vstavaesh', tak — «Gospodi, blagoslovi». (Alehovshhina, Lodejropol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

257. Dak vot vyj djosh' i govori, perekrestis' i skazhi: «Spasi, Gospodi, ot gada plyvuchego, ot zverja beguchjova». Vot tak i skazhi. (Igokinichi, Lodejropol., Len., SDK-62, 1999).

258. Nu, konečno, detej vot kto-to kuda poedet, ja vseгда govorju: «Podi s Bogom!» «Idite schastlivo!» «Idite s Bo(h)om!» «Daj vam Bog vsego dobrogo!». Konečno, kak govorjat: «Bez Boga ni do poroga!». Vsjo ravno my jeto govorim, verim ishho tam. (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).

259. Davaj Bog vam svjatoj chas! (Bajgorovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).

260. Angel moj, hranitel' moj, idi vpered i, ja za toboj — i nichego ne sluchitsja. (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).

261. Bog, blagoslovi! (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

262. Perekreshhu i: «Otkuda ushjol, tuda i vernis'!» (Zakobjakino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

263. Poezzhaj s Bogom! (Krutik, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

264. Gladkoj dorogi! Schastlivogo puti! (Troica, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).
265. Angela-Hranitelja! (Ljubim, Jarosl., SDK-2024)
266. Gospodu, pomogi! (Ljubim, Jarosl., SDK-2024)
267. S Bogom! (Ermakovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024)
268. Ni gvozdja ni zhezla! (Ermakovo, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).

Home

269. Ran'she v dom prihodili, perekreshhivajutsja, u poroga stojat i govorjat: «Mir domu!». Jim otvechajut: «Prinimaem mir!». (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).
270. Ili vhodjat, govorjat: «S angelom!». (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).
271. Kogda zahodjat v dom, govorjat: «Mir vashemu domu!» (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., SDK-ORZ-2023).
272. Dedushka-domovejushka, pusti, poj, kormi, obuvaj, odevaj i obogrevaj. Ljubi i beregi. (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).
273. Poklonish'sja v chetyre ugla i skazhesh': «Dedushka-domovejushka, poj, kormi, na menja, hozjajushka, ne nadejsja». (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).
274. Poshli syn da nevestka v novyj dom, ja vzjala hleba, soli, krupki. Zashla: «Dedushko-domovejushko, primi moih detucek, obogrevaj, obuvaj, odevaj, na dobry dela ih nastavlaj». Oboshla po uglam. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
275. A skotinu zavodili, ja slyhala: «Dedushko-domovejushko, voz'mi moju skotinushku, primi, poj, kormi i ljubi». Morochili sami sebe. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
276. Korovu kupila, da govorila tjojta: «Vot tebe, pestronushka, dom i mesto, zemlja i voda, i rodima storona, pej, esh' i hodi, ja tebe hozjajka, a ty mne — vernoj sluga». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
277. V novyj dom petuha da koshku nosili, chtoby nochevat' veselej. Dak vot govorili: «Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti nas na podvor'ice». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

278. V novyj dom vhodili, novu veshh' zanesut, a hto prihodit, tozhe hto chego prinesjot: ja — koshku prinosila: «Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti zhit'. Ja prihozhu sjuda na zhit'jo-byt'jo, budu tebjja priberat', laskat'. Govorjat, dedko-domovejko zabralsja, davil da dushil. «Dedushko-domovejushko, ty skazhi, k dobru li, k plohu». On otvetit: «K dobru id k lihu». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

279. «Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti pozhit', da ty ne obizhaj, da skotinu ne trevozh'». (Petrovo, Mez., Arh., SDK-30, 1986).

280. «Dedushka-domovejushko, poj, kormi, po shersti glad'». (Petrovo, Mez., Arh., SDK-30, 1986).

281. Dak da, kak zhe, byvaet vseгда v dome, kak gritsja, domovoj obychno. Vot sejchas my tozhe v gorode ved' zhivjom, priezzhaem sjuda, objazatel'no govorim: «Dedushko-domovej, pusti pozhit'-ponochevat'» — jeto prigovarivaem vseгда, vot my zahodim, my uezzhaem ved' nikto ne ostajotsja vot dopustim, priedem v mae, dopustim, objazatel'no i zhivjom spokojno. Nu, tak uz h zavedeno, najeno (naverno), prit'sja nado, ak jeto v ljuboj izbushke ved', dopustim, v lesnyh izbushkah tozh byvaet. Nado prosit'sja, dak vot tozhe vot: «Dedushko-domovoj, pusti perenochevat'». (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

282. [Kogda vhodjat iz starogo doma v novyj] Poklonis' u vorot i skazhi: «Dedushka-domohozjajushko, pojdjom s nami». (Lampozhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

283. [Kogda vvodjat v hlev novuju skotinu] Dedushka-domovejushka, poljubi u menja pestronushka, poj, kormi, droti. (Lampozhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

284. Dedushko-domozhirovoshko, pusti skotinku postojat', ne much', poljubi! (Lampozhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

285. Dedushko-domohozjajushko, poljubi moju skotinushku. Skotinku — na poly, a sam — pod poly. (Lampozhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

286. Poklonit'sja vo vse chetyre storonu i skazat': «Dedushko-domozhiroshko, poljubi moju skotinushku, ljubi svoej dorogoj laskotochkoj, glad' svoej zolotoj lapochkoj. (Lampozhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

287. Domovejushko-dedushko, primi nashu skotinku, napoj, nakormi i poljubi. I tak — tri raza. (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

288. Dedushko-domozhirovoško, pusti skotinku postojat', ne much', poljubi. (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

289. Dedushko-domohozjajushko, poljubi u menja pestronushka, poj, kormi, droti. (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

290. Pokupajut, zavodjat korovu i prigorivat: «Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti na podvor'jushko». Kusoček hleba skružhat nad golovoj korovy, i skormjat, chtoby ona hodila. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

291. Skotinu zavodili, skazhut: «Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti na podvor'e, navsegda, vot te dom, da trava, da rodima storona». Govorjat, čto vsjo dedushko-domovejushko kakoj-to. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

292. «Dedushko-domovejushko, primi moju skotinushku, poj, kormi dosyta». Jeto kogda korovu zavodili. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

293. Poprosish'sja u domovejki: «Poj, kormi, na menja na hozjajushku ne nadejsja». Ne poprosilas'-to ja krjosnica, da korova vsja mokra, domovejka mucil. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

294. Jagyshok roditsja, nad' prositsja, ne poprosish'sja — tak propadjot. «Dedushko-domovejushko, primaj movo Borjushku, na menja lentjajushku, ne nadejsja, poj, kormi dosyta». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

295. Slova byli: «Raba ty, pestronushka, nikuda ne hodi, pojdi vo svoj ugol, vo svoj terem, do trjoh raz skazhi. Jeto chtob korova domoj shla». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

296. Kogda zavedjosh' skotinu domoj, zamesti ejo sledy metelkoj i jetu grjaz' s ejo sledami položit' ej v hlev, gde ona stoit. Vykormit' v kuske hleba sery iz ushej, posypav kusok hleba sol'ju i skazat': «Vo imja otca, syna i svjatogo duha. Amin». (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

297. «Dedushko-domozhirushko, pusti na podvor'ice» — i korovu zavodish' ili ovcu tam tozhe. Vsjo nado prosit'sja, koshku dazhe, i pochapat' nad', v pechku tozhe poprosit'sja, lapkami o pechku. (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

298. [Kogda v dom vnosjat novorozhdenno] Kogda rebenok roditsja, zanosili v izbu, vse ugly krestili da prigovarivali: «Dedushko-domovejushko, pri mládina raba bozh'ja, obuvaj, odevaj, zolotoj lapochkoj glad', da na hozjaev ne nadejsja. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).

299. Kogda vhodish' v novyj dom: "Dedushka-domovejushka, pusti, poj, kormi, obuvaj, odevaj i obogrevaj. Ljubi i beregi!" (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

300. Dedushko-domovejko, poljubi moju semejushku! (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

301. Skotinishku zavodjat: «Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti na podvorice», — esli vo svoj hlev vezut. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

302. Korova esli ljagaetsja, sosedka slova napisala: vymja myt', doit' da prigovarivat': «Stoj, moja pestronushka, kak stolp seredovoj, babki stojali, mamka stojala, tebe, moja pestronushka, stojat' veleli. Stoj goroj, teci rekoj, (chtoby horosho doilas', obil'no), derzhi nogu kolotkoj-kolotkoj. Amin'. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

303. Vot ty prishla domoj i govorish': «Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti menja na podvor'e, hozjajushko, ne pugaj i menja ne zadevaj». (Timoshhel'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).

304. Domovika prosit' nado: «Vot budem zhit', da ja, da muzh, da eshhjo kto tam, nas beregi da hrani, da. [A iz starogo domu ne zovut domovogo?] Net, v novyj dom zahodish', tut i hozjain novyj i vsjo po-novomu. My v novyj dom zahodili, k nam kto idjot, ohapku drov nesjot, naprimer, kto deneg skol'ko mozhet polozhit' — nemnozhko, kto ikonku prinesjot. Jeto chtoby zhilos' v dome. (Trufanova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

305. Esli skotinu pokupali, domoj veli i govorjat: «Batjushka-dvorovoj, pojdjom so mnoj». A esli na novo mesto: «Pojdjom zhit', da nam sluzhit'». (Stupino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987).

306. Domovoj i sejchas est', prosit'sja nado: «Dedushka-domozhirushko, babushka-domozhórushka, pusti na podvor'ice skotinku uspokoit', samim da pozhit',

bezo vsjakoj pritchi, chtoby ploho ne bylo. Chto vo dvore, to i v dome — vsjo domovoj, on dom i hozjajstvo hranit. (Pirinem', Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

307. U dedushka domovogo prosit'sja nado v novyj dom. Ne poprosish'sja — ono budet pugat', hodit' po domu noc'ju. Skazhut: «Dedushka menja segodnja vydavil, jeto ne k dobру». Kogda davit, sprosit' nado: k dobру li k lihu. (Kevrola, Pinezh., Arh., SDK-1984).

308. Dedushko-domovoj es'. Kogda v novyj dom pereedesh', nado prosit'sja, poklanjajsja: «Dedushko-domovoj, pusti!». Poklanjajsja. Ne poprosish'sja — tak govorja, budet pugat'. Noch'ju hodit po domu, chuesh', chto hodit, a védet'-to ne védeshi. (Kevrola, Pinezh., Arh., SDK-1984).

309. Kogda idjosh' v dom, nado skazat': «Dedushko, pusti na prozhivanie». A ja vot ne prosilas', mne i govorjat: ty tak i zhivjosh' ploho, chto ne poprosilas'. (Nemnjuga, Pinezh., Arh., SDK-1984).

310. Hlebca otrezh' kusocek, v ugol polozhi — i skazhi: «Hozjain-dvorovoj, primi podarocek, chtob korova domoj hodila». (Chjornaja, Bat., Novg., 1988).

311. [Prosilis' li v novyj dom?] Da, kak-to ona govorila: «Dedushka-domovejushka da matushka-domoviha, pustite zhit', budem s vami družno tam zhit'» — dazhe ona klala kuda-to, po-moemu, hleb, v ugol kuda li. (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

312. [Nuzhno li prosit'sja v novyj dom?] Jeto-to govorili, menja svekrov' uchila, skota zapuskat' v novyj hleb ili korova telitsja, domovoj chtoby poljubil, govorila: poprosis' u domovogo. «Dedushko-domovejushko ili domozhirushko» — ja uzh zabyla, ne znaju, ja dazhe svojim devkam govorila: kvartiry poluchili — poprosites' u domovogo. (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

313. «Dedushko-domozhirushko, pusti nas pozhit'» — mama jeto govorila. Snachala poklonilas' na vse chetyre ugla i skazala. (Shotogorka, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

314. «Dedushko-domovejushko, hozjain-domohozjajushka, pustite na podvor'ice, rabu bozh'ju ili kogo tam». Nu ded-domovoj, laskovo ego tak nazyvajut. (Shotogorka, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

315. Prosilis' vot s zhiivotinoj, ili vot zahozhu ja v novyj dom da v novyj ili kuda-to na kvartiru, i nado kak-to prosit'sja: «Dedushko-atamanushko, pusti nas tam s korovushkoj ili s ovechkoj, ili s kem li» — vot tak vot. Kakie slova tol'ko govorili vot jeti, jeti vse govorjat. (Kobeljovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

316. «Dedushko-domozhirushko, pusti nashu skotinochku zhit'-pozhiivat', dobra nazhiivat'», a esli nevzljubit dedushko-domanushko nachnjo hodit' po izby, vot domovoj-to est', hozjain izby, my ego ne videli. (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

317. «Dedushko-domovejushko, pusti zhit'-nochevat', sam ne bespokojsja i nas ne bespokoj, sam zhivi i ne rasstraivajsja i nas ne rasstraivaj». (Bol'shoe Krotovo, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

318. Nado poprosit'sja. Nado it' v ljuboj dom, kudy hot' zahodish' napervo, dak prosit'sja: «Hozjain da hozjajushka, pustite pozhit' da tam ponochevat', detochek moih i tam vseh, perechisli i vsjo, i perekrestis'. Kormite i vodite chistyj. I v banju idjosh' vsjo nado. (Krasnoe, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

319. Vot kogda v dom vhodili — vnosili koryto, potomu chto bel'jo grjazno polno, bogaty-to. Zahodili prosilis' u dedushko-domovidushko: «Pusti nashu sem'ju, privechi vseh, poj sladko, vodi gladko». Takzhe i skota privodili tozhe prosili, chtoby dedushko ljubil. I, naverna, takzhe i v bane, i vezde, naverno, dedushko-domovoj hozjain vsego dom i postroen'ja. (Pirinem', Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

320. Vot ty zahodish', kudy v pervyj raz: «Dedushko-domozhirushko, babushko Solomnidushko, primi raba Bozh'ja» — do trjoh raz. (Chjoshegora, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

321. Kto dolzhen pervym zahodit' v novyj dom? Hozjain da hozjajka-to, koshka, i poprositsja v dom u dedushki i domodedushki: «Dedushko-domovoj, pusti pozhit'». (Mar'ina, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

322. «Dedushka-domozhirushko, hrani menja, sberegi i vsjo. V hlev skotinu zavedjosh' — tozhe prosish'sja. Ona (sosedka) vsjo moloko v chetyre ugla lila. Podoit nemnozhko korovu i l'jot v chetyre ugla. (Mar'ina, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

323. V ljubom dome domovoj est', v ljuboj kvartire, v ljubom dvore. (Pirinem', Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

324. Skotinu privedut, chitajut vot: «Hozjain-domovoj, ty moju skotinu-to napoj, nakormi». (Mar'ina, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

325. Domovoj-dedushka, hojazin doma. Govorjat, vezde on. Da, ved' kozochku zavodish' vo hlev, slova govorish': «Dedushka-domovinushka, babushka-domovina, pusti na postojanno mestechko, poi, kormi kozochku, chtob ne obizhali, suho mestechko steli, malyh detushek rasti». (Mar'ina, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

326. Domovoj dolzhen byt' v kazhdom dome. Kogda v dom zahodish', nado poprosit'sja u domovogo, chtob on tebja pustil v dom zhit': «Dedushka-domovoj, pusti takih-to v dom zhit'». (Mar'ina, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

327. Nu, kak: «Dedushka-domozhirushka, pusti v dom. Spasibo tebe, chto vsjo sohranil v dome». (Mar'ina, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

328. Vot skotinu pokupaesh', tak prosjatsja. Kak-to «hozjain da hozjajushka», — vsjo govorili, — «primite li pustite, hozjain da hozjajushka vsjo», domovye, naverno. V dome tozhe, govorja, byvait, v dom-ot tozhe prosjatsja, kogda zahodjat. Nu, teper'-to vsjo osveshhajut, kogda v novye doma zahodjat. (Pirinem', Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

329. Tozhe prosilis' ved' kak, s chem-to (zahodjat), snachala koshku zapuskali. Chego nesli, Ignatij vot zahodil u nas v novyj dom, mimo doma nashego dak, poshli, cego nesli-to, kto skazhet — koryto nesti nad', kto skazhet — koshku, kto skazhet — kvashnju nad' nesti snachala. Vhodit-to v novoj-to dom. Kak-to tozhe prosilis', skazhut: «Dedushko-domozhirushko, pusti tam kakogo Nikolaja pozhit'», vo dvoró prosilis'-ba. (Pirinem', Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

330. Ran'she skazhut — domovoj v kazhdom dome es'. Dedushko-domozhirushka, hto znat, hto byvat Bog, korol' li hto, laska, laska jeto begala ran'she. Poshli, vsjo Dusja govorila, iz starogo doma v novyj dom, dak ja, govorit, videla —

dedushka-domozhirushka s nami poletel, laska, méne koshki takija vot, kak gornostaj. Dak muzhiki govorja: jeto gornostaj. Ona govorit: jeto laska — dedushko-domozhirushko. V kazhdom dome es', i vsjo prosjatsja dak. Skotinu-to vot vo hlev stavit' tozhe prosjatsja: «Dedushko-domozhirushko, pusti skotinu-tu v dom, poj sladko li, vodi gladko, kormi». (Pirinem', Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

331. V novyj dom, znachitsjo, govorish': «Dedushko-domozhirushko, pusti nas pozhit' s hlebom, s sol'ju i s tret'ej ljubov'ju». V kazhdyj ugol posypat' sol'-hleb, vo vse komnaty, ugol v tot-tot-tot (pokazyvaet v chetyre ugla).

332. U dedushka prosjatsja: «Dedushka-domozhirushka, pusti skotinku na podvor'jo, poj, kormi sytjohon'ko, glad', drochi gladjohon'ko, na menja na hozjajushku ne nadejsja» — vot tak. / V kazhnom dome domovoj-to dedushka ved' est', v kazhnom dome. I vot perehodjat — dom srubjat, iz starogo doma pojdut zhit' v novyj, dak tozhe go zovut: «Dedushka-domozhirushka, pojdjom s nami v novyj dom, so svoej zhenoj domanushkoj — vot tak eshhjo prigovarivali. A ne pozvat' — on budjo vyt' v starom dome. Ja pomnju v Verhnjom vsjo govorili, chto tamotki dedushka vsjo puga, puga. Tozhe uehali tut v gorod, a govorjat, chto nado, esli poedesh' kuda, nado chtoby postel' postlat', hot' takuju, nehoroshu, no postel' nado objazatel'no postlat', chtoby dedushka hodil, nocheval. Jeto esli dom sotavljaesh'. A tobyvaet skazhut: dedushka vydavil. / Tak vot, chto li, on budet volnovat'sja. Chto i v ugly ved' kusochki polozhat, hleb — v hlevu vot prosjatsja i hleba polozhat — dlja dedushka, naverno. / Koshku, koshka — hozjain doma. (Mar'ina, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

Sneezing, yawning, coughing

333. Kak iz-za stola vstanut, da «spasibo» skazhut, tak i govorish': «Chem bogaty, tem i rady!» (Vjatka, Tver, Ostashk., D-226, 1991).

334. Kody chelovek chihnul, govorili: «Bud' zdrav!». Levyj glaz cheshetsja — k slezam, a pravij — k radosti. (Sluda, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).

335. Chihnjosh' esli, govorjat: «Schastliv bud'!». (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).

336. «Spica v nos da para kolos! Dve osi razodralo i tvoi nozdri». (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).
337. Esli chihnul: «Bud' zdorov za sto korov!». (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).
338. Kogda zamuchit, chihat i chihat, emu govorjat: «Spica v nos!». A on otvechaet: «Spasibo na mjagkoj zatyckhe!». (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).
339. Govorili: «Bud' zdorov!». Ot otvechaet: «Spasibo!». I vsjo. (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).
340. Chihat, chihat, nadoest. Govorili emu: «Spica v nos da para kolos!». Ot otvechal: «Spasibo na dobroj zatyckhe!». (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).
341. Chihnul razok, skazhut: «Zhivite bogato, bud'te zdorovy!». Otvechash': «Spasibo!». (Lampochnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).
342. Esli chihnul da skazhu: «Bud' zdrava!». Esli malen'ka zachihat, to «Bud' zdrav, mladenec!». (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).
343. «Byt' zdorov da schastliv!». (Kimzha, Mez., Arh., SDK-28, 1986).
344. Esli kto-to chihnul, to govorili: «Bud' zdorov!» (Vjazovija, Ostashk., Selizhar., SDK-59, 1997).
345. A chihnjot': «Bud'te zdorovy!». — «Spasibo» - otvechaet'. (Saharovo, Rzhensk., Tver., SDK-1991).
346. /Chto polagaetsja govorit', kogda chelovek zevaet?/ «Len'-pozevota vsja na Fedota, s Fedota na Jakova, s Jakova na vsjakogo». (Zakokur'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986). zevota
347. /Chto polagaetsja govorit', kogda chelovek spotknulsja?/ Zapnjossja, tak srazu govorjat, - leshij nadaval, kak ja nogu naveredil. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).
348. Esli spotknulsja, govorjat: «Voz'mi soboj!». (Kovrig, Ljubytin., Novg., SDK-36, 1986).
349. Spotknulsja, govorjat: «Chjort tebja vzjal». Iknul — dusha s bogom razgovarivaet. (Lukovo, Ljubytin., Novg., SDK-36, 1986).

350. Spotknulsja: «Bog s tobój!» (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).

351. Zakashljalsja, kto-to speshit, a tovarishh emu: «Chto zh tak jeto ty, Hristos s tobój!» (Saharovo, Rzhevsk., Tver., SDK-1991).

352. Kogda ekcheca, govorjat, svin'ja ob ugol popu cheshet. (Kovrig, Ljubytin., Novg., SDK-36, 1986).

353. Skol'ko za stolom posidish', stol'ko i v raju pobudesh'. (Kovrig, Ljubytin., Novg., SDK-36, 1986).

354. /Chto govorjat, esli chelovek ikaet?/ Chervi v mogile vspominajut, devjatu kobyly doedajut, tebja dozhidajut. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).

Getting ready for bed

355. /Kakie slova proiznosili pered snom?/ «Svjat Bog nad domom, Svjat Bog nad golovoj, Svjat Bog nad raboj» - tak govorili, tri raza povtori. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).

356. Chtoby ne ljagalas', slova byli razny. Sadish'sja pod korovushku: «Nogami ne ljagajsja, hvostom ne mashis', rogami ne motajsja». Kaka korova po msati-to, tak i nazyvali. Do trjoh raz govorish'. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

357. U menja bylo jedak na stade dve korovy. Dnjom pridut, pastuhi vidjat, dnjom vyhodjat korovy, otpuskaet. Pridu v obed podoju. Večerom nikak im hodu net domoj, korovam, ne otpuskaet. I tak bylo u menja podi, s nedelju dlilos'. Poshla k jetoj zhenshhine. Prishla — ona mne sdelala, rasskazala na kusok, na hleb, podala kusok i potom denjuzhku. Vot i skazala ot tak sdelay. Ja sdelala, kak ona mne velela, korovy pervye domoj idut. Oni nashptyvajut na kusok ili na vodu, ili na kusok. Vot podajut tebe kusok, podajut tebe denjuzhku, vot tol'ko i skazhut, s kakogo pola otpuskala skotinushku, cherez levo plecho kidaj kusok i denjuzhku. I skazhi, chto: «Batjushka-polevoj, otpusti moju korovushku domoj», — i vsjo. (Krasnyj Bereg, Volog., Volog., SDK-2005).

358. Kakie slova proiznosili pered snom?/ Mat' pered snom molitvu uchila menja govorit':

«Lozhus' so Hristom,

Nagrazhdajus' krestom.

Tam angely stojat

Moju dushu storozhat». Tak tri raza. (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Tversk., SDK-60, 1997).

359. Roditeli govorili, chtob my na noch' molitvu chitali «Otche nash». (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Tversk., SDK-60, 1997).

360. Son plohoj nel'zja rasskazyvat'. Nado perevernut' podushku i skazat': «Kuda noch', tuda i son». (Jasenskoe, Ostashk., Selizhar., Tversk., SDK-59, 1997).

Holidays

361. A uzh sejal kazhdoj sam, sam i prigovarival: «A vot Borisov den', Borisa i Gleba, narodi, Gospodi, hleba» — jeto vesnoj, a potom uzhe blagodarjat, jeto shestogo avgusta, narodil, gospodi, kormu i hleba, a vot tam gde-to govorjat sovsem ne tak, po-svoemu. (Shejno, Cherep., Volog., SDK-38, 1987).

362. Pridem, byvalo, so starichkom-to, sjadem, posidim v pole na meshochki s hlebom (zernom), Bogu pomolimsja. Govorili: «Urodi, Gospodi, horoshego hlebca, na nishhovo bratija, na vseh pravoslavnyh hristijan». Esli malen'kie (rebjata) es' i s malen'kimi hodjat, byvalo, i teh uchat: perekrestis' Gospodu, Bogu molis', shtoby Gospodi hlebca urodiv na vseh pravoslavnyh hristian. Hozjajka brosit v zemlju pervu gorsku na polose, potom malen'kie, a potom Hozjain i pojdet zasevat', a my s robjatami pojdem domoj. (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).

363. Batjushka-Pokrov, daj horoshuju svekrov'! (Iskra, Cherep., Volog., SDK-37, 1987).

364. A uzh sejal kazhdoj sam, sam i prigovarival: «A vot Borisov den', Borisa i Gleba, narodi, Gospodi, hleba» — jeto vesnoj, a potom uzhe blagodarjat, jeto shestogo avgusta, narodil, gospodi, kormu i hleba, a vot tam gde-to govorjat sovsem ne tak, po-svoemu. (Shejno, Cherep., Volog., SDK-38, 1987).

365. Na Rozhdestvo ran'she-to korovushki iz testa delali, da i ne tol'ko korovushek i ovechek, i loshadej, i kur, i ryb — vsjaku vsjachinu nadelajut, rebjatishki soberutsja i koljadovat' idut i govorjat: «Koljada-Koljada, dedushka da babushka, podajte po korovushke ovseca», skazhesh' tak, vot tebe i otdadut — kto

korovushku, kto loshadku, kto chego. (Srednie Chud'i, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

366. V Egorij voz'mu ikonku i ves' dvor obojdu, i prigovarivaju: «Egorij-batjushka, sohrani moju skotinishku ot zlyh ljudej, ot zverej», a to dva remeshka postelju nakrest i zamok poveshu na pervuju dver' na dvor, togda korovushka budet doma derzhat'sja (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

EFF of various topics

367. «Daj bog, chtob emu schast'ja ne bylo!» (obmanul kto-to). (Grigor'ev, Bat., Novg., SDK-1988).

368. «Skol'ko na hmele shishechek, stol'ko u vas rebjatishechek» (pozhelanie na svad'bu). (Chjornaja, Bat., Novg., SDK-1988).

369. Vstavaj, dochka, a to nashi jadjat, a vashi — gljadjat! (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991).

370. — Spasibo! — Na zdorov'e! Svoja sila v rot nosila! (Vjatka, Tver., Ostashk., SDK-1991).

371. Snimajte svojo holshhove, my povestim svojo shelkove! K svadebnomu obrjadu. (Chizhovo, Staroruss., Novg., SDK-54, 1994).

372. /Kakie slova proiznosili pered vygonom skota?! «Hodi Bog s toboj na vol'ku» - tak skazhu i vsjo. (Zaozer'e, Mez., Arh., SDK-27, 1986).

373. Sohrani, beregi, gospodi, moju postroechku s okladnovo brevna i do ohlupnja. (Lampoehnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

374. Da u nas koshki teper' nikogo, ni kuric, nikogo ne derjot, koshakov zapuskajut. A tak govoritsja: «Mohnatyj zver' — da na bogatyj dvor». (Karshevo, Pudozh., Karelija, SDK-2006).

375. Hudyje rebjata (hilye), dak cherez mezhu projmajut; po podnizu prokapyvajut zemlju i prigovarivajut: «Ty, zemlja, daj zdorov'ja, a ne to k sebe voz'mi». (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).

376. Kogda kupish' korovushku, privedjosh' na dvor i pered tem, kak v stado vypustit', tri raza voz'mjosh' zemel'ki ne pod kopytca, brosinh' cherez golovu i

skazhesh': «Daj, Gospodi, na vladenie», — jeto chtob dom znala. (Skovjatino, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

377. V novokúpku pojas pred korovoj klali, chtob ona pereshagnula, znat' guljat' ne budet i v stado hodit' budet, i ved' vernaja, devki, primeta, v vojnu ne bylo u nas korovy, vot ja i poshla k predsedatelju, a on tjolku-to i dajot, a na chto ona mne s malymi rebjatami, vot i poshla iskat' korovushku, kupila ja kormilicu za zerno, odkryla ja vorota, da rasterjalas', ejo srazu i vveli, hozjain snjal verevochku i skazal: «Daj tebe, Bog, na vladen'e!» da i v ruku poklal, da chto za napast' — ne guljaet moja korova, vot ja i vspomnila, chto pojas-to podlozhit' zabyla, vygonju ejo, korovushku v stado, a ona vsjo domoj, vot ja kak-to fartuk i broсила, i potom hot' raz by so stada sbezhala, stala kak vse. (Nikolo-Ramen'e, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

378. Govorjat, na kladbishhe ne zdorovajutsja. Kogda s pohoron pridut, zaslonku otkrojut da posmotri, chtob ne skuchal. (Zherd', Mez., Arh., SDK-31, 1986).

379. Skol'ko ona lechila, vsjo v banjah. Odnogo mal'chika ot ispuga vylechila. Snachala skazala, chto prigotovit', velela banju istopit', chtom prishla lechit'-to, tak vsjo molchala. S nej nikto i ne govorit, kogda ona lechit kogo. Znajut, ne otvetit. (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

380. Nel'zja zdorovat'sja, koda v dome pokojnik. Nehorosho zhe, koda v dome pojoknij. Vhodish', a ty zdorov'ja zhelaesh' hozjaevam. (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

381. Byl sluchaj so mnoj. Idjot starushka, Nikolaevnoj zvali. Kricu: «Nikolaevna, zdravstvuj! Pogodi!». A ona molchit, ja snova ej krichu. Ostanovilas' ona, vylila vodu, chto s reki nesla, so mnoj pozdorovalas'. Ponjala ja, chto ona nesla molchanu vodu, a togda razgovarivat' nel'zja. (Lampožhnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

382. Molchanu vodu nesu, vsjo molchu, vsjo molchu. Vstrechaju kogo: «Zdravstvujte!». A ja molchu. Trudno ejo nesti, ni s kem ne pogovori. A esli

zagovorish', vylivaj vodu i nesi snova. Tak možno mnogo raz idti, no ne govori tol'ko! (Lampožnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

383. Nel'zja zdorovat'sja, kogda v dome pokojnik. Nehorosho zhe! (Lampožnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

384. Mojut kogda poly, nel'zja razgovarivat', a to umrjosh'. (Sluda, Pin., Arh., SDK-26, 1985).

385. Vo hleve ne zdorovajsja, so skotinoj kody zhivjosh', goni, vo dvor ne puskaj nikogda nikogo, nel'zja puskat' nikogo ko skotu. (Sura, Pin., Arh., SDK-21, 1985).

386. Dak, za ruku ne zdorovajutsja ved', kogda na pohorony idjosh' dak ne zdorovajutsja, tol'ko mogut kivnut' i vsjo. (Shotova, Pin., Arh., SDK-2008).

387. Odin djaden'ka zabludilsja, vot i reshil kostjor razvesti, i ne mozhet such'ja-to te polozhit', vsjo odin k drugomu kladjot, a nadobno na krestik, vidno nechistyj poputal, vot i skazal: «A nu, gospodi, blagoslovi!». Kak skazal jeto, vraz kostjor i razzhjog. (Ignatovo, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

388. /Kogda zahodili k porosenku, chto-nibud' govorili emu?/ Net. My, kak pozhenilis', otec nam korovu privel srazu, vyrastili oni ee. Pervyj raz kogda dojat korovu (kogda otelilas' ona pervyj raz, pervyj telok — tak govorjat) tak prigovarivajut: «Kak jeti stroki lezhali tiho i spokojno, tak i ty stoj tiho i spokojno», - chtoby ona ne ljagalas', kak govoritsja. A porosenka kogda nesli domoj, prigovarivali: «Kak na kosti mjaso, a na mjaso salo», — chtoby porosenok ros zhirnym i zdorovym. (Nicol'skoe, Totem., Volog., ORZ-SDK, 2023).

389. Kto poperhnulsja ili zahlebnulsja, sprashivat hozjajku ili soseda za stolom pozhalela, chto li? I ta otvechat: «Jeto ne moja zhalost', a tvoja zhadnost'». (Lampožnja, Mez., Arh., SDK-29, 1986).

390. Esli starushki sidjat, to im govorjat: «Siden'ju vashemu!». A oni uz otvechajut: «Sidet' po-nashemu!» (Ignatovo, Cherep., Volog., SDK-41, 1987).

391. V nekotoryh derevnjah oni (zhenshhiny) ne zdorovajutsja, a govorjat: «Lebed' belaja!» (i pri jetom klanjajutsja). (Tot'ma, Volog., SDK-2000).

392. Ran'she k starichkam ne tak odnosilis'. Kak vstretjat na ulice starika, dak vsjo govorjat: «Zdras'te, Vashe stepenstvo!». (Kisovo, Volog. Cherep. SDK-40, 1987).

393. (Jetiketnaja formula vstrechi) — Otkuda ty takaja javilas'? — Iz teh vorot, otkuda ves' narod (Tver. Ostashk. 1991).

394. (Starshim): Zdravstvujte! Shapochku snimali, klanjalis'. (Rakomo, Novg., Nogv., SDK-54, 1994).

395. Da, so vsemi zdorovalis'. Kto-to idet, da, neznakomyj: «Zdravstvujte». Zabytoe kakoe-to, v gorode zhe ne tak. (Fomino, Ljubim., Jarosl., SDK-2024).