

Györfi, Beáta

Auxiliary clitics in Old Russian chronicles

Linguistica Brunensia. 2023, vol. 71, iss. 2, pp. 39-57

ISSN 1803-7410 (print); ISSN 2336-4440 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/LB2023-2-2>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/digilib.79263>

License: [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Access Date: 16. 02. 2024

Version: 20240122

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

Beáta Györfi

AUXILIARY CLITICS IN OLD RUSSIAN CHRONICLES

ABSTRACT

Present tense auxiliaries in Old Russian could have different categorial status: they could be perceived as simple auxiliary verbs, as clitics or as weak pronouns. The investigation aims at clarifying this situation relying on corpus studies in the text of chronicles. Problems like the position of perfect auxiliaries relative to their host, their behaviour in clitic clusters, and their relation to pronominal subjects will be looked at. The quantitative and distributional analysis of these forms helps us decide whether these elements actually acted as enclitics, in what proportions, and what position they occupied in clauses.

KEYWORDS

enclitics; auxiliaries; perfect; Old Russian; chronicles; corpus linguistics

Introduction

Old Russian (OR)¹ in contrast to Modern Russian employed various types of enclitics. They are of interest for two reasons. First, because they were lost in East-Slavic languages. Second, because despite the free word order, their syntactic position was fixed: they occupied the second position (the so-called 2P) in sentences, i.e., they were always located after the first word of the clause.

OR enclitics constitute a diverse group in the sense that discursive, pronominal, and verbal enclitics are distinguished. Each type has its unique morphological, semantic, and presumably even syntactic properties.

1 List of abbreviations: OR- Old Russian, 2P - second position, V2 - post-verbal, 2PV - second position after a verb, Cl - clitic, AUX - Auxiliary, RNC - Russian National Corpus, VC - Volhynian Chronicle, GC - Galician Chronicle, KC - Kievan Chronicle, NC - Novgorod Chronicle, PC - Primary Chronicle, SC - Suzdal Chronicle, CNT - Chudovsky New Testament

The present research focuses on verbal enclitics. In Russian linguistics, they are treated as a homogeneous group, in spite of the fact that for example the present tense forms of «быти» could have different syntactic functions. In the linguistic literature there is still not much information regarding the grammatical status of these elements.

The aim of this investigation is to take a closer look at the syntactic status of these elements. In order to achieve this, first a short overview on OR auxiliaries will be given. After that the general characteristics of clitics will be briefly outlined. As various opinions have arisen concerning the status of present tense auxiliaries, in the third section I will introduce these views. In the fourth section the material and method of the analysis will be presented, while the last two parts are devoted to the actual investigation of these forms and to the conclusions.

1. The system of OR auxiliaries

OR had a more complex system of tenses, than contemporary Russian. It contained four past tenses: 2 synthetic (aorist, imperfect) and 2 periphrastic (perfect, pluperfect) ones. The periphrastic tenses involved the present, imperfect or aorist forms of the auxiliary *быти* accompanied by the 1-participle of the main verb. For the present research we will focus on the present tense forms of this auxiliary that participate in the formation of the perfect and one type of pluperfect.²

The OR perfect designated a past action, that is relevant in the present. It is the predate of the past tense used in contemporary Russian. Formally it is a complex tense formed with the verb 'to be' that functions as an auxiliary and the so-called 1-participle (a designated participial form used in complex tenses), which agreed with the subject of the clause in gender and number.

The paradigm and varieties of the the present tense auxiliary forms are summarized in the following table:

Tab.1.

	singular	plural	dual
1st person	есѣ, есѣи	есѣмъ, есѣи, есѣи	есѣѣ
2nd person	еси, еси	есѣте, есѣте	есѣта
3rd person	есѣтъ, есѣтъ, есѣ	есѣтъ, есѣтъ, есѣ(тъ)	есѣта

² The pluperfect is either rendered by the imperfect form of «быти» and the past participle of the main verb (азъ вѣхъ сдѣлаи) or by the present form of *быти* and the 1-participle of *быти* and the main verb (азъ есѣмъ вѣхъ сдѣлаи).

2. Properties of clitics

Defining the class of clitics – if at all possible – is difficult. It is due to the fact that they interact with different layers of grammar.

Phonologically, they are deficient elements that lack word stress, therefore they attach to some other prosodic word, a host, to be pronounced.

Morphologically, clitics are between affixes and independent words. Similar to affixes, they cannot appear in isolation, however, unlike affixes they are not selective to their hosts, but show promiscuous attachment (i.e., they can take words of any category as their host).

Syntactically, they also form a heterogeneous class and lack taxonomic characteristics even within one and the same language (clitics can mark agreement, behave like auxiliaries, pronouns, they can express evidentiality or context or they can even act like etc conjunctions) (SPENCER – LUIS 2012).

All in all, we can conclude that what is actually perceived as a clitic varies from study to study, however two common properties can be highlighted:

- 1) Clitics are prosodically weak elements as they do not have an independent prosodic structure. Thus, they must be attached to a stressed word to be pronounced. In practice, this means that they cannot be accented or focalized. Depending on the position of the clitic relative to the main word, proclitics and enclitics are distinguished.
- 2) Syntactically, clitics are words that occupy special syntactic positions in a sentence. ZWICKY (1977) based on their syntactic properties distinguishes between special and simple clitics. The syntactic position of special clitics is determined by completely different principles than those of other elements. They, as a rule, in Slavic languages occupy either the second position in the sentence (2P) or post-verbal (V2). The position of simple clitics is regulated only by phonological principles.

3. Opinions concerning the status of OR verbal auxiliaries

The first linguist to acknowledge the clitic status of the present tense auxiliary *быти* was Jakobson, who claimed that “Ancient Russian and Bulgarian texts prove to us that originally these two languages had enclitic pronominal forms as well as enclitic forms of the auxiliary verb, and that the position of these words in a phrase was determined by Wackernagel’s law” (JAKOBSON 1971, 18).

Within the group of clitics Jakobson differentiated between particles and inflected words (pronouns and auxiliaries).

The clitic status of certain OR auxiliaries was also raised by ZALIZNYAK (2008, 28) who set up a ranking of OR enclitics based on their position in clusters. According to his classification the first five ranks are occupied by discourse clitics (же, ли, бо, ти, бы). Dative pronominal clitics (ми, ти, си, ны, вы, на, ва) take the sixth place, accusative pronouns (я, ты, с, ны, вы, на, ва, и, ю, ѣ, я) fill the seventh, while auxiliaries (есмь (есми), еси, есмъ (есме, есмо, есмы), есте, есѣ, еста) take the final position. Zaliznyak's view is shared by other researchers (FRANKS 1999; WILLIS 1999; FRANKS - KING 2000; KOSTA - ZIMMERLING 2013) as well.

The spread of the above view led to the rise of a contrary opinion first expressed by Jung (JUNG 2015; JUNG - MIGDALSKI 2020), Jung claims that on the basis of the morphosyntactic behaviour of auxiliaries in OR manuscripts they cannot be interpreted as full-fledged clitics. To back up her theory Jung presents the following arguments:

1. Auxiliaries in many cases show non-2P distribution. ZALIZNYAK (2008) insists that the prosodic structure of the clause must confirm to the 2P clitic pattern and thus in many cases he presupposes the 2P clitic status of AUX by arbitrarily inserting an intonational boundary between the first and second elements of the clause (JUNG - MIGDALSKI 2020).
2. Phonological reason: auxiliaries have tonic forms and maintain full morphology, while clitics are generally atonic.
3. These forms show inconsistency in the second position, as in some cases they are hosted by a conjunction, in other cases by a tonic word after a conjunction. This phenomenon is referred to as “secondary proclisis” by Zaliznyak.
4. They occupy the rightmost position in clitic clusters, while in South Slavic languages auxiliaries precede pronominal clitics.

Jung assumes on the basis of the non-obligatoriness of the present form auxiliary (AUX) in the presence of a strong subject pronoun, that it is not an agreement marker.

In OR, personal pronouns and the be-auxiliary contain identical features: they are both phi-feature bundles, containing the D-feature, in the disguise of a person feature, and lacking lexical semantics. The only difference between the be-auxiliary and personal pronouns is that phi-features in pronouns are interpretable while auxiliaries' phi-features are uninterpretable, becoming interpretable only through agreement. The fact that AUX and pronouns share the same kind of features suggests a possibility that they may shift to each other.

4. The material and method of the investigation

4.1. *Material of investigation*

The analysis is carried out on the text of six Russian Chronicles from the Historical Subcorpus of the Russian National Corpus (RNC).

The choice of such a corpus may seem somewhat unusual at first glance, as contemporary researchers of OR tend to rely on documents reflecting the vernacular, such as the birchbark letters. Chronicles on the other hand, are linguistically diverse in the sense that they combine features of both the formal, bookish and that of the spoken language, i.e., the scribes' dialects. Even in the RNC chronicles can be found in the Old Russian (Old East Slavonic) subcorpus and their language is defined as "hybrid", as they contain different registers (formal or vernacular). This hybrid nature is what unites them. The choice between the different registers is determined by the context and the content. Segments containing direct speech reflect the properties of the spoken language, moralizing sections, and fragments related to church life on the other hand, are under the influence of Church Slavonic. (PETRUHIN 2008, 213–214; ZHIVOV 1996).

From a structural and compositional point of view chronicles prove to be better sources for linguistic research than birchbark letters. First, they have a uniform structure. They contain annual entries containing predominantly extensive narratives and dialogues written in direct speech. If we want to focus on the hypothesized vernacular, we can exclude religious reflections from our research. Second, chronicles contain mostly well-formed clauses, while the birchbark documents abound in incomplete, fragmented, deficient constructions. Third, due to their size, these manuscripts can provide an ideal amount of data for diachronic research. Chronicles spanning different ages make diachronic trends easier to follow.

Chronicles are considered for diachronic research not in the order of their actual creation, but in the order of the creation of the copies (codices) containing them. The original versions of these manuscripts did not survive, their text remained to us through copies. However, these copies reflect the linguistic conditions of the period of their copying.

The following table contains metatextual information on the date of chronicle texts and their copies and also on the number of words they include.

Tab.2.

Chronicle	date of the text	date of the copy	number of words
Galician Chronicle	1201–1260	1 st quarter of the 15 th century	22666
Kievan Chronicle	1119–1199	1 st quarter of the 15 th century	78926
Novgorod 1 st Chronicle	1016–1330	mid 13 – 2 nd quarter of 14 century	33608
Primary Chronicle	1110	1 st quarter of the 15 th century	54504
Suzdal Chronicle	1111–1305 (1377)	14. century	45931
Volhynian Chronicle	1262–1292	1 st quarter of the 15 th century	15787

4.2. Method of investigation

The investigation of present tense auxiliary forms is carried out applying corpus methodology. For this purpose, the Old East Slavic subcorpus of the RNC is used which contains 655 thousand tokens. It comprises thirty-six 11–14th century texts representing a variety of genres.

The subcorpus allows users to perform a wide range of grammatical or lexical queries after setting the required parameters. The search interface enables us to exclude or include texts for research and thus create our own subcorpus. Research in the corpus facilitates the quantitative and distributive analysis of structures. Quantitative research can help us understand how and why a certain change happened. Quantitative methods make phenomena visible, that otherwise would be not accessible for inspection. It might provide a fresh, unbiased look at the phenomena (HILPERT – GRIES 2016, 52).

The historical corpus besides metatextual information is supplied with POS and morphological tagging, which might come useful in the case of controversial forms. The search results are accompanied by examples containing both the preceding and the following context. Moreover, after setting the search parameters, the corpus offers all variants of the requested form.

5. Analysis

When defining 8th rank verbal enclitics Zaliznyak underlies that these words have an enclitic status only in auxiliary function. However, when functioning as copulas, they are accented and act as independent words (ZALIZNYAK 2008, 221). In order to exclude copulas from our analysis, we are not going to deal with examples containing nouns (2), adjectives (1), adverbs and prepositional phrases in the nominal part of the predicate.



(1) и всеволодъ же призва к собѣ киане. / и
 and Vsevolod.NOM.SG CL call.AOR.SG.3 PREP himself.SG.DAT Kievan.ACC.PL and
 науд молвити / азъ есмь велии боленъ. КС
 start.AOR.SG.3 talk.INF I.NOM am very ill.NOM.SG.MASC
 ‘And Vsevolod called to himself the Kievans and started to talk ‘I am very ill.’

(2) а ты ли еси свои братъ и снъ не
 and.you.NOM I.DAT are own.NOM brother.NOM.SG and son.NOM.SG not
 помни злобы брата его КС
 remember.PART.ACT.PRES vice.GEN.SG brother.GEN.SG
 ‘And you are my brother’ and his son did not remember the vice of his brother.’

It should be noted that Zaliznyak excluded 3rd person forms from his analysis claiming that on the hand, these forms, in contrast to 1st and 2nd person forms, were used primarily as copulas. On the other hand, they were used as auxiliaries mainly in the bookish language. (ZALIZNYAK 2008, 233, 236). Researchers of OR took Zaliznyak’s view for granted, however considering that in other Slavic languages they could also function as clitics (see BŘEZINA 2023 for Czech) I decided to put corpus methodology to the test and include 3rd person forms as well.

The analysis focuses on the following:

- the quantitative analysis of present tense forms focusing on auxiliaries.
- the prosodic nature of auxiliaries
- the syntactic position of these forms within the clause, with special attention to the clause initial position and their position within clitic clusters.
- the distribution of explicit pronominal subjects standing together with these elements.

5.1. Quantitative analysis of the present tense forms of «быти»

As it has already been mentioned, the present forms of быти in OR could function either as copulas or as auxiliaries. Setting the search parameters [lemma= “быти” & tag= “sg/pl/du.praes.1,2,3”] we get the number of present tense forms in the six chronicles. The search also gives contracted negative forms (3), which are irrelevant for the given investigation.

(3) ихъ же нѣ(с) ни племени ни наследка РС
 they.GEN.PL CL is.not not family.GEN.SG not heir.GEN.SG
 ‘They have no family, no heir.’

In order to access exclusively those auxiliaries that appear in perfect constructions I gave the following settings for lexico-grammatical inquiry [lemma= “быти” &

tag="sg/pl/du.praes.1,2,3"], distance: 1-3 words, [tag="V, perf"]. The order of the two queries is interchangeable. Indeed, they should be swapped, as auxiliaries can precede or follow the main verb.

Tab.3.

	Number of present forms	1st person sg	2nd person sg	3rd person sg	1st person pl	2nd person pl	3rd person pl	1st person dual	2nd person dual	3rd person dual	Number of AUX
VC	68	26	16	-	3	2	-	-	-	-	47
GC	121	2	8	15	1	1	7	-	-	-	34
KC	544	69	116	18	35	29	14	6	10	1	298
NC	69	7	11	3	6	8	2	-	-	-	37
PC	437	10	35	53	4	6	18	-	-	-	126
SC	144	10	22	11	6	4	5	-	-	-	58
Σ	1383	124	208	100	55	50	46	6	10	1	600

The second column of the table shows the total number of the present tense forms of *быти* in the text of the chronicles. As data suggest, most of these forms were used as copulas. The texts contain 600 examples where it functions as an AUX in the perfect. The distribution of AUX forms in the various persons and numbers is also presented.

The corpus contains a single pluperfect example with the auxiliary *быти*:

- (4) и рече / тако не мыслиа есмь до
and say.AOR.SG.3 as not think.PERF.SG.1.MASC AUX.PRES.SG.1 PREP
пльсковичу грѣба / ничего же нъ
P.GEN.PL.ADJ.GEN.SG.PRON.GEN.PARTIC rude nothing.GEN.SG CL not
взла есмь была въ коробахъ.NC
take.PLUPERF.SG.1 AUX.PERF.SG.1 AUX.PERF.SG.3 PREP box.LOC.PL
'And he said 'as I did not think of the Pleskovich anything rude, I did not take anything in the boxes''

As the table shows, only approximately 43% of perfect constructions contain auxiliaries. Their proportion is the highest in the Volhynian Chronicle. Second person singular forms were the most widely used, probably because of their prevalence in dialogues.

Interestingly, there are numerous examples for the use of third person auxiliaries, in fact, they are represented in all numbers:

- (5) Данилъ **приидѣ** **сть** Брѣстни. ГС
 D.NOM occupy.PERF.SG.3 AUX.PERF.SG.3 Brest-ACC
 'Danil occupied Brest.'
- (6) **уже** **бавуцславѣ** **и** **изяславѣ** **и** **ростиславѣ** **повѣдили**
 already V.NOM.SG and I.NOM.SG and R.NOM.SG defeat.PERF.PL.3
сть **гюргѣ** / **и** **половци** **его** **извиша**. КС
 AUX.PERF.PL.3 G.ACC.SG and Polovtsian.ACC.PL he.ACC.SG defeat.AOR.PL.3
 'And Vyacheslav and Izyaslav and Rostislav defeated Gjurgi and defeated his Polovtsians.'

5.2. Prosodic nature of AUX

A key issue concerning the clitic status of auxiliaries is their prosodic property. The prosodic characteristics of the Old Russian language were reconstructed by ZALIZNYAK (2019). He suggests that the prosodic unit was the tactic group, i.e., one word form or several word forms combined by prosodic relation (ZALIZNYAK 2019, 9). Word forms are divided into independent words, which can form a separate tactic group, and into clitics. The peculiarity of this prosodic system is that it differentiates between enclitomena - such word forms in which all forms are unstressed and accentuated independent word forms containing a stressed syllable.

According to Zaliznyak, two tools help us to reconstruct the prosodic status of Old Russian:

1) accentuated manuscripts (for example: Chudovsky New Testament); 2) observations on the placement of auxiliaries in phrases.

As regards manuscripts, auxiliaries in the text of the CNT are stressed. Zaliznyak lists a number of possible explanations: on the hand he assumes that auxiliaries had only the syntactic properties of enclitics, but not the phonological ones; On the other hand he supposes that the arrangement of stress marks in the CNT reflects the bookish style of reading, in which each word was pronounced and accentuated independently; Thirdly, he claims that auxiliaries are mostly disyllabic, and even in those positions where they lose their stress, they retain some weakened stress (ZALIZNYAK 2008, 223-224).

Thus, we can conclude that from a prosodic point of view, these forms were stressed and, as such, they did not require the presence of a host.

The second tool in the reconstruction of the prosodic status of OR (i.e., the position of auxiliaries) will be explored in the next section.

5.3. The syntactic status of auxiliaries

In the present section the syntactic behaviour of auxiliaries will be looked at. As data show, their status was quite complex for several reasons. The position of AUX will be investigated first within perfect constructions, second, at clause level.

Perfect constructions were in a transitional state in the period considered, as they started to be used more frequently without auxiliaries. In cases when the AUX was present, we find that it could either precede (7) or follow (8) the main verb.

- (7) и рекоста / се оуже Игоря есте оубили /
and say.AOR.SG.3 PARTIC already I.ACC.SG AUX.PERF.PL.2 kill.PERF.PL.2
ать похорони(м) тѣло его SC
PARTIC bury.PRES.PL.1 body.ACC.SG he.GEN.SG
'And they said 'you have already killed Igor and we bury his body.'

- (8) Потом же оуслышавше Половци тако змереть
then CL hear.PART.ACT.PAST.NOM.PL Polovtsian.NOM.PL that die.PERF.SG.3
есть Володымеръ князь / присѣнѣшася вборзѣ(х) / и
AUX.PRES.SG.3 V.NOM.SG prince.NOM.SG rush.AOR.PL.3 quickly and
наборониша изгоно(м)·SC
attack.AOR.PL.3 chase.INSTR.SG
'Then the Polovtsians heard that prince Volodymyr died and they quickly rushed and attacked with a chase.'

Moreover, the auxiliary could be adjacent to the main verb or 1–3 words could intervene between them (9), (10).

- (9) рекшоу емоу Данило / чѣмъ еси
say.PART.PAST.ACT.DAT.SG.MASC he.DAT.SG D.VOC.SG why AUX.PRES.SG.2
давно не пришель. / а нынѣ вже еси
for.a.long.time not come.PERF.SG.2 but now already AUX.PRES.SG.2
пришель. GC
come.PERF.SG.2
'And he told him 'Danilo, why haven't you come for a long time but now you have come.'

- (10) и дороговѣжъ еси оу мене Ѡгаль / а ты
and D.ACC.SG D.VOC.SG PREP I.GEN.SG.1 take.PERF.SG.2 and you.NOM.SG.2
ма тако перевидали / а личѣ еси вѣшгеродѣ
I.ACC.SG.1 so come.PERF.SG.2 and I.DAT AUX.PRES.SG.2 D.ACC.SG
шдинѣ далъ КС
single.ACC.SG.MASC give.PERF.SG.3
'And you took from me Dorogobuzh and you offended me so much and you gave me only Vyshgorod.'

Turning this positional diversity to quantitative data we find the following:

Tab.4.

	Number of perfect forms	AUX immediately precedes the l-participle [Word 1: lemma="быти" & tag="sg/du/pl&praes&1p/2p/3p"] [Word 2: tag=V&perf at a distance of 1 from word 1]	AUX precedes the l-participle with 1-3 words in between [Word 1: lemma="быти" & tag="sg/du/pl&praes&1p/2p/3p"] [Word 2: tag=V&perf at a distance of 2-3 from word 1]	AUX immediately follows the l-participle [Word 1: tag=V&perf] [Word 2: lemma="быти" & tag="sg/du/pl&praes&1p/2p/3p" at a distance of 1 from word 1]	AUX follows the l-participle with 1-3 words in between [Word 1: tag=V&perf] [Word 2: lemma="быти" & tag="sg/du/pl&praes&1p/2p/3p" at a distance of 2-3 from word 1]
VC	205	19	7	19	5
GC	100	7	2	23	2
KC	1151	116	79	83	6
NC	152	14	8	14	-
PC	355	28	1	81	10
SC	292	18	3	31	3
Σ	2255	202	100	251	26

In the second column we can find the overall number of perfect forms with and without AUX. In the next four columns the number of perfects containing AUX is depicted. The third column shows the number of examples with AUX immediately preceding the l-participle. In the fourth column we can see the number of examples where AUX and the participle follow each other at 1-3 words. In column 5 the number of instances with the AUX immediately following the l-participle are summarized, while the number of examples with their distance at 1-3 is shown in column 6. Data show that AUX predominantly was adjacent to the main verb and in most cases, it was positioned after it.

Focusing on the supposed enclitic status of AUX, as it has already been mentioned (see Section 2), Slavic clitics were so called special clitics, as they occupied either 2P or V2 in clauses. These canonical clitic positions hold in the case of our auxiliaries well. In (11) the AUX **есмы** takes 2P after a pronominal subject.

- (11) и поуаша Володимерци молвити / агы **есмы**
 and begin.AOR.PL.3 Volodimerian.NOM.PL talk.INF we.NOM AUX.PRES.PL.1
 волнага княза **пригали** к сое'к·SC
 willing.ACC.DUAL.MASC prince.ACC.DUAL.3 take.PERF.PL.1 PREP REFL.DAT
 'And the Volodimerians started to talk 'we took two willing princes to us''

In (12) AUX takes V₂, as it is situated inside the clause immediately attaching to its verbal host.

- (12) **а** **а** **пониаъ** **есми** **коне** **тѣхвѣрью** **а** **еще**
and I.NOM water.PERF.SG.1 AUX.PRES.SG.1 horse.ACC.PL T.INSTR and more
волаховомъ напою NC
V.INSTR.SG water.PRES.SG.1
'And I watered the horses at Tver and I will water them in Volkhov as well.'

Example (13) is interesting in the sense, that “**еси**” takes the second position following its verbal host. I designated this position as 2PV.

- (13) **Мѣстиславѣ** **же** **привѣгшию** **Новѣгородаѣ** / **рекоша** **емѣ**
M.DAT.SG CL flee.PART.ACT.PAST.DAT.SG N.DAT.SG say.AOR.PL.3 he.DAT
Новѣгородци / **дариаъ** **еси** **пятию** **Новѣгородаъ** / **и**
N.NOM.PL give.PERF.SG.2 AUX.PRES.SG.2 five.DAT.SG N.ACC and
шелъ **еси** **бѣмъ** **на** **стрѣпа**
go.PERF.SG.2 AUX.PRES.SG.2 AUX.PERF.SG.2 PREP uncle.ACC-GEN.SG
св(о)ѣго **на** **Михалка** SC
REFL.ACC-GEN.SG PREP M.ACC-GEN.SG
'Mstislav fled to Novgorod and the Novgorodians told him 'you gave away Novgorod five times and attacked your uncle, Michail''

Moreover, we can also find examples, where AUX is situated inside the clause, but not in V₂ (14):

- (14) **и** **приѣхавъше** **видѣша** **Игора**
and arrive.PART.ACT.PAST.NOM.PL see.AOR.PL.3 I.ACC-GEN.SG
лежаща / **и** **рекоста** / **се** **оуже** **Игора**
lie.PART.ACT.PRAES.ACC-GEN.SG and say.AOR.DUAL.2 PARTIC already I.ACC-GEN.SG
есте **оубили** / **аго** **похорони(м)** **тѣло** **его** SC
AUX.PL.2 kill.PERF.PL.2 PARTIC bury.PRAES.PL.1 body.ACC.SG his.ACC.SG
'On arrival they saw Igor lying and the two of them said 'you have killed Igor and we will bury his body''

In numerous cases clitics of higher ranks could also intervene between the host, as it is designated in (15), where the pronominal clitic **ны** separates the AUX in V₂ form its host. The intervention of other clitics, however, does not affect the AUX's 2P or V₂ position.

- (15) послаша послы своа рекоуще. /
 send.AOR.PL.3 messenger.ACT.PL REFL.ACC.PL.MASC say.PART.ACT.PRAES.NOM.PL
 ако Жирславъ повѣдалъ ны естъ. GC
 that Zh.NOM.SG talk.PERF.SG.3 we.DAT.PL.1 AUX.PRES.SG.3
 ‘He sent his messengers saying that Zhirosлав talked to them.’

The distribution of these positions is summarized in the following table.

Tab. 5.

	2P	2P+Cl	2PV	2PV+Cl	V2 inside	V2+Cl inside	V+other parts inside	inside
VC	8	5	6	2	12	2	–	8
GC	5	–	–		23	2	–	4
KC	74	30	15	–	69	2	1	93
NC	3	1	2	–	11	–	–	9
PC	6	3	9	6	70	4	–	10
SC	10	–	8	–	23	1	1	6
Σ	145		48		219		132	

As data show in 35% of the examples auxiliaries occupy the canonical position for enclitics, i.e., 2P. In 40% of examples auxiliaries are situated inside the clause following their verbal host (in V2). In 24% of examples AUX is situated inside the clause not attaching to an l-participle.

The above data lead us to a conclusion, that in most cases auxiliaries did not occupy 2P. According to ZALIZNYAK (2008) only these forms can be regarded as enclitics. Most auxiliaries are located in V2 which is also a typical position for enclitics in Slavic languages. The enclitic nature of these forms can be confirmed by the fact that other enclitics may intervene between the l-participle and the auxiliary.

5.3.1. The problem of clause initial position

Provided that present tense auxiliaries in perfect forms are enclitics, they cannot take the initial position of the clause. As it has already been mentioned in section 2, enclitics are enclinenomas, i.e., they need to attach to a host for prosodic reasons. Among the examples of the corpus there is only one instance of clause initial auxiliary:

- (16) и тако рекоша / есанъ ждали кнѣже / а
 and so say.AOR.PL.3 AUX.PRES.PL.1 wait.PERF.PL.1 prince.VOC.SG and
 ѹблѡуи к намъ хр(с)тѣ. KC
 kiss.IMPER.SG.2 PREP we.DAT CROSS.ACC.SG
 ‘And they said the following ‘we have waited prince. Kiss the cross for us.’

However, the context and the preposed position of the perfect construction suggests, that in this case the predicate was focused. Therefore, the accented form cannot behave as a clitic.

Another problem that frequently arises when investigating the initial segment of the clause is the definition of the first accented word or unit. In most cases clauses are introduced by clearly definable single units, like polysyllabic conjunctions or adverbs. It is problematic however, whether monosyllabic conjunctions (17), pronouns or particles (18) can serve as hosts for enclitics.

- (17) **сѣ** **єсть** **крѡвь** **моѧ** **новѧго**
this.NOM.SG.NEUTR be.PRES.SG.3 blood.NOM.SG my.NOM.SG.FEM new.GEN.SG.MASC
зѧвѣта. / **снже** **того** **нѣ** **твѡратѣ.** / **и**
testament.GEN.SG this.NOM.PL.MASC this.GEN.SG.NEUTR not do.PRES.PL.3 and
сѡтъ **нѣ** **исправилѣ** **вѣрѣ.** PC
AUX.PRES.PL.3 not change.PERF.PL.3 religion.GEN.SG
'This is my blood of the New Testament they don't commit things like this and did not change their religion.'

- (18) **начѧ** **изѧславѣ** **моувити.** / **сѣ** **єсѧгы** **сѣла**
begin.AOR.SG.3 I.NOM.SG talk.INF PARTIC AUX.PRES.PL.1 village.ACC.PL
(**иѧ**) **пожгли** **всѧ.** / **и** **жизнь** (**иѧ**)
they.GEN.PL burn.PERF.PL.1 all.ACC.PL.NEUTR and life.ACC.SG they.GEN.PL
всю. KC
all.ACC.SG.FEM
'Izyaslav started to talk 'we have burnt all their villages and their whole life''

The chronicles provide numerous constructions with conjunctions that consist of two words, constituting a single tactic unit (19).

- (19) **тогда же** **Шварнови** **соуцию** **в** **Новѣгородѣ(ѡ)ѣ.** /
then CL S.DAT.SG be.PART.ACT.PRES.DAT.SG.MASC PREP AUX.PRES.PL.1
тако **река.** / **по што** **мѧ** **єси**
thus say.PART.ACT.PRES.NOM.SG.MASC what.for I.ACC AUX.PRES.SG.2
воѡвалѣ. VC
fight.PERF.SG.2
'At that time Shvarno was in Novgorod and he said 'why have you attacked me''
- (20) **оже** **намѣ** **нѣтоу** **исаковица** / **с** **нимѣ** **же** **єсѧ**
any.more we.DAT not I.GEN.SG PREP he.INSTR CL AUX.PRES.PL.1
пришли NC
come.PERF.PL.1
'We do not have Isakovic any more. We came with him.'



As example (20) shows, higher ranking (especially discourse) enclitics, that adhere more to 2P also support the single tactic unit status of such initial elements as they intervene between the initial prepositional phrase and the clitic auxiliary.

5.3.2. Position within clitic clusters

A prominent feature of Slavic word order systems is the existence of grammaticalized constraints on the placement of clause-level clitics (ZIMMERLING – KOSTA 2016). In a class of modern and old Slavic languages clause-level clitics form ordered clusters (or “clitic groups”). Clitic clusters are contiguous strings of clitics arranged in a rigid order according to language-specific rules called “Clitic Templates” (FRANKS – KING 2000) or “Ranking Rules” (ZALIZNYAK 2008; ZIMMERLING 2012).

The order of enclitics within the clitic clusters is regulated by three principles: the Categorical, the Diachronical and the Prosodic principles (ZIMMERLING – KOSTA 2013).

The Categorical Principle states, that clitics are grouped according to their taxonomic category: Particle ∨ Pronoun ∨ Auxiliary.

The Diachronical Principle predicts that most recent clitics adjoin to the already existing clitics of the same category from the right.

Apart from the above mentioned principles occasionally languages also apply the Prosodic Principle. It predicts that light (e.g., monosyllabic) clitics precede heavy (e.g., disyllabic) clitics irrespective of their category.

According to Zaliznyak’s classification auxiliary clitics occupy the final position in clitic clusters. Therefore, if auxiliaries act as enclitics, there should not be any examples with clitics of higher ranks following them.

The RNC does not allow us to determine the exact number and nature of clitic clusters as research can be set only for two items. So, I looked at the relation of present tense auxiliaries to definite discourse and pronominal clitics. In (21) AUX in 2P is preceded by a dative and an accusative pronominal enclitic, while in (22) by a discourse enclitic and the accusative pronominal clitic *ċ*.

- (21) **нѣи(н) же бра(т)ѣ** **киѣне /** **чего** **ѣсте** **хотѣли /**
 now CL brother.VOC.PL Kievan.VOC.PL what.GEN AUX.PRES.PL.2 want.
 PERF.PL.2
- чмль** **ми** **са** **ѣсте** **вѣѣдали. кс**
 what.INSTR I.DAT PARTIC AUX.PRES.PL.2 promise.PERF.PL.2
- ‘And now, brothers, Kievans, what did you want? What did you promise me?’

- (22) азъ ко не хощю тяжкы дани
I.NOM CL PARTIC want.PRAES.SG.1 heavy.GEN.SG.FEM tax.GEN.SG
въздложити на васъ. / такъ(ж) мужъ мои. но
impose.INF PREP you.ACC as husband.NOM.SG my.NOM.SG,MASC but
сего оу ва(с) прошио мала. **изнемогли**
all.GEN.SG PREP you.GEN ask.PRES.SG.1 little.GEN.SG.NEUTR lose.strength.PERF.PL.2
ко **са есте** въ шадѣ. PC
CL PARTIC AUX.PRES.PL.2 PREP siege.LOC.SG
'I don't want to impose on you heavy taxes, as my husband. I just ask you small things as you have lost your strength in the siege.'

The corpus data show that auxiliaries in 2P and V2 without exception follow the ranking rules.

5.3.3. Auxiliaries and explicit pronominal subjects

Perfect auxiliaries in the text of chronicles reflect a transitional stage in the evolution of Russian. On the one hand, parallel with the development of pronouns, the use of pronominal subjects in the perfect became widespread. Also, in many cases the original three-membered (explicit subject – auxiliary – l-participle) perfect constructions were disappearing: we can find either auxiliary + l-participle or (primarily pronominal) subject + l-participle structures. In the presence of the auxiliary the pronominal subjects are missing to prevent the duplication of the grammatical categories of person and number (ZALIZNYAK 2008, 239). JUNG (2020) explains the same phenomenon by claiming that both elements carry the same grammatical features and can be perceived as weak pronouns.

The above statements are confirmed by the example below:

- (23) азъ же с вѣма и сѣслова прогналъ /
now CL brother.VOC.PL Kievan.VOC.PL what.GEN AUX.PRES.PL.2 want.PERF.PL.2
а волостъ ва **сми** **изискалъ**. KC
and territory.ACC.SG you.DAT.DUAL.2 AUX.PRES.SG.1 find.PERF.SG.1
'I am with you and banished Sviatoslav and I found you territory.'

In the first clause of (24) we can find a pronominal subject accompanied by an l-participle predicate, while in the second clause there is a complex predicate comprising of an auxiliary and an l-participle without a subject.

In the present section I look at the distribution of subjects in perfect constructions containing auxiliaries. Pronominal subjects can precede (24) or follow (25) the auxiliaries.

- (24) **ИЗАСЛАВЪ ЖЕ Р(У)Ѣ ВДУЕСЛАВѢ. / Δ ЕСМЬ К**
 I.NOM.SG CL say.AOR.SG.3 V.DAT.SG I.NOM AUX.PRES.SG.1 PREP
ТОБѢ СЛАДЪ / Δ КИЕВЪ ТОБѢ ДАДА. КС
 you.DAT send.PERF.SG.2 and K.ACC you.DAT.SG.2 give.PART.ACT.PRES.NOM.SG
 ‘Iziaslav told Viacheslav ‘I sent to you, giving to you Kiev.’’
- (25) **ДА ПРИИМЕ(Т) ТѢ ЖЕ КАЗНЬ. / ТАКОЖЕ ПР(И)ГЛАТЬ**
 and take.PRES.SG.3 that.ACC.SG.FEM CL punishment.ACC.SG that take.PERF.SG.3
ПР(И)ГЛАТЬ ЕСТЬ ВНЪ. РС
 take.PERF.SG.3 AUX.PRES.SG.3 he.NOM
 ‘And he takes the same punishment that he (another person) took.’

In a couple of examples explicit full subjects (mainly proper nouns or geographical names) appear with auxiliaries. This happens not in perfect, but medial or passive constructions.

- (26) **ПОСЛА И ВО ОБЕЗЫ/ РЕКА. /**
 send.AOR.SG.3 he.ACC PREP O.LOC.SG say.PART.ACT.PRAES.NOM.SG.MASC
ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ ОУМЕРЛЪ ЕСТЬ. GC
 V.NOM.SG die.PERF.SG.3 AUX.PRES.SG.3
 ‘He sent him to Obez saying Volodymyr is dead.’

The findings are summarized in the table below:

	Total number of perfects with AUX	Number of pronominal subjects	
		AUX + (Cl) + V	V + (Cl) + AUX
VC	43	1	–
GC	34	–	–
КС	284	36	9
НС	26	2	1
РС	104	–	3
СС	49	3	–

Data reflect that subjects were not typically explicit in perfect constructions. As for word order, (although it is hard to make generalizations on the basis of such scarce data), their presence was more characteristic of constructions with AUX preceding the l-participle.

6. Conclusions

The investigation of perfect auxiliaries in the text of chronicles reflects a transitional state of OR. The application of corpus methods shows us, that Aux was present only in 22% of perfect constructions. Also, the change went hand-in-hand with the rise of pronominal subjects. These subjects appeared only scarcely with auxiliaries.

The research confirms that present forms in auxiliary function show enclitic properties (they do not occupy the initial position of clause and adhere to the ordering rules in clitic clusters). These enclitic auxiliaries also reflect an intermediate state of evolution, in 35% of examples they occupy 2P, while in 40% V2. Similar variation is in all probability characteristic of lower ranking enclitics, e.g. *сѧ* (see GYÖRFI 2023). This positional variation is in accordance with the ongoing changes in the tense system. Contemporary Slavic languages with overt tense exponents (Bulgarian, Macedonian) have verb-adjacent enclitics, while languages with a less prominent tense morphology retained 2P enclitics.

The enclitic nature of these forms was weakening: they do not fulfill the prosodic requirements for clitics (see 5.2.), they could precede as well as follow their host, i.e., the l-participle of the perfect form. There is a considerable number of examples with AUX inside the clause at a distance from the participle. Therefore, they do not always meet the syntactic requirements for enclitics.

As for their diachronic evolution, their frequency or distribution is not considerably differing in texts reflecting earlier states of language (such as the Novgorod or the Suzdal Chronicle).

The investigation points out that in chronicles even 3rd person auxiliaries could be found in enclitic status.

It is important to emphasize that the features and peculiarities mentioned in the present article reflect only the characteristics of the hybrid language of chronicles.³ Encovering the truth regarding their actual nature of auxiliary clitics requires the further investigation of texts of different genres.

REFERENCES

BŘEZINA, Martin. 2023. Syntax of (non)syllabic present tense forms of the verb *býti* in the 3rd-person singular in Old Czech. To be published.

³ One of my reviewers turned my attention to the fact, that besides the 2P – 2V transition that occurred in Old Bulgarian as well, the shift between the two systems could be due to the Old Church Slavonic influence on the language of chronicles. I would not rule out this possibility, however, it requires further research.

- FRANKS, Steven. 1999. *Clitics in Slavic*. In: *The Slavic and East European Language Resource Center*. <http://seelrc.org/glossos/> [05.06.2019].
- FRANKS, Steven – KING, Tracy Holloway. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. Oxford.
- JAKOBSON, Roman. 1971. Les enclitiques slaves. In: JAKOBSON, Roman. *Selected Writings. II. Word and Language*. The Hague.
- GYÖRFI, Beáta. 2023. Belaja vorona pronominalnyh enklitik: (en)klitika sja v tekste drevnerusskih letopisej In: *Kategorija jazyka i myshlenija: aspekty sovremennoj interpretacii. Sbornik statej*. Petrozavodsk, pp. 57–60.
- HILPERT, Martin – GRIES, Stefan. 2016. Quantitative approaches to diachronic corpus linguistics In: KYTÖ, Merja – PAHTA, Päivi, eds. *The Cambridge Handbook of English Historical Linguistics*. CUP, pp. 36–53.
- JUNG, Hakyung – MIGDALSKI, Krystof. 2015. Degrammaticalization of pronominal clitics in Slavic. In: SZAJBEL-KECK, Małgorzata – BURNS, Roslyn – KAVITSKAYA, Darya, eds. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The First Berkeley Meeting 2014*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, pp. 143–162.
- JUNG, Hakyung. 2020. The be-auxiliary's categorial status in Old Russian. *Studia Linguistica*. 74(3), pp. 613–644
- KOSTA, Peter – ZIMMERLING, Anton. 2013. Slavic clitics: A typology. *STUF – Language Typology and Universals*. 66(2), pp. 178–214.
- PETRUHIN, Pavel V. 2008. Diskursivnye funkicii drevnerusskogo pluskvamperfekta (na materiale Kievskoj i Galicko-Volinskoj letopisej) In: *Issledovanie po teorii grammatiki. Grammaticheskie kategorii v diskurse*. Moskva.
- SPENCER, Andrew – LUIS, Ana R. 2012. *Clitics: An Introduction*. Cambridge.
- WILLIS, David. 1999. The structure of Old Russian periphrastic verbal constructions. In: KENESEI, István, ed. *Crossing Boundaries: Advances in the Theory of Central and Eastern European Languages*. Amsterdam, pp. 45–65.
- ZALIZNYAK, Andrej A. 2008. *Drevnerusskie enklitiki*. Moskva.
- ZALIZNYAK, Andrej A. 2019. *Drevnerusskoe udarenie. Obshchie svedeniya i slovar*. Moskva.
- ZHIVOV, Viktor M. 1996. *Jazyk i kultura v Rossii XVIII*. Moskva, pp. 31–41
- ZIMMERLING, Anton A. 2012. A unified analysis of clitic clusters in world's languages. *Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies*. 11(18), pp. 726–738.
- ZWICKY, Arnold M. 1977. *On Clitics*. Bloomington.

Beáta Györfi

University of Szeged

6722 Szeged, Egyetem utca 2.

Hungary

blazsenyka@yahoo.com



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as image or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights.

