
ПРОГЛАШ

Издание на Филологический факультет
при Великотърновския университет „Св. св. Кирил и Методий“

кн. 1, 2022 (год. XXXI), ISSN 0861-7902

ВОДЕЩА ТЕМА НА БРОЯ: ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ – ЕЗИКОВИ, ЖАНРОВИ, МЕДИЙНИ

DOI: 10.54664/CNOB1150

*Beáta Györfi**

DISCOURSE CLITICS IN THE TEXTS OF 12TH–16TH CENTURY RUSSIAN CHRONICLES

Беата Дьорфи

ДИСКУРСИВНЫЕ ЭНКЛИТИКИ В ТЕКСТАХ ДРЕВНЕРУССКИХ ЛЕТОПИСЕЙ XII–XVI ВВ.

The present research is aiming at the investigation of the distributional, syntactic and paradigmatic features of Old Russian (OR) discourse clitics. Clitics constitute a special class in OR, as despite the relative free word order, their position is fixed in the clause. From the three types of OR enclitics (discourse, pronominal and auxiliary) the least attention has been paid to discourse clitics. An investigation of their frequency, distributional properties and role in the information structure of OR clauses by corpus linguistic methods could provide new perspectives for the research of OR word order as well.

Keywords: *enclitics; discourse clitics; Old Russian; chronicles; corpus linguistics.*

Настоящее исследование направлено на изучение дистрибутивных, синтаксических и парадигматических особенностей древнерусских дискурсивных клитик. Клитики составляют особый класс слов в древнерусском языке, так как, несмотря на относительно свободный словопорядок, они занимают фиксированное положение в предложении. Из трех типов древнерусских энклитик (дискурсивных, прономинальных и глагольных связочных энклитик) дискурсивным клитикам уделяется в научной литературе меньше всего внимания. Изучение их частотности, дистрибутивных свойств и роли в информационной структуре предложений применением методов корпусной лингвистики может открыть новые перспективы и в исследовании порядка слов в древнерусском языке.

Ключевые слова: *энклитики; дискурсивные клитики; древнерусский язык; летописи; корпусная лингвистика*

Introduction

Word order is one of the key issues in the investigation of syntax in Slavic languages. An extensive amount of research has been devoted to the order of elements in contemporary Slavic languages as well as in earlier stages of language development. Studies show that despite the relative free order of most constituents, there are elements that occupy a fixed position in the sentence structure. These, seemingly meaningless but nevertheless key elements are the enclitics, that are present in contemporary South and West Slavic languages, however, have been lost in the East Slavic branch.

* **Beáta Györfi** – Assist. Prof. at the Institute of Slavic Studies, PhD, Faculty of Arts, University of Szeged, bgyorfi@lit.u-szeged.hu.

The present article focuses on the behaviour of discourse enclitics in Old Russian (OR), where they were still present. This topic is relevant in the sense that although we can find studies on Old Russian clitics in linguistic literature (Jakobson 1971; Zalizniak 2008; Zimmerling 2012), there is no consensus in these works concerning the use and peculiarities of this specific subtype of enclitics. This subgroup of clitics, however, as they interfere with discourse-pragmatic factors, plays a crucial role in understanding the syntactic structure of the seemingly free word order in OR language.

In view of the above, in the first part of the article a short overview is given on clitics in general and enclitics in OR in particular. The second part of the paper is devoted to discourse clitics and the basic notions of information structure. Special attention is paid to those aspects of information structure that are accessible for diachronic research. The third part introduces the corpus and the method of investigation. Clitics are studied by applying the methodology of corpus linguistics, which provides a more empirical perspective for their observation. The fourth part sheds light on the distributional, syntactic features and semantics of discourse clitics. In the last section conclusions are drawn.

On clitics in a nutshell

Clitics constitute a rather complex and controversial class of grammatical items that interact with different layers of grammar. Phonologically they are deficient elements that lack word stress, therefore they attach to some other prosodic word in order to be pronounced. Consequently, clitics cannot be focused or emphasized. Morphologically, clitics are between affixes and independent words. Similarly to affixes they should attach to a host, however they do not select words of a particular class but show promiscuous attachment (i. e. they can take words of any category as their host). As for their morphological functions, they make up a heterogeneous class and lack taxonomic characteristics even within one and the same language (clitics can mark agreement, behave like auxiliaries, pronouns, etc.). On the basis of the position of clitics in relation to the main word we can differentiate between enclitics (that attach to the main word from the right) and proclitics (which attach from the left). The syntactic status of clitics is similarly controversial, which is partly due to their functional diversity. In most languages their position is determined by syntactic principles (they can take 2P or V2 positions) and it should also be noted that in many cases the position of clitics differs from the position of a full-form word with the same function (e.g. in the case of clitic pronouns which cannot take a sentence initial position, like full pronouns. (Anderson 2005; Zimmerling 2012).

Universally two canonical clitic positions can be distinguished: the Wackernagel position (referred to as 2P), where the clitic is in the first tactic unit of the clause and the verb second position (V2), where the clitic is attached to its verbal host.

Clitics form a heterogeneous class, consequently, several classifications of clitics exist in the world's languages. On the basis of their possible position in the clause we can differentiate between phonological/simple and syntactic/special clitics. Phonological clitics compose a single phonetic word/tactic unit attaching to a neighbouring form/host. Syntactic clitics are elements that take syntactic positions that are reserved for prosodically and/or syntactically deficient expressions. (In Slavic this position comes in two basic variants: one is second in the clause, the other is adjacent to the verb.)

Functionally, particles, pronominal clitics and clitic auxiliaries can be distinguished. Semantically, enclitics can be of two kinds: 1. local, that specify the meaning of their host, which they immediately follow; 2. phrasal, that relate to a whole phrase and have a more general meaning. On the basis of morphology special and simple clitics are distinguished. Special clitics are the ones that have paradigms (Franks 1999).

According to recent research, cliticization types interact with other aspects of grammar, such as tense or the presence of articles. Migdalski in his paper points out that Slavic languages with designated tense morphology have verb adjacent clitics, while tenseless languages have 2P clitics, which obligatorily occur after the clause-initial element (Migdalski 2013). Boškovič (2016) came to the conclusion that 2P clitic systems are available only in languages without articles.

For a comprehensive analysis of clitics in general see (Zwicky 1977; Anderson 2005; Luis, Spencer 2012) and for clitics in Slavic (Jakobson 1971; Franks 1999; Zimmerling, Kosta 2013).

The system of Old Russian clitics

Old Russian contained only enclitics, which conformed to Wackernagel's Law marking the end of the first tactic unit of the clause. Besides Wackernagel's Law the placement of clitics could be modified by the insertion of rhythmic-syntactic barriers. As a result, clitics could end up to the right from 2P.

Functionally, three types of clitics were used: discourse clitics, clitic pronouns and clitic auxiliaries. The different types of enclitics could be assembled into clitic clusters. The order of clitics within the clusters was regulated by the following three principles (Kosta, Zimmerling 2013: 189-191):

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

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

3. The Prosodic Principle, which predicts that light (e.g. monosyllabic) clitics precede heavy (e.g. disyllabic) clitics irrespective of their category.

Zalizniak set up a ranking of OR enclitics on the basis of their position in clusters:

- 1) же;
- 2) ли;
- 3) во;
- 4) ти;
- 5) вѣы;
- 6) dative pronoun – ли, ти, си, нѣы, вѣы, на, ва;
- 7) accusative pronoun – на, та, са, нѣы, вѣы, на, ва, и, ю, е, ѣ, я;
- 8) auxiliaries, especially 1st and 2nd person есмь (есми), еси, есмѣ (есме, есмо, есмѣ), есте, есвѣ, еста

According to the above scheme, Early Old Russian (11th –13th century) had a clitic template, the first five items of which represented discourse clitics, they were followed by clitic pronouns and clitic auxiliaries. In the next sections the distributional, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic features of discourse clitics will be discussed.

On discourse clitics

Discourse clitics – or as they are also referred to discourse particles or operator clitics – are words which convey rhetorical effects, emphasis, the attitude of the speaker and so on (Spencer, Ruiz 2012: 34). They can be found in many contemporary languages. In Finnish, for example clitics attach to the first constituent of the clause. The clitic *ko* serves for the formation of questions, *pas* expresses contrast, *han* reminding (Ranta 2012). The Japanese clitic *wa* signalizes topicalization. The Polish clitic *to* signalizes contrast and identifies the subject of the sentence. In contemporary Russian *же* can appear in any position in the sentence, and always marks focus structure.

Discourse clitics are exceptional in the sense that they are the only clitics that do not have non-clitic counterparts. These clitics have a strong tendency to occur in second position. In some languages they even impose special restrictions with respect to the syntactic or categorial status of their host (Luis, Spencer 2012).

Information structure and diachrony

The discourse (information) structure of the sentence is defined as “the component of sentence grammar in which propositions as conceptual representations of state of affairs are paired with lexicogrammatical structures in accordance with the mental states of interlocutors who use and interpret these structures as unit of information in given discourse contexts” (Lambrecht 1994: 5).

Discourse factors and information structure in contemporary languages are studied by means of intonation patterns. This method, however, is not applicable in the case of diachronic states.

However, it is still possible to reach some relevant generalizations about the realization of pragmatic categories even in written texts. It follows from Lambrecht's definition (1994) that discourse structure is linguistically observable, as it is tied to morphosyntactic structures, i.e. it receives formal manifestations in the use of morphological discourse markers, special syntactic positions, cleft sentences. Working with corpus languages, we can rely on these patterns.

Attempts have already been made to reconstruct the information structure of Indo-European by Kiparsky (1995), who relied on the structural differentiation of topic and focus for ancient Indo-European.

For the purposes of the present research instead of the twofold division of information structure I rely on a threefold division suggested in Neeleman et al. (2009), which considers – besides topic and focus – contrast as well. Neeleman's typology is presented in the following table:

Syntactic typology of topic, focus and contrast (Neeleman et al. 2009)

Topic		Focus	
non-contrastive topic [topic]		non-contrastive focus [focus]	
contrast	contrastive topic [topic] [contrast]	contrastive focus [focus] [contrast]	

The main motivation for the above scheme comes from the observation that languages show cross-cutting generalisations over the syntactic distribution of items sharing one of the three notions. If [topic], [focus] and [contrast] are indeed autonomous notions that can be targeted by syntax, one would expect to find mapping rules for each category (Vermeulen 2015).

A topic is the entity that a speaker identifies as already known (presupposed) or given in the discourse. Consequently, topics tend to be definite and are often pronominal. In Slavic languages, when word order is pragmatically unmarked, the topical constituents which represent old information, occupy the left part of the sentence string, before the verb (Gebert 2009).

The other key discourse unit of the sentence is focus. It is generally described as information that is new to the discourse and not presupposed; In Slavic languages focused constituents appear sentence-finally¹.

Contrast is a notion that can combine either with focus or topic. It implies the negation of at least one in the set of relevant alternatives. Syntactically it licences scrambling (i.e. change in word order and discontinuous phrases).

In order to determine the topic and focus of each sentence, we need to define the immediate context. This is called the Principle of Local Interpretation, which says that only the most immediate context is needed to interpret the sentence. The surrounding context of a sentence both conditions the syntactic relations and contributes to the meaning of the sentence (Blekher, 1995, Billings 2015: 4).

As a topic is associated with givenness phenomena, it gains expression through grammatical devices such as anaphoric expressions, that have givenness features in their lexical specification (personal pronouns, clitics and person inflection, demonstratives, definite articles), ordering, deletion. They indicate that their denotations are given in the immediate context. (Neeleman, Vermeulen 2013). Cliticization can also be diagnostic of the information structure in languages with relatively free word order (Condoravdi, Kiparsky 2002). For example, in contemporary Russian the clitic *яе* can appear in any position in the sentence, and always marks focus.

The method of investigation

The analysis of enclitics is carried out applying the methodology of historical corpus linguistics.

Applying electronic corpora for linguistic investigation facilitates frequency analyses of various phenomena, provides insights for contrastive linguistics, sociolinguistics, lexicography or even discourse analysis.

¹ However, in emotive sentences focus anywhere else in the sentence. To clarify, in emotive sentences the focused constituent is likely to be found in preverbal position preceded by topicalized material (Billings 2015).

A corpus-based analysis is characterized by the following features: 1) it is empirical, as it analyzes actual patterns of use in a natural text; 2) it utilizes a large and principled collection of natural texts, known as „corpus”; 3) it makes extensive use of computers for analysis, using automatic and interactive techniques; 4) it depends on both qualitative and quantitative techniques (Biber, Conrad, Reppen 2000: 4).

Its subfield, i.e. historical corpus linguistics, comprises the computer-aided analysis of extensive collections of historical texts. There are numerous benefits of this approach: 1) it allows the study of stages of linguistic development from a contrastive or comparative perspective; 2) it facilitates the statistical analysis of relationships between linguistic phenomena and linguistic or extralinguistic factors at work in language change; 3) it enables the statistical analysis of large-scale historical texts beyond the traditional manual approach. However, it also has a couple of drawbacks: historical linguists seldom have access to stratified, balanced corpora that would cover the full range of diachrony and/or genres investigated (Kytö 2011: 419, 420). Therefore, it is difficult to access balanced historical corpora.

Historical corpora of different languages have been compiled, such as the Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form for English, the *Mittelhochdeutsche Begriffsdatenbank*, the *Bonner Frühneuhochdeutsches Korpus* and the *DeutschDiachronDigital* for German, the *Textes de Français Ancien* for French and the *Corpus del Español* for Spanish (Kytö 2011).

There are several diachronic corpora for Russian as well: the *Regensburg Diachronic Corpus of Russian*, The parallel corpus of “The Tale of Igor’s Campaign” translations, the VMČ Query interface (containing 16th century texts) <http://www.vmc.uni-freiburg.de>, project Manuscript http://www.manuscripts.ru/?p_lid=1 and the Petersburg Corpus of Hagiographic Texts (<http://project.phil.spbu.ru/scat/page.php?page=project>) (Zacharov 2013; Mitrenina 2014).

The present research of Old Russian enclitics is conducted by using the Russian National Corpus (RNC). It is one of the largest, publicly available, balanced, morphologically annotated, POS-tagged and lemmatized corpus for Russian. It contains several subcorpora, such as the Diachronic subcorpus, comprising the Church-Slavonic, Middle Russian, Old Russian corpora, and the corpus of Birchbark Letters.

The subcorpus allows users to carry out a wide variety of grammatical or lexical query after setting the necessary parameters. The search interface gives option to exclude or include texts for the research, and thus create one’s own subcorpus for research.

Research in the corpus facilitates the quantitative and the distributional analysis of structures containing clitic particles. Each search result is displayed with several examples with preceding and following context, which is essential for the investigation of information structure.

The object of the investigation

The investigation of OR discourse clitics is based on the language of chronicles. This choice might seem a bit unusual at first sight, as the language of OR chronicles is not homogeneous in the sense that it reflects different dialectal varieties of Old Russian with different degrees of OCS influence. However, from a structural or compositional point of view, these texts with their annual entries containing dominantly extensive narratives and dialogues (excluding religious contemplations) are suitable for linguistic research. As opposed to the text of the birchbark letters these texts contain mainly well-formed sentences, which is definitely an asset for syntactic research. Moreover, owing to their size, these manuscripts can provide ideal amount of data for diachronic investigation. Last but not least, chronicles dating back to different centuries facilitate the monitoring of diachronic tendencies.

For the purposes of the present research I have chosen the following six 12th – 15th century OR chronicles from the RNC: the *Primary Chronicle* (PC) (12th c.), the *Kievan Chronicle* (KC) and the *Galician Chronicle* (GC) (early 13th c.), the *Volhynian Chronicle* (VC) (late 13th c.), the *Suzdal Chronicle* (SC) (14th c.) and the *Novgorod 1st Chronicle*, or *Synod Scroll* (NC) (15th c.).



What is there to know about discourse clitics in chronicles?

In the following section I shall try to shed light on the behavior of OR enclitics applying the methodology of corpus research. The first part of the investigation focuses on the distributional properties of these elements, i.e. on their frequency and their prevailing hosts. In the second part, looking at their syntactic environment, I will attempt to refine their discourse function.

The distribution of clitics

Frequency analysis is one of the basic types of corpus-based linguistic investigation. However, when the frequency of features is examined across texts, it is important to make sure that the counts are comparable. In particular, if the texts in a corpus are not all of the same length, then frequency counts from those texts are not directly comparable (Biber, Conrad, Reppen 2000: 263–264).

As we do not have the electronic version of all the texts in question, it is impossible to determine the exact number of words the chronicles contain, therefore, a frequency analysis cannot be carried out. Such a comparison would be misleading because some chronicles (e.g. the Kievan) are more voluminous, than others (e.g. the Novgorod 1st Chronicle).

Number of occurrence of discourse clitics:

The table below shows the number of occurrences of clitics in chronicles. Chronicles are listed in the chronological order of their compilation. Therefore, the table enables not only the overall comparison of the occurrences of clitics, but the correlation of the frequency of clitics in individual chronicles, as well, the change in their commonness diachronically.

	<i>же</i>	<i>ли</i>	<i>бо</i>	<i>ми</i>	<i>бы</i>
Primary Chronicle	1069	113	380	5	7
Kievan Chronicle	1949	38	350	44	1
Galician Chronicle	1094	19	199	4	6
Volhynian Chronicle	535	17	74	5	6
Suzdal Chronicle	880	23	219	3	-
Novgorod 1st Chronicle	245	21	79	-	-

As it can be deduced from the numbers, the clitic *же* was by far the most widespread, the second most widespread being *бо*, while *бы* was the least common in the text of chronicles. As for their temporal distribution, the number of all enclitics shows a decrease in time.

The category of the host

Slavic clitics are enclitics, i. e. they attach to the right edge of their host. Theoretically, they can attach to any element of the sentence on the right. However, a closer look at their syntactic environment suggests, that in OR they had a tendency to attach to a particular host. The table below gives information about the co-occurrence of individual clitics with hosts representing different parts of speech.

	<i>же</i>	<i>бо</i>	<i>ли</i>	<i>ми</i>	<i>бы</i>
S	2252	171	20	9	1
Adj	183	60	14	-	-
Num	26	6	-	-	-
V	747	528	45	3	-

Adv	364	79	11	6	6
Conj	16	-	78	12	8

The investigation of the grammatical category of the host suggests that regardless of the century of use, OR clitics had a prevailing host: the clitic *же* attaches primarily to nouns, while *бо* prefers verbal hosts. In the case of *ли*, *ми* and *бы* the texts contain fewer examples, nevertheless *ли* seems to have a preference for conjunctions and verbs, while *ми* and *бы* for conjunctions.

Role of clitics in the information structure

Although the first five members of Zalizniak's classification are referred to as discourse clitics in the linguistic literature there is neither much information, nor consensus concerning the discourse function of individual clitics.

Kosta and Zimmerling (2013) assume that the order of clitics represents a kind of hierarchy of sentence categories, i. e. the template *же* (1) – *ли* (2) – *бо* (3) – *ми* (4) – *бы* (5) embodies a functional hierarchy like this: Illocutionary Force (1) > Focus (2) > Cause (3) > Evidentiality (4) > Mood (5) (Kosta, Zimmerling 2013: 189). Unfortunately, this assumption was neither elaborated, nor verified. Nevertheless it reflects the basic functional properties of individual clitics.

In the next section, in order to determine the role of these elements in the information structure, examples from the RNC are examined with the previous and preceding context. Due to size constraints, only certain tendencies will be mentioned, which would provide a basis for further research.

The clitic *же*

According to Zalizniak the clitic *же* expresses focus or contrast and carries an intensifying or adversitive meaning. Migdalski (2007) claims that it marked illocutionary force, while Zimmerling assumes that it was used to express focus, contrast and emphatic use.

Zalizniak also emphasizes that *же* participated in a wide spectrum of constructions. He distinguishes phrasal and local uses of *же*. As a local particle it belongs to its host and specifies its meaning. As a phrasal enclitic, it attaches to a verb and relates to a whole phrase and has a more general meaning. (In contemporary Russian *бы* and *же* represent this group.)

In order to determine the role of *же* in the information structure of the sentence, the Principle of Local Interpretation is followed, i.e. the immediate context is considered.

As *же* attaches mainly to nominal hosts, there is a good chance that it is associated with either the topic or the focus of the clause. Having looked at the previous context of examples, it turned out that the referent designated by the host is always mentioned there, i.e. it is not a new element of the discourse. Moreover, information is stated about the nominal host, thus it is associated with topichood.

Typologically two basic types of topics are differentiated: 1) a sentence topic is a syntactic category that newly introduces a referent as what the rest of the sentence is about; 2) a discourse topic is what the whole discourse is about. The two types of topics are clearly closely linked: the referent introduced by a sentence topic often functions as a discourse topic, and continues to do so in the subsequent discourse.

To give empirical proof to my assumption I looked at expressions of givenness phenomena, i.e. repetitions and anaphoric expressions, such as pronouns or demonstratives.

Repetition:

(1) и Володимеръ вѣжа изъ Галича и сѣнь его Изяславъ / и гнаша и до Незды / Изяславъ же биса Незды рѣкы. / и ѿгаша ѿ него коня соумнѣша. GC

And Volodimer escaped from Galich and his son, Izyaslav and they chased him till the Nezda. Izyaslav defeated the river Nezda and they took his convoy horse from him.

In (1) the name Izyaslav is mentioned in the previous context, although the topic of the first part of this excerpt was Volodimer. From the third clause it becomes the new topic.

In other instances old information is inferred from the previous context:

(2) Усень оувитъ вѣсѣ великии кнѣзь Литовьскии Миньдовѣтъ. / самодержеу вѣсѣ во всеи земли Литовьскон. / оувиство же его сиуе скажемъ. / вѣсѣ князю емоу в земли

Литовьскон. /и наѹа избивати братью свою. и сѣовць VC

In autumn the Lithuanian king Mindovg was killed. He was the autocrat of Lithuania. We hereby tell the story of his murder. He was ruling in Lithuania. And he started to kill his brothers and sons.

Anaphoric pronouns:

(3) изаславъ же оускори днѣмъ передѣть братью. / заа люди ѿ града. / **ѡни же** оустрашившася предашася. / а изаславици поѹаша битиса. с вачьславомъ KC

Izyaslav sped up in the daytime before his brothers, taking the people from the town. They were scared and surrendered. And Izyaslav began to fight Vyacheslav.

(4) и иде даньславъ лазоутиницѣ съ дружиноюю кыеву къ мьстиславу по снѣ / а сѣославъ приде съ соуждалицѣ и съ братѣи и съ смолняны и съ полоцанъ къ роусѣ / идоша новъгородѣци съ акоюномъ противу ихъ / **они же** не дошедѣшьедѣше веротиша са / не оупѣша во ничтожеи NC

And there went Danislav Lazutinec with his men to Kiev to Mstislav for his son. And Svyatoslav came with the Suzdal people, with his brothers and with the Smolyan people and with the Polochans to Rusa. And the Novgorodians went Yakun against them. And they did not reach but returned. And they did not manage to do anything.

Sometimes the anaphoric pronoun refers back to the whole previous context:

(5) и тако извиша га всѣ. /и уста ѿ нихъ нишдинъ. / **се же** оуслышавъше князи Пиньских. Федоръ и Демидъ и Юри. / и приѣхаша к Василкови с питьемъ. VC

And that way they all beat them. And not one survived from them. And having heard it, the princes of Pinsk, Fyedor, Demil and Yuri. And then arrived at Vasilkov with drinks.

The clitic *же* often carries a contrastive meaning. Contrast implies the negation of at least one alternative in the set of relevant alternatives. It generally occupies the clause initial position as its referent is newly introduced and it shifts the topic of discourse.

(6) и поемше вон идоша на Полтескъ / и повѣдиста Роговолода / **Рогъволодъ же** ввѣже в городъ / и пристѣпивъше к городъ / и взаша городъ / и самого кнѣз Роговолода гаша и женѣ его и дщерь его. SC

And having taken his men they went to Poltesk and defeated Rogovolod. Rogovolod, however, ran into the town. And they proceeded to the town, and they took the town and Rogovolod himself and his wife and his daughter.

With nominal hosts there are numerous examples where the title of the host is given after the clitic. In such instances *же* has a meaning of identification. The scope of the clitic is local.

(7) оувѣдавъ же гарополка. в переяслави вратишася на посъльа воявать. / **гарополкъ же князь** оукрѣпивса. / и идиа по нихъ. KC

And they informed Yaropolk in Pereyaslav. And they returned to Posulye to fight. Prince Yaropolk, however, got stronger and went against them.

The clitic *же* often appears after verbs, as verbs are the second most common hosts with these clitics. Examples suggest that in such instances *же* shifts the topic of discourse putting a kind of emphasis on the action designated by the verb.

(8) идоша ѡвои подлѣ рѣкъ за неделю къ Звенигородѣ / и на Рожни поли не моглоша са бити / зане Володимеръ стоа на Голыхъ горахъ / **приде же** к немѣ Изаславъ Дѣдвичъ с Половци SC

They both went along the river for a week to Zvenigorod. And they could not fight on the field of Rozhne as Volodimer stood on the Goly mountains. However, Izyaslav Davidovich came him with the Polovets.

Interestingly, *же* is especially frequent with participle hosts. Of the total 747 examples with verbal hosts there are 457 with participles. Comparing examples with and without the enclitic *же* suggests that putting an emphasis on the action designated by the participle, the clitic enhances its predicative nature.

(9) кнѣзь же въспати са на озеро. / нѣмци же | чюдъ поздоша по нихъ. / **оузрѣвъ же** кнѣзь Александръ з новгородци. / поставиша полкъ на чюдьскомъ озерѣ NC

The prince stood up to the lake. The Germans and the Chud went against them. However when prince Alexandr and the novgorodians saw this, they put an army to the Chud lake.

This meaning frequently appears in dative absolute constructions as well:

(10) Того же лѣтѣ послаша Олговици по Половци и наѹаша воѹвати по Сѹлѣи Андрѣевичи же не могущио спротивити са имъ а ѿ братъи не вѣсѣ юмѹ помочи и всхотѣ лишитисѹ Переяслава и тако вѣсѣ пагѹба SC

In the same year the Olgovich sent to the Polovets and they started to fight in Sula. Andrey, however, could not withstand them and he did not have any help from his brothers and he wanted to forfeit Pereyaslav and so was the destruction.

With pronouns and adverbs *же* has a local scope and carries an affirmative interpretation

(11) По сем же долгоу времени минуѹшю / матежь вѣсѣ. межи братома и Володимеромъ. и Романомъ SC

All through this long time there was a revolt between the two brothers, between Volodimer and Roman.

(12) В то же лѣтѣ ис Тѹрова иде Изяславъ в Мѣнескъ / Ѿтолѣ же иде Новгородъ к братъи SC

In the very same year from Turov, Izyaslav went to Minsk. And from there he went to Novgorod, to his brothers.

(13) И сѣде Къиѣвѣ Мстиславъ / сѣнь юго старѣшини кнѹжа с кротостъю / а Ярополкъ братъ юго иде Переяславлю / Потомъ же оуслышавше Половци / тако змерлъ юсть Володимеръ кнѹзь / присѣдшасѹ вворзѣхъ SC

And Mstislav ruled in Kiev. And his eldest son ruled gently. And his brother Yaropolk went to Pereyaslav, and then when the Polovets heard that king Volodimer died, they rushed quickly.

In conclusion it can be stated that *же* as the most widely used enclitic has various meanings and scopes. In most cases it attaches to nominal hosts and signalizes discourse topic or contrastive topic. The clitic *же* often attaches to verbs or participles emphasizing the action designated by the host. In the above instances it has a wider scope and acts as a phrasal clitic.

In other cases, with nominal, pronominal and adverbial hosts *же* has a smaller scope (it is only a local enclitic) and carries an affirmative meaning. With phrasal nominal hosts, when *же* stands between a name and a title, it expresses identification.

The clitic *ли*

By its frequency, this clitic was the third widespread in the language of chronicles. Interestingly in most cases it takes a conjunction or a verb as its host.

(14) и ѿ тѣхъ да оувѣмъи и мъи. / Ѿже с миромъ приходѹт. / аще ли безъ грамоты придѹтъ / и предани вѣдѹтъ намъ. PC

And by them we are informed that they are coming with peace. And if they are coming without a charter, they will be dedicated/loyal to us.

(15) а любо с нимъ миръ вѣзъмемъ пакы ли с нимъ ратъю конѹанимъ . ѿни же рекоша. ты нашъ кнѹзь ты нашъ володимеръ. KC

And it is better to make peace with him, than to end up in war. And they said: you are our king, you are our Volodimer.

With verbal hosts, *ли* has an even more evident alternative meaning:

(16) ѿн же рѹѣ дѹщери свои / хощеши ли за Володимера / ѿна же рѹѣ / не хощю розѹти ровичиѹа. / но Ярополка хощю SC

And he told his daughter: 'Do you want to marry Volodimer?' And she said: 'I do not want to marry the son of a slave, but I want Yaropolk'.

(17) и приѣха въ Берестии. / и рѹѣ вогаромъ своимъ. / есть ли. ловчий здѣ. VC

And he arrived in Berestiy and said to his boyars: are there any huntsmen here.

Thus we may conclude that in all cases *ли* has an alternative meaning and it does not interfere with information structure. The scope of the clitic varies depending on whether it attaches to a verbal host or not. With verbal hosts it has a wider scope – the whole clause – while in other cases it is only local.

It is noteworthy, that *ли* is often positioned lower than 2P in the clause:

(18) да вѣи ны оупередити до Гюргѹа / а любо и прожене(мъ) / ли примиримъ к совѣ SC

We had better forestall Gyurgi and either we let him go or subdue him.

Repetitions of parallel structures:

(19) а вѣы соудите таковаго мѡужѣ вѣ попѣхѣ лиї в ѣгѡуменехѣ лиї вѣ черенцихѣ лиї NC

And you should look for such a man either among the priests or among the abbots or among the monks.

As the examples show, the meaning of the enclitic *ли* is much the same as in contemporary Russian – it expresses an alternative. It had a narrow and a wider scope (with verbs) and it often occupied a position lower than 2P.

The clitic *бо*

The clitic *бо* occupies the third position in Zalizniak's clitic ranking. It is the second most widespread clitic in the language of chronicles. It attaches mainly to verbal hosts and, as Zalizniak claims, it carries a casual meaning,

With nominal hosts *бо* seems to allocate the topic of the sentence:

(20) и реѣ добрына / просите володимира. / володимиръ бо вѣ ѡ малши милостъницѣ вльжингы. PC

And Dobrynya said: 'Ask Volodimer'. For Volodimer was from Malusha, from Olga's favourite maid.

(21) и мѡжь ея похвали ю. / жена бо разсмива благсвена естъ PC

And his husband praised her. Because his wife is thoughtful and blessed.

The case is more complicated with verbal hosts, which are the most common with this clitic.

(22) а сама иде в Белзъ. / оставивши и оу невѣрныхъ Галичанъ. / Володиславимъ свѣтомъ. / хотѣща бо княжити сама. GC

And she went to Belz, leaving him with the unfaithful Galicians, following Volodyslav's suggestion, as she herself wanted to rule.

(23) Мѡхалко же затворисѣ в городѣ / не сѣшилѣ Володимерцеи Володимери / ѣхали бо вѣхѣ по велѣнью Ростовецѣ противѣ князема с полторгы тѣсѣхѣ SC

Mihalko, however, closed himself into the town, as there were no citizens of Volodimer in Volodimer, because they had gone by the decree of the citizens of Rostov against the two princes with one and a half thousand soldiers.

As it is apparent from the above examples, constructions containing *бо* seem to exhibit an unneutral word order. The verb seems to be raised to the left edge of the clause. The clitic attaches to the initial verb or auxiliary of the phrase or of the clause separating the main verb from the auxiliary (23) or the two parts of the compound predicate (22). Examples with the auxiliary *бэ* are especially common (24).

(24) сторожеве же Изяслави оубоившесѣ вѣжаша / вѣ бо в то время послалъ сѣна своего

Мстислава вѣ Оугры / да тѣмъ / и не твердѣ вѣ юмѣ вродѣ SC

Izyaslav's guards were scared and they fled. He had sent his son, Mstislav to the Ugrins, therefore the wade was not strengthened.

All in all, we may conclude that *бо* seems to interfere with the information structure of the clause. In the case of nominal hosts it highlights the topic of the construction. It positions the verbal predicate to the left edge of the clause, giving it some kind of emphasis.

The clitic *му*

The investigation of the clitic *му* is difficult in the sense that it is homonymous with the Dative 2nd person pronominal clitic *му* and with the conjunction *му*. The distinction of these elements is simplified by setting the search parameters of the NCR. According to Zalizniak, it carries an affirmative meaning, it acts primarily as a kind of „indicative amplifier” as it emphasizes that the fact takes place and points to its significance for the speaker. It can have contextually determined additional meanings of contrast, cause

or effect. This clitic was especially widespread in the Old Novgorod dialect (Zalizniak 2008: 32). As the text of chronicles contains relatively few examples, we cannot make generalizations concerning its use.

With nominal hosts, it seems to carry a similar causative meaning as the clitic *бо*, but probably it is due to the contexts.

(25) а ко изяславѣ посла мѣжи свои / река емѣ. / азъ ти емѣ съ братѣмъ твоимъ с володимеромъ ѿсеелѣ оуже пошелѣ. КС

And he sent his men to Izyaslav, telling him: 'And I have already gone from here with your brother, Volodimer'.

(26) Мстиславѣ же лежацию юще / и дрѣжинѣ его пригнавшѣ сторожеве / рекоша емѣ / не лежи княже / Глебъ ти пришелѣ на та СС

Mstislav was still lying and guards hurried to his troop, telling him: 'Do not lie, prince! Gleb came to you.'

(27) и тѣ повѣда володимирѣ послѣ изяславию / сѣославъ ти послалъса къ гюргевѣ / река емѣ / въ правдѣ ли идеши на изяслава КС

And then Volodymyr told Izyaslav's messenger: Svyatoslav sent to Gyurgi and told him: 'You definitely go to Izyaslav/ you definitely attack Izyaslav.'

However, in most cases it attaches to conjunctions or pronouns functioning as conjunctions.

(28) конь оумерлъ. / а азъ живъ. / и повелѣ ѿсѣдлати конь. / да тѣ вижю кости его. / и приѣха на мѣсто идеже вахѣ лежашѣ кости его голы РС

The horse died and I am alive and he ordered to take off the saddle from the horse. And I see its bones and he came to the place where its naked bones were lying.

The example suggest, that the enclitic *ми* is also related to the topic in the sense that it evokes a shift in topic.

The clitic *бы*

Бы is the youngest enclitic as it evolved from the aorist of the verb *быти*, and the process of its transformation into an enclitic has not been completely finished during the investigated period. That is why our texts provide a small number of examples for its use. Therefore, we do not learn much about its characteristics. This enclitic survived as a particle in contemporary Russian, preserving its optative meaning.

Interestingly, our examples show that, most frequently, it occurred with conjunctions and adverbs.

(29) и рече им / луче бы ми сде оумрети. [РС.

And she told them: 'It would be better for me to die here'.

(30) бывшю же свѣтоу. / всѣхъ князѣи. во градѣ Кыевѣ. створиша свѣтъ сице. /

лоуе ны бы есть приати ја на чюжен землѣ. / нежели на свои. СС

There was a council. All the princes in Kiev made a council. It would be better for us to take them on foreign ground, than on ours.

Examples from the texts also suggest that *бы* does not adhere to its 2P position but often appears lower in the clause (30), even after clitics of a lower rank (31).

(31) самъ взѣ городъ с Татары. / сдоумали же вахотъ. / тако уже бы имъ всѣмъ вземше Новгородокъ. / тоже потомъ поити. в землю Литовскою. СС

He himself took the town with the Tatars and they thought they would all take Novgorodok and then they should go to the land of Lithuania.

It is also worth mentioning that the clitic *бы* often stands together with the predicative adjective *лѣгче*:

(32) и нача молитиса со слезами гла оувъ ми гси луче бы ми оумрети с братомъ нежели жити въ свѣтѣ семъ. ~ прелестнемъ ÷ РС

And he started to pray with tears saying: 'Alas, God. It would be better for me to die with my brother, than to live in this delusive world.'

(33) и азъ вѣхъ тѣ же приалъ стрѣтъ. луче бы ми с товою оумрети нежели

ВЪ СВѢТѢ СЕМЬ ПРЕЛЪСТНѢМЪ ЖЗТ. РС.

And I took the suffering. It would be better for me to die with you, than to live in this delusive world.

Conclusion

The present study aimed to give an insight into the distribution, syntactic and pragmatic features of OR discourse enclitics by relying on the methodology of corpus linguistics.

Examples taken from the text of OR chronicles suggest that although discourse clitics have no referential meaning -- as clitic pronouns do -- they are nevertheless not semantically vacuous, but carry meanings like topicality, contrast, causativity or alternation.

Syntactically, clitics behave as variables in the sense that they seem to have a preference for certain types of hosts. It also seems that although the neutral word order in OR is still unresolved, they induce word order changes by fronting their hosts.

As for the information structure of OR chronicles, we can deduce that discourse was determined by accessibility and definiteness. The established information was expressed mainly by anaphora and personal or deictic pronouns. Of the five OR discourse clitics, three (*же*, *бо*, *ли*) were involved in the expression of topicality or contrast.

The two most widely used enclitics *же* and *бо* often attached to verbal hosts. Generally, structures with initial nominal hosts introduced a new topic by maintaining the narration line, while structures with verbal hosts introduced a new topic by changing the discourse situation.

Enclitics were lost in the course of the evolution of Russian. Former discourse clitics like *же*, *бы* or *ли* are still used, but they can be placed freely in any position in the sentence. Therefore, they have turned to discourse particles.

REFERENCES

- Anderson 2005:** Anderson, S. R. *Aspects of the Theory of Clitics*. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 11. Oxford: OUP.
- Biber et al. 2000:** Biber, D., Conrad, S., Reppen, R. *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge: CUP
- Billings 2015:** Billings, S. K. *A Corpus-Based Analysis of Russian Word Order Patterns*. <<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/5624>> [21.03.2021]
- Blekher 1995:** Blekher, M. *Word Order and Discourse Management in Russian*. Papers Experimental and Theoretical Linguistics, 3, 1–14.
- Boškovič 2016:** Boškovič, Ž. On second position clitics crosslinguistically. – In: Lako, F., M., and R. Žauber (Eds.) *Formal Studies in Slovenian Syntax*. 23–54.
- Condoravdi, Kiparsky 2002:** Condoravdi, C., Kiparsky P. Clitics and Clause Structure. – In: *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5. 59–83.
- Franks 1999:** Franks, S. *Clitics in Slavic*. The Slavic and East European Language Resource Center. <<http://seelrc.org/glossos>> [05.06.2019].
- Jakobson 1971:** Jakobson, R. Les enclitiques slaves. – R. Jakobson. *Selected writings. II. Word and language*. The Hague, Paris.
- Gebert 2009:** Gebert, L. Information structure in Slavic languages. – In: Mereu, L. (Ed.) *Information Structure and its Interfaces*. De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin, New York.
- Kiparsky 1995:** Kiparsky, P. Indo-European Origins of Germanic Syntax. – In: Batty, A., Roberts, I. G. (Eds.) *Clause structure and language change*, OUP: Oxford 140–169.
- Kosta, Zimmerling 2013:** Kosta, P., Zimmerling, A. Slavic Clitics: A typology. – In: *STUF – Language Typology and Universals*. Akademie Verlag, 66/ 2. 178–214.
- Kytö 2011:** Kytö, M. Corpora and historical linguistics. – In: *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*. 11 (2), 417–457.
- Lambrecht 1994:** Lambrecht, K. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representation of discourse referents*. CUP: Cambridge

- Migdalski 2007:** Migdalski, K. On the emergence of the second position cliticization in Slavic. – In: *Formal Description of Slavic Languages*. 7. Leipzig, 69–71.
- Migdalski 2013:** Migdalski, K. Diachronic Source of Two Cliticization Patterns in Slavic. – In: Salvesen, C. M., Helland, S. P. (Eds) *Challenging Clitics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 135–158.
- Mitrenina 2014:** Mitrenina, O. V. The Corpora of Old and Middle Russian Texts as an Advanced Tool for Exploring an Extinguished Language. – In: *Scrinium*. Vol. 10, 455–461.
- Neelman et al. 2009:** Neeleman, A., Titov, E., de Koot, H., Vermeulen, R. *A syntactic typology of topic, focus and contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 15–51.
- Neeleman, Vermeulen 2013:** Neeleman, A., Vermeulen, R. The Syntactic Expression of Information Structure. – In: Neeleman, A., Vermeulen, R. (Eds). *The Syntax of Topic, Focus, and Contrast – The Syntax of Topic, Focus, and Contrast*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton
- Ranta 2012:** Ranta, A. On the Syntax and Translation of Finnish Discourse Clitics. – In: Santos, D., Lind'en, K., Ng'ang'a, W. (Eds), *Shall We Play the Festschrift Game? Essays on the Occasion of Lauri Carlson's 60th Birthday*. Heidelberg: Springer pp. 227–241.
- Spencer, Luis 2012:** Spencer, A., Luis A. R. *Clitics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: CUP
- Vermeulen 2015:** Vermeulen, R. The syntax of topic, contrast and contrastive topic. – GIST <<https://www.gist.ugent.be/file/55>> [21.06.2021].
- Zimmerling 2013:** Zimmerling, A. V. Possessor Raising and Slavic Clitics. – In: Chahine, I. K. (Ed.) *Current Studies in Slavic Linguistics*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co. 43–58.
- Zimmerling 2018:** Zimmerling, A. V. ŽE LI or LI ŽE: discourse particles and clitic clusters in Late Old Russian. – In: *The XIII Annual Meeting of the Slavic Linguistics Society*. Eugene, 28–29. <https://www.academia.edu/37454252/%C5%BDE_LI_or_LI_%C5%BDE_discourse_particles_and_clitic_clusters_in_Late_Old_Russian> [12.03.2020].
- Zwicky 1977:** Zwicky, A. M. *On clitics*. Bloomington: Ohio State University.
- Зализняк 2008:** Зализняк, А. А. *Древнерусские энклитики*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры // **Zaliznyak 2008:** Zaliznyak, A. A. *Drevnerusskiye enklitiki*. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskoj kul'tury.
- Захаров 2013:** Захаров, В. П. Корпусная лингвистика в России. Доклад на конференции: IV международный научный симпозиум Retro –2013. Ретроспектива филологии в информационном обществе знаний (Украина, Крым, Песчаное, 27 июня – 3 июля 2013 г.) // **Zakharov 2013:** Zakharov, V. P. Korpusnaya lingvistika v Rossii. Doklad na konferentsii: IV mezhdunarodnyy nauchnyy simpozium Retro-2013. Retrospektiva filologii v informatsionnom obshchestve znaniy (Ukraina, Krym, Peschanoye, 27 iyunya – 3 iyulya 2013 g.) <https://www.academia.edu/7911977/%D0%9A%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%BF%D1%83%D1%81%D0%BD%D0%B0%D1%8F_%D0%BB%D0%B8%D0%BD%D0%B3%D0%B2%D0%B8%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0_%D0%B2_%D0%A0%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%81%D0%B8%D0%B8_Corpus_linguistics_in_Russia> [03.03.2021]
- Циммерлинг 2012:** Циммерлинг А. В. Системы порядка слов с клитиками в типологическом аспекте – В: *Вопросы языкознания* № 4, 3–38. // **Tsimerling 2012:** Tsimerling A. V. Sistemy porjadka slov s klitikami v tipologicheskom aspekte – V: *Voprosy yazykoznanija* № 4, 3–38.