

# Diachronic Slavonic Syntax 4

Committee of Linguistics of Polish Academy of Sciences

Faculty of Languages of Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

Faculty of Polish and Classical Philology of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

# Diachronic Slavonic Syntax 4

Functional organisation of utterance in diachronic and  
comparative perspective in Slavic languages  
(Toruń, June 13–15, 2019)

On the occasion of the 90<sup>th</sup> anniversary  
of the scientific work of Zdzisław Stieber

Book of Abstracts

NICOLAUS COPERNICUS  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF LANGUAGES

Toruń 2019

Publication supported by:



*Polish Academy of Sciences*



*Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń*



*Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań*

Edited by

*Agnieszka Słoboda*

*Piotr Sobotka*

Reviewed by

*prof. Magdalena Pastuch*

*prof. Zofia Zaron*

© Copyright by Faculty of Languages  
Nicolaus Copernicus University  
Toruń 2019

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES  
NICOLAUS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY

ul. Fosa Staromiejska 3, 87-100 Toruń

tel. +48 56 611 3510

e-mail: Dziekanat\_WF@umk.pl

<https://www.fil.umk.pl>

# Table of contents

Preface .....	7
Zdzisław Stieber (1903–1980): The biographical note .....	9
Workshop program .....	11
Sandra Birzer	
Distinguishing between narration and the utterances of protagonists: On the function of <i>accusativus cum infinitivo</i> and code-switches in the history of Polish <i>verba dicendi</i> .....	15
Simeon Dekker	
Discourse organization in East Slavic reported speech: Greek influence vs. vernacular habits .....	19
Aleksandra Deskur	
Sentence structure and extra-linguistic reality .....	21
Andrea Di Manno	
The placement of OCS clitic particles as a way in OCS information-structure .....	23
Christine Grillborzer	
The case of Russian <i>lučše</i> ('had better') construction: Diachronic account .....	27
Wojciech Guz	
Marking direct speech with <i>iz(ę)</i> , <i>izci</i> and <i>ze</i> in Polish in the 15 <sup>th</sup> , 16 <sup>th</sup> and 21 <sup>st</sup> centuries .....	29
Beáta Györfi	
A Topical Problem: Subjects, Word Order and Clitics in Old Russian Chronicles .....	33
Pavel Kosek, Radek Čech & Olga Navrátilová	
On the development of the Czech pronominal enclitics in the finite VP in Older Czech Bibles .....	37
Anna Kozłowska	
Interpretation of utterances in old artistic texts: The case of Cyprian Norwid (1821–1883) .....	41

Ольга В. Курьянова	
Влияние семантики прилагательного на его место в линейном порядке в старославянском, древнерусском и старорусском языке .....	43
Imke Mendoza	
Topicalization strategies in Old Russian literacy .....	47
Tomasz Mika	
How to Establish the Boundary of a Sentence in Mediaeval Vernacular Texts? Methodological Queries .....	49
Marcin Podlaski	
Contextual determinants of three dative functions in older Slavic languages .....	51
Daniel Sax	
The pathway to Polish <i>to</i> : from deixis to quantification to information structure .....	53
Agnieszka Słoboda & Piotr Sobotka	
The origin of the Slavic infinitive and the development of its syntactic functions .....	57
Wojciech Stelmach	
The function of the syntactic rows in translations of Latin texts in the 16 <sup>th</sup> -century Polish Апокрыфа (based on <i>Historija bardzo cudna o stworzeniu nieba i ziemie</i> ) .....	63
Diana Stolac	
Attribute between the traditional syntax and utterance organization in old Kajkavian Croatian language .....	65
Марфа Н. Толстая	
Фразовые клитики в одном украинском говоре Восточной Словакии .....	67
Светлана М. Толстая	
Глагольное управление и семантика отглагольных имен .....	71
Björn Wiemer	
Univerbation and scope in the development of Polish and Russian clause-initial connectives .....	75

# Preface

The workshop *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax 4: Functional organisation of utterance in diachronic and comparative perspective in Slavic languages* is dedicated to the study of the causes and mechanisms of syntactic change in Slavonic languages, with a special focus on the shifts in such areas of syntax as:

- the functional perspective of the sentence expressed in terms of focus, theme, rheme, transition etc.,
- syntactic markers of modality understood as a category covering indications either of a kind of speech act or of the degree of certainty with which something is said,
- all extra-grammatical means of organizing an utterance (cf. Daneš 1964: 228),
- variations of the linear order of the sentence as the means of coding or constructing the meaning,
- extra-sentence comments, including conjunctions, connectives, discourse particles
- suprasegmental coding of the meaning
- etc.

Functional approaches to linguistic research, in particular in the field of syntax, are usually applied and tested to the contemporary linguistic phenomena. We propose to reflect on the functional aspects of Slavic syntax both in diachronic and comparative perspectives, considering reference to the influences of Greek and Latin. The aim is to promote recent developments in the field, be it em-

pirical, theoretical or methodological, as well as the confrontation between contemporary theoretical approaches and the analysis of old Slavic texts.



## Zdzisław Stieber (1903–1980): The biographical note



Zdzisław Stieber (June 7, 1903–October 12, 1980) was a Polish Slavist. He was born in Szczakowa, Poland, then part of the Austro-Hungarian province of Galicia. His family was of assimilated German descent in Polish for generations. He died in Warsaw.

Initially a student of chemistry, Stieber turned his attention to comparative Slavic linguistics at the University of Kraków in 1926. His interest in the dialects of border areas led him to the study

of East Slovak and Ukrainian dialects, where his work focused on toponyms, their etymology, and the history and settlement of the places where they are attested. He also carried out research on Sorbian and Belarusian, and was involved in producing linguistic atlases of Kashubian (1964–1978), Polish (Nitsch 1957–1970), and Lemkian (1956–1964). Stieber also produced works on the history and development of Polish (1934), Czech (1957), and Slavic in general (1969, 1971, 1973, 1979). Stieber held teaching appointments in Kraków, Lviv, Łódź, and Warsaw. His work in Polish and Slavic philology had a particularly strong influence on the introduction of the structural method in the teaching of phonology at the University of Łódź and at the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences. His best-known work is the study of the comparative grammar of Slavic languages that includes two linguistics disciplines – phonology and inflection. Our workshop continues the research of Zdzisław Stieber.

# Workshop program

## Thursday, 13<sup>th</sup> of June

- 9<sup>00</sup>–9<sup>30</sup> The registration & the opening of the conference
- 9<sup>30</sup>–10<sup>00</sup> Beáta Györfi – *A topical problem: subjects, word order and clitics in Old Russian Chronicles*
- 10<sup>00</sup>–10<sup>30</sup> Pavel Kosek, Radek Čech & Olga Navrátilová – *On the development of the Czech pronominal enclitics in the finite VP in Older Czech Bible*
- 10<sup>30</sup>–11<sup>00</sup> Марфа Н. Толстая – *Фразовые клитики в одном украинском говоре Восточной Словакии*
- 11<sup>00</sup>–11<sup>30</sup> Andrea Di Manno – *The placement of OCS clitic particles as a way in OCS information-structure*
- 11<sup>30</sup>–12<sup>00</sup> Coffee break
- 12<sup>00</sup>–13<sup>00</sup> Master lecture: Светлана М. Толстая – *Глагольное управление и семантика отглагольных имен*
- 13<sup>00</sup>–15<sup>00</sup> Lunch
- 15<sup>00</sup>–15<sup>30</sup> Sandra Birzer – *Distinguishing between narration and the utterances of protagonists: on the function of accusativus cum infinitivo and code-switches on the history of Polish verba dicendi*

- 15<sup>30</sup>–16<sup>00</sup> Agnieszka Słoboda & Piotr Sobotka – *The origin of the Slavic infinitive and the development of its syntactic functions*
- 16<sup>00</sup>–16<sup>30</sup> Marcin Podlaski – *Contextual determinants of three dative functions in older Slavic languages*
- 16<sup>30</sup>–17<sup>00</sup> Coffee break
- 17<sup>00</sup>–17<sup>30</sup> Tomasz Mika – *How to establish the boundary of a sentence in medieval vernacular texts? Methodological queries*
- 17<sup>30</sup>–18<sup>00</sup> Anna Kozłowska – *Interpretation of utterances in old artistic texts: the case of Cyprian Norwid (1821–1883)*
- 18<sup>00</sup>–21<sup>00</sup> Dinner

### Friday, 14<sup>th</sup> of June

- 9<sup>00</sup>–9<sup>30</sup> Wojciech Guz – *Marking direct speech with iż(e), iżci and że in Polish in the 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries*
- 9<sup>30</sup>–10<sup>00</sup> Simeon Dekker – *Discourse organization in East Slavic reported speech: Greek influence vs. vernacular habits*
- 10<sup>00</sup>–10<sup>30</sup> Imke Mendoza – *Topicalization strategies in Old Russian Literacy*
- 10<sup>30</sup>–11<sup>00</sup> Coffee break
- 11<sup>00</sup>–12<sup>00</sup> Master lecture: Björn Wiemer – *Univerbation and scope in the development of Polish and Russian clause-initial connectives*
- 12<sup>00</sup>–12<sup>30</sup> Wojciech Stelmach – *The syntactic sequences as a manner of translation of latin textes in 16<sup>th</sup>-centuried Polish (based on Historyja bardzo cudna o stworzeniu nieba i ziemie)*
- 12<sup>30</sup>–13<sup>00</sup> Diana Stolac – *Attribute between the traditional syntax and utterance organization in old Kajkavian Croatian language*

- 13<sup>00</sup>–15<sup>00</sup> Lunch
- 15<sup>00</sup>–15<sup>30</sup> Ольга Курьянова – *Влияние семантики прилагательного на его место в линейном порядке в старославянском, древнерусском и старорусском языке*
- 15<sup>30</sup>–16<sup>00</sup> Aleksandra Deskur – *Sentence structure and extra-linguistic reality*
- 16<sup>00</sup>–16<sup>30</sup> Coffee break
- 16<sup>30</sup>–17<sup>00</sup> Christine Grillborzer – *The case of Russian lučše ('had better') construction – diachronic account*
- 17<sup>00</sup>–17<sup>30</sup> Daniel Sax – *The pathway to Polish to: from deixis to quantification to information structure*
- 17<sup>30</sup>–18<sup>00</sup> The conclusion of the conference

### Saturday, 15<sup>th</sup> of June

Toruń—Biskupin—Gniezno—Strzelno—Kruszwica

- 7<sup>30</sup> departure from Toruń
- Biskupin:  
9<sup>00</sup>–10<sup>45</sup> guided tour  
11<sup>00</sup>–12<sup>00</sup> museum lesson  
("Become a resident of a prehistoric settlement")
- Gniezno:  
12<sup>30</sup>–13<sup>30</sup> lunch  
13<sup>30</sup>–15<sup>30</sup> Cathedral and Cathedral Museum
- 16<sup>10</sup>–17<sup>00</sup> Strzelno
- 17<sup>15</sup>–18<sup>00</sup> Kruszwica
- 18<sup>50</sup> return to Toruń



SANDRA BIRZER

University of Bamberg

**Distinguishing between narration and the utterances of protagonists: On the function of *accusativus cum infinitivo* and code-switches in the history of Polish *verba dicendi***

This abstract describes the development of discrete marking for direct and rendered speech in Polish and the role of language contact therein.

In Modern Polish, two types of speech can be distinguished clearly: rendered speech is encoded as complement clause of a *verbum dicendi* and may thus be considered as semantically and syntactically fully integrated into the sentence containing the *verbum dicendi*. Direct speech, if introduced by a *verbum dicendi*, constitutes its semantic argument, but is not integrated syntactically. Yet it is marked with the help of punctuation.

From the 15<sup>th</sup> until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, with a peak in the 16-17<sup>th</sup> centuries, Polish *verba dicendi* are attested with the *accusativus cum infinitivo* (AcI; 1), a code-switch to Latin (2), a combination of AcI and code-switch (3), and with complement clauses introduced by a complementizer (4).

So far, it has been assumed that the replicated AcI in Polish is a result of accident, triggered by the high prestige of Latin at that time (Kropaczek 1928), and the code-switches are traditionally labelled „maccaronisms“ and considered to be motivated stylistically (cf. Dubisz 2007: 469). However, our corpus data (from PolDi <http://rhssl1.uni-regensburg.de/SlavKo/korpus/poldi>, KorBa <http://wiki.nlp.ipipan.waw.pl/korba> and a private collection based on the Biblioteka staropolska <http://www.staropolska.pl/bibliografia/lbs/index.html>) show that both the AcI and the code-switches bear

functional load: At the time of replication, Polish complementizers are functionally underspecified in the sense that they may mark both direct (4) and rendered speech (5), and complementizers containing *-by* may be used both for marking assertive sentences (5) and the rendering of imperatives (6). Additionally, the deictic shift in rendered speech is performed only irregularly (cf. Pisarkowa 1984: 211). Thus, the AcI is the only discrete means for marking rendered speech; in the cases where code-switches go along with the AcI, the quotation is most explicitly marked as such (3). At the same time, explicit marking of (rendered) speech also means a clear distinction between the narration and the utterances of protagonists, i.e. of text in the text.

In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Polish complementizers become distributed complementarily according to functions (*że / iż* render assertive clauses and complementizers on *-by* mark conditional clauses, including rendered imperatives), and norms for the usage of punctuation marks are being established. As a result, a new discrete system for the distinction of direct and rendered speech is available. This development coincides with decreasing usage frequency of the AcI, which finally gets out of use in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

### Examples

(1) ...	<i>rzekli</i>	[ <i>bez</i>	<i>bitwy</i>	
	say-PST.3PL	without	battle-GEN	
<i>się</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>sobą</i>	<i>nie</i>	<i>rozjechać</i> ] <sub>AcI</sub>
REFL. ACC	with	REFL.INSTR	not	part_ways-INF

‘... they said that they would not part ways without a battle.’  
(Janczar. 1496–1501. *Pamiętniki*)

(2)	<i>Jedna</i>	<i>mówiła</i>	<i>vindicabit,</i>
	one- NOM.SG.F	say-PST.3SG.F	win-FUT.3SG



*druga*                      *quando?*  
other-NOM.SG.F            when

‘One said „He will win“; the other one said „When?“ (Chmielowski. 1745. *Nowe Ateny...*)

(3) ...     *przeto*            *Orpheus*            *powiedział,*     [*Jovem*  
              therefore     Orpheus-NOM say-PST.3SG.M Jupiter-ACC  
*być*        *masculum*     *et*        *feminam*]<sub>Acc</sub>  
be-INF    male-ACC     and        female-ACC

‘... for this reason Orpheus said that Jove is both male and female’  
(Górnicki. 1566. *Dworzanin polski*)

(4) ...     *święty*            *anioł*            *jest [...]*        *k*        *n{i}m*  
              holy-NOM        angel-NOM        AUX.3SG        to        him  
*tako*        *rzekł*                            *był,*            *że*        *nie*  
so        speak-PTCP.NOM.SG    AUX.3SG        COMP    not  
*bojcie się*     *wy*                            *niczego ...*  
fear-IMP.2PL    you-NOM.PL    nothing-GEN

‘... the holy angel spoke to them: „Don’t fear anything” ...’ (*Kazania nieznieńskie*. 1409)

(5) ...     *mnie*     *on*     *rzekł,*                            *aby*     *jemu*  
me     he     speak-PTCP.NOM.SG    COMP    him-DAT.SG  
*była*                            *siostra ...*  
be-PTCP.NOM.SG.F     sister-NOM

‘... to me he said that he had a sister...’ (*Biblia Królowej Zofii*. 1455)

(6)     *Apostoł*            *rozkazał*                            *smokowi,*     *aby*  
              apostle-NOM    comand-PST.3SG        dragon-DAT    COMP  
*się*            *do*     *swojej*                            *wrócił*  
return\_        to     POSS.REFL.GEN                \_return-COND.3SG  
*jaskini.*  
den-GEN

‘Apostle commanded the dragon to return to its den.’ (Chmielowski. 1745. *Nowe Ateny...*)

## References

- Dubisz, Stanisław. 2007. Wpływ łaciny na język polski. *Poradnik Językowy* 5/2007. 3–13.
- Kropaczek, Stefan. 1928. Zwrot „accusativus cum infinitivo” w języku polskim. *Prace Filologiczne* 13. 497–504.
- Pisarkowa, Krystyna. 1984. *Historia składni języka polskiego* (Prace Instytutu Języka Polskiego 52). Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

SIMEON DEKKER

University of Bern

## **Discourse organization in East Slavic reported speech: Greek influence vs. vernacular habits**

During the lengthy process of the development of its written form, Russian has absorbed and adapted various influences on the level of pragmatics. In medieval and early modern Russia, two lines of pragmatic development can be seen in written sources pertaining to 'high' and 'low' culture. Both lines exhibit textual structures of a dialogical nature that go beyond individual grammatical features; they rather belong to the domain of historical discourse analysis.

This case study builds on previous results from the analysis of speech reporting in vernacular texts, such as the birchbark and parchment letters from Novgorod. In addition, more formal texts will be investigated, as seen in a selection of religious and philosophical treatises by Iosif Volockij and Maksim Grek (15<sup>th</sup>/16<sup>th</sup> centuries).

It will be shown that dialogical features in 'low' texts stem from indigenous oral habits; in 'high' texts, however, dialogicality tends to be a constructed rhetorical device known as 'diatribe', borrowed from Classical, Biblical, patristic and Byzantine Greek; this device had been known from translated literature throughout the Middle Ages, but it only gradually became an established feature of original Russian texts.

More specifically, the dialogical features under investigation mainly concern reported speech as used in argumentation. Such dialogical elements can be quotes, opponents' questions, or other voices that are integrated into the author's own utterances.

Sometimes, these shifts of perspective are explicitly indicated by linguistic means; more often, they are not, so that the question arises how the right interpretation of each utterance's referential structure was ascertained.

One important strategy is the use of *verba dicendi* (e.g. *perce*) as discourse particles, in order to structure the flow of information, so that the right stretch of discourse is attributed to the right speaker in the (fictional) rhetorical debate. If such strategies are absent, the only solution can be of a suprasegmental (extra-grammatical) nature, which works only if the texts' audience is already familiar with this way of formulation and structuring a text.

Dialogical and oral features were already a well-known phenomenon in vernacular texts throughout the Middle Ages. The adoption of foreign dialogical elements in texts of the higher genres could thus build on already existing habits of formulation. In other words, the implementation of foreign elements was facilitated by vernacular habits of utterance and textual organization.

ALEKSANDRA DESKUR

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

## **Sentence structure and extra-linguistic reality**

In their book Zdzisława Krążyńska, Tomasz Mika and Agnieszka Słoboda (2015) notice that the tendency to autonomize the language is one of the most important developmental tendencies of the Polish syntax. One of its signs is the disconnection of the sentence structure and the sequence of events in the extra-linguistic reality (cf. Krążyńska, Mika & Słoboda 2015: 96). The aim of this paper is to explore the syntactic means used to render the sequence of events and to examine how disrupting this sequence is reflected in sentence structure. Particular questions which will be discussed are:

- Which structures are connected with keeping the extra-linguistic sequence of events? Do sentences with disrupted chronology require a greater complexity of syntactic structure (apposition and parataxis vs. hypotaxis)?
- Which structures are the most archaic ones?
- Which formal exponents of syntactic relations indicate keeping the extra-linguistic sequence of events and which show its disruption?

The problems above will be examined based on the old Polish apocrypha of The New Testament.

## References

Krzyżyńska, Zdzisława, Tomasz Mika & Agnieszka Słoboda. 2015. *Składnia średniowiecznej polszczyzny*, vol. 1: *Konteksty – metody – tendencje*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Rys.

ANDREA DI MANNO

Università degli Studi di Roma „La Sapienza”

## **The placement of OCS clitic particles as a way in OCS information-structure**

Old Church Slavonic clitic particles (*že*, *li*, *bo*) are said to occupy second position in the sentence, the so-called Wackernagel position (Zaliznjak, 2008; Migdalski, 2018). However, at a closer inspection, data reveal not only that there are different behaviours, depending on the function and on the semantics of the particle [1], but also that the domain the Wackernagel position refers to is not always the sentence itself [2]. In fact, if we take into account the punctuation of the manuscripts, we find out that these particles are consistently in second position with respect to what Gvozdanović (1993: 177) defines as “a continuous textual unit separated by periods” (see [3], where the position of *že* is accounted for by the presence of a period before *ovъцѣ*: thus, if we consider the single textual unit, *že* appears to be in the expected second position).

As pointed out by Gvozdanović for Old Russian, “we may hypothesize that medieval punctuation habits, at least in some languages, reflected the pragmatics of a text more closely than do modern punctuation rules” (Gvozdanović, 2000: 332). The latter may be said to reflect syntactic relations, rather than pragmatic.

Using data from the Tromsø Old Russian and OCS Treebank, I will show how punctuation in OCS manuscripts is useful for a better understanding of OCS information-structure and, consequently, for the rules underlying the placement of clitic particles.

I will mostly use data from Codex Marianus and Codex Zographensis, since they are aligned with the Greek text and thus

susceptible of contrastive analysis. Comparing the allosentences (see Lambrecht, 1994 for the term), I will show how important is the role played by information-structure and how the punctuation reflects the organization of information in the coding of OCS sentences.

### Examples

[1] ꙗ приѡжъ подвигъше сѧ. ꙗ обрѣтѡжъ маринѡжъ же и осифѧ.  
ꙗ младенецъ лежаштъ въ ѳслехъ. (Marianus, Luke, 2:16)

[2] ꙗ обрѣте въ цркви продажштѧ овъца и волы ꙗ голъби  
ꙗ пѣнажъникы сѣдаштъ ꙗ сътвори бичъ отъ врѣвии всѧ  
изгъна и-цркви. овъца же и волы ꙗ тръжьникомъ расъпа  
пѣнасы. ꙗ дъскы опровръже. ꙗ продажштимъ голъби  
рече. (Marianus, John, 2:14–16)

[3] ꙗ обрѣте въ цркви продажштѧ овъца и волы ꙗ голъби  
ꙗ пѣнажъникы сѣдаштъ ꙗ сътвори бичъ отъ врѣвии всѧ  
изгъна и-цркви. овъца же и волы ꙗ тръжьникомъ расъпа  
пѣнасы. ꙗ дъскы опровръже. ꙗ продажштимъ голъби  
рече. (Marianus, John, 2:14–16)

### References

- Gvozdanović, J. 1995. Parameters underlying the organization of mediæval Russian texts". In Andersen, H. (ed.). *Historical linguistics 1993*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia, 177-190.
- Gvozdanović, J. 2000. Parameters underlying punctuation in older Russian texts. In Herring, S.C. et al. (eds.). *Textual parameters in older languages*. Amsterdam, 331-352.
- Migdalski, K. 2018. The syntax of Slavic. In Klein, J. (Ed.), Joseph, B. (Ed.), Fritz, M. (Ed.), et al. *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*, vol. 3. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 1557-1571.
- Lambrecht, K. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: topic, focus and the mental representation of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



Zaliznjak, A. A. 2008. *Drevnerusskie ěnklitiki*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.



CHRISTINE GRILLBORZER

University of Freiburg

## The case of Russian *lučše* ('had better') construction: Diachronic account

In my contribution, I will describe the diachronic change in a Russian construction, consisting of *lučše*

('is better'), a facultative first dative argument and the infinitival clause, cf (1):

- (1) *Vam*                    *lučše*                    *ujti.*  
you-DAT                better(?)                leave-INF

'You should (You'd better) leave.'

The first question to answer concerns the syntactic function of *lučše*: Are we dealing here with a matrix predicate or a modifier? Both assumptions are substantiated. On the one hand, we find in Russian a productive construction type, including so-called predicatives (or category) of state, the facultative dative noun phrase and infinitive, cf. (2):

- (2) *Mne*                    *xolodno*                    *stojat'*                    *zdes'.*  
me-DAT                cold                    stay-INF                here

'I'm cold staying here.'

At the first glance, the only difference between the construction types in (1) and (2) concerns predicative's degree of comparison. On the other hand, it may also be an instance of the so-called free infinitive construction, which can express modal semantics of necessity and (im)possibility.

- (3) *Im*                    *bylo*    *ne*    *projti.*  
 them -DAT            was       NEG    come through-INF

‘They were not able to come through.’

In the latter case, *lučše* would occur in the syntactic function of the modifier (so-called sentential adverb or disjunct). After having weighted the pros and cons of the both interpretation in my research, I would like to propose the third one: Analyzing the semantics makes us aware of another difference between (1) and (2). The experiencer of the state in (2) is the person the first dative argument refers to. In (1) we are dealing with speaker’s advice or warning, addressed to the referent of the first dative argument, rather than with his or her experiential state.

As such, my first aim is to argue for the deontic sense of *lučše*. Secondly, I will outline the situation from the oldest extant texts (11th-13th centuries) up to the Present Day Russian. The investigation has been tailored to answering following questions: 1) What are the implications for the syntactical behavior of *lučše* in the history of Russian, 2) are we dealing with an instance of grammaticalization and 3) which suggestions about what has motivated the constructional change can be made.

## References

- Collins, Peter. 2009. *Modals and quasi-modals in English* (Language and Computers: Studies in Practical Linguistics 67). Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi.
- Hansen, Björn. 2001. *Das slavische Modalauxiliar. Semantik und Grammatikalisierung im Russischen, Polnischen, Serbischen/Kroatischen und Alt-kirchenslavischen*. München: Otto Sagner.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and constructional changes* (Oxford Linguistics 6). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WOJCIECH GUZ

The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

## Marking direct speech with *iz(e)*, *izci* and *ze* in Polish in the 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries

This paper traces the development of Modern Polish quotative *ze* compared to 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century quotative *iz(e)/izci*. ‘Quotative’ is understood here narrowly to mean the function of introducing direct speech, i.e. quotation. Relevant data are given in (1–3), representing the 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, respectively. The data sample used in the study consists of 587 tokens of direct quotation: 58 from a collection of 15<sup>th</sup> century texts, 377 from 16<sup>th</sup> century texts, and 152 examples from Scopes – a spoken conversational corpus of contemporary Polish.

The first part focuses on *ze*-quotation today. As will be claimed, Modern Polish *ze* is a quotative marker that is used virtually exclusively in unplanned colloquial speech, unlike *iz(e)/izci*, which are attested in 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century texts (cf. the relevant entries in *Słownik staropolski*, *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*). I will also argue in favour of recognizing a functional and distributional split between the complementizer *ze* (Comp) and the quotative *ze* (Quot) indicating that the two types of *ze* are two distinct elements in the contemporary grammar of Polish. Some of the differences between Comp and Quot pertain to **function**: attaching complement clauses vs. quoting speech acts, respectively, including quotation of speech, thought, constructed discourse (i.e. imagined speech), facial expressions, attitudes; Quot-introduced clauses are often prosodically marked as quotations by pausing and/or distinct intonational delivery signalling another ‘voice’. They also receive focus and convey

dramatization of discourse. Other differences pertain to **distribution**: (a) association with vs. dissociation from head elements; (b) obligatoriness vs. optionality, as in (3); (c) contrasting distributions relative to left and right context, as in (3); (d) (non)-constituency; (e) the possibility of joint occurrence of Comp and Quot in appropriately constructed examples, as in (4); the possibility of joint occurrence of Quot with other semantic types of *że*; (g) availability vs. unavailability to act as a host for person-and-number clitics, see (5).

The second part concentrates on the diachronic development of Quot. It will be claimed that Quot and Comp have diachronically diverged from each other and specialized more narrowly in their quotative and complementizer functions, respectively. On the other hand, *iz(e)/izci* in 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries are better seen as general speech-introducing particles (or quotative complementizers) used indiscriminately for direct and indirect reports. This conclusion is based on two differences between *iz(e)/izci*-quotation in the 15<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> centuries and *że*-quotation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: (i) the relative formal rigidity of Quot compared to *iz(e)/izci*, and (ii) expansion of Quot to quote constructed discourse besides actual speech.

First, the historical quotative complementizer includes multiple forms: *iz*, *ize*, *izci*, *że*. Also, Old Polish early Middle Polish *iz(e)/izci* can introduce direct speech and at the same time act as host elements for 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. clitics, as in (6). The ending *-smy* belongs to the verb (cf. *ize wzięliśmy*) but it is also free to cliticize onto *ize* and be separated from the verb. This results in tighter integration and syntactic connectivity across the *ize*+“quoted speech” complex. This marks an intermediate stage between a quotative and a complementizer, and constitutes a contrast between *iz(e)/izci* then and Quot today. As shown in (5), Quot today cannot act as a host for mobile clitics. It has since specialized further in its quotative function and keeps its morpho-syntactic distance from the quoted material.

Second, the historical data feature *iz(e)/izci* linked to speech verbs or nominals related to speech, with only one exception to

this pattern. Today, Quot has become more generalized and enjoys a degree of freedom from speech verbs or speech-related nominals, see (7).

The above clues indicate that the split between Quot and Comp in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries was not as well-defined as it is today, suggesting that since then Quot has further specialized in its function and consolidated its status, its separateness.

(1) (*Kazania gnieźnieńskie*, 2a, lines 7–9)

Pożądali są wierni krześcijani przyścia jego a rzekąc tako, iże przydzi ty k nam, nasz miły Panie Boże.

‘Anxious are the faithful Christians to see his arrival, and (they are) saying as follows IŻE “Come, thou, to us, our dear Lord.”’

(2) (Mikołaj Rej *Apokalipsis*, 167)

á iż Pan ná cię woła y ná wŹytki fwoie/ iŹci was nie zoftáwię Źirotkám/ iŹci ia was nie opuŹczę

‘And the Lord calls upon you and all his (people) IŻCI “I will not leave you as orphans”, IŻCI “I will not abandon you”’

(3) (Spokes; parentheses indicate optionality; że is present in Spokes)

yyy jakoś tak padło pytanie (<sup>OK</sup>że<sub>QUOT</sub>)/\*że<sub>COMP</sub> “A czy masz faceta?”

‘And this question was raised ŻE “And do you have a boyfriend?”’

(4) (constructed)

A: I na co to jest dowód?

B: Że<sub>comp</sub> w Polsce pociągi w ogóle nie jeżdżą

C: (reporting) no i ona tak „I na co to jest dowód?”, a on że<sub>QUOT</sub> “Że<sub>COMP</sub> w Polsce pociągi w ogóle nie jeżdżą.”

A: ‘What does it prove?’

B: ‘THAT there’s no train service in Poland at all.’

C: (reporting) ‘She’s like “What does it prove?”, and he **ŻE**<sub>QUOT</sub> “**THAT** there’s no train service in Poland at all.”

(5) (based on Spokes)

(a) Powiedział, <sup>OK</sup>**żeśmy**<sub>COMP+PROTH</sub> my mu humor trochę poprawili.

(b) A on (mówi) <sup>OK</sup>**że**<sub>QUOT</sub> “Wy żeście mi humor trochę poprawili”

(c) A on (mówi) <sup>\*</sup>**żeście**<sub>QUOT+PROTH</sub> “Wy mi humor trochę poprawili”

(6) (*Rozmyślanie przemyskie*, p. 360)

A oni myśleli między sobą rzekąc, **iżesmy** chleba nie wzięli.

‘And they thought among one another saying **IŻE**-1PL “(We) hadn’t taken any bread.”’

(7) (Spokes; speakers discuss a TV commercial and its advertising slogan)

A: Nie, to jest Era

B: To jest Era?

A: Tak, że „Miej zasady, łam zasady”

A: ‘No, it’s Era’

B: ‘It’s Era?’

A: ‘Yes, **ŻE** “Have rules, break the rules”’

## References

- Mayenowa, Maria Renata, Franciszek Peplowski & Krzysztof Mrowcewicz (eds.). 1966–. *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*, vol. 1-. Wrocław – Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo PAN – Wydawnictwo Instytutu Badań Literackich PAN.
- Pęzik, Piotr. 2019. *Spokes (corpus and exploration service)*. <http://spokes.clarin-pl.eu>
- Urbańczyk, Stanisław (ed.). 1953–2002. *Słownik staropolski*, vol. 1–11. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.



BEÁTA GYÖRFI

University of Debrecen

## A Topical Problem: Subjects, Word Order and Clitics in Old Russian Chronicles

The question of Old Russian word order is a long debated but still unsolved issue. In historical grammars of Russian we can find various opinions concerning this question: Borkovskiy (1949: 140), Borkovskiy-Kuznecov (1963) claim that similarly to Present Day Russian, Old Russian (OR) had SVO order, while Berneker (1900), Zhivov (2008) and Mitrenina, Romanova, Slioussar (2012) point out that Old Russian manuscripts displayed VS order.

A quantitative analysis of clauses of the Suzdal Chronicle (Györfi 2018) shows that structures with preposed subjects prevailed:

Number of clauses	Number of explicit subjects	SV	VS	zhe
6506	2570	1315	1199	452

However, interpreting the rough numbers we should also bear in mind, that a considerable number of explicit subjects (especially pronominal subjects) is followed by clitics (the clitic *же* for example is present in 452 cases).

Clitization was the main means of topicalization in Old Russian. By topicalizing the subject, it is moved leftward from its original position in Spec,IP. Therefore, by simply counting clauses with SV orders we get a falsified picture of the position of the subject in Old Russian.

The present study aims at:

1. defining the canonical subject position in Old Russian. It is assumed, that OR had VS order and it was a canonical pro-drop language. OR chronicles do not provide examples with adverbs to define the canonical subject position, so we need to rely on the quantitative analysis of explicit subjects, where topicalized examples are excluded.

2. examining the problem of topicalization. In doing so, I will rely on Zaluzniak's monograph (Залиняк: 2008). For our purposes clitics of the first five ranks (же, ли, бо, ти, бы) are of special interest. These clitics occupy the P<sub>2</sub> (Wackernagel position) and display the following distribution:

XP – CL- V- S – (1), (2)

V – CL – S – (3)

S – CL – V – (4), (5)

Examples with „split phrases” (6), where the clitic intervenes in the phrase are of special interest.

Clitics will be dealt with in the Minimalist perspective, as functional heads occupying the leftward possible position. (Franks 1999)

3. The study makes possible the typological characterization of the language of chronicles. As Kosta and Zimmerling (2013) point out Slavic languages can be classified into four groups according to their systems of clitics: C-systems, W-systems, W+-systems and W\*- systems. We can also see, how the principles regulating clitic positions (Template Principle, Constituency Conditions and Barrier Rules) worked.

### Examples (from the Suzdal Chronicle):

(1) Пото<sup>м</sup> же оуслышавше Половци .

(2) Аѣрополку бо вѣсть есть

(3) вн же заповѣдь Бѣю хранѣ добро твораше враго<sup>м</sup> своимъ.

- (4) князь же Ярополкъ . оукрѣпивьса Бѣю помощю .  
(5) Ярополчи бо бяхуть посадници . по всеи Семи .  
(6) князь же Ярополкъ . оукрѣпивьса Бѣю помощю .

### References

- Berneker, E. 1900. *Die Wortfolge in den slavischen Sprachen*. Berlin
- Franks, S. 1999. Clitics in Slavic. In *The Slavic and East European Language Resource Center*. <http://seelrc.org/glossos/>
- Györfi V. 2018. Диахронное изменение параметра ЕРР в русском языке (на основе анализа текста Суздальской летописи по Лаврентьевкому смиску. *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 63(1), 39-47.
- Kosta, P., Zimmerling, A. 2013. Slavic Clitics: A typology. *STUF, Akademie Verlag*, 66(2), 178- 214
- Борковский, В. И. 1949. *Синтаксис древнерусских грамот*. Львов.
- Борковский, В. И., Кузнецов П.С. 1963. *Историческая грамматика русского языка*. Москва
- Живов, В. М. 2008. Референтная структура и порядок слов. Дателный самостоятельный в двух древних церковнославянских текстах. *Русский язык в научном освещении* 2008(1), 5–56.
- Зализняк, А. А. 2008. *Древнерусские энклитики*. Москва.
- Митренина, О.В., Романова, Е.Е., Слюсарь, Н.А. 2012. *Введение в генеративную грамматику*. Москва.



PAVEL KOSEK, RADEK ČECH & OLGA NAVRÁTILOVÁ

Masaryk University, University of Ostrava & Masaryk University

## On the development of the Czech pronominal enclitics in the finite VP in Older Czech Bibles

The paper is focused on the set of the short pronominal forms that have status of constant enclitics / enclitica tantum / “stálé příklonky” in Modern Czech: *mi* ‘me’, *ti* ‘to you’, *si* ‘to myself’ / ‘to yourself’ etc.; *ho* ‘him’, *mu* ‘to him’; *se* ‘myself’ / ‘yourself’ etc., *tě* ‘you’. The development of the Czech enclitics is characterized by the competition of the postinitial and contact position (Kosek 2011, Kosek et al. 2018a,b). This competition can be demonstrated by Ertl’s (1924) examples or their variants that include the reflexive enclitic *se* and following phrases:

starý strom = ‘old tree’  
(old<sub>NOM.M.SG</sub> tree<sub>NOM.M.SG</sub>)

skácel se = ‘fell’  
(fall<sub>PART.PRET.ACT.M.SG + REFLACC</sub>)

rázem = ‘suddenly’

v zahradě = ‘in the garden’  
(in garden<sub>LOC.F.SG</sub>)

The postinitial position is common in clauses whose first phrase consists of one word, which is shown by the examples (1a.) and (1b.). If the first phrase of a clause is modified, then the (en)clitic can appear

1. after the first stressed word in the middle of the first phrase, which is shown in ex. (1c.), 2. after the first modified phrase shown

in ex. (1d.). In Older Czech texts, the number of examples of the postinitial position in clauses with the modified first phrase is small. It seems that the authors avoided these positions of enclitics.

- (1) a. [rázem] se [starý strom] [v zahradě] [skácel]  
 b. [v zahradě] se [starý strom] [skácel] [rázem]  
 c. [starý]<sub>1</sub> se<sub>2</sub> [strom]<sub>1</sub> [rázem]<sub>3</sub> [skácel]<sub>2</sub> [v zahradě]<sub>4</sub>  
 d. [starý strom]<sub>1</sub> se<sub>2</sub> [rázem]<sub>3</sub> [skácel]<sub>2</sub> [v zahradě]<sub>4</sub>

The less frequent position of the Older Czech enclitics is the contact position. This position occurs also in several variants (Kosek 2011; Kosek et al. 2018a,b,c): 1. a postverbal position of an enclitic after its superordinate verb – in the middle of the clause (ex. (2a.)) or at the end of the clause (ex. (2b.)), 2. a preverbal position of an enclitic before its verb – in the middle of the clause (ex. (2c.)) or in the prefinal / penultimate position in the clause (ex. (2d.)):

- (2) a. [starý strom]<sub>1</sub> [skácel se]<sub>2</sub> [v zahradě]<sub>3</sub> [rázem]<sub>4</sub>  
 b. [starý strom]<sub>1</sub> [v zahradě]<sub>2</sub> [rázem]<sub>3</sub> [skácel se]<sub>4</sub>  
 c. [starý strom]<sub>1</sub> [rázem]<sub>2</sub> [se skácel]<sub>3</sub> [v zahradě]<sub>4</sub>  
 d. [starý strom]<sub>1</sub> [v zahradě]<sub>2</sub> [rázem]<sub>3</sub> [se skácel]<sub>4</sub>

The paper is based on the material gained from the Older Czech Bibles translated in the different period (Kyas 1997), esp. *Dresdner Bible* (second half 14<sup>th</sup> century), *Olomouc Bible* (1417), *Miller's Bible* (second half 15<sup>th</sup> century), *Kralice Bible* (1579–1593), *St. Wenceslaus Bible* (1677–1715).

The aim of the paper is to analyze, how these texts reflect the historical competition of the postinitial and contact position and which factors influence the contact position. The previous research shows that the contact position was motivated (Kosek 2011; Kosek et al. 2018a,b,c): a) by style, b) by rhythmic rules, c) the complexity of the clause, d) by the original pretext, e) by the information structure. The paper focuses esp. on the possible influence of the

information structure on the placement of the enclitics (for Modern Czech, it attested by several scholars – Franks, King 2000; Uhlířová, Kosta, Veselovská 2016).

### References

- Ertl, V. 1924. Příspěvek k pravidlu o postavení příklonek. *Naše řeč* 8, 257–268, 293–309.
- Franks, S. – King, T. H. 2000. *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford.
- Junghanns, U. 2002. Klitische Elemente im Tschechischen: eine kritische Bestandaunahme. In Daiber, Th. (ed.) *Linguistische Beiträge zur Slavistik* 9. München, 117–150.
- Kosek, Pavel. 2011. *Enklitika v češtině barokní doby*. Brno.
- Kosek, Pavel., Čech, Radek, Navrátilová, Olga. 2018a. Slovosled staročeských pronominálních enklitik závislých na VF ve staročeské bibli 1. redakce. *Slavia* 87(1–3), 189–204.
- Kosek, Pavel., Čech, Radek, Navrátilová, Olga, Mačutek, J. 2018b. On the Development of Old Czech (En)clitics. *Glottometrics* 40 (1), 51–62.
- Kosek, Pavel., Čech, Radek, Navrátilová, Olga, Mačutek, J. 2018c. Word order of reflexive “sě” in finite verb phrases in the first edition of the Old Czech Bible translation. Part I., Part II. *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*, in print.
- Kyas, V. 1997. *Česká Bible v dějinách národního písemnictví*. Praha.
- Uhlířová, L, Kosta, P., Veselovská, L. 2016. Entry Klitika. In *Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Praha.





ANNA KOZŁOWSKA

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw

## **Interpretation of utterances in old artistic texts: The case of Cyprian Norwid (1821–1883)**

Studies on the syntax of individual authors usually refer to categories developed for describing the language system; so they focus on the syntactic structure, pushing into the background or even omitting other levels of an utterance, including those particularly important for the utterances' interpretation, such as the thematic-rhematic structure, the semantic structure, the word order, and some metatextual components. The proposed research is intended to overcome this limit by attempting to describe "the current organization of utterances" (Wajszczuk 2005: 30) in some texts by Cyprian Norwid (1821– 1883).

Previous attempts to characterize the Norwid's utterance structure were constructed basically in the stylistic paradigm, with possible references to the historical-linguistic background. They seem highly insufficient and lead even to the conclusion that in Norwid's writings "in many cases there is no syntax at all" (Fik 1930: 35). Sometimes such assertions are accompanied by attempts to explain or even justify the problems with Norwid's sentence building, naming impactful factors of the history of the Polish language (the weakness of the nineteenth-century norm, the multiplicity of existing variations and changes), as well as biographical and psychological ones (the role of foreign languages, the emotionality of expression, the carelessness of the author) and artistic determinants (stylization, innovative structures). However, a closer look at all the studies on the syntax in Norwid's texts allows us to argue that the research on

this issue is primarily constructed by the fundamental methodological problem. First of all, each of these descriptions, aiming at the characteristics of the tendencies in the text, concentrates only on the syntactic structure.

Norwid's texts, due to the poet's particular linguistic sensitivity, the multiplicity of sender–receiver relations, as well as the role of orality, constitute an excellent “laboratory” that shows the specificity and possibilities of the proposed approach that can be expressed as follows: Norwid's syntax is the syntax of speech, not of structure and writing; describing it in terms of dependency syntax is imposing today's way of thinking on the old texts. For understanding utterances by Norwid (and other former authors), we need to take into account the functional organization of sentences. That main thesis is to be supported and illustrated in the presentation.

### References

- Fik, Ignacy. 1930. *Uwagi nad językiem Cyprjana Norwida* (Prace Historycznoliterackie 34). Kraków–Warszawa: Skł. gł. Kasa im. J. Mianowskiego.
- Wajszczuk, Jadwiga. 2005. *O metatekście*. Warszawa: Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej UW.

Ольга В. Курьянова

МГУ имени М.В. Ломоносова

## **Влияние семантики прилагательного на его место в линейном порядке в старославянском, древнерусском и старорусском языке**

Прилагательные – одна из типологически наиболее «свободных» в плане линейного порядка категорий. Один из наиболее интересных подходов к моделированию линейной позиции прилагательного предложила «картографическая» лингвистическая традиция, опирающаяся на различие в семантике прилагательных. Как было впервые обнаружено в Dixon (1977) и далее показано в Scott (2002) и Cinque Cinque (1993, 2010), друг относительно друга прилагательные в разных языках имеют тенденцию упорядоченного линейного расположения:

Субъективная оценка > Размер > Длина > Высота > Скорость > Глубина > Ширина > Вес > Температура > Влажность > Возраст > Форма > Цвет > Происхождение > Материал (Scott 2002)

Для современного русского языка в рамках эксперимента (Pereltsvaig 2007) и в корпусном исследовании (Толдова & Муханова 2017) также показано существование такой тенденции. Отдельный интерес на этом фоне представляет вопрос об эволюции линейного порядка атрибутивных прилагательных.

В данном докладе будут представлены результаты, основанные на данных, полученных в ходе исследования 14 наиболее объемных текстов из корпуса The TOROT Treebank, представляющего собой совокупность отдельных текстов, написанных на старославянском, древнерусском и старорусском языке,

размеченных морфосинтаксически с помощью «Universal dependencies». Из данного подкорпуса были извлечены все краткие и полные прилагательные в атрибутивной функции, для каждой лексемы семантически размечена принадлежность к одному из классов: размер (*великъ, болии, маленькыи*), срок (*новъ, ветъхъ*), оценка (*благыи, скврнь*), посессивное (*стефановъ, невѣфталимль*), цвет (*чрънь, краснь*), материал (*хольщовыи, зуфряныи*), происхождение (*рязаньскыи, гондустаньскыи*).

В отличие от аналогичных исследований современных языков, которые требуют сочетания нескольких прилагательных в группе для установления их взаимного отношения, в данном случае предлагается методика, требующая всего одного прилагательного в группе, что позволяет оперировать большим объемом материала в ходе анализа.

В рассмотренном материале обнаружены признаки упорядоченности семантических классов прилагательных, которая проявляется по шкале тяготения к пре- или постпозиции к существительному и, по-видимому, не является объектом языковых изменений. Взаимное отношение семантических классов имеет тенденцию сохраняться вне зависимости от эволюции проанализированных смежных грамматических категорий: т.е. классы, располагающиеся в левой части представленной выше иерархии, больше тяготеют к распределению левее от существительного-вершины независимо от того, полная перед нами форма атрибутивного прилагательного или краткая, и того, к какому периоду она относится. Например, полные прилагательные со значением материала в препозиции к существительному встречаются, в среднем, в ~45% случаев, а полные прилагательные со значением оценки – в ~85% случаев.

## Литература

- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1993. On the Evidence for Partial N-Movement in the Romance DP. *Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 3(2). 21–40.

- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2010. *The Syntax of Adjectives. A Comparative Study* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 57). Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1977. Where have all the adjectives gone? *Studies in Language* 1(1). 19–80.
- Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2007. The universality of DP: A view from Russian. *Studia Linguistica* 61(1). 59–94.
- Scott, Gary-John. 2002. Stacked adjectival modification and the structure of nominal phrases. In Guglielmo Cinque (ed.), *Functional structure in DP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 1, 91–120. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press.
- Толдова, С. Ю. & Р. В. Муханова. 2017. Порядок следования прилагательных разных семантических классов в русском языке в свете корпусных данных. In А. А. Белкина (ed.), *Компьютерная лингвистика и интеллектуальные технологии. По материалам ежегодной международной конференции «Диалог» (2017)*, vol. 2: *Компьютерная лингвистика: лингвистические исследования* (16), 429–441. Москва: Изд-во РГГУ.



IMKE MENDOZA

Salzburg University

## Topicalization strategies in Old Russian literacy

Topicalization strategies in Old Russian come in many forms and are subject to various conditions. Overt topic marking can be achieved by using connectors (cf. *a* (1)), prepositions (cf. *pro* in (2)), relative pronouns (cf. *ežb to* in (3)) or particles (cf. *že* in (4)) and others.

(1) а обезьяны : то тѣ живутъ по лесу (Afanasij Nikitin, Troickij izvod 375v) ‘and the monkeys they live in the woods’

(2) про **ѸЦАКЪ** пришли ко мни грамоту с кимъ будешъ послалъ (Gramoty, Novg. 358, 14th c.)

‘about the helmet, send me a gramota, with whom you are going to send it’

(3) **ЕЖЬ ТО** [Т]и есьмь послала ꙗ резане михальви на повои да же ти вѣ-далъ (Gramoty, Novg. 682, 1160-1180)

‘about [the fact that] I sent Mixal’ three rezany for the headscarf: may he give [it] away’

(4) Михаилъ царь изиде с вои брегомъ и моремъ на болгары Болгаре же увидевше, не могоша стати против (LL, 7)

‘Michael the emperor went forth with his troops by land and sea against the Bulgarians. The Bulgarians, having seen them, could not stand against them’ (Translation Ickler 1977, 659)

The topicalization markers vary over genres. While connectors

and prepositions prevail in non-bookish genres, particles such as *že* are typical for Church Slavic documents.

In my presentation, I will analyze the origin and development of topic markers in different genres from the from the 11<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> centuries. The data will be taken from the following sources: the Old Russian birch bark documents (11<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> c.), *Afanasij Nikitin* (15<sup>th</sup> c.), *gramoty* from Novgorod and Pskov (GVNP; 13<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> c.), *Izbornik 1076 g.*, *Žitie Andreja Jurodivogo* (12<sup>th</sup> c.), *Novgorodskaja 1-aja letopis'*, *Sinodal'nyj spisok* (14<sup>th</sup> c.). These documents provide a cross section of different genres, both bookish and non-bookish, hence the outcome of the analysis allows for careful generalization.

### References

- Afanasij Nikitin = Lur'e, Ja. S.; Semenov, L. (eds.) 1986. *Choženie za tri morja Afanasija Nikitina*. Leningrad: Izdat. Nauka.
- Gramoty = *Drevnerusskie berestjanye gramoty*. www.gramoty.ru
- GVNP = Valk, S.N. (red.) 1949. *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova*. Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR.
- Ickler, N. 1977. Topicalization and Relativization in Old Russian. In Whistler K. et al. (eds.). *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley, 656-669.
- LL = *Lavrent'evskaja letopis'*. <http://expositions.nlr.ru/LaurentianCodex>.
- Mendoza, I. 2007. Relativsätze in den Birkenrindentexten. In: Junghanns, U. (ed.), *Linguistische Beiträge zur Slavistik XIII*. München: Sagner, 49-62.
- Mendoza, I. 2017. Unbestimmtheit und Eindeutigkeit in der Syntax von Afanasij Nikitin. In: Meyer, A.-M.; Reinkowski, L. (eds.), *Im Rhythmus der Linguistik. Festschrift für Sebastian Kempgen zum 65. Geburtstag*. Bamberg: Bamberg Press, 347-360.
- Nacional'nyj korpus russkogo jazyka. www.ruscorpora.ru
- Zaliznjak, A.A. 1987. Tekstovaja struktura drevnerusskix pisem na bereste. In: Civ'jan, TV. (otv. red.), *Issledovanija po strukture teksta*. Moskva: Nauka, 147-182.
- Zaliznjak, A.A. 2004. *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- Živov, V.M. 2017. *Istorija jazyka russkoj pis'mennosti*. Moskva: Universitet Dmitrija Požarskogo.



TOMASZ MIKA

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

## **How to Establish the Boundary of a Sentence in Mediaeval Vernacular Texts? Methodological Queries**

The paper results from the experiences of the author gathered in two research areas. The first one includes an attempt to describe the syntax of the Old Polish language (cf. Krążyńska, Mika & Słoboda 2015), syntactical characteristics of functional expressions (cf. Mika & Słoboda 2015) and the description of syntax of the earliest text containing a succession of Polish sentences, i.e., Latin-Polish *Kazania świętokrzyskie* (cf. Krążyńska & Mika 2018). The second area includes the studies into mediaeval delimitation and punctuation introduced to the transcription of Polish mediaeval texts by publishers (cf. Mika 2012, Mika & Ziółkowska 2017).

The author, although accepting the possibility to conduct studies into mediaeval Polish without isolating sentences, contends that without making a decision in this regard we cannot formulate general statements regarding the length of a sentence in the Middle Ages and the degree of its complexity.

Because of this reason, despite the fact that the isolation of sentences in mediaeval texts in compliance with the intention of their writers is – in most cases – impossible, the author proposes a multi-stage and multi-level analytical procedure which leads to the establishment of “a syntactical strategy” and “a punctuation strategy” for individual texts. Within the framework of this procedure, the

grammatical aspects become equally important as the textological ones (type of text, its genetic multi-layered structure, relationship with the sources, etc.).

The examples assembled in the paper originate from Polish and Czech mediaeval sermons and apocrypha.

### References

- Krażyńska, Zdzisława & Tomasz Mika. 2018. „Kazania świętokrzyskie” w perspektywie tekstowej i ogólnojęzykowej. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Rys.
- Krażyńska, Zdzisława, Tomasz Mika & Agnieszka Słoboda. 2015. *Składnia średniowiecznej polszczyzny*, vol. 1: Konteksty – metody – tendencje. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Rys.
- Mika, Tomasz. 2012. „Kazania świętokrzyskie” – od rękopisu do zrozumienia tekstu (Filologia Polska 132). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.
- Mika, Tomasz & Agnieszka Słoboda. 2015. *Wyrażenia funkcyjne w średniowiecznej polszczyźnie z perspektywy składniowej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Rys.
- Mika, Tomasz & Olga Ziółkowska. 2017. Jak wprowadzać interpunkcję do transkrypcji tekstu staropolskiego? In Karolina Borowiec, Dorota Maslej, Tomasz Mika & Dorota Rojszczak-Robińska (eds.), *Jak wydawać teksty dawne* (Staropolskie Spotkania Językoznawcze 2), 105–125. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Rys.

MARCIN PODLASKI

Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

## **Contextual determinants of three dative functions in older Slavic languages**

In this paper, I would like to present the results of my research on the former Slavonic dative. In his work, Zdzisław Kempf analyses functions of *dativus*, *allativus* and *finalis*, considering them to be a different grammatical cases. However, I aim at proving that in fact, it is the dative that surprisingly performed several functions in Slavonic (and the other ones can be considered its variants). This is indicated by the closest context in which the dative appears, the context of the noun (the carrier of the case form) and the context of the verb. For each of the three functions of dative mentioned, such a context differs in an interesting way. To notice this, it is necessary to delve into the semantics of the sentences appearing in texts. The aforementioned factors differ considerably for each of the three dative functions. To notice this, one needs to delve the semantics of the sentences. My analyses are based on the corpora of ancient Slavic languages (Old Church Slavonic, Old Russian, Old Czech, Old Polish), such as *Cyrrillomethodiana*, *Национальный корпус русского языка*, *Staročeská textová banka*, *Electronic Corpus of Polish texts from the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries (until 1772)* *KorBa*, as well as the collection of the *Library of Monuments of the Polish medieval literature*. The analysis is crowned by conclusions and perspectives for further research.



DANIEL SAX

University of Warsaw

## **The pathway to Polish *TO*: from deixis to quantification to information structure**

The primary use of Polish *TO* is as a neuter deictic pronoun, as in (1). However, *TO* also has several information-structure related uses, appearing both in Polish *it-clefts* (when clause-initial), as in (2), and *topicalization* structures (when non-initial), as in (3).

In these information-structural uses, *TO* is routinely analyzed in Polish linguistics as a particle devoted to expressing information structure, explicitly marking the partition between putative universal categories (be it ‘theme’/‘rheme’ or ‘topic’/‘focus’, etc.), and as such providing tangible evidence of the existence of such categories (e.g. Huszcza 2000). On this view, Polish *TO* poses a direct challenge to some more recent approaches to information structure, questioning the theoretical necessity and psychological reality of such categories as ‘theme’/‘rheme’ or ‘topic’/‘focus’ and instead striving to explain similar information-structural effects in terms of the dynamic interaction of more general principles – e.g. Sperber & Wilson (1995: 202–217), Cann et al. (2005), Wedgwood (2005), Matic̆ & Wedgwood (2013).

However, *TO* also has a wide range of other uses in Polish, including for instance ones typically analyzed as a conjunction (4), copula (5), and emphatic particle (6). These other uses, I argue, offer considerable insight into the overall function of Polish *TO* and the potential source of its information-structural functions as in (2–3). I suggest that *quantification* is a common thread shared by the meaning of *TO* in all of (2)–(6).

Quantification over situations is readily apparent in the conditional (4), over entities in the identificational (5). In the other examples (2, 3, 6), I propose, this function of *TO* is pressed into service mid-utterance, quantifying over partial representations (as online interpretation is underway), to yield the observed effects. The analysis I propose draws in part upon the processing model outlined by Wedgwood (2007) and more broadly upon the model of comprehension proposed by Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson 1995 and many others).

I also briefly examine some partly similar devices in other Slavic languages – Serbian ‘event pronominal’ *TO* (Progovać 1998), Czech *TO*-clefts (Šimík 2009), and Russian *ETO*-clefts / contrastive particle *-TO* (Junghanns 1989; McCoy 2003) – for further insight into the possible pathway by which the IS-like uses of Polish *TO* may have historically developed from its primary use as a neuter deictic pronoun, as in (1). The conjectured pathway to information-structural effects (deixis → quantification → information structure) is different than, for instance, any of those discussed in Radetzky’s (2002) cross-linguistic study of the origin of IS markers or in Matic & Wedgwood (2013).

- (1) *Widziałem to już wcześniej.*  
 ‘I’ve seen it already before.’ [TO = ‘this/that/it’]
- (2) *To JANEK gra w brydża.*  
 ‘It’s John who plays bridge.’ [TO = it-cleft device]
- (3) *JANEK w BRYDŻA to gra w PIĄTKI.*  
 ‘As far as John and bridge are concerned, he plays on Fridays.’  
 [TO = topic marker]
- (4) *Jeśli CHCESZ, to PRZYJDE.*  
 ‘If you want, then I’ll come.’ [TO = ‘then, in that case’]
- (5) *Moja najlepsza PRZYJACIÓŁKA to ANNA.*  
 ‘My best friend is Anna.’ [TO = ‘be’]
- (6) *JANEK to PŁYWA!*  
 ‘John can really swim!’ [TO = emphatic particle]

## References

- Cann, R., Kempson, R., Marten, L. 2005. *The Dynamics of Language*. Elsevier.
- Huszczka, R. 2000. Nie ma żeby nie było. *Poradnik Językowy* 8, 1–8.
- Junghanns, U. 1997. On the so-called *èto*-cleft construction. In: Lindseth, M., Franks, S. (Eds.), *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics. The Indiana Meeting of 1996*. Michigan Slavic Publications, Ann Arbor, 166–190.
- Matić, D., & Wedgwood, D. 2013. The Meanings of Focus: The Significance of an Interpretation-Based Category in Cross-Linguistic Analysis. *Journal of Linguistics* 49 (1), 127–163
- McCoy, S. 2003. Set-evoking particles. In: van der Wouden, T., Foolen, A. and Van de Craen, P. (Eds). *Particles [Belgian Journal of Linguistics 16]*, 93–104.
- Progovać, L. (1998) Event pronominal *to*. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 6, 3–39.
- Radetzky, P. (2002) *The Functions and Evolution of Topic and Focus Markers*. PhD, University of California, Berkeley.
- Šimík, R., 2009. The syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of the focus particle *to* in Czech. In: Zybatow, G., Junghanns, U., Lenertová, D., Biskup, P. (Eds.), 2009. *Studies in Formal Slavic Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics and Information Structure: Proceedings of FDSL 7, Leipzig 2007*. Peter Lang, 329–342.
- Sperber, D. & D. Wilson. [1986]1995 *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wedgwood, D. (2005). *Shifting the Focus: From static structures to the dynamics of interpretation*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.





AGNIESZKA SŁOBODA & PIOTR SOBOTKA

Adam Mickiewicz University & Nicolaus Copernicus University

## The origin of the Slavic infinitive and the development of its syntactic functions

### I

All Slavic verb forms can be divided into finite and non-finite forms (also termed indefinite, nominal or impersonal forms). The non-finite forms do not bound the morphemes of grammatical tense, mood or person and usually play a function of the syntactically dependent element. The inventory of non-finite Slavonic forms consists the participles, the infinitive, and the supine. The infinitives, beyond relics of the type *направи, каза, говори, вдава*, etc., do not appear in Modern Bulgarian and Macedonian while the supines do appear only in Modern Slovenian and Lower Sorbian. The supine is a combinatorial variant of the infinitive, and it appears after verbs of movement, cf. *šel spat* 'he did something (lit. went) to go to sleep/bed'. The markers of the Slavonic infinitive are the reflexes of PS. \*-*ti*, cf. Pol. and USorb. -*ć*, LSorb. -*ś*, Slovak -*t'*, Cz. -*t*, Sorb./Cro. -*ti*, Russ. -*t'* or -*t'i*, and in some historically grounded cases -*c/c'* or -*č'* (cf. Pol. *móc*, Russ. *мочь*). The formal marker of the supine in both Slovenian and Upper Sorbian languages is ending -*t*, as in *spat, delat* (cf. Dalewska-Greń 2012: 367–370). In most of the Slavic languages, the supine was replaced by the infinitive already in the preliterate period; however, Proto-Slavic had morphologically distinct categories of the infinitive and the supine. The paper aims to investigate the origin and syntactic functions of the Slavonic infinitive in the diachronic perspective.

There is little information about the Slavonic derivative termed infinitive in the literature (cf. Jeffers 1975). The scholars present different and even opposing opinions on the origin of the Proto-Slavic infinitive (cf. Moszyński 2012, Olander 2015). Most common observations limit to the conclusion that the infinitive is, in origin, a verbal noun of a specific derivational type which has become fixed in either dative of the deverbal nouns (cf. Moszyński 2012: 325) or locative of the *i*-stem nouns (cf. Olander 2015: 172) and subsequently incorporated into the verbal system. Accusative case of the *u*-stem nouns should also be considered, given that the etymologically and functionally the supine is to be equated with the Balto-Slavic infinitive. In Proto-Slavic the dative ending of the *i*-stem nouns differ from the locative ending in the tone as well as the length of the vowel, accordingly  $*-e\bar{i} \leq$  Proto-Balto-Slavic  $*-e\bar{i}$  and  $*-\bar{e}i \leq$  Proto-Balto-Slavic  $*-'e\bar{i}$ . The comparative data shows that forms such as PS  $-*e\bar{i}$  and  $*-'e\bar{i}$  may be viewed as different ablaut forms of an original dative-locative inflection. The only difference between them is the length of the vowel. It is possible to assume that dative ending continues  $*-e\bar{i}$  which presumably arose from PIE  $*-eyei$  by haplology while locative ending – PIE  $*-\bar{e}i$ . Besides that, according to Kuryłowicz (1964: 190) Indo-European dative is genetically an offshoot of the locative. An obvious example of this is the Slavic infinitive. We assume that this form of verb arose from the dative-locative *i*-stem deverbative abstract nouns and – what is more important – dative and locative were not distinguished in Indo-European (cf. Adrados 1988) as well as the distinction between the cases in Proto-Slavic, insofar as it existed, was secondary in their function. The marker of the infinitive is the nominalizing suffix *-t-* followed by a case ending. On the other hand, a petrified old accusative is represented by infinitives used after verbs of motion to denote the goal, and functionally corresponds to the Slavic supine.

The IE infinitive should be considered as a nominalization of the verb. The primary functional status of such deverbative form is to abstract the base. The PIE infinitive represents a “second verb” in the sentence, it presupposes a predicative articulation between the verbal base of the abstract and an explicitly named or unnamed

subject (cf. Sgall 1958: 158, Kuryłowicz 1964, Keydana 2013). The predicative function of the infinitive explains both the syntactic dependency features that are inherited from a verb and the loss of the original nominal inflection or at least the inflexibility of the paradigm. It is likely that the infinitive played the part of a secondary predicate in the sentence. Primary, infinitival forms could be combined with nouns as complements, they could be also used alone in complementation with the same subject as the principal verb. They expressed simply purpose or purpose of the action what proves the relation between the infinitive and dative case, and they were used to indicate a variety of complements of PIE (for more see: Lehmann (1974)). The main syntactic infinitival constructions in IE dialects are: a) the nominative and infinitive construction as an exponent of epistemic modality, b) the accusative and infinitive construction in the function of a gerund clause, c) the dative and infinitive construction in the function of a subordinate clause d) the use of present infinitive with a subject nominative as a finite verb in a place of a past indicative, e) the use of the infinitive with a subject accusative in exclamations for increase an expressive or impressive function of the sentence.

The nominal nature of the Slavic infinitive is expressed in the fact that it can occur in a sentence as a subject (cf. *něstb bo dobro otęti xľeba čędomb i pbsomb povręšti*) or a complement (možęši mę ištisitit). The Slavic infinitive was also the part of the following syntactic constructions present in literary texts which were – according to the variety of Christian tradition rooted in literature – significantly influenced either by Greek or Latin: DcI (*bystb že vb drugojq sqbotq vbniti jemu vb sbnbmište i učiti*), NcI (*kęto ubo tęxb tręvb iskręnbjvb męnitb ti sę byti*), AcI (*kogo mę glagol'qtb človęci byti*). In these constructions the infinitive is the nominalization of the verb in a subordinate sentence. In most examples it is used to express purpose. The infinitive together with the auxiliary verb as *xoęti, imęti, naęti, vbęti* was a marker of future tense (*učitel'u, kгда ubo si bqdqtb i čbto jestb znamenęje, jegda xoętb si byti*).

## II

In Polish linguistic literature, there is no work describing all functions of the infinitive in the history of the Polish language. Krystyna Pisarkowa (1984) distinguishes two main positions of the infinitive in Polish simple sentence: 1) in nominal phrase as a determinant of a noun (of predicative power), e.g. *nadeszła godzina gnać stado* 'the hour has come to drive the herd'; 2) as a predicate in AcI and NcI constructions. The first structure evolved to complex sentence with the complementizer (*że*)by 'that' or nominal phrase with a deverbal noun in genitive, e.g. *godzina, żeby* ('that') *gnąć stado* or *godzina gnania stada* ('the hour of driving the herd'). The second ones were transformed into complex sentences with the complementizer *że* 'that'. According to Pisarkowa (1984: 139), the infinitive in a nominal phrase is a modal marker that allows to indicate the degree of certainty of an action. Other syntactic functions of the infinitive are described in different places in her book, but there is some inconsequence in the description, for example, Pisarkowa writes about infinitive as a subject of a sentence without a subject (Pisarkowa 1984: 34). The second part of the presentation aims to identify the syntactic constructions with the infinitive in Old Polish texts and to consider which of them have been inherited from Proto-Slavic and which were borrowed from other languages, mainly Latin. Because the majority of Polish older texts are Latin translations, this question is very valid. We distinguish the following syntactic function of the infinitive:

1. as a component of an analytic form of future tense;
2. as a component of structures with modal and causative predicates, such as *móc* 'can', *musieć* 'must', *mieć* 'to have', *dać* 'to give', *chcieć* 'to want', *kazać* 'to order', *żądać* 'to demand', *obietać* 'to promise', *ślubić* 'to vow' / 'to make a pledge/promise', *woleć* 'to prefer', etc.
3. as a component of structures with phase predicates, such as *począć* 'to begin', *przestać* 'to stop', etc.
4. as an adverbial predicate (an analogue to supinum), e.g.: *a ja pojedę cirpieć za was* (Rozm 611); *Bosmy widzieli gwiazdę jego na wschodzie słońca i przyszliśmy chwalić go* (EwZam 3v);

5. as a component of accusativus cum infinitivo, e.g. *A mni mający go być w pospólstwie, uszli drogę dnia i szukali go między przyrodzonymi i znajomymi.* (MW 4v); *Przepuściliśmy tę dziewczę – między sobą mówili – tak iście chodzić a nie przemyć jej nam posłuszną być, wwiędziem nowy obyczaj* (Rozm 27);
6. as a component of nominativus cum infinitivo, e.g. *gdyż rzeczony Piotr nie żywota otejmując, ale krzywdę jemu przed tym uczynioną mszcząc, Jana poznan jest uranić.* Sul 33; *Powiedziano jest nam, iż starosty ziem naszych pospolicie rzeczy ktorekole, jeź k nim też nie słuchają ani uznany są przysłuchać, sądzą, skazują a rozprawiają.* Sul 79;
7. as an adnominal predicate, e.g. *A jelekolwiek przyjęli ji, dał jim moc syny bożymi być,* (MW 1r); <10> *A gdyż-jest-koli 21 przyszedł czas owczam kotno być, <...> widział jeść <we śnie>, iże się schadzały z barany owce <...>.* (BZ 18a); *nosili je ci, jż mieli urząd naprzod chodzić, a potem je zasię przynosili* (BZ 108 c); *bo dokąd był Jozef żyw, chodziła, jako tedy był zakon małżenkam chodzić.* (Rozm 146);
8. as a complement of a main predicate, e.g. *począł Maryje dziewice prosić, aby im dała jeść* (Rozm 102); *Pij a i twymci wielbłądom dam pić* (BZ 15a);
9. as a subject of a sentence, e.g. *bo słyszeć twą śmierć jest silna boleść sercu memu a wielki płacz duszy mojej* (Rozm 166); *A tegodla podobno jest w sobotę dobrze czynić* (Rozm 326); *Ty uczynki czynić jest być mi<ło>sierdnym cielnie* (KazWW 221v).

We consider as borrowed mainly the structures presented in p. 5, 6, and 8, although, it is conceivable that they were present in Old Polish before the Middle Ages. We compare the Polish texts with the Latin ones if it is possible.

## References

- Adrados, Francisco R. 1988. On the origins of the Indo-European dative-locative singular endings. In Mohammad Ali Jazayery & Werner Winter (eds.), *Languages and Cultures. Studies in Honor of Edgar C. Polome* (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 36), 29–41. Berlin–New York–Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Dalewska-Greń, Hanna. 2012. *Języki słowiańskie*, 2 edn. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Jeffers, Robert J. 1975. Remarks on Indo-European Infinitives. *Language* 51(1). 133 –148.
- Keydana, Götz. 2013. *Infinitive im R̥gveda: Formen, Funktion, Diachronie* (Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 9). Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1964. *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European* (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Untersuchungen). Heidelberg: Carl Winter – Univeristätsverlag.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. 1974. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Moszyński, Leszek. 2012. *Wstęp do filologii słowiańskiej*, 2. zmienione edn. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Olander, Thomas. 2015. *Proto-Slavic inflectional morphology: A comparative handbook* (Brill's studies in Indo-European languages & linguistics volume 14). Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Pisarkowa, Krystyna. 1984. *Historia składni języka polskiego* (Prace Instytutu Języka Polskiego 52). Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Sgall, Petr. 1958. Die Infinitive im R̥gveda. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philologica* 2. 137 –142.

WOJCIECH STELMACH

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

**The function of the syntactic rows in translations  
of Latin texts in the 16<sup>th</sup>-century Polish Apocrypha  
(based on *Historyja bardzo cudna o stworzeniu  
nieba i ziemie*)**

Old Polish Apocrypha are the source of religious language research. The reason for the extensiveness of these Apocrypha is, from the one hand, the writers' need to supplement the canonical works as much as possible, on the other – their genetic multilayer nature. In recent years, many studies have been produced on the language of non-canonical texts, including how they were translated from Latin as well as the relationship between the original and the target text. Scholars focus mainly on the scribe–author's works, investigating the degree of their dependency on the Latin origin. The subject of linguistic studies is, among others, lexis, inflection, and syntax of the apocryphal oldest written texts. An interesting syntactic issue is the use of syntactic rows instead of single Latin words. Researchers described this phenomenon based on canonical *Leopolita's Bible* (Bieńkowska) or apocryphal texts (Twardzik, Gesner, Rojszczak-Robińska). The subject matter of the paper aims to concern on the syntactic rows in the printed Polish Apocryphon from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, i.e., *Historyja bardzo cudna o stworzeniu nieba i ziemie* 'The marvelous story on the Heaven and Earth creation'. Special attention is paid to the synonymic and synonymic-like rows that appear instead of single Latin words. The conclusions present the influence of the use of syntactic rows on the Old Polish syntax, as well as a hypothesis about the reasons for the use of some row constructions.





DIANA STOLAC

University of Rijeka

## **Attribute between the traditional syntax and utterance organization in old Kajkavian Croatian language**

Attribute is a syntactic category linked to a noun or a nominal regardless of its syntactic function. Attributes can be divided into congruent (e.g. *z gustemi suzami*) and incongruent attributes (e.g. *posla obvršitelji; torbica z penezi*).

Traditional syntax stresses the firm link that exists between the constituent elements of an attributive syntagm. This link is also reflected in continuous, i.e. uninterrupted, syntagms (e.g. *takvoga dobroga staroga vina*). Interrupted syntagms are possible in rhythmic, but not in syntactic terms (e.g. *na zapoved dohađam tvoju*).

If we take into account the word order, we can notice that attributes can appear in apposition (e.g. *dragi ljubleni prijatelj*) or in post-position (e.g. *prek morja širokoga*), frequently without any difference in meaning, but the difference in position results in different stylistic effects (e.g. *način življenja : življenja način*). Stylistic differences can also be identified in the case of other attributive structures (e.g. *zapoved od oca : zapoved oca; vu hiže Eufemijana : vu eufemijanski hiži*).

More contemporary approaches that focus on the organization of the utterance also include the supra-syntactic level, i.e. the level of discourse, and can raise some doubts regarding the function of individual syntagms. Thus, syntagms that at first glance are interpreted as adverbials of place (e.g. *na nebu*), can be analysed on the syntactic and the textual level, and as a result, attributes can be identified (e.g. *zvezde na nebu*). Specifically, by placing the

intonational and syntactic boundary in two possible places, two alternative interpretations can be reached: *\*zvezde na nebu / svetiju* (*na nebu* = attribute) / *\*zvezde / na nebu svetiju* (*na nebu* = adverbial of place).

In addition to this, some syntagms can only be understood with the help of a wider, situational context. This is particularly true in the case of subject genitives (e.g. *ljubav bližnjega* / ‘someone loves their neighbour’ : ‘neighbour loves somebody’).

The materials analysed in this paper come from three works by the Croatian Kajkavian playwright Tituš Brezovački (1757-1805), and we focus on those syntagms that lend themselves for interpretation on different levels.

Марфа Н. Толстая

Институт славяноведения РАН

## Фразовые клитики в одном украинском говоре Восточной Словакии

о. Карпатоукраинские говоры – единственные из восточнославянских, сохраняющие живые фразовые клитики, для которых остается актуальным правило Вакернагеля, сформулированное для древних индоевропейских языков: клитики, относящиеся к сказуемому, стремятся занять место в первой тактовой группе фразы. Диалектные системы клитик могут быть детально выявлены только на достаточно большом корпусе текстов из каждого говора.

1. **Материал.** Село Нехвалёва Полянка расположено в районе Гуменне в Восточной Словакии. Уроженец этого села, писатель Штефан Сухый (1946 г.р.), часть своих книг написал на родном диалекте. Материалом послужила его книга новелл «Як Руснакы релаксують», изданная впервые в 1997 г. (объемом около 48 тыс. слов).

2. **Состав фразовых клитик** и их организация по рангам (месту, занимаемому в цепочке клитик) таковы (у глагола и местоимений в скобках приводятся соответствующие отличающиеся неклитические формы): 1. *же*; 2. *бы*; 3. связки – формы наст. вр. глагола быти: *ем/-м (ем), есь/-сь (есь), е, сьме, сьте, суть*; 4. возвратное *ся*; 5. местоименные клитики Dat.: *мі (мені, ми), ти (тобі), сі (собі), му (ёму), ей, нам, вам, їм*; 6. местоименные клитики Acc.: *ня (мене), тя (тебе), [ся (себе)], го (ёго/нёго [с предлогами]), ю (ю/ню), нас, вас, їх (їх/них)*. Неклитические

формы связок (в начале фразы и с отрицанием), а также связки 3 sg. и pl. отмечены только в составе именного сказуемого. Местоименные клитики Dat. могут употребляться в посессивном значении (т.е. не как фразовые): *мати ті, жена му* и т.п. Форма *мі* может употребляться также как полная форма (в начале фразы и при логическом ударении). Отмечены единичные случаи аномальных последовательностей *мі ся* и *му ся*.

В сочетаниях с предлогами могут употребляться, помимо полных, краткие формы *ня, тя, ся* (в Acc. и Gen.), а также *ми* (в Dat., Loc., Gen.: *ку мі; на мі, по мі, о мі; у мі, проти мі*). Сочетания односложных форм местоимений с предлогами регулярно образуют цепочку с клитиками, занимая место в конце цепочки (*кедь єсь го од ня взяв*). Отмечены единичные случаи употребления как клитик личных местоимений-подлежащих: *не любив я го, перепозерам я го, зогнув він ся*.

**3. Положение во фразе.** Фразовые клитики, как правило, образуют цепочку. В клаузах с неначальным глаголом обычна препозиция клитик по отношению к глаголу. При этом клитики не разрывают актантные группы. Наличие в начальной части фразы обособленного оборота (придаточного предложения, обращения и т.п.) не влияет на расстановку клитик в пределах клаузы: они могут оказаться и перед таким оборотом (*а потім ся, не знати коли, десь задів*), и после него (в том числе непосредственно после: *І о тому, котру мам, ся не мушу бояти*); возможна постановка клитик после неначальных соединительных союзов (*і, та, бо, але* и т.п.: *Гварив, же тя барз любив і тя сановав*). Клитики инфинитивных клауз размещаются в пределах главной клаузы и встраиваются в общую цепочку (*Теперь, міла моя, дай ся мі дачого найісти*).

**4. Статистические показатели.** Место системы клитик говора Нехвалёвой Полянки среди других восточнославянских систем может быть проиллюстрировано данными статистического анализа по методу, разработанному А.А. Зализняком. Для сравнения привлекаются закарпатский верховинский говор с. Синевир (по диалектным записям), гуцульский говор

с. Головы (по книге П. Шекерика-Доникового «Дідо Иванчік») и материал новгородских берестяных грамот (по данным А.А. Зализняка).

	Нехвалева Полянка	Синевир		Головы	НГБ	
	конец XX в.	инф. 1 (1924 г.р.)	инф. 2 (1940 г.р.)	(1930-е)	XI–XII в.	XIII–XV в.
Препозиция *sę	95%	89%	83%	47%	77%	35%
Клитики в паре *mi – *mьně (dat., без предлога)	98,5%	84,5%	81%	51,5%	98%	64%
Клитики в паре *me – *mene (acc., без предлога)	99,5%	72,5%	74,5%	33,5%	92%	43%
Клитики-связки в составе перфекта	74%	61%	57%	19%	85%	

#### Дополнительный параметр:

Неавто-матическая контактная препозиция *sę	12,5%	23%	25%	39%
---	-------	-----	-----	-----

Таким образом, говор Нехвалёвой Полянки оказывается в употреблении клитик самым активным (здесь не исключено поддерживающее словацкое влияние); на другом полюсе находится гуцульский говор села Головы, где уже ясно видна тенденция к утрате клитик. Кроме того, рассмотренный говор показывает диалектные различия с закарпатскими и гуцульскими системами, в частности, в отношении рангов клитик и положения их после соединительных союзов и обособленных оборотов.



Светлана М. Толстая

Институт славяноведения РАН

## Глагольное управление и семантика отглагольных имен

1. «Актантные» девербативы. Актанты глагола, соответствующие участникам обозначаемой глаголом ситуации, довольно регулярно обозначаются субстантивными дериватами производящего глагола, например, от *пахать*: *пахарь* (субъект), *пахня* (локус, объект или само действие), *пахота* (действие), от *резать*: *резчик* (субъект), *резьба* (действие), *резак* (инструмент), *отрезок* (результат или продукт); от *купать(ся)*: *купальщик* (субъект), *купальня* (локус) и т.п. (ср. Buzássyová 1974). При этом одни и те же словообразовательные типы девербативов могут иметь разную категориальную (актантную) семантику. Ср. *варка* (помен actionis от *варить*), *мерка* (инструмент) от *мерить*, *швейка* (субъект) от *шить*, *делка* (результат) от *сделать*, *ходок* (субъект) от *ходить*; *сиделка* (субъект) от *сидеть*, *косилка* (инструмент) от *косить*, *парилка* (локус) от *парить*, *дразнилка* (продукт) от *дразнить*, *мешалка* (инструмент) от *мешать*, *вешалка* (локус) от *вешать* и т.п.

2. Актантная структура сложных слов. Различные актанты производящего глагола отражены в структуре сложных девербативов: субъекты действия (*водопад*, *водосток*, *ледоход*, *бурелом*, *листопад*, *камнепад*, *снегопад*, *звездопад*), объекты действия (*водопой*, *водонос*, *лесоруб*, *стеклодув*, *пулемет*, *скотовод*, *свинопас*, *землекоп*, *пустомеля*, *благодарить*, *градоносный*, *хлебохранилище*, *словораздел*, *казнокрад*), локус (*мореход*,

*пустынножитель*), время (*долгострой, новодел, свежеиспеченный*), способ (*вертолет, самолет, самосуд, пустоцвет, полуоткрытый, молниеносный, двуспальный*) и т. п.

3 «Иррадиация залога». В сфере отглагольной деривации глагольная категория залога продолжает быть семантически релевантной и порождает имена (субстантивы и адъективы) активного (субъектного) и пассивного (объектного) типа. Особенно это характерно для прилагательных. Прилагательные, образованные с помощью суффиксов активных и пассивных причастий (квази-причастия), имеют соответственно субъектную (служащий) или объектную (закрытый) семантику. Прилагательные, образуемые с помощью сугубо именных суффиксов *-к, -лив, -чив, -льн, -тельн* и др., могут иметь как субъектное, так и объектное значение. Среди прилагательных с суфф. *-к* «субъектные»: *дерзкий, липкий, верткий, стойкий, хрусткий* и др., «объектные»: *ковкий, плавкий, жалкий, сыпкий, варкий, ноский* и др., «амбивалентные»: *колкий кустарник* (он колет, колючий) и *колкие дрова* (их легко колоть). Среди дериватов с суфф. *-тельн* преобладают «активные» (благодаря агентивной семантике суффикса): *утешительный, освежительный, увлекательный, обвинительный* (такой, который утешает, освежает, увлекает, обвиняет), но имеются и «пассивные»: *желательный, употребительный, замечательный* (такой, кого / что желают, употребляют, замечают), а также амбивалентные: *чувствительный человек* (он чувствует) и *чувствительный укол* (его чувствуют).

Существительные в целом гораздо слабее, чем прилагательные, сохраняют залоговые свойства производящего глагола. Преимущественно активное (субъектное) значение имеют существительные со значением лица: *житель, шутник, носильщик, кормилец, страдалец, писарь*, и т. д., но есть среди них и пассивные (объектные) дериваты: *подкидыш, найденыш, выкормыш, посол* (тот, кого подкинули, нашли, выкормили, послали) и др. Дериваты с предметной семантикой, наоборот, имеют исключительно объектное значение, за исключением



существительных, обозначающих инструменты, приспособления и орудия действия, которые часто «омонимичны» дериватам со значением лица, ср. *истребитель* (лицо и самолет), *проводник* (лицо и предмет), *счетчик* (лицо и устройство) и т. п.

**4. Синтаксис отглагольных субстантивов.** В севернорусском фольклоре употребительны конструкции с *nomina agentis*, сохраняющие или определенным образом преобразующие управление производящего глагола. Пример из причитания: «... И будешь *летна мне*, горюше *водонощичка*, / И будешь *зимняя на гумни* да *замолотщичка*, / И будешь *баенна родителям* *истопщичка*» [Барсов 1997/2: 301], что означает: «Будешь летом мне воду носить, будешь зимой на гумне молотить, будешь баню родителям топить» (выделены курсивом актанты глагола).



BJÖRN WIEMER

Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz

## **Univerbation and scope in the development of Polish and Russian clause-initial connectives**

The talk is devoted to empirical and methodological problems in the development of Slavic complementizers and particles. As a rule, complementizer and particle use share a common history, i.e. the relevant units are (partial) cognates. I will concentrate on those particle—complementizer pairings for which the following conditions apply: (i) The etymological root of the units are in the domain of comparison; (ii) the units have acquired functions related to epistemic support (epistemic modality) and/or epistemic justification (evidentiality, information source), i.e. they have become metalinguistic operators, more particularly: non-factive modifiers of propositional content; (iii) their “morphological history” consists in univerbation, namely in the morphologisation and subsequent loss of segmentability of primitive morphemes (from the basic stock of Common Slavic; cf. Nikolaeva 2008).

Prototype representatives of such units are Pol. *jakoby* and Russ. (*kak*) *budto* (*by*).

Each of the properties (i-iii) requires scrutiny, mainly for the following reasons:

1. Comparison markers and irrealis markers, often in combination, prove a recurrent source of knowledge-related particles and complementizers. At least in Slavic, this is a prominent feature adding to more well-known North-South isoglosses within the whole language group: while comparison markers, combined

with an irrealis morpheme (*by*) are widespread in West and East Slavic (with an East>West cline extending to the West beyond West Slavic), the prominent strategy in South Slavic employs another irrealis marker (*da*), usually in combination with other morphemes to yield complex connectives. A further difference between North and South Slavic is the degree of univerbation and relation to subjunctive mood, largely due to the different fate of clitic rules (Wiemer 2015b; 2018).

2. Such univerbations have quite consistently shown a parallel employment as complementizers and particles (often dubbed “homonyms”). Their common property is that they are no clausal constituents, but they operate on propositional content. Although this domain can in general be regarded as an endpoint in their development, after univerbation was finished and the domain of propositional modification reached, functional development did not stop (*pace* Kleszczowa 2015), but took place **within** this domain.

3. In contrast to particles, complementizers are signs of subordination to some higher-order predicate. We thus have to address at least two basic issues: (a) What are indisputable signs of complementation (as a specific type of subordination)? In particular, how reliably does complementizer use (= subordination) correlate with clause-initial use of connectives operating on the metalinguistic level? (b) Which has been the chronological relation between morphologization (see [1]) and (adverbial and complementizing) subordination, on the one hand, and between complementizer vs particle use, on the other? More specifically, has the complementizer followed on the particle (as a result of reanalysis, see [2]), or did both syntactic employments of these cognates proceed along parallel, but independent paths?

[1] Morphologization scale: free collocation > univerbation > entire loss of transparency

A - B > A+b > A|b > Ab

[2] Reanalysis: juxtaposition, clause-initial position of particle > complementizer

$$\begin{array}{l} \dots V_{\text{fin}} / \text{noun}_{\text{event-cl1}} \text{ --- } [\text{PTC} - \dots]_{\text{cl2}} \\ > \quad \left[ \dots \text{CTP} \right]_{\text{cl1}} \leftarrow \left[ \text{COMP} - \dots \right]_{\text{cl2}}_{\text{SENT}} \end{array}$$

After a partial survey of relevant phenomena associated to irreal-ity marking in contemporary Slavic languages and their diachronic background, I will focus on two case studies of prominent representatives in the history of Polish (*jakoby*) and of Russian (*(kak) budto (by)*). Continuing on earlier studies (Wiemer 2008; 2015a; 2018), I will concomitantly follow the example of Kleszczowa (2015) by catching up with research into particles and complementizers in modern Polish (cf. Grochowski et al. 2014); see also Mika/Słoboda (2015), Pastuch (2017), Kisiel/Sobotka (forthcoming). Finally, on this backdrop, I will discuss methodological and „practical“ issues which arise from the work with dictionaries and, first of all, electronic corpora. An argument will be given why (electronic) corpora are an indispensable tool **in principle**, provided they are used with circumspection and philological background.

## References

- Grochowski, Maciej, Anna Kisiel & Magdalena Żabowska. 2014. *Słownik gniazdowy partykuł polskich*. Kraków.
- Kisiel, Anna & Piotr Sobotka. (forthcoming). The paths of grammaticalization of North Slavic connectors – An interface point of Slavic, Greek and Latin. In: Birzer, Sandra & Imke Mendoza (eds.), *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax. Traces of Latin, Greek and Church Slavonic*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton (2020).
- Kleszczowa, Krystyna. 2015. *U źródeł polskich partykuł (Derywacja funkcjonalna, przemiany, zaniki)*. Katowice.
- Mika, Tomasz & Agnieszka Słoboda. 2015. *Wyrażenia funkcyjne w średniowiecznej polszczyźnie z perspektywy składniowej. Wybrane problemy badawcze*. Poznań.
- Nikolaeva, Tat'jana M. 2008. *Neparadigmatičeskaja lingvistika (istorija "bluždajuščix častic")*. Moskva.

- Pastuch, Magdalena. 2017. Jak łączyć historyczne jednostki języka w klasy funkcjonalne? Problemy z wyodrębnianiem dopowiedzeń w materiale historycznym. *Język Polski* 97(4), 24–37.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2008. Pokazateli s citativnoj i inferentivnoj funkcijami v ruskom i polskom jazykax – komunikativnye mexanizmy semantičeskogo sdviga. In: Wiemer, Björn & Vladimir A. Plungjan (eds.): *Lexikalische Evidenzialitätsmarker im Slavischen*. München, 337–378. (= Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 72.)
- Wiemer, Björn. 2015a. An outline of the development of Pol. *jakoby* in 14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> century documents (based on dictionaries). In: Wiemer, Björn (ed.): *Studies on evidentiality marking in West and South Slavic*. München, 217–302.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2015b. Među naklonenim i fossilizacij: O mnogolikoj sud'be klitiki *by*. In: Popović, Ljudmila, Dojčil Vojvodić & Motoki Nomachi (eds.): *U prostoru lingvističke slavistike* (Zbornik naučnih radova povodom 65 godina života akademika Predraga Pipera). Beograd, 189–224.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2018. On triangulation in the domain of clause linkage and propositional marking. In: Hansen, Björn, Jasmina Grković-Major & Barbara Sonnenhauser (eds.): *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax: The Interplay between Internal Development, Language Contact and Metalinguistic Factors*. Berlin—Boston, 285–338.



