Беата Дьёрфи,

Историческое изменение синтаксического статуса причастных оборотов в языке Суздальской летописи

(=Tractata Slavica Universitatis Debreceniensis, Vol. II), Дебрецен, 2011, 308 pp.

Anna V. Sakharova

Abbyy Software House, Moscow

Анна Вячеславовна Сахарова

Компания «ABBYY», Москва

The book is devoted to a group of constructions exhibiting interesting properties in the history of the Russian language — that is, participles. The author aims not only at describing, but also explaining the essence of the diachronic changes of participle syntax with the help of modern theoretical linguistics (that is, Chomskyan syntax). The data for the investigation were the participle constructions of the Suzdal chronicle from the Laurentian codex. The broadening of the empirical scope of the linguistic theory to a data set previously unaccounted for is undoubtedly a promising objective, but also one demanding a huge effort and sufficient competence.

However, a large part of this book is just an overview. The author provides a general account of the use of subordinate and coordinate conjunctions (Chapter 1), the formation of participles and converbs in Russian (Chapter 2), the history of the Laurentian codex (Chapter 5), approaches of studying historical syntax and types of diachronic language changes (Chapters 6 and 7), etc. Some of this information is not even directly related to the topic of the book (such as calculations of Church Slavonic and East Slavonic orthographical variants of morphemes or a history of Marrism).

Some passages concerning general properties of Old Russian verbs are misleading. For example, the author examines two participle forms of specific prefixed verbs — "past participle" *похваливъ* and "present participle" *похваля* — and affirms that they have

two different meanings, that of precedence and simultaneity (p. 128). This view, however, is outdated, as [Кузьмина, Немченко 1982: 362] have shown that the "present" participles of these prefixed verbs are used interchangeably with "past" participles in the perfective (precedence) meaning, as in the example from the Suzdal chronicle: Вста Рюрикъ. на Романа. и приведе к собѣ Ѡлговичѣ. в Къıєвъ. хота поити к Галичю. на Романа. и оупереди Романъ **скопа полкъı. Галичьскъıѣ. и Володимерьскъıѣ**. и въѣха в Русскую землю (fol. 141v, col. 417, s. v. 1202) (="Rurik turned against Roman and led Oleg's sons to his city of Kiev wishing to go to Galich, and Roman forestalled, **having gathered troops from Galich and Vladimir**, and came to the Rus' land").

The main empirical contribution made by the author is the enumeration of all the occurrences of the participles in the given text, classified into four groups: substantiated, attributive, predicative and adverbial. In each group, active present, active past, passive present and passive past participles are enumerated separately. The principles of this classification are presented in Chapters 3 and 4.

The substantivized subgroup does not require special comment.

The attributive group includes diverse types of participles agreeing with nouns (not only full, but also short forms are found in this list – possibly by mistake). Perhaps the inclusion of examples with verbs of perception (Изяславъ же оувѣдѣвъ **по собѣ идуща Володимерка с силою**. заложаса нощью поиде (fol. 110, col. 330, s. v. 1150; p. 260 in the book) ="Iziaslav having learned **that Volodimerko is following him with forces**, having hidden himself in the night, left") was not a deliberate decision but merely a mistake, as such participles are better regarded as predicates depending on the matrix verb [Потебня 1958: 308–316]; cf. other misinterpreted examples below.

The adverbial group consists of short participles having the same syntax as converbs in Modern Russian (with null subject coreferent with the subject of a finite verb; no coordinate conjunctions between the participle and the finite verb are possible).

The predicative subgroup is the most heterogeneous one. Actually, active predicative participles can be further subdivided into four constructions:

— short participles with implicit subject coreferent with the finite verb subject, linked to the finite verb with a coordinating conjunction (Идоша веснѣ на Половцѣ. Ст҃ ополкъ. Володимеръ. Дв҃ дъ. **и дошедше Воина и** воротишаса (fol. 95v, col. 284, s. v. 1110; p. 154) = "In spring Sviatopolk, Vladimir, David went to war with the Cumans and **having reached Voin** [they] returned");

— "absolute nominative" short participles, with their explicit subject in nominative (**кнꙗзь же Всеволодъ стоꙗвъ ѡколо города .ı҃. дн҃ и. Видѣвъ брата изнемагающа**. и Болгаре въıслалиса баху к нему с миромъ. поиде ѡпꙗть къ исадомъ (fol. 132, col. 390, s. v. 1184; p. 158) = "**Prince Vsevolod remained near the town for 10 days, having seen that his brother was growing faint**. And Bulgars sent to him [asking] for peace, and he went back to the moorage");

— short participles as predicates of a clause with a relative pronoun (an original Slavonic construction, typical of colloquial language) (в то же время поима городъı. Гюргевъı Ѡлговичь. и конѣ. и скотъı. и ѡвцѣ. и товаръ. **кдѣ что чюꙗ** (fol. 103, col. 309, s. v. 1141; p. 151) = "At this time Oleg's son took Gurgiy's

towns, horses, cattle, sheep and belongings **wherever and whatever he saw**")
[Потебня 1958: 185];

— present participle with copula as the predicate, exemplified with a single example in the entire text: такоже и сии кнӑ Ѡлександръ **бѣ побѣжаꙗ а не побѣдиⷨ**.. (fol. 168v, col. 477, s. v. 1263; p. 154) (= "So this prince Alexander **was the winner, but was not defeated**"). It is a very rare literary construction, modeled after Greek Gospel syntax [Потебня 1958: 6; Успенский 2002: 256].

As to the dative absolute constructions, they are also divided into two groups: predicative, i. e., with coordinate conjunctions (изидоша противу имъ Володимеричи. **и бъившю сступленью ѡбѣма полкома. и** бишасꙗ крѣпко. но вскорѣ побѣгош Половци (fol. 101, col. 303–304, s. v. 1136; p. 191) = "Vladimir's sons went against them and **when both armies met**, they fought hard but soon the Cumans ran) and adverbial, i. e., without them (**сступившиⷨ же сꙗ полкоⷨ**. побѣгоша погании (fol. 154, col. 448, s. v. 1225; p. 258) = "**when the armies met**, the pagans ran"). In the Annex, constructions of these two types are divided into separate "predicative" and "adverbial" units.

The reason for this classification, in which constructions different both in surface syntactic features and stylistic character are included in the same group, is not clear. In addition, it is well known that in the process of copying or editing, the scribes might delete or add coordinate conjunctions between the short participle and the main verb — thus, "adverbial" and some "predicative" constructions were treated as interchangeable.

Many of the conclusions of this research offer no novelties. The author enumerates *l*-forms (with and without copula) in the list of predicative constructions but it was always well known that they were used only as predicates. Similarly, it is not news that the explicit subject of the participle was able to be only dative or nominative.

All the examples are given in the Annex. This collection of data could be very useful for subsequent research, but unfortunately the examples are given nearly without context or strangely torn from the middle of clauses[1]. One notices immediately that many examples were misunderstood and misinterpreted by the author.

Thus, the author treats as a participle the preposition дѣля (сжалилаꙗ бахъ. зане ѿ ꙗ моꙗго ꙋби. и землю ꙗго полони **мене дѣлꙗ**. и се нъинѣ не любиши мене и съ младенцѥⷨ симь. (fol. 99v, col. 300, s. v. 1128; p. 197) = "I had been upset because you killed my father and captured his land **because of me** and now you don't love me with this infant"). Aorists (even if they are not homonymous to the participles) are understood as participles (блж нъии же еппⷭ Кирилъ посла **взꙗ** тѣло ꙗго. и привезошⷨ и в Володимерь. (fol. 165v, col. 471, s. v. 1248; p. 215) = "the beatific bishop Cyril sent to **take** his body, it was brought to Vladimir").

Substantiated participles (from Scripture citations) are called "predicates" (**блж҃нъ разумѣваꙗи на нища и оубога**. в дн҃ь лютъ избавить и Г҃ь (fol. 142v, col. 423, s. v. 1206; p. 153) = "Blessed is **he that considereth the poor**: the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble") or "attributes" (бъиⷭ да наполнитсꙗ писаньѥ ст҃ъиⷯ гл҃ющеѥ. блгж҃ни

---

[1] This is why I quote the examples in full from the edition [ПСРЛ I], with reference to the folio of the codex, the page of the edition, the year of chronicle entry, and finally to the corresponding column of the reviewed book.

смірающіи ꙗко ти снве Бъи нарекутсѧ (fol. 157v, col. 456, s. v. 1230; p. 265) = "it happened to fulfill the Scripture saying: Blessed are **the peacemakers**, for they shall be called the children of God"). The Dative Absolute is treated as nominative (**и бывшю дни стго въскрньꙗ Гна.** и приспѣ ѿ днь памѧ стѧ мка Логина. (fol. 151, col. 441, s. v. 1218; p. 161) = "**when it was the day of the Holy Resurrection of the Lord**, came the day of memory of the Saint martyr Longinus"), more often as attributive constructions (боимсѧ льсти ихъ. ꙋда поиду изънезапа ратью на на. **кнѧзю не сущю оу на.** пошлѣ къ Глѣбу (fol. 125v, col. 372, s. v. 1175; p. 261) = "We are afraid of their deception that they could suddenly attack us **when we have no prince**, let us send to Gleb").

Some short participles without conjunctions ("adverbial") are found in the list of predicative constructions (Володимеръ же **мнѧ ако к нему идуть.** ста исполчивъсѧ передъ городомь (fol. 103v, col. 311, s. v. 1144; p. 153) = "Vladimir **thinking that they are coming to him** stood having prepared to battle near the town") or attributive constructions (бъꙗ же оу поганꙑꙗ .ѳ. сотъ копии. а оу Руси девѧносто копии. **надѣюще же сѧ на силу** погании поидоша. и наши противу имъ. (fol. 121, col. 360, s. v. 1169; p. 261) = "The pagans had 900 spears, but the Russians — 90 spears. **Hoping for their power**, the pagans moved forward, and ours — against them). Constructions introduced by coordinate conjunctions ("predicative" ones, according to the classification) are treated as "adverbial" (а хочешь и сеꙗ волости. **а оубивъ мене** тобѣ то волость. а живъ не иду из своеꙗ волости (fol. 102, col. 307, s. v. 1139; p. 219) = "You want this country, **if [you] kill me**, the country is yours, but I won't leave my country alive"), and so on.

In the last part of the book, in Chapters 8 and 9, the author presents how the modern version of generative linguistics depicts the predicate structure and promises to show how the universal mechanisms of language change formed the changes in the syntax of participles from chronicles to Modern Russian (p. 120).

Non-finite clauses typically do not form independent predication and, consequently, do not express tense (but rather taxis). Both in Old and in Modern Russian, the main pattern is for finite clauses to have nominative subjects and for infinitive clauses to have dative (see [Franks 1995: 258] and also [Chomsky 1981] on modern Russian). In Old Russian, the use of non-zero dative subject is witnessed by examples such as those in the text under study: се тъ со мною цѣловаꙗ крꙿтъ **ходити нама по ѡдинои думѣ ѡбѣма** (fol. 170v, col. 482, s. v. 1284) (= "You have sworn on the cross with me **that we both will follow the same thought**"). On the basis on these facts, linguists working within the generative approach assume that in Russian it is the [+Tense] feature of the finite clause that assigns nominative case to its subject.

Obviously, this pattern faces some problems in Old Russian data. Thus, this model does not explain the Absolute Nominative constructions (where the covert participle subject stands in nominative), although constructions of this type are found even in some Old Church Slavonic texts, for example **Жателене же услышавъше плача младништа** и мати почоувъши обратися и разумѣвъши своего зъла въскрича со всеми (= "**The reapers have heard the baby's cry** and the mother having heard [it] turned back and understood that her baby was in trouble [and] cried together with everybody") (the Codex Suprasliensis cited via [Потебня 1958: 189]).

The author hypothesizes that the participle construction with nominative subject could appear as a result of the loss of copula (p. 131, also p. 28), and that short participles were used as clause predicates because they were analogues of the l-forms. This hypothesis is inconclusive, as "Absolute Nominative" participles were used even in the oldest East Slavonic texts (as in the phrase in the Primary Chronicle …[а] **въ плотници суще**. а приставимъ въ хоромомъ рубити (fol. 48v, col. 142, s. v. 1016) = "**You being carpenters**, we'll appoint you to put up buildings" which exists in all of the versions of the chronicle in the story of Yaroslav and Sviatopolk's battle). Such examples could hardly be interpreted as derived from short present participles with copula, which are a rare construction modeled after Greek, as noted above. In addition, past participles were never used with copula (Greek had no constructions of this type), though they were used as clause predicates with non-zero subject.

Short participles may be called analogues to preterites only in one sense: inexperienced scribes of later epochs (not knowledgeable about Church Slavonic grammar) treated short participles (converbs), as well as old preterites, as high-style analogues of the colloquial l-preterit [Успенский 2002: 223ff; Алексеев 1987; Живов 1995].

In the concluding section the author postulates that, as the participles could have nominative subjects in Old Russian, the language system had "a stronger category of tense" (p. 142). The author supports this idea further by noting that Old Russian (in contrast to modern Russian) regularly expressed person in past tenses (thus, the paradigm was "strong"). The concept of a "strong(er)" category of tense appears literally on the last page of the text, and the notion remains only an informal hint of some possible interpretation.

The author also asserts that the predicative features of the participle temporarily emerged due to the "redistribution of grammar categories of aspect, tense and voice"; and that nominative subjects of the participles reflect "the transitional language state" (p. 135). This may be the "explanation of the syntax phenomena with the means of the modern theoretical linguistics," but the author does not explain how, exactly, the "transitional" state of verbal categories (for example, development of regular aspect opposition) could have provided some non-finite clauses with nominative subjects.

Unfortunately, the author does not know how the chronicle language functioned. Enumerating the problems of historical syntax research, the author postulates that the written language is codified (pp. 101–102), and, mentioning the presence of orthographic rules in the written language in Old Russian (p. 68), treats the chronicle language as a codified one (such as Latin in Europe). But the first short and primitive descriptions of grammar appeared only in the 16th century. Actually, the scribes were taught orthography but their ideas of literate syntax were formed only with their reading experience. Colloquial syntax was very far from Church Slavonic usage but some texts, for example, chronicles, were required to look similar to the model text (even if the similarity was only superficial); as a result, the scribes re-interpreted specific literary constructions and elements in a way that was understandable for them, and later readers treated these re-interpretations as legalizing precedents [Живов 1995; Живов 1998; Успенский 2002].

Some specific literary Church Slavonic constructions got tied to definite lexemes; thus, in the language of later periods, consequence clauses were packaged with *яко*+infinitive constructions only for the verbs *дивитися* and *чудитися*. This

was because the equivalent infinitive dependent construction was used in the Gospel (Mark 15, 5) ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν Πιλᾶτον [Тимберлейк 2002]. The phrase сълнцу въсходящу — "when the sun was rising" (a favorite one among the chroniclers) comes from the Greek Genitive Absolute ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου (Mark 16, 2, cf. Matthew 13, 6; Mark 4, 6). See also [Успенский 2002: 255–256] on the origin of some lexicalized participle constructions.

Actually, the parameters of the short participles usage in the chronicles were determined by the complicated interaction between the parameters of the model texts and the parameters of the colloquial speech of the scribes. In such colloquial speech, short participles (converbs) might be used with a subject that was not coreferent to the finite verb subject, perfects of converb origin [Трубинский 1984: 156] might be used, or short participles might not even occur at all (the situation that holds in colloquial Modern Russian [Земская 1973: 160–196].

This does not mean that it is impossible to create a generative "system of parameters and rules" for this multilayered Medieval Russian language, but this task demands a better knowledge of the language itself. In addition, these rules should be formulated in a more complex and nuanced fashion than "non-finite verb assigns dative case to the subject."

References

Алексеев 1987
Алексеев А. А., "Participium activi в русской летописи: особенности функционирования", *Russian Linguistics*, 11, 1987, 187–200.

Живов 1995
Живов В. М., "Usus scribendi. Простые претериты у летописца-самоучки", *Russian Linguistics*, 19/1, 1995, 45–75.

Живов 1998
Живов В. М., "Автономность письменного узуса и проблема преемственности в восточнославянской средневековой письменности", в: *Славянское языкознание. XII Международный съезд славистов. Краков, 1998. Доклады российской делегации*. Москва, 1998, 212–247.

Земская 1973
Земская Е. А. (Ред.), Русская разговорная речь, Москва, 1973.

Кузьмина, Немченко 1982
Кузьмина И. Б., Немченко Е. В., "История причастий", в: *Историческая грамматика русского языка. Морфология. Глагол*, под ред. Р. И. Аванесова, В. В. Иванова, Москва, 1982, 280–411.

Потебня 1958
Потебня А. А., *Из записок по русской грамматике,* 1–2, Москва, 1958.

ПСРЛ I
Полное собрание русских летописей, I: Лаврентьевская летопись, Москва, 2001.

Тимберлейк 2002
Тимберлейк А., "Significatio, conventio, imitatio et invention", *Русский язык в научном освещении*, 2/4, 2002, 57–74.

Трубинский 1984
    Трубинский В. И., *Очерки русского диалектного синтаксиса*, Ленинград, 1984.

Успенский 2002
    Успенский Б. А., *История русского литературного языка (XI–XVII вв.)*. Изд. 3-е, испр. и доп., Москва, 2002.

Chomsky 1981
    Chomsky N., *Lectures on government and binding*, Dordrecht, 2002.

Franks 1995
    Franks S., *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax*, NY—Oxford, 1995.

Анна Вячеславовна Сахарова, к.ф.н.
Компания «ABBYY», Москва
nenen@inbox.ru