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Abstract

The article states that communication in Old Russian as well as in modern Russian discourse is characterized by the use of mono-functional and poly-functional indirect speech acts. Moreover, the important aspect that helps to specify the illocutive functions of indirect speech acts in Old Russian is their verifiability: the verbal or non-verbal response of the interlocutor as well as the frame constructions, which introduce direct speech (preposition). These constructions are also used in the middle of the utterance (interposition) or at the end of the utterance (postposition). The author of the chronicles observes the communicative purposes of both the speaker and the interlocutor, indicating that the given utterance should be regarded as an indirect speech act. By analyzing the use of mono-functional indirect speech acts in the original dialogue fragments of the Tale of Bygone Years, the author works out their typology. The groups of interrogative and non-interrogative indirect speech acts have been singled out, each of them having certain typical characteristics. The semantics of non-interrogative utterances in most cases is connected with the expression of indirect meanings of time and aspect of verbal forms. The use of interrogative utterances as indirect speech acts is mostly connected with the changes not only in the illocutive function, but also in the propositional meaning of the predicative unit: interrogative utterances with negations should be interpreted as affirmative non-interrogative utterances and vice versa.
The author comes to the conclusion that the use of modern mono-functional indirect speech acts is traditional, since it is identical to their functioning in Old Russian.
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1.  State of the Art

One of the basic concepts used in modern communicative science is the notion of the *indirect speech act* (hereafter—ISA). The ISAs, described in terms of the theory of speech acts [Серль 1986], will be regarded as utterances not with direct illocutionary functions, those “arising from the literal meaning of a sentence” [Падучева 2001: 44], but utterances with indirect functions. The notion of the ISA allows one to allocate within the communicative potential of an utterance, which is a set of its possible illocutionary functions (hereafter—
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IF), the main (direct) one, perceived as devoid of context, and the peripheral (indirect) functions, which are realized in the ISA. The recipient should be able to distinguish between the ISAs and the direct speech acts (hereafter—DSA), and adequately interpret the communicative intention of the speaker, incidentally reconstructing the non-explicatory meanings “hidden” in the ISA. The basis of this ability is that “the use of indirect speech acts is, to a greater or lesser extent, conventionalized” [Лайонз 2003: 269].

The types of ISAs characteristic of Russian speech have been streamlined during the study of the modern discourse, which is quite natural. Meanwhile, an analysis of the Old Russian texts shows that statements with indirect IF were also used in Old Russian communication.

Let us now turn to the analysis of the dialogue fragments of the Tale of Bygone Years (hereafter—the TBY).¹

The important aspect that helps to define the illocutive functions of ISAs in Old Russian is their verifiability. On the one hand, the IF of the utterance can be established on the basis of the judgment of the response of the interlocutor, who either gives a response or commits a response action. On the other hand, the chronicle dialogue is preceded and followed by a frame construction, which lists the participants of the communicative act, their communicative goals and perlocutionary effect, the specific features of the given speech act, the physical conditions of communication, the author’s assessment of the dialogue, etc. For example, in the following fragment И воевода нача Стаполъ, вада вызд кърлы, оукрати новгородци, гла: “(a) Чту приюдосте с хромецемь симь, а вы, плотники сущй? (b) А приставимъ вы хорошь рубить нашыхъ”. Се слышавше новгородци и рѣша Ірославъ, иако: (c) “Заоутра перевеземьсѧ на нихъ. Аще кто не повидетъ с

¹ The material for this research is the TBY text from the Hypatian Codex published by [ПСРЛ 1908]. In cases when the text of the Hypatian Codex has certain omissions, they are reconstructed in accordance with the Khlebnikov Chronicle (the comparison of the two chronicles is given in the same edition). In cases when the interpretation of the Hypatian Codex is considered to be erroneous by the TBY researchers engaged in the publication of the text, footnotes are provided to the corresponding places in the Khlebnikov Codex and to the chronicles used to reconstruct the Laurentian Codex: the Laurentian, the Radziwill, and the Academic chronicles [ПСРЛ 1926]. The footnotes generally include the Khlebnikov and Laurentian Codex variations, and if only one of them is used, the absence of the second one indicates the coincidence of its interpretation with the interpretation of the Hypatian Codex. Various interpretations can be useful and even necessary for the analysis of the fragments of the TBY, which are difficult to analyze without consulting the texts of different chronicles.

To split the text into words, the edition of [ПСРЛ 1908] has been used. However, to split the text into sentences and to punctuate it (if punctuation marks were nonexistent in the TBY), modern standards have been used. The parentheses after the examples specify the year of the quoted fragment (in accordance with the Byzantine chronology accepted in the TBY, from the creation of the world, and the timeline of Christianity). In some cases, it was necessary to give a Modern Russian translation of the corresponding fragments.
намъ, то сами потнѣе”. [...] Орославъ же щаоутрѣ, исполчиівъ дружину, противу свѣтѣ перевезесѣ (6524/1016) the voivode of Svatopolk utters two ISAs, which formally represent an informative question (a) and the message of an intention (b). However, the reaction of the interlocutor (c—the decision to attack the enemy) and the evaluation of the statement IF by the chronicler in the framework structure (ухарѧти), as well as the fact that he points to the utterance of the voivode as the cause of the reaction of the Novgorod citizens (се слашавше), confirm that (a) and (b) are indeed ISAs.

The same example shows another important feature of the Old Russian utterances: many of them are illocutionarily poly-functional, which means that the statement can be used simultaneously in several illocutionary functions in the course of one locutionary act. For example, the utterance (a) is both an evaluative judgment (Зачем вы пришли . . . ? = Незачем вам было приходить . . . !) and an insult (the propositive content of the utterance should appear offensive to the interlocutor: the speaker “lowers” the social status of both the interlocutor and his leader). Statement (b) is also polyfunctional: it not only informs about the intention of the speaker but it is also an insult. While (a) is an ISA (the speaker does not expect an answer, and the interlocutor does not perceive this “question” as an actual question), then (b) is a DSA: in order to understand the offensiveness of (b), it is necessary to link it with (a) and to consider (b) as an intention motivated by a derogatory assessment of the abilities of the interlocutor (вы, плотници суиже ⇒ приставимъ вы хоромъ рубить нашу).

In this article, we are going to turn to the analysis of mono-functional ISAs—utterances used with one IF. When identifying the types of ISAs, we first list the basic IF of the utterance (the one in which it could be used as a DSA), and then the indirect IF of the utterance (the one in which it is used as an ISA in the given dialogue fragment).

2. Typology of Mono-functional Indirect Speech Acts in the Speech of TBY Characters

I. Statement Concerning the Present

1. Statement Concerning the Past

The speaker informs of an event that took place prior to the moment of speech, using the present tense. The reason for using the present tense is as follows: under the conditions of the violation of the canonical speech situation, he is guided by the time when his interlocutor gets the message. The most illustrative example in this regard is (1a): the Greek king hears the words of the Russian prince as if they were uttered in his presence.4

2. Statement Concerning the Intention of the Speaker

(2) И посла къ деревляндо, рѣкун сицѣ: “Ге одже иду къ вамъ, да пристроите мѣды многихъ оу города, идже оукунте мужа моего, да поплачюсѧ надъ гробомъ ен и створю трызну мужу моему”. Уни же, слышавше, свезоша мѣды многихъ зѣло (6453/945).

When pronouncing the given utterance, Princess Olga is only going to visit the Drevlyane, however, as in (1a) and (1b), she focuses on the time when the interlocutor gets her message.

3. Statement Concerning the Intention of a Person Who is not Involved in the Dialogue

(3) Од едину ночу присла по мѧ кнѧзь Дв̃дъ. И придохъ къ нему, и сказа дружину школо его, и посади мѧ и рече ми: “[. . .] Да се, Василю, шляо тя: кди к Василкови со сила штрокомъ, и моли ему тако: «Мже хоинеся послати мужа своего, и коротитсѧ Володимръ, то вдам ти которы люво городъ: люво Всево-ложъ, люво Шеполъ, люво Перемилъ». Акъ же идохъ къ Василкови и погѣдахъ ему всю рѣчъ Двд̃ву. Уни же рече: “[. . .] Послю къ Володимру, да быша не прольӻли крови мене дѣлѧ. Но сему мнѣ дивно: да етъ ми градъ съ он, акъ и Теребовль, моя волость, пождавше и нѣ.” (6605/1097).

Prince Vasilko talks of the proposal of Prince Davyd, pointing out that the latter is giving him one of the cities; however, Prince Davyd has only declared his intention, the implementation of which depends on the further actions of Prince Vasilko. Thus, Prince Vasilko judges the situation as if the condition of

---

4 The use of the present tense in this type of context is not necessary (for example, По семъ же придоша икаци ў Рима, глушце, ико: “Придохъ послани њ папежа”. И речо ему: “Реклъ ти папежъ: "Землѧ твоѧ землѧ на, а вѣра ваша не акы вѣра наша". [. . .]” (6494 / 986). И рекоша новгородци Стополку: “Ге мы, кнѧже, присланн къ тойкъ, и рече намъ тако: "Не хоинеся Стополка, ни сіѧ егѡ [. . .]” (6610 / 1102); the choices of verbal forms in the context of distant communication are described in detail in the article [Са̀льцев 2016].

It should also be pointed out that in modern communication, when the rules of the canonical speech situation are violated, we often convey the words of another person using statements like Александра просит Вам передать . . . Александр говорит, что . . . Александра обещает Вам . . . etc. together with the possible variants like Александра просила Вам передать . . . Александра сказала, что . . . Александра обещала, что . . .
Prince Davyd has already been fulfilled. In the preceding part of his utterance, Prince Vasilko does agree to fulfill the request of his interlocutor.

4. Call for Action

(4) (a) Огослав же и Всеволодъ посласта къ Изславу, гище: “[..] Аще ли хощешъ погубити гра, то въ къ синъ, ико нами жаль итъ стола”. То ссылашвъ, Игаславъ встали лацы, идъ съ Волславомъ, мало лацовъ поемъ (6577/1069), (b) И послапасѧ паки къ Володимеру, гище: “Понди, княже, Киевъ. Аще ли не пойдешъ, то въ къ синъ, ико много зла удвигнеться. [..]”. 

Се же ссылашвъ, Володимеръ пондѧ в Киевъ (6621/1113).

Using the present tense, the speaker urges the interlocutor to perform the action (сам знаешь > знай, прими во внимание). It is significant that the verb used here is вѣдѣти: modeling the alleged mental state of the interlocutor, who supposedly knows himself what is reported, the speaker is “forcing” him to accept his point of view.

5. Call for Joint Action

(5) (a) И сычхаста, и рече Редѧкъ къ Мстиславу: “Не вружеьмъ са въ е- въ, но королько”. И встала са короти крѣйко (6530/1022), (b) Половцы же, слышавше, идуть русь, и собрашасѧ бес числа и начаша думати. И рече Русо: “Просимъ мира в руси, ико крѣйко са имуть бити с нами, мы бы много зла съ краю намъ Рускои земли” (6611/1103).

As in (4a) and (4b), in (5a) and (5b) the speaker is talking as if the desirable joint action has already been committed.

6. Institutional Statement

(6) Приидоша Стополкъ, и Володимеръ, и Двѧдъ Игоревичъ, и Василко Ростиславичъ, и Двѧдъ Стославичъ, и братъ его ѣлагъ, и снѧша Любчи на строенье мира. И гише къ сеѣ, рече: “Почто губимъ Русскую землю [..]? Уесѧ имѣлься са по едино сѣ и сълагдѣмъ Русскую землю. Кождо держить учини съ нами: Стополкъ — Киевъ Изславль, Володимеръ — Всеволодъ [..]”. И на томъ цѣловаша хрестъ (6605/1097).

In uttering this (6), the speaker is establishing a norm according to which he is going to act in the future. Thus, the present tense describes what should happen after the Council of Princes in Liubech.5

5 In all fairness, it should be pointed out that the Laurentian Codex uses the form держать.
7. Prediction

(7) Бонѧкъ же приѣха, повѣда Давыдови, ӻко: “П о б ѣ д ă н ы е с т ь н а у г р ы ”. И завѣтра Бонѧкъ исполчишь вон свои — Давыдово р̃., а Бонѧкъ оу̃. стѣхъ — и разлѣли на ӻ. полкы и поде ко оугромъ (6605/1097).

Using the present tense, Bonyak is talking about a victory in a battle which has not yet even started as if it were a fait accompli.

Thus, in most cases the use of the present tense in an ISA allows the speaker to describe the event that has not yet occurred as one that is taking place; to convince the interlocutor that the given event is inevitable.

II. Statement Concerning the Future

1. Statement Concerning the Present (Present Tense)

(8) (a) Пришедшю ми в Ладогу, повѣдаша ми ладожане, ӻко сдѣ есть: “Е г д а б у д е т ь т у ч а в е л и к а , нахо ть дѣти наши глазкы стеклѧныи, и малы и вели кы, повертаны, а дрыя подлѣ Волховъ перѣжутъ, еже выполносязветь вода” (6622/1114), (b) И иде въ варѧгы, и приде въ Римъ, исповѣда, єлико наоучи и єлико видѣ, и ре имъ: “Андо видѣхъ землю словеньску, идущю ми сѣмо. Видѣхъ княгь древѧны, и пережжутъ и велами, и съвлекутся, и ву дасть нажи, и шолются мытью, и боимуть въникъ, и на чиютъ хвостаты, и того сѣвъ дохъ, ӻва вылѣзутъ ле живы, и окояются водою студеною, и тако живъ. И тако творѧть по всѧ дн̃и не мучими никым же [. . .]”.

Such ISAs can be found in fragments of the narrative type of the dialogue: the speaker talks about things that can happen, with the ISA contained in an initial predicative unit (hereafter—PU), which describes the condition of the emergence of such a typical situation (see 8a), or in the main part of the story, which describes the sequence of the events (see 8b). The other parts of the utterance contain DSAs with the forms of the present tense in the function of the usual present (8a: нахо ть дѣти наши глазкы стеклѧныи; 8b: тако творѧть по всѧ дн̃и).

2. Statement Concerning the Present (the Present Gnomic)

(9) В се лѣ придоша послѣ из немецъ къ Ст̃ославоу. Ст̃ослав же, величаше, показа имъ батьство свое. Ви ны же, видивъе бесчисленное множество зла, и срѣкра, и паволъ, рѣша: “Ге ни во что же есъ, се бо лежить мртъво. Сего суть смѣтье лучье. Мужи бо доинууть и болша сего” (6583/1075).

The ambassadors, responding to the approval of Prince Svyatoslav, point out that the warriors are more valuable, meaning not a single action in the future but their ability to commit the action.
3. Statement Concerning the Decision

(10) (a) И ре ему шлипъ кудесникъ: “Княже! Конь, егоже любиши и ѣздити на немъ, въ тогу зи умрети”. Savedъ же приниъ и оум, си рече: “Н иколи же всѧду на конь, и ни вижко его золо того”. И повѣля кормити и не водити его къ нему (6420/912), (b) Стополъ же шканыны, здѣшь оумъ Остслава, пославъ къ горѣ Оугоръ, екция ему къ отры. И нача помышляти, иако: “Изьбу всю крѧть свою и принику власть русскую единицу”. Помышли высокооумьемъ своимъ, а не вѣды, иако . . . (6523/1015), (c) Изслав же иде въ лѧхы со навтпнемъ многимъ и съ женою, оуповала бѧтвствомъ многымъ, глѣ, иако: “Сямъ налѧку вола”. Еже вѣдѧша оу него лѧхове, показаша ему путь въ селье (6581/1073), (d) Азъ же иде къ Василкови и повѣдалъ ему всѧ рѣчь Двѧбъ. Вѣ же рече: “[. . .] Яко приде ми вѣсть, иако нечтъ къ мнѣ кореньдичи, и печенѣги, и торчи, и [. . ] помышлихъ: “На землю Лѧдъскую наступаю на землѧ грядо ю и восму землю Лѧдъскую и мышю землю Русскую” (6605/1097).

The speaker utters his decision to perform an action in the future or to follow a certain pattern of behavior. More often than not, these utterances are addressed to the speaker himself: the narrator introduces the thoughts of the character to the reader, verbalizing his “inner speech.” This theory is backed up by the fact that it is mentioned in the framework construction that the character (10a) приниъ и оумъ, си рече, (10b) нача помышляти и помышли высокооумьемъ своимъ, (10c) иде оуповала бѧтвствомъ многымъ, (10d) приде ми вѣсть и помышлихъ. Example (10d) is the most illustrative because in this example, it is not the narrator but the character himself—Prince Vasilko—who tells his interlocutor about his thoughts, seeing them as the reason for the misfortunes he had to endure: А неу вѣдѧшь въ срѧдцѣ моемъ не было ни на Стѣополка, ни на Дѣба. [. . .] Но за мое оузнесенье — иже повдѣша вереньдичи ко мнѣ, и веселѧ срѧце моє, и вѣзвеселилъ оумъ моє — и низложенъ мѧ Бѣ и смѣри мѧ.

4. Call for Action

(11) Рѣ же имѣ Влѧга: “[. . .] Азъ оутро пошлю по вы, вы же рѣ тѣ: «Не ѣдємъ ни на конєхъ, ни пѣши идємъ, но понєсєтє ны въ лодьи», и вѣзвеселилъ оумъ моє, и ѣзду въ лодьи (6453/945).

The form of the future tense describes the action Princess Olga encourages her interlocutor to perform. As in (4a), (4b), (5a), and (5b), the speaker uses the ISA as a rhetorical device, allowing them to “impose” their point of view on the recipient.
5. Call for Joint Action

ISAs with the forms of the future tense are used to encourage the interlocutor to perform a joint action, the speaker and interlocutor constituting a single social group. In some cases, this group is undifferentiated (12a, 12b): the utterance of such statements demonstrates the making of a common decision concerning further actions, which labels such statements as self-addressed ones (the whole group is specified as the speaker), and which brings these statements closer to those described in (10). In some other cases, the “head” of the group appeals to all the rest. If the recipient accepts the call, the chronicler either gives his response utterance (12c: Идєже глав твоє лѧжеть, ту и главы наша сложи(6479/971), (d) Свѧслявъ же приӻ дары и почдумати съ дружиною своєю, рекѧ сицє: [. . .]; or gives the response of the recipient in the frame construction (12d: и люба бы рѣчь сї дружинѣ, и послаша лѣпьшии мужи къ црви (6479/971), (e) Свенгелдъ и Ас мудъ: “Кнѧзь оужє почалъ. Потѧгнємъ, дружиню, по кнѧзѣ!” И посташа свѣту сему смысленѣи мужи — Êнь и прочи. Князь же не восхотѣша свѣта сего, но рєкоша: “Хощємъ сѧ бити. Поступимъ на ѡну сторону рѣкѣ” (6601/1093).
the descriptions of the subsequent actions (12e: и покъдиша дереўланны). If the recipient does not agree with the call—which is a rare case—the narrator states this in the frame construction and gives an utterance explaining the disagreement of the interlocutor (12f: Кіныще не восхо́тѣша свѧ́тта сего, но реко́ша: “Хо́семъ сѧ бити. Поступи́мъ на въну сторону рѣ́кѣ”).

All ISA forms of this type contain the forms of the 1st person plural, with most statements containing clichés uttered in typical communicative situations (“the discussion of ‘the search for’ the Prince”: Пониже́мъ!, Понйемъ!; “the speech of the headman, calling to make peace with the enemy”; Створи́мъ миръ!). It is characteristic that six of fourteen ISAs with IF “call for joint action” contain a cliché Потѧ́гнемъ! (Пондемъ!), and the information about the consent of the recipient is given as implicit information (see 12e)—this way of describing events characterizes the speech genre of “a warlord addresses his warriors before a battle.”

6. Institutional Statement

(13) Ст̃ополкъ и Володимеръ посла́ста к Олгови, ѓша си́ще: “Пои́мъ! Пои́мъ! ст̃ополкъ и Володимеръ испо́стка к нему: “Да се ты ны на поганыӻ идеши с нама, ни на думу; то ть и ты зло мыслиши на нас и помогати хощеши поганымъ. А Б ъ̃ промежи нама бу́деть”. Ст̃ополкъ же и Володимеръ идоста на Ѣлга къ Чернигу (6604/1096).

Just as in (6), the speaker sets the standard (Бог нас рассудит), which will henceforth determine the relationship between the dissenting brothers-princes.

7. Promise (Oath)

(14) И э Ст̃ославъ: “[. . .] И не имамъ оуфкінги, но станемъ крѣ́пико, азъ же предъ вами пои́ду. Аще моѧ глава лѧжеть, тоже промыслитѧ се́бѣ”. И рекоше воя: “Идєже глав твоѧ лѧжеть, ту и главы наша сложи” (6479/971).

Uttering a response statement, the warriors do not report about possible future events, but swear allegiance to Prince Svyatoslav.

III. Report of an Event that did not Happen due to the Non-implementation of a Certain Condition

1. Evaluative Judgment, Condemnation of the Events of the Past

(15) Уни же рѣ́ша: “Разъгнѣвалъсѧ Бъ на ѡци нѧ и расточи ны по страна грѣ́хъ рѧ нашихъ, и предана въ землѧ наша хрѣ́цьемъ”. Володимиръ же рѣ́: “То како вы инѣхъ оучите, а сами ўвѣ́ржени Бѧ? Аще въ Бъ любили

---

7 The latter method of description is the most frequently used one.
The utterance states, *Вы рассеяны по чужим землям, потому что Бог не любит вас.* It should be noted that the understanding of the ISA in this case is impossible without reference to the content of the two parts of the utterance: the speaker describes a situation exactly the opposite to the one which is true (*Вы не были бы рассеяны по чужим землям vs. В действительности вы рассеяны по чужим землям*), which gives a pejorative connotation to the views expressed in the second part of the structure (*Бог любил бы вас vs. В действительности Бог не любит вас*).

All the statements given above are non-interrogative. As we can see, in most cases their use as an ISA is associated with the use of special verbal forms. Present forms are used in constructions describing events that took place prior to the moment of speech or the events that, according to the speaker, should occur in the future, and the degree of probability of their implementation is estimated differently. Future tense forms express the meaning of the usual present and the gnomic present, and are also used in the constructions describing future events, the implementation of which seems problematic to the speaker, which makes him add to them a modal evaluation. It is characteristic that the use of past tenses in mono-functional ISAs is extremely rare.\(^8\) Example (15) may be considered as an exception—a statement that describes the condition in which the past situation would not have emerged. Thus, the use of mono-functional non-interrogative ISAs is primarily related to the changes of the semantics of the verb forms—in terms of tenses or modality.

**IV. Call for Information (Verifying Question)**

1. **Call for ACTION**

(16) (a) И заоутра, въставъ, рече къ сущимъ съ нимъ ученикомъ: “Видите горы сии? Иже на сихъ горахъ въсиѧть благь Іахъ. Имать и городъ велики въстьти, и цѣки многи има Бѣкъ вѣдвигнути”, (b) И послала киѧнѣ къ Стѧславу, глаѧще: “Ты, княже, чужен земли ищешь и владѣешь, а своеѧ лишивъ. Малѣ бо не вѣщаѧ печепѣгъ, и мтѣрь тѣю и дѣтнн твоихъ. Аще не придеши, ни ѡборониши на, да пакы вѣзмуть. Аще ти не жаль штѣнные своеѧ, и мтѣрь, стары суща, и дѣти свой?" То слышавъ, Стѧславъ вкорѣзъ вѣсѧдъ на кони съ дружиною своею и приде къ Киеву, и цѣлова мтѣръ свое и дѣти свое, сѣяѧщи въ вышѣ вѣ печепѣгъ (6476/968).

Uttering an interrogative sentence, St. Apostle Andrew encourages his disciples to look in the necessary direction. The citizens of Kiev do not want to

---

\(^8\) At the same time, they can be found in the poly-functional ISA; see [Соколовский 2005: 253].
know if Prince Svyatoslav has pity either for his own homeland or for his loved ones, but urge him to have pity for them, and manage to put their message across: to съ жалести, Отецъславь [...] страждящихъ вь бывшихъ печенѣгъ.

The example (16b) is characterized by a feature already mentioned in (15) and characteristic of the majority of interrogative ISAs (both verificative and informative): the utterance with a negation should be seen as an affirmative one and vice versa (Тебе не жаль? > Пожалей!).

2. Evaluative Judgment


The speaker expresses his judgment on the impossibility of performing an action in the future (see 17a) or that it would have negative consequences (17b).

3. Reminder


It should be pointed out that the IF “reproach” detected in connection with the whole utterance (18) is derived from the correlation of this syntagm with other syntags, complementing it: if these “additional” syntags were not pronounced, the statement would not be understood as a reproach (cf: И не блауѣ ли по чужимъ землямъ + имѣйѧ лишень выхъ + не створи зла ничтоже? > Я скитался по чужим землям, хотя и пострадал безвинно: меня лишили имущества, хотя никакого зла я не сотворил vs. *И не блауѣ ли по чужимъ землямъ > Я скитался по чужим землям). Thus, this additional IF is characteristic of a complex of speech moves rather than of each taken individually, and therefore the ISA (18) should not be considered a poly-functional statement.
In contrast to (18), the utterance in the same question *Не выгнаша ли мене и имѣнне мое разграбиша?* is poly-functional: the speaker simultaneously reminds his brother of the past and reproaches him, and each PU, constituting a statement, is seen as a reminder and as a reproach, even if the second PU is “removed.”

The utterance *Не изгнаста ли ви мене, брата своя?* is more difficult. On the one hand, the IF “rebuke” is set by correlating the contents of two syntagms, constituting a complex speech move (*Не изгнаста ли ви мене + брата своя?* > *Вы поступили плохо, изгнав своего брата*). On the other hand, even if the second part of the structure is omitted, the first will be illocutionarily poly-functional due to its personal mode of address: the subject of a proposition, describing a negatively evaluated event, coincides with the recipient, and therefore this part of the statement is perceived as a reminder and as a reproach (*Не изгнаста ли ви мене?* > *Это вы меня изгнали*). The second part of the structure, because it is not propositive, has no illocutionary poly-functionality, but is communicatively significant: it does not allow the recipient to doubt that the speaker is turning his attention to his being involved in a negatively evaluated action.

4. Call for Information (Informative Question)

(19) (a) И въстужиша ли в городѣ и ркоша: “Нѣ ли кого, иже ви на вну страну моглы доити? 11 аще не приступите оутро подъ городъ, предатель ималъ печеньги”. И ре вдинонъ втротъ: “Азъ могу пренти” (6476/968), (b) Вък же вьддѣ відъ града съ оудою и хожаше скверкѣ печенкѣ, гла: “Не вида ли кона никтоже?” — ἐκ ὧδε ομѣгα печенкѣς, и и мнѣхъ и своимъ (6476/968).

ISAs (19a) and (19b), as formally negative utterances which require the validation of the stated information, are actually pronounced in order to see who can be the agent of the proposition described in the utterance (the pronouns *кто* and *никто* are used in the same function): *Нет ли кого, кто мог бы . . . ?* should be seen as *Кто может . . . ?* and *Никто не видел коня?* means *Кто видел коня?*

V. Information Required (Informative Question)

1. Evaluative Judgment

The ISAs of the given type can be observed in the *Tale of Bygone Years* most frequently. They often include pronominals in the cataphoric function, which replace the syntactic positions in the predicative units [PU]. These syntactic positions can correlate both with nouns and with proposition predicates.
The pronoun кто refers to the grammatical patient in the position of the subject.

The use of the pronoun что (21a: чему; 21b: что ради; 21c: по что) with or without prepositions is mainly connected with the expression of the meanings of cause and motive, but, at the same time, they cannot be differentiated. The use of the pronoun что in (21d), where it expresses a quantitative meaning, should be mentioned as an individual case.

In all ISAs, which include the pronominal adverb kako, there can be observed predicates which consist of a modal verb and the infinitive of a notional verb. At the same time, the PU which includes kako describes the event which is

---

12 Laurentian Codex: ннa.
being evaluated and the implementation of which is ‘limited’ by the condition, stated in the following PU.

The utterances which include the verb хотѣти in the present tense form refer to the intention of the subject of the proposition to take action, expressed by the infinitive, either at some time after the moment of speech (see 22a) or shortly after the given utterance was made (see 22b). In the second case, the speaker evaluates the possibility of taking the verbal action, which he, supposedly, does not dare to take (Как же мне говорить, если...): this so-called masking strategy of both speech and behavior allows him to express his point of view and, at the same time, to forestall the possible objections of the interlocutor.

In (22c) the modal verb мощи is used. It is remarkable that although the given event took place in the past, the speaker uses the form of the present tense as in (22a) and (22b) in the meaning of the gnomic present.

D. Utterances with КИИ


The pronoun киин takes the position of an attribute of the noun, the truthfulness of its denotative meaning is somehow discredited by the speaker (the Magi’s god is not god, thus, the fault of Izyaslav is not a fault).

E. Utterances with КДЕ

(24) И се слышавъ, Глахъ вьспи вѣли сѣ словеса твоѧ, паче же и по братѣ, и нача молитисѧ со слезами, глѧ: “[…] Аще бо быхъ, брате, видилъ лице твоѧ ангелое, оумерлъ быхъ с тобою. Нынѣ же что ради стояхъ агѣ едино? Кде суть словеса твоѧ, иже глаше ко мнѣ, братье мои любивши? […]” (6523/1015).

The ISA with the pronominal adverb кде [where] is observed in the same passage as (21b). The use of two ISAs, one after another, allows the speaker to express the sorrow he feels after he lost his beloved brother.

F. Utterances with ЧТО СДѢЛАТИ

(25) И р̀ варѧгъ: “Не сѣ ту кѣни, но древо. […] А Бѣ едины есть, емуже слу- жатъ грѣши и кланяютса, исе створиа ъбо, и землю, и чѣвка, и зѣвѣзды, и сныце, и луну и далѣ есть жити на земли. А си кѣни что сдѣлаша? Самы дѣлани суть. […]” (6491/983).
The pronominal use of a verb can also be observed in the TBY: the predicative combination (predicative complex) что сдѣлаша replaces those predicative combinations that could have been used in the response utterance if the speaker’s question had not been an ISA, implying that pagan 'gods' did nothing [ничего не сдѣлали].

2. Reminding of the Past, Stating Intentions, and Describing the Current Situation and Affairs

(26) (a, b, c) Давыдъ же, имѣ вѣры лживымъ словесемъ, нача молвить на Василя, гдѣ сице: “(a) Кто есть оузнавъ брата твоего Идрополка, (b) а нынѣ мыслить на та и на мѧ (c) и сложилъся есть с Володимеромъ? Да промышливъ си в свой говѣр!” (6605/1097).

Example (26) presents a number of ISAs united by a common agent and expressed by the pronoun кто. Example (26a) reminds the interlocutor of an action, which the person they talk about committed earlier; (26b) states his intention; and (26c) speaks about the current situation, which is the result of his previous actions. Correlation of the propositive meanings of these three PUs should make the interlocutor consider the speaker’s words as a warning (26a, 26b, and 26c cannot be regarded as a warning individually), moreover, the given IF is also typical of the PU Да промышливъ си в свой говѣр!—the utterance, used here as a DSA.

3. Unfavorable Forecast


In examples (27a) and (27b), the pronoun кто refers to the agent. In example (27c), the pronoun что at the verb досѣдѣти replaces the object, which should be taken as a proposition (at the end of the utterance, made by Princess Olga, this proposition is verbalized: вы хочете голодомъ измереть). In (27d), a pronominal verb is used (comp. to 25).

It should be stressed that (27a) is a forecast unfavorable for the speaker; (27b) for the participant of the proposition who is not a communicant; and (27c) and (27d) for the interlocutor.
4. Apprehension

(28) (a) Володимиръ же ре: "То како вы инѣхъ оучите, а сами ѵѣкрѣжени Бѣ? Дѣе бы Бѣ мѣнялъ вась, то не кысть расточени по чюжимъ Ѵѣмлѣй. Еда и намъ то же мыслите Ѵѣ пѣйати?" (6494/986). (b) Видѣвъ же малую дружину своею, ре в себѣ: "Ѳъа, како прѣлѣстнѣе, нѣ кѣируютъ дрѣж""ну мою и мене?", кѣша ко мною погыбли на полку. И ре: "Пойду в Ръ и приведу коле дружину" (6479/971).

The speaker expresses apprehension that the event unfavorable for him can take place. At the same time, he addresses his utterance either to the interlocutor (see 28a), or to himself (see 28b): in the second case, as in (10), the narrator verbalizes the ‘inner speech’ of the character, showing its specific nature in the frame construction (ре в себѣ).

5. Hope

(29) Ща же не хотѧше ити, Ѵко в поганыѲъ, и ре им: "Луче бы ми сдѣ оумрети". И ре сестра еванг.: "Ѳъа како прѣратытѣ Бѣ Рѣскую Ѵѣмлѣ в поканніе, а Грѣкую Ѵѣмлѣ нѣкавиши Ѵъ лютымъ рати? [...]" (6496/988).

In contrast to (28b), the speaker expresses his hope that the mentioned event will take place; in both cases the conjunction єгда is used, but at the same time its meaning is so different from the meaning of a time conjunction “when” косда that there is a question as to whether these interrogative utterances are verificative. However, attention should be paid to the fact that both in (28) and in (29), the participants of communication speak about future events, and the possibility of their implementation is the subject the speaker is really worried about. It is the combination of two time zones—the moment of speech and the event following it—that accounts for the use of a time conjunction.

VI. Call for Information (Combination of Verifying and Informative Questions)

A number of TBY passages include constructions where two ISAs are used together: the verifiable question, the IF of which is ‘calling to an action,’ and the informative question, the IF of which is the ‘evaluative judgment’:

(30) (a) И ре Блудъ Іѧрополку: "Видишъ ли, колько къон оу крацта тѣ? Намъ нѣ не верекоѣти. И твори мирѣ съ браѣмъ своямъ", лѣтѧ подь нѣй, сѣ
In all of these utterances the first position is taken by the ISA in the form of the 2nd person present tense видиши, which forms the mental modus structure: the interlocutor, supposedly, evaluates the current situation himself, although in fact the speaker adduces his own point of view, which is expressed by the following ISA with the pronoun колко, meaning a great number/amount of the evaluated thing: (30a: Сколько воинов? = Много воинов; 30b и 30c: Сколько зла? = Много зла). It should be pointed out that such ‘compound’ ISAs are observed in dialogues in which the speaker, by means of changing different strategies of speech and behavior, tries to convince the interlocutor of something, and each time he succeeds. Thus, the chronicler regards ‘compound’ ISAs as utterances that allow him to achieve the perlocutive effect he wants in a discussion the result of which is not obvious.

Concluding the analysis of interrogative ISAs, let us once again discuss the feature that has been discovered when describing example (16b). As we can observe, in most cases the use of interrogative utterances as ISAs is connected with the following semantic changes in the propositions:

• if an utterance, which is understood literally, expresses a negative judgment (formally, it is expressed by the negative particle не), it should be interpreted as a positive one (16b: Тебе не жаль? > Пожалей!; 18: Не скитался ли я по чужим землям? = Я скитался по чужим землям!; 19a: Нет ли кого, кто мог бы. . . ? = Кто может. . . ?; 19b: Никто не видел. . . ? = Кто видел. . . ?; 20: Кто этому не рад? = Все этому рады!),

• if an utterance, which is understood literally, expresses a positive judgment, it should be interpreted as a negative one (17a: Можете ли вы перестоять нас? = Вы не можете перестоять нас!; 17b: Лучше ли нам будет, если мы умрем? = Если мы умрем, нам лучше не будет!; 21a: Зачем вы совершаете им

14 Compare with (16a), where the verb is used in its literal sense.
15 This reveals a pattern: in cases when, determining the number of the positively evaluated object, the speaker refers to the lack of it (see 21d: Сколько ты без горестей жил на этом свете? = Мало ты жил на этом свете без горестей), and in cases when, determining the number of the negatively evaluated object, the speaker refers to its redundancy (see 30a, 30b, and 30c).
16 Concerning speech behavioral tactics, see [ВЕРЕЩАГИН, КОСТОМАРОВ 2005: 524, 525].

Thus, as it has turned out, the feature that is so typical of modern Russian discourse has a long history and is quite traditional.

3. Conclusions

The analysis allows for the following conclusions:

1. The use of ISAs is typical not only of modern but also of Old Russian communication. ISAs in Old Russian can be used both as mono-functional and poly-functional utterances.

2. Mono-functional ISAs can be observed in 33 of 320 original (i.e., not observed in other texts) dialogue passages of the TBY. At the same time, more often than not, more than one ISA is used in a certain dialogue passage: the total number of mono-functional ISAs is 82 utterances.

3. The semantics of non-interrogative mono-functional ISAs (44 utterances) in most cases is connected with the expression of indirect time and aspect of verbal forms (present forms referring to events in the past, future forms to unreal events, and so forth).

4. 38 mono-functional ISAs are interrogative utterances. In the majority of cases their semantics is narrowed to the statement of a certain evaluative judgment; at the same time, in the structure of the proposition the semantic operator of negation is replaced by the semantic operator of assertion and vice versa.

5. The types of mono-functional ISAs, singled out in the course of the analysis, can be observed in modern Russian discourse as well, which allows us to assume that they are quite traditional.
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