

## **UC Berkeley**

### **Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society**

**Title**

Topicalization and Relativization in Old Russian

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4fc1564c>

**Journal**

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 3(3)

**ISSN**

2377-1666

**Author**

Ickler, Nancy

**Publication Date**

1977

Peer reviewed

Topicalization and Relativization in Old Russian

Author(s): Nancy Ickler

*Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (1977), pp. 656-669

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

---

*The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Topicalization and Relativization in Old Russian  
 Nancy Ickler  
 University of California, Berkeley

Topic-comment organization in Modern Russian is marked by word order, intonation, and certain conjunctions, adverbs, and particles. I will show that topic-comment structure is also relevant to a description of Old Russian, and propose that one source for relative clauses in Old Russian is a construction in which topics were fronted and marked under certain discourse conditions by the particle že.

This study is based on four works from the earliest attested period of Russian, consisting of about 400 printed pages, and representing a cross-section of styles: the Primary Chronicle, Nestor's vita of St. Theodosius, the anonymous vita of Sts. Boris and Gleb, and the pilgrimage of Abbot Daniel. These works date from the eleventh and early twelfth centuries.

### Topicalization in Old Russian

As a first approximation, topicalization in Old Russian can be assumed to work similarly to topicalization in Modern Russian. Intonation and word order are the chief markers of topic-comment structure in Modern Russian. The primary sentence stress always falls on the comment, and in neutral order the comment follows the topic.

There are two kinds of topics in Russian which behave similarly with respect to word order and other topic marking devices but which have different discourse functions. The first are adverbials of time and place, corresponding in function to what Chafe (1976:50) calls topic (Chinese style): a constituent which establishes a framework within which the main predication holds. I will call such topics situational topics. The second type corresponds more closely to Chafe's notion subject: what the sentence is about, or the starting point of the sentence, about which the rest of the sentence adds knowledge (Chafe 1976:43-4). I will call such topics thematic topics. In Russian, the thematic topic usually is the grammatical subject, but other sentence constituents, if they are given, that is, assumed to be in the addressee's consciousness (Chafe 1976:30), can be preposed and function as thematic topics. A sentence can have both a situational and a thematic topic (in that order), only a thematic topic, only a situational topic, or no topic. Sentences without thematic topics either have no nominal arguments or else are presentational sentences, sentences which convey the existence or arrival of their subjects. Neutral order for presentational sentences is VS. A sentence can also have two thematic topics: this occurs when a non-subject argument, for example an object, serves as topic and is followed by a given subject which also acts as a topic. In such sentences the non-subject topic precedes the subject, and the subject is usually pronominal.

For Old Russian this schema must be modified to take into account two major ways in which Old Russian syntax differs from Modern Russian. First, in Old Russian, subjects which represent given information and are neither emphatic nor necessary for disambiguation do not have to be expressed. Third person subject pronouns as a rule do not occur unless a subject change is involved, and even then often do not appear if they duplicate information inferrable from verb morphology or context. Subject non-occurrence is a form of topicalization. It means that the speaker or writer assumes that the addressee knows so well what the utterance is about that there is no need to be more explicit. The subject is especially likely not to appear, after its initial mention, if it is acting as topic in a larger sense: not only what the particular sentence is about, but what a more lengthy passage is about as well. Second, VSO or VOS word order occur frequently in Old Russian in places where they could not occur in Modern Russian. Berneker (Delbrück 1900:71-3) states that Old Russian was mostly verb final and verb initial, with verb initial order predominating. My observations suggest that word order in Old Russian was transitional from SOV to SVO, with the numerous verb initial sentences generalized from SVO sentences without overt subjects. At any rate, preposing of topicalized or emphasized constituents was possible, and discussion in this paper will concentrate on those instances where topics are marked by sentence initial position.

A short passage from the Primary Chronicle will illustrate the notions discussed so far. Topics in this and the following examples are underlined.

1. PC s. a. 6527 = 1019

1. by<sup>s</sup> sěča zla . jaka že ne byla v Rusi .  
was battle bad like part. neg. was in Rus
2. i za ruky eml'uče sēc'axus'a .  
and by hands taking (they) fought
3. i sstupašas'a triždy . jako po udoljěmĭ krovĭ tešči .  
and (they) clashed thrice as in valleys blood to flow
4. K večeru že odolě Jaroslavŭ .  
towards evening part. triumphed Yaroslav
5. a Sŭtopolkŭ běža .  
and Svyatopolk fled
6. i běžašč'u emu napade na nĭ bėsŭ .  
and fleeing (dat.) him fell upon him devil

'And there was a terrible battle, the like of which there had never been in Rus. And they fought hand to hand. And they clashed thrice, so that the valleys flowed with blood. Toward evening Yaroslav triumphed, and Svyatopolk fled. And as he fled there fell upon him a devil.'

The first sentence is presentational and topicless. The topic of the second and third sentences is 'Svyatopolk and Yaroslav' (and their armies), understood from the context which precedes this passage.

The fourth sentence has a situational topic, k večeru. The topic-comment structure of the remainder of the sentence is open to question. Since victory is an expected part of a battle, one could consider odolě to be the thematic topic and Jaroslavů the comment. The word order would, according to this analysis, convey something similar to what the word order and definite article convey in the translation 'The victor was Yaroslav.' On the other hand, it could be argued that odolě does not represent given information in the usual sense and that the sentence is simply an example of the common Old Russian VS word order. The topic of the fifth sentence is the sentence initial subject, Štopolků. The sixth sentence begins with a dative absolute, a complementizer for expressing previous or simultaneous actions or states. The dative absolute in this sentence is the situational topic, and, the verb being presentational, there is no thematic topic.

### Old Russian že

Three functions of Old Church Slavic and Old Russian že can be factored out of traditional descriptions: it marks insistence, in which case it directly follows the word insisted upon, it acts as a coordinating or contrastive conjunction, in which case it directly follows the first tonic word of the sentence, and it serves as the second component of the relative pronoun. A fourth use which is a special case of its insistence marking function is the use of že after the demonstrative t- to indicate coreference, for example, tů že gorodů 'that very city' or 'the same city.'<sup>3</sup> These four functions are interrelated in ways which will be explored below, with discussion concentrating on the conjunctive and relative uses.

že in sentence second position has been described (see, for example, Stecenko 1972:188-90) as a conjunction or particle which sometimes acts simply as a sentence connective and sometimes indicates contrast between the sentence containing že or the word followed by že and the preceding sentence or a constituent within it. I would like to suggest that a function of že in this position is to optionally mark topic switch, that is, it indicates that the first topic of its sentence is not coreferential with the thematic topic of the preceding sentence.<sup>4</sup> The contrastive or double contrastive meanings which sometimes seem to be conveyed by že (for example, in passages (5) and (9) below) follow naturally from shift marking under appropriate semantic conditions. že following a contrastive topic is also marking insistence.

Examples (2) through (10) illustrate the topic switch marking function of že. In passages (2) and (3) the switch marked topics are situational (see also example (1.4)):

#### 2. PC s. a. 6505 = 997

i	povelě	rosytiti	velmi . i
and (he)	ordered	to dissolve	honey in water much and
vůlījati v	kadī v	družemī	kolod'azi . utro že
to pour	into tub	in other	well tomorrow part.

povelě poslati po Pečeněgy .

(he) ordered to send for Pechenegs

'And he ordered them to make strong syta (a drink made from honey and water) and pour it into the tub in the other well. The next day he ordered them to send for the Pechenegs.'

3. T 37d

po vš'a že dñi štýixů m'asopuščí štýi očí naši

after all part. days of holy Shrovetide holy father our feodosii . otkožaše vŭ štýju svoju peščeru ide že i

Theodosius went off to holy his cave where also

čistinoe tělo ego položeno bystī . tu že zatvor'aše s'a venerable body his laid was here part. closed refl. edinŭ do vřibŭnyja neděl'a .

alone until palm Sunday

'After Holy Shrovetide our holy father Theodosius would go to his holy cave, where his venerable body was also laid. Here he would close himself up alone until Palm Sunday.'

In examples (4) through (10), the topic marked for switch is thematic. In (4) through (6) it is the grammatical subject:

4. PC s. a. 6366 = 853

Mixailŭ cřī izide s voi bregomŭ i moremŭ

Michael emperor went forth with troops by shore and by sea na Bolgary . Bolgare že uviděvše . ne mogoša

against Bulgarians Bulgarians part. having seen neg. could stati protivu . kr tītis'a prosiša . i pokoritī

stand against to be baptized (they) asked and to submit Grekomŭ . cřī že krtī kn'az'a ixŭ . i bol'ary

to Greeks emperor part. baptized prince their and boyars vs'a . i mirŭ stvori s Bolgary .

all and peace made with Bulgarians

'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. They asked to be baptized and to submit to the Greeks. The emperor baptized their prince and all the boyars and made peace with the Bulgarians.'

5. PC (initial section, undated)

i nesoša Kozari ko kn'az'u svoemu . i kŭ starišinyŭ and carried Khazars to prince their and to elders

svoimŭ . i rěša imŭ se nalězoxomŭ danī noou . oni their and said to them behold (we) found tribute new they

že rěša imŭ o kudu . oni že rěša vŭ lěšě na part. said to them from where they part. said in forest on

goroxŭ . nadŭ rěkoju Dneprīskoju . oni že rěša čto sutī hills above river Dnepr they part. said what aux.

vŭdali . oni že pokazaša mečí (they) gave they part. showed sword

'And the Khazars carried it to their prince and elders and said to them, "Behold, we found a new tribute." They said to them, "From where?" They said, "In the forest on the hills above the Dnepr River." They said, "What did they give?" They showed the sword.'

6. D 122  
 idoxomů sů nimů vů Akru . Akra že gradů estī bylů  
 (we) went with them to Acre Acre part. city aux. was  
 Sraciniskij  
 Saracenic  
 'We went with them to Acre. The city of Acre was Saracenic ...'

In examples (7) through (10), the topic marked for switch is some constituent other than grammatical subject. Most sentences with non-subject topics have no overt subject, that is, the understood subject is also topicalized. Such sentences correspond to Modern Russian sentences whose first thematic topic is a non-subject nominal and whose second thematic topic is a given and usually pronominalized subject.

7. PC s. a. 6476 = 968  
 onů že re azů esmī muzī ego . i prišelů esmī vů  
 he part. said I am man his and come aux among  
 storožě . i po mně idetī polků so kn'azemů . be-ščisla  
 guards and after me comes army with prince countless  
 množīstvo . se že re groz'a imů .  
 multitude this part. (he) said frightening them  
 'He said, "I am his man and have come with the vanguard, and  
 after me comes the army with the prince, a countless multitude."  
 This he said to frighten them.'
8. PC s. a. 6576 = 1068  
 l'udle že vysěkoša Vseslava is poruba . vů .ěi. dnī  
 people part. cut out Vseslav from prison on 15 day  
 semt'abr'a . i proslaviša i sredě dvora kün'aža . dvorů zī  
 of September and glorified him amid court prince's court part.  
 kn'azī razgrabiša  
 prince's (they) plundered  
 'The people freed Vseslav from prison on the fifteenth of  
 September and glorified him amid the prince's court. The  
 prince's court they plundered ...'
9. T 29b  
 načatů bo pešči proskury i prodajati . i  
 (he) began part. to bake Communion breads and to sell and  
 eže ašče pribud'aše emu ků cěně to dad'aše niščinů .  
 that if came to him over cost that (he) gave to beggars  
 cěnoju že paky kup'aše žito .  
 with cost part. again (he) bought grain  
 'For he began to bake Communion bread and sell it and whatever  
 he took in over and above his outlay he gave to beggars. With  
 the money he charged to recover his outlay he bought more grain.'
10. T 64b  
 Bīgověryni že kn'azī sťoslavů bě ne daleče ot  
 pious part. prince Svyatoslav was neg. far from  
 manastyr'a blaženaago stoja . i se vidě  
 monastery of the blessed one standing and behold (he) saw

stůlůpů ognňů do n̄bse suščĩ nadů manastyřĩmĩ tẽmĩ . sego  
 column of fire to sky being above monastery that this  
 že inů nikůto že ne vidě  
 part, other no one part. neg. saw

'Pious Prince Svyatoslav was standing not far from the monastery of the Blessed One. And suddenly he saw a column of fire up to the sky above that monastery. This no one else saw ...'

It should be pointed out that not all topic switches are marked by že. The preponderance of že after switched topics varies with the genre and the individual work. For example, in the Primary Chronicle že is frequent in the narrative passages but practically non-existent in this use in the inserted treaties and in the admonition and letter of Vladimir Monomakh. It is relatively uncommon in the pilgrimage of Abbot Daniel. Within hagiographical works, it is much more common in the vita of St. Theodosius than in the vita of Sts. Boris and Gleb.

Lexical, grammatical, and discourse factors also have some bearing on whether or not že is likely to follow the topic. In works where it tends to be used, že always follows the third person anaphoric pronoun on-. Since on- signals subject switch, and subject switch almost invariably implies topic switch, it seems likely that writing že after on- simply became automatic. On- is also frequently contrastive, as it is, for example, in passage (5); že following contrastive on- is being used to mark insistence as well as to mark topic switch.

Also in works where že tends to be used, it nearly always marks non-subject topics. Several factors conspire to produce this regularity. Non-subject topics are atypical in that they are not grammatical subjects, in that they are often inanimate, and in that they rarely serve as topic of the larger passage; since in some sense they do not fulfill the reader's expectations, extra attention is drawn to them by marking them with že. Furthermore, it is precisely after non-subject topics, since they are not typical sentence openers, that one would expect že to be exploited for marking the sentence boundary. Moreover, non-subject topics, since in order to be topicalized they must represent given information, usually are coreferential with a nominal in the preceding sentence, often, in fact, the last nominal in that sentence. Where this pattern occurs, as for example in passage (8), že in its topic switching function is reinforced by the meaning of the že which more characteristically follows t- to show coreference.<sup>5</sup> In example (8), then, že indicates not only topic switch, but also something like "we are continuing to talk about that same court." Topics marked by že which are coreferential with the last nominal of the preceding sentence are not limited to non-subject topics, as examples (4) and (6) illustrate. If in sentences of this pattern the two coreferent nominals occur side by side, že also plays an important role as a boundary marker. It shows unambiguously that the speaker is starting a new sentence and not repeating himself or, where the forms of the nominals differ (for example, where they



are in different cases), correcting himself.<sup>6</sup> The boundary marking function of že shows up clearly in examples (4), (6), (8), and (11).

11. PC s. a. 6559 = 1051

Feodosiēvi že živušč'u v manastyri i  
 Theodosius (dat.) part. living (dat.) in monastery and  
 prav'ašč'u . dobrodětelnoe žitje . i černečijskoe pravilo .  
 observing (dat.) virtuous life and monastic rule  
 i primajušč'u vs'akogo prixod'aščago k nemu . k nemu  
 and accepting (dat.) each coming to him to him  
 že i azū pridoxū xudyi i nedostoinyi rabū . i  
 part. also I came poor and unworthy servant and  
 prijatū m'a .  
 (he) accepted me

'When Theodosius was living in the monastery and leading a virtuous life and observing the monastic order, and accepting everyone who came to him, to him also came I, a poor and unworthy servant, and he accepted me.'

In example (11) že is not marking topic switch<sup>7</sup>; it seems that the other factors just discussed were sufficiently powerful by themselves to motivate its occurrence in this instance. Occasionally in the Primary Chronicle že also occurs after a non-switched subject topic. In each case the topic is a proper noun and identical to the subject and topic of the preceding sentence, which is also followed by že. Example (12) illustrates this pattern:

12. PC 6523 = 1015

Štopolkū že ispolnivūs'a bezakonija . Kainovū  
 Svyatopolk part. having become filled with lawlessness Cain's  
 smyslū priimū . posylaja k Borisu gļše . jako s toboju  
 thought having taken sending to Boris said that with you  
 xoč'u l'ubovī iměti i kū otn'u pridamī ti .  
 (I) want love to have and over father's (I) will give to you  
 a līst'a pod nimī kako by i pogubiti . Štopolkū  
 but deceiving under him how part. him to kill Svyatopolk  
 že pride nočiju Vyšgorodu .  
 part.came by night to Vyshegorod

'Svyatopolk, filled with lawlessness and having begun to think like Cain, sent to Boris and said, "I want to live in love with you and I will add to your inheritance," deceiving him and contemplating how to kill him. Svyatopolk came by night to Vyshegorod.'

One could dismiss such apparent overuses of že as scribal errors. It is striking, however, that in each case either another human being besides the topic is mentioned in the first sentence, or the subject-topic of the first sentence addresses someone, or both. The reader could reasonably expect the second sentence to have a new topic, either the other person mentioned in the first sentence picking up the action, or the addressee of the message in the first sentence replying. For example, after the first sentence in

passage (12), one might expect some information about Boris's response. že in passages like (12) seems to be marking another kind of switch: a switch from an animate noun which the listener or reader could expect to pick up the action back to the topic of the preceding sentence.

Such phenomena suggest that the use of že to mark topic switch is a special case of a broader rule according to which že could mark topics under certain more general and sometimes coinciding discourse conditions, including at least: topic switch, unrealized expectations of various kinds, and the need to prevent an incorrect interpretation of a repeated nominal as a mistake or self-correction.

### The Old Russian relative construction

Relative pronouns in Old Russian consist of the inflected anaphoric pronoun j- followed by že. For example, the dative singular masculine-neuter anaphoric pronoun is emu, so the dative singular masculine-neuter relative pronoun is emuže. The only exception to this rule is the nominative case, where relative pronouns are built on the j- stem and anaphoric pronouns on a demonstrative stem, usually on-. The relative pronoun occurs clause initially, and the relative clause is usually postposed, that is, following the relativized noun or the entire matrix clause. Semantically, relative clauses can be descriptive or restrictive, but at least in writing there is no formal difference in the marking of these two types.

In reading Old Russian one is struck by the large number of sentences beginning with (non-nominative) pronoun plus že which are interpretable both as relative clauses and as independent sentences marked for a switched topic. Examples (13) through (18) illustrate this phenomenon. The two translations given for each example do not imply that the Old Russian was ambiguous, but simply reflect the fact that English marks sentences as either independent or subordinate where Old Russian sometimes did not.

13. PC s. a. 6420 = 912  
 na p'atoe lě<sup>c</sup> pom'anu koni . o t nego že b'axuti  
 in fifth<sub>1</sub> year (he) remembered horse from {it + part.} aux.  
 rekli vo svi umrti . {which }  
 said magicians to die  
 'In the fifth year he remembered the horse { . Through that }  
 the magicians had said he would die.' { , through which }
14. PC s. a. 6494 = 986  
 služati bo oprěsnoki rekše oplatki .  
 (they) serve part. with unleavened breads called wafers  
ixuže Bū ne preda . no povelě xľbomū služiti .  
 {them + part.} God neg. gave but ordered with bread to serve  
 {which }  
 'For they serve Communion with unleavened bread called wafers { .  
 Those }  
 which } God did not hand down, but ordered that Communion be  
 served with bread.'

15. PC s. a. 6504 = 996  
 i prizri na crkvi tvoju si . juže sozda<sup>x</sup>  
 and look upon church your this {it + part.} (I) built  
 {which  
 nedostoinyi rabu tvoji . vu im'a rožišaja t'a Matere .  
 unworthy servant your in name of having born you mother  
 prisnodvyja Bca .  
 ever-virginal Mother of God  
 'And look upon your church { . I, Your unworthy servant, built  
 it } , which I, Your unworthy servant,  
 built } in the name of the Mother who bore You, the ever-  
 virginal Mother of God.'
16. T 28d  
 blgyi že bu ne popusti emu otiti otu strany  
 gracious part. God neg. allow him to leave from country  
 seja . ego že iščreva materin'a i pastuxa byti vu  
 this {him part.} from womb mother's even pastor to be in  
 {whom  
 straně sei bo glasinyixu ovici naznamenena .  
 country this of devout sheep (he) designated { . Him }  
 'Gracious God did not allow him to leave this country { , whom }  
 He had designated from his mother's womb to be pastor of the  
 flock of the devout in this country.'
17. BG 8c  
 volodimiru že poganui ešče ubivu jaropulka . i  
 Vladimir part. pagan still having killed Yaropolk and  
 pojatu ženu ego neprazdnu sušč'u . otu neja že rodi s'a  
 took wife his pregnant being from {her part.} bore refl.  
 {whom  
 sii okaninyi štopulkū .  
 this accursed Svyatopolk  
 'Vladimir, still a pagan, having killed Yaropolk, took his wife,  
 who was pregnant { . Of her } was born this accursed Svyatopolk.'  
 { , of whom }
18. D 88  
 i vu toj gore žilū oteci Markijanū , ku nemu že  
 and in that mountain lived father Marcian to {him part.}  
 pride žena bludnica iskusitū ego . {whom }  
 came woman adultress to tempt him { . To him }  
 'And in that mountain lived Father Marcian { , to whom } came  
 an adultress to tempt him.'

Also relevant to most of the above examples is the use of že to mark coreference of a topic with the last nominal of the preceding clause. Relevant to all clauses beginning with non-nominative pronoun plus že, of course, is the value of this particle for marking clause boundaries when the clause in which it occurs begins with a non-adverbial and non-subject constituent, atypical for this position. Relative clauses, however, behave differently from independent clauses with že in several ways. First, že is obligatory in relative

but optional in independent clauses. Nearly all instances of clause initial j-, however, are followed by že. Second, relative clauses can be ordered directly after the relativized noun and followed by more material from the matrix clause, as in example (19):

19. BG 20d  
 prilagaše ků vředu . imĩ že bol'aše na šii . i ků  
 (he) laid to sore {with it part.} (he) hurt on neck and to  
 {with which }  
 očima i ků temeni .  
 eyes and to crown  
 '... he touched it to the sore which was hurting him on his neck, to his eyes, and to the top of his head.'

This ordering was uncommon except with the nominative case of the relative pronoun, for reasons which will be discussed below. Finally, of course, the nominative relative pronoun is built on the stem j-, whereas the nominative anaphoric pronoun is supplied by a demonstrative stem, usually on-. The clause beginning with ize in example (20), then, must be read as relative:

20. PC s. a. 6582 = 1074  
 taci ti byša černorizci . Feodosiěva manastyr'a .  
 such for you were monks of Theodosius's monastery  
 iže sijajutĩ i po smřti jako světila .  
 who shine even after death like lanterns  
 'Such were the monks of Theodosius's monastery, who even after death shine like lanterns.'

#### A historical perspective

The number of passages permitting both topic marking and relative readings of že motivates one to speculate on the historical and synchronic relationship between the two functions. Opinion on the origin of early Slavic relative clauses with j- plus že is divided. Vaillant (1958:425-6) and Meillet (1965:484), for example, derive relative j- že from an Indo-European relative \*yo (etymologically related to Sanskrit ya-, Greek ho-) extended by the particle že. Historians of Russian, including Buslaev (1959:545), Lomtev (1956:551) and Stecenko (1972:300), see relative j- že as a later reinterpretation of the anaphoric pronoun followed by connective or insistent že. I would like to suggest that these two opinions are not mutually exclusive. Rather, taken together they provide a framework for dealing with questions unanswerable by either theory in itself.

Crucial to the question of the origin of early Slavic relatives are the infrequent examples of preposed relatives like the following:

21. T 46b  
 nů na nemĩ že městě javivů s'a . na tomĩ že paky  
 but on it part. place having appeared on that part. again  
 which  
 i nevidimů bystĩ .  
 also invisible became

'But at which place he appeared, there he also became invisible again.'

The relative clause type exemplified by passage (21) appears to be more archaic than that exemplified by passages (13) through (18). It is rare, it is not derivable in any obvious way from the postposed relative construction, and it is a typical relative construction for an SOV language, which Indo-European probably was. The pronoun in this relative construction, as Vaillant and Meillet suggest, probably continues the Indo-European relative usage of \*yo; it is difficult to see the pronoun as an extension of its anaphoric usage, as Buslaev, Lomtev, and Stecenko propose. že in this construction is no doubt a development of an original connective function (compare Sanskrit ha), a function which could also quite naturally give rise to the use of this particle for marking topic or topic switch.

If the relative clause construction illustrated in passage (21) is the more archaic, the change in Slavic from OV to VO word order provides a plausible reason for its obsolescence. A language undergoing such a change can be expected to move the relative clause from the left to the right of the relativized noun (see Kuno 1974). In Slavic, this change could have been accomplished by adapting to relative use a strategy already existing in the language, the placement of topicalized nominals (in this case, topicalized anaphoric j-) in clause initial position followed by že. Thus, as Buslaev, Lomtev and Stecenko suggest, the (postposed) relative is in one sense a late reinterpretation of anaphoric j- followed by že. A topic marking construction is a natural source for a relative construction because the pronoun in such a relative is the topic par excellence of its clause: information introduced or reintroduced in the preceding clause and therefore in the addressee's immediate consciousness, and in an obvious sense what the clause is about. Relative clauses following the relativized noun and beginning with pronoun plus že would thus have been motivated by a synchronic pattern in the language, as well as preserving the lexical apparatus of the earlier relative construction.

The hypothesis that the postposed relative construction with j- že arose via a topic marking construction suggests a cause for its eventual replacement throughout Slavic. Unless j- že is nominative and therefore clearly relative, it is often difficult to ascertain the degree of subordination of the clause it introduces. A resulting perceptual problem is illustrated by example (19) above: the addressee does not know that the clause imī že bol'aše na šii must be interpreted as a relative 'which was hurting him on his neck' and not as a new independent sentence 'It was hurting him on his neck' until he reaches the material which follows. The difficulty in processing sentences like (19) could explain the rarity of Old Russian relatives followed by material from the matrix clause. The unwieldiness of a modifying clause which could not easily follow its head noun directly unless that noun occurred in clause final position, as well as the inability of this

construction to formally distinguish subordination from coordination no doubt contributed to the disappearance of relative clauses introduced by j- plus že.

## Footnotes

<sup>1</sup>Gary Holland (personal communication) has proposed that Indo-European languages undergoing a word order change from SOV in the direction of SVO show a high incidence of verb initial sentences. This is true of Avestan, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Germanic.

<sup>2</sup>The transcription system is that which would be used for Modern Russian except that jers are written as ĭ and ŭ, jat' as ě, letters written above the line are raised, and the tilde, which marks abbreviations and letters in their numerical function, is retained. The punctuation and spacing are those of the standard reference versions of the works cited; it should be noted that the spacing represents the work of later copyists and/or editors. It was not the practice to mark word divisions by spaces at the time these works were written, though the period was used to mark syntactic boundaries.

<sup>3</sup>This usage is usually assigned a different etymology (see, for example, Vaillant 1964:141) on the basis of Old Church Slavonic tŭžde, Kiev Missal tŭže, etc. For a suggestion as to how these forms can be derived from the same source as že, see Meillet 1918: 108-9.

<sup>4</sup>This analysis does not purport to deal with sentence second že in verb initial sentences.

<sup>5</sup>Similarly, Krejdlin and Padučeva (1974b:35) point out that Modern Russian a in one function links two clauses in which the topic (theme in their terminology) of the second is anaphorically or associatively linked to the comment (rheme) of the first. Modern Russian a patterns with Old Russian že in other ways as well.

<sup>6</sup>Jack Du Bois (personal communication) has suggested that a number of syntactic processes including Equi and reflexivization are motivated by the need to prevent repetitions which might be misinterpreted as self-corrections.

<sup>7</sup>Example (11) could be analyzed as one sentence whose situational topic is the dative absolute (Feodosiĕvi ... prixod'aščago k nemu) and thematic topic is k nemu or as two sentences whose topics are coreferential: Feodosiĕvi and k nemu.

## Bibliography

## A. Texts

- BG = Sūkazanie i strasti i poxvala sv'atuju mučeniku Borisa i Gleba. In Uspenskij sbornik XII-XIII vv., ed. by S. I. Kotkov, Moscow, 1971, 43-71.
- D = Žitje i xoženje Danila, ruskyja zemli igumena. Igumen Daniil, Xoženje, ed. by M. A. Venevitinov, reprinted with an introduction and bibliographical references by K. D. Seemann, Munich, 1970.
- PC = Létopisiš po lavrentjevskomu spisku. In Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, vol. 1, Moscow, 1962, 1-286.
- T = Žitie prepodobnago otca našego Feodosija igumena pečeriskago. In Uspenskij sbornik XII-XIII vv., ed. by S. I. Kotkov, Moscow, 1971, 71-135.

## B. Other works

- Adamec, Přemysl. 1966. Por'adok slov v sovremennom rusckom jazyke. Prague: Rospravy Československé Akademie Věd, 15.
- Borkovskij, V. I. and P. S. Kuznecov. 1965. Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Moscow: Nauka.
- Buslaev, F. I. 1959. Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Moscow: Gos. Učebno-Ped. Izdat. Min. Prosvěščenija RSFSR.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. Subject and topic, ed. by Charles Li, 25-55. San Francisco: Academic Press, Inc.
- Dahl, Osten. 1969. Topic and comment: a study in Russian and general transformational grammar. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis (Slavica Gothoburgensia 4). Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Delbrück, B. 1900. Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischer Sprache, vol. 3. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Diels, Paul. 1932. Altkirchenslavische Grammatik, vol. 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Greenberg, Joseph. 1966. Some universals of language with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. Universals of language, ed. by Joseph Greenberg, 73-113. Cambridge: M. I. T. Press.
- Gundel, Jeanette. 1974. The role of topic and comment in linguistic theory. University of Texas at Austin dissertation.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1975. Topic-comment structure and the use of tože and takže. SEEJ 19.2.74-81.
- Kovtunova, I. I. 1976. Sovremennyj russkij jazyk: por'adok slov i aktual'noe členenie predloženiya. Moscow: Prosvěščenje.
- Krejdlin, G. E. and E. V. Padučeva. 1974a. Vzaímodejstvie asociativnyx sv'azej i aktual'nogo členeniya v predloženijax s sojuzom a. NTI, ser. 2, 10.32-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974b. Značenje i sintaksičeskie svojstva sojuza a. NTI, ser. 2, 9.31-7.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1974. The position of relative clauses and conjunctions. LI 5.117-36.

- Lapteva, O. A. 1972. Nerešennye voprosy teorii aktual'nogo členenija. VJa 2.35-47.
- Lobanova, N. A. and A. L. Gorbačik. 1976. Por'adok slov v ruskom jazyke. Moscow: Izdat. Moskovskogo Universiteta.
- Lomtev, T. P. 1956. Očerki po istoričeskomu sintaksisu ruskogo jazyka. Moscow: Izdat. Moskovskogo Universiteta.
- Meillet, A. 1965. Le slave commun. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1918. Vieux slave tůžde et ašte. MSL 20.108-10.
- Stecenko, A. N. 1972. Istoričeskij sintaksis ruskogo jazyka. Moscow: Vyssšaja Škola.
- Vaillant, André. 1958. Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, vol. 2, part 2. Lyon: IAC.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. Manuel du vieux slave. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves.