



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Ekaterina Schnittke

**DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF NON-
INITIAL REFERENTIAL CHOICE
IN SELECTED 17TH CENTURY
RUSSIAN TEXTS**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LINGUISTICS

WP BRP 20/LNG/2015

*Ekaterina Schnittke*¹

DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF NON-INITIAL REFERENTIAL CHOICE IN SELECTED 17TH CENTURY RUSSIAN TEXTS

The referential system of Middle Russian is notable for having in addition to the "standard" anaphoric devices—such as zero, pronominal, and nominal forms—devices that combine pronominal and nominal components, e.g. *on knjaz' Mixajlo* 'he prince Mixajlo', *tot d'jakon Iov* 'that deacon Iov'. Traditionally, referring expressions of the type Pron+NP were regarded as typical of administrative language and functionally interpreted as satisfying the need for clarity and unambiguous identification of the referents. I show that in a selection of 17th century texts these constructions are used independently of the disambiguation need. I argue that both compound constructions, Pron+NP and Dem+NP, function as markers of the referent's status at different levels of discourse. Specifically, participants who are major at the discourse level and thematic at the episode level tend to be encoded by means of Pron+NP, whereas participants who are thematic at the episode level but minor at the discourse level are usually encoded by means of Dem+NP. These facts are examined against the background of the history of pronouns and demonstratives in the Russian language.

Keywords: historical pragmatics, discourse deixis, discourse status, referential choice, referring devices, appositives, 17th century, history of Russian language, Solovki monastery

JEL Classification: Z.

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics, eschnittk@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The repertoire of referring devices used for tracking referents in Middle Russian is notable for including compound referring expressions of the type Pron+NP (1) and Dem+NP (2), where NP stands for personal names and/or titles.

(1)

a kazny Ø_i *poslal pečatat' svoim perstnem* rotmistra Stepana Potapova_j <...> // *i on* Stepan_j <...> *zapečatal*<...> // *i poslan on* Stepan_j *k velikomu gosudarju k Moskve* // *i posle* *evo* Stepana_j <...>

'and (he_i) [Ø] sent a cavalry captain Stepan Potapov_j to seal the Treasury // and he Stepan_j ... sealed <...> // and he Stepan_j was sent over to the great Master to Moscow // and after him Stepan_j ...'

(Subbotin, 1878 p. 405–406).

(2)

i Ø_i *vzjal s sobuju* sobornovo starca Aleksandra Stukalova_j // *i buduči na beregu* <...> / *monastyrskoj službka sovetnik evo arximaritov* Ivaška Mikitin_k <...> / *tovo starca Aleksandra_j* *branil i ukorjal* <...> // *a on arximarit_i* *za takuju derzost' tovo svoego sovetnika* Ivaška_k <...> *ne tokmko* [sic] *ne unimal* <...>

'and (he_i) [Ø] took with him a Council elder Aleksandr Stukalov_j // and when (they) were on the shore / a monastery servant his the archimandrite's advisor Ivashka Mikitin_k scolded and reproved that elder Aleksandr_j // and he the archimandrite_i not only didn't stop that disciple of his ([that his disciple]) Ivashka_k for such a rudeness ...'

(Subbotin 1878 p. 54);

Traditional treatments regarded referring expressions of this type as a distinctive feature of administrative language, the NP and the personal pronoun forming an appositive relationship (cf. Borkovskij 1949:49, Savel'eva 1962, Stecenko 1972:59). Functionally, adding a NP to a pronoun was said to satisfy the need for clarity and unambiguous identification of the referent in official documents. However, linguistic data show that referring devices of the type Pron+NP are frequent when there is no need whatsoever for disambiguation: in fragments with a single

participant or in contexts where other referents cannot compete for the pronoun resolution due to grammatical constraints such as number or gender. For example, in (3) archimandrite Varfolomej is the only 3rd person participant with a well established role in the episode, thus the specification *arximandrit Varfolomej* added to the pronoun *on* is unnecessary from the point of view of pronoun resolution.

(3)

<...> *veleno byti u nas v Soloveckom monastyre arximandritom našemu ž' soloveckomu postrizenniku starcu Varfolomeju_i / čto on_i ot postrizenija svoego_i u nas v monastyre let s desjat' i bolše tružalsja na krylose / žitie žil nezazorno / i p'janovo pitija ne pil // i my bogomolcy tvoi togo radi o nem_i tebe velikomu gosudarju bili čelom // i vybor dali / čajali / čto i vpred' on_i ne izmenit svoego obyčaja // i učnet žit' po predaniju velikix čjudotvorcov // i vo vsem monastyrskoje blagočinie učnet nevredno soxranjat' / kak i prežnie vlasti v vašem gosudar'skom bogomol'e v Soloveckom monastyre zili # i nyne velikij gosudar' on arximandrit Varfolomej v tvoem gosudareve bogomol'e v Soloveckom monastyre svoeju slabostiju i nebreženiem predanie velikix čjudotvorcov Zasimy i Savatija vo vsem narušil <...>*

'<...> it was ordered that in our Solovki Monastery an elder Varfolomei who was also tonsured in our Solovki Monastery_i be an archimandrite / because since his_i tonsure he_i has worked in a choir at our monastery for about ten years and more / has lived an honorable life / and has not drunk alcoholoc drinks // and because of that we, your prayers, petitioned you, the great Master, about him_i / and made the choice expecting ([expected]) / that in the future he_i would not change his_i custom / and (that he) [Ø] would start to live according to the tradition of the great wonderworkers / and would keep the monastery well-being unchanged / as previous authorities in your, the Master's, pilgrimage place, in the Solovki Monastery did # and now, o great Master, he the archimandrite Varfolomej in your, Master's, pilgrimage place, in the Solovki Monastery violated the tradition of the great wonderworkers Zosima and Savvatij in everything because of his weakness and carelessness <...>' (Subbotin 1878 p. 47-48)

In (4) there is only one individual referent, the archimandrite, referred to with *emu* in the first line; other referents, the fishery and trade supervisors, are represented as a group and are referred to with plural NPs, and therefore they cannot be possible referents for the singular referring expression. Thus the apposition of a NP to the pronoun is redundant.

(4)

a kotorye posuly emu dajut / i te nadejasja na nevo / živut <...> bezščinno // <...> // i kaznu denežnuju deržat po svoem strastem // i k nemu arximaritu vino privozjat <...> // <...> // a vzjat' na nix nečevo // propili i provorovali monastyrskuju kaznu po evo arximaritove potačke // i prepravali v posuly emu ž' arximaritu so učnikami #

'and the ([*kotorye* RELATIVIZOR]) stewards that give bribes to him / those relying on him / live <...> lawlessly // <...> // and [0] use the funds according to their passions // and bring the wine to him the archimandrite <...> // and there is nothing to take from them / (because they) [0] spent in drink and squandered monastery funds because of his the archimandrite's indulgence / and (they) [0] gave (the funds) [0] as bribes to him the archimandrite and to (his) disciples #' (Subbotin 1878 p. 49-50)

Examples like (1) and (2) suggest that the use of referring expressions of the type Pron+NP and Dem+NP is not governed merely by disambiguation needs. This paper proposes an alternative explanation for compound referring expressions. Specifically, it explores the role of the referent's discourse status in choosing a specific referring expression. Referential choice is recognized to be a cognitive process that involves multiple potential factors (Grüning & Kibrik 2005), discourse status being one among other factors, such as the linear distance between the tracking referring expression and the antecedent (measured by clause (Givón 1983) and episode (Fox 1984) boundaries), syntactic and semantic roles of the referring expression (Longacre 1983), etc.

The three hypotheses of this study are as follows: (i) referential choice correlates with the referent's discourse status; (ii) encoding the discourse status of a participant is implemented at the level of the clause along two axes: the location of that participant in the importance hierarchy at the macro level of the entire discourse, and his location in the thematic hierarchy at the level of

the episode; (iii) major thematic participants are higher in the process of referential choice and thus the encoding of minor thematic participants is contingent on that of major thematic participants.

These hypotheses were formed and tested on a selection of seventeenth century texts published in the third volume of Subbotin's *Materialy dlja istorii raskola za pervoe vremja ego suščestvovanija* [*Materials for the history of the Schism in its early stages*] (1878). The core corpus consists of three groups of texts, all concerned with the Solovki monastery during the period of the Church Schism. Each group is organized around some conflict in the monastery and includes two text types—correspondence and interrogation transcripts—where the same events are described from different perspectives and with different readerships in mind.

To test the hypothesis, the texts were divided into episodes and all the participants were ranked for their thematicity on the local level of the episode and on the macro level of the entire discourse. Five different participant configurations were identified according to the number of the participants and their discourse status.

The analysis revealed that there is a correlation between certain referring expressions and the discourse status of the participants. Specifically: (i) compound referring expressions of the type Dem+NP are used predominantly to refer to participants who are minor at the global level of discourse but thematic at the local level of an episode; (ii) compound referring expressions of the type Pron+NP are used to refer to both major and minor thematic participants, but more for major participants than minor ones. At the same time, this is the predominant way to refer to major non-thematic participants. (iii) Attenuated referring expressions (zero and pronouns) encode major thematic participants twice as often as minor thematic ones, suggesting a hierarchy of thematicity. (iv) Full NPs tend to encode major thematic participants more than minor thematic ones. Finally, (v) the encoding of participants of lower discourse importance and thematicity is determined by that of participants with higher discourse importance and episode thematicity. These findings are interpreted against the background of the preceding and the subsequent history of the Russian language as a grammaticalization which did not finalize.

In what follows I first describe the methods, including the corpus and sample characterization, and the data analysis. Then I present the results of the analysis. I conclude with a discussion of the findings and their implications.

METHODS

Corpus

The present study is part of a larger project that explores linguistic encoding of social deixis in Middle Russian. Subbotin's texts present particularly congenial material for such study for their control of several factors in the discourse situation: the interlocutors' relationships, their personal characteristics, communicative intentions, points of view, attitudes etc. The originals of the texts were written in the format of scrolls (*stolbcy*) and are now kept in the manuscript department in the State Historical Museum (GIM), Moscow. The three conflicts that resulted in the letter exchanges and a number of interrogations are described in the Appendix.

The total length of the examined corpus is 140 published pages, approximately 28,000 words. The texts were divided into episodes based on time, space, and participant continuity (Givón 1983). Of these episodes, 37 were selected for closer examination of tracking reference. The only criterion for including an episode in the sample was the presence of several mentions of the same human referent(s). All human referents were ranked for their thematicity on the local level of the episode and their importance on the macro level of the entire discourse. A thematic participant is defined as "that participant around whom the paragraph is organized, about whom the paragraph speaks" (Levinson 1978:75). The major participant is the protagonist who is mentioned in more episodes than other (minor) participants. This gives four values for the discourse status variable: major thematic (MjTh), major non-thematic (MjNon-Th), minor thematic (MnTh), and minor non-thematic (MnNon-Th).

The resulting sample includes 538 entries referring to humans. Among these 330 refer to major thematic participants, 27 to major non-thematic, 162 to minor thematic, and 9 to minor non-thematic ones. In addition to these, there are 10 entries of plural referring expressions that refer to minor and major thematic participants at once.

One of the hypotheses concerns the relative encoding of the lower discourse status with respect to the higher one. To test this hypothesis the 37 sample episodes were grouped according to the number of the participants and their rank at two levels—the macro level of the discourse and the local level of the episode. The following five participant configurations were found relevant for the present analysis:

Category I: MjTh, MnTh. There are two participants who differ in their macro level status but are equal in thematicity on the episode level.

Category II: MjTh, (MnTh)₁, (MnTh)₂. There are two minor thematic participants and one major thematic participant. This category differs from the previous one in that the relative discourse status of the minor thematic participants is to be marked with respect to the major participant and with respect to each other.

Category III: MjNon-Th, MnTh, (MnNon-Th). There are two or more participants: the major macro level participant is not thematic on the episode level, while the minor one is. There may be an optional non-thematic minor participant. These episodic participants are always referred to with a full NP and never affect the marking of the other participants' discourse status.

Category IV: MjTh₁, (MjTh₂), (MjNon-Th), (MnNon-Th). This includes a number of major thematic participants and optional minor non-thematic participants. The major participants are ranked for their relative thematicity based on the frequency of reference in the episode.

Category V: MjTh (×n), MnTh (×n), (MnNon-Th). This complex participant configuration includes a number of major thematic participants, a number of minor thematic participants, and a number of optional minor non-thematic ones.

Most of the 37 fragments comprise one episode, but some may include several episodes that form a larger unit. The episode boundary in such fragments is marked at the content plane by a discontinuity in participant configuration or by breaking spatial or temporal continuity while keeping other features constant. Such episodes are usually formally unified at the end by a restoration of continuity.

Citing Examples

Examination of the manuscripts shows that in his publication Subbotin followed the orthography of the originals quite faithfully, but punctuated the texts according to nineteenth-century norms. In citing examples, the following principles will be applied: (i) the graphics will be simplified for technical reasons. The letter "ě" [ѣ] will be rendered as "e"; no differentiation will be made between the so-called "i desjatiričnoe" ["і"] and 'i vos'miričnoe' ["и"]; and the letter "ъ" will be omitted word-finally; (ii) spelling will be kept as in Subbotin's publication with the exception of standardization in the use of lower and upper case letters: (a) the onsets of all syntactic units will be rendered with lower case letters, (b) the noun *Bog* 'God' and all proper names (anthroponyms, toponyms) will be capitalized; (iii) Subbotin's punctuation will be

omitted; instead, "/" will be used to signal clausal boundaries, "//" will signal sentential boundaries, and "#" will signal episode boundaries.

Data Analysis

Two lines of analysis were pursued in the study. First, I examined the general distribution of referring devices across two variables: the referential class (zero, pronouns, Pron+NP, Dem+NP, and full NP) and the discourse status of the referents (MjTh, MjNon-Th, MnTh, MnNon-Th). Then the variable of participant configuration category was added (Category I, Category II, etc.) and a relative encoding of the participants was explored. A battery of 24 chi-square tests was performed to assess statistical significance of the results.

RESULTS

Four sets of chi-square tests were performed to test the impact of different variables.

Major vs. Minor participants

The first set was performed to determine whether there is a significant difference in the use of referring devices for major vs. minor participants regardless of their status at the level of an episode (Table 1). The results show, and a chi-square test confirms, that the two variables are dependent ($\chi_1^2 = 46.787$, $df=4$, $p<0.001$). Moreover, the other two chi-square tests revealed that attenuated referring devices are insensitive to the global status of the referent ($\chi_2^2 = 2.576$ \nrightarrow 2.706 , $df=1$, $p<0.1$). In contrast to this, compound devices indicate a clear dependence on the discourse status of the referent. Thus devices from the Pron+NP class refer more to major participants than to minor, whereas compound devices from the Dem+NP class are used predominantly to refer to minor participants: only 3% of the major participants are referred to with this device vs. 18% of the minor ones. A chi-square test confirmed the significance of the differences ($\chi_3^2 = 42.323$, $df=1$, $p<0.001$). Full NPs equally encode both major and minor participants (17.4% vs. 13.5%, respectively).

Table 1. Frequency counts for encoding global discourse status with different classes of referring expressions (percentages in parentheses)

	Mj (Th+NonTh)	Mn (Th+NonTh)	Row totals
zero	79 (22.1)	49 (28.7)	127
pronoun	87 (24.4)	35 (20.5)	122
Pron+NP	119 (33.3)	33 (19.3)	152
Dem+NP	10 (3)	31(18)	41
NP	62 (17.4)	23 (13.5)	85
Column totals	357	171	528

Notes.

1. Chi-square test 1. 2x5: $\chi_1^2 = 46.787$, $df=4$, $p<0.001$
2. Chi-square test 2. (zero, pronoun)x(Mj, Mn): $\chi_2^2 = 2.576$ \nlessgtr 2.706, $df=1$, $p<0.1$
3. Chi-square test 3. (Pron+NP, Dem+NP)x(Mj, Mn): $\chi_3^2 = 42.323$, $df=1$, $p<0.001$

Thematic vs. Non-Thematic participants

Next, a chi-square test was performed to assess whether there are differences between the distributions of referring devices across the discourse status of the participant at the local level of an episode. The test revealed a strong correlation between these two variables ($\chi_4^2 = 31.471$, $df=4$, $p<0.001$). No chi-square test could be performed to check the significance in the distribution of attenuated forms due to the small numbers, but it is clear that the zero device is predominantly used for thematic participants: less than 3% of the non-thematic participants are referred to with this device vs. 26.9% of the thematic ones. Pronouns and the compound devices from the Pron+NP class are used non-discriminately to refer to both thematic and non-thematic participants, with a slight (and non-validatable) preponderance of the pronouns toward the thematic participants (23.5% vs. 16.7% of the non-thematic) and the opposite tendency of the compound device (27.6% of the thematic participants vs. 36.1% of the non-thematic). Compound devices of the Dem+NP class, although not numerous, refer exclusively to thematic participants. Full NPs refer mostly to non-thematic participants (44.4% vs. 13.8% in reference to thematic participants).

Table 2. Frequency counts for encoding local discourse status with different classes of referring expressions (percentages in parentheses)

	Th(Mj+Mn)	Non-Th(Mj+Mn)	Row totals
zero	135 (26.9)	1 (2.8)	136
pronoun	118 (23.5)	6 (16.7)	124
Pron+NP	139 (27.6)	13 (36.1)	152
Dem+NP	41 (8.2)	0	41
NP	69 (13.8)	16 (44.4)	85
Column totals	502	36	538

Note.

1. Chi-square test 4. 5x2: $\chi_4^2=31.471$, df=4, p<0.001

Major Thematic vs. Major Non-Thematic vs. Minor Thematic vs. Major Non-Thematic vs. Groups of Major and Minor Thematic participants

The next set of chi-square tests was performed to assess differences in the distribution of the referring devices across the two-dimensional variable of discourse status (Table 3). This revealed that the differences in the distribution of referring expressions belonging to different classes are highly significant ($\chi_5^2=62.382$, df=8, p<0.001; the last two columns had to be ignored due to small numbers).

Chi-square test 6 was performed to determine whether there are significant differences in the behaviour of the two attenuated referring devices. The non-thematic columns and the plural devices were excluded from the analysis because of the small number of examples. However, the analysis of a 2 contingency table (zero, pron x MjTh, MnTh) indicated that the distribution of attenuated referring devices was independent of discourse status ($\chi_6^2=2.318 \nless 2.706$, df=1, p<0.1).

In contrast to this, the distribution of the compound referring devices and full NPs turns out to be highly dependent on the discourse status of the referent ($\chi_7^2=50.987$, df=4, p<0.001). Tested separately (test 8), compound devices proved to be highly dependent on the discourse status variable: $\chi_8^2=42.843$, df=2, p<0.001. The analysis shows that the referential type Pron+NP

tends to encode major over minor participants: 32% of major thematic and 48% of major non-thematic vs. 20% of minor thematic participants are encoded with this referential device.

Table 3. Frequency counts for encoding of discourse status by different classes of referring expressions (percentages in parentheses)

	MjTh	MjNon-Th	MnTh	MnNon-Th	(Mj+Mn)Th	Row totals
zero	78 (23.6)	1 (3.7)	49 (30.2)	0	8 (80)	136
pronoun	82 (24.9)	5 (18.5)	34 (21)	1 (11)	2 (20)	124
Pron+NP	106 (32.1)	13 (48.2)	33 (20.4)	0	0	152
Dem+NP	10 (3)	0	31 (19.1)	0	0	41
NP	54 (16.4)	8 (29.6)	15 (9.3)	8 (89)	0	85
Column totals	330	27	162	9	10	538

Notes.

1. Chi-square test 5. (zero, pronoun, Pron+NP, Dem+NP, NP)x(MjTh, MnTh, MjNon-Th): $\chi_5^2=62.382$, df=8, p<0.001
2. Chi-square test 6. (zero, pronoun)x(MjTh, MnTh): $\chi_6^2=2.318$ $\not\geq 2.706$, df=1, p<0.1
4. Chi-square test 7. (Pron+NP, Dem+NP, NP)x(MjTh, MjNon-Th, MnTh): $\chi_7^2=50.987$, df=4, p<0.001
5. Chi-square test 8. (Pron+NP, Dem+NP)x(MjTh, MjNon-Th, MnTh): $\chi_8^2=42.843$, df=2, p<0.001

The last set of tests was performed with an additional variable: the participant configuration category (Table 4). Here too the columns with small numbers had to be excluded from the analysis or merged with others where possible (as, for example, was the case with columns 1 and 3 in Category IV where the difference in the degree of thematicity could be neglected). Sixteen chi-square tests were performed to examine whether encoding of the discourse status depends on the type of the participant configuration: first within the categories and then between them.

Table 4. Frequency counts of referring expressions across discourse status and participant configuration category (percentages in bold)

	I		II		III			IV					V			
	MjTh, Mn Th		MjTh, MnTh(2x)		Mj --Th, MnTh, (Mn --Th)			MjTh(nx), (Mj --Th), (Mn --Th)					MjTh(nx), MnTh(nx), (Mn --Th)			
	MnTh	Mj Th	MnTh	MjTh	MnTh	Mj --Th	Mn --Th	Mj Th ¹	Mj --Th	MjTh ²	Mj + Mn	Mn --Th	Mj Th	MnTh	Mj + Mn	Mn --Th
zero	14 23.3	35 44.9	11 21.6	14 42.4	23 62.2	1 5.3		18 11.5			3		11 18.9	1 7.1	5 71.4	
pron	17 28.3	14 17.9	6 11.8	4 12.2	5 13.5	5 26.3	1	47 29.9		4			13 22.4	6 42.9	2 28.6	
on+NP	16 26.7	24 30.8	12 23.5	14 42.4	2 5.4	10 52.6		49 31.2	3				19 32.8	3 21.4		
tot+NP	11 18.3	2 2.6	14 27.5	0	4 10.8	0		8 5.1					0	2 14.3		
NP	2 3.3	3 3.8	8 15.7	1 3	3 8.1	3 15.8	1	35 22.3	5			2	15 25.9	2 14.3		5 100
TOTAL	60	78	51	33	37	19	2	157	8	4	3	2	58	14	7	5
Total config	138		84		58			174					84			

Category I. Chi-square test 9. 5x2: $\chi_9^2=15.232>14.860$, df=4, p<0.005

Category II. Chi-square test 10. 5x2: $\chi_{10}^2=17.295>14.860$, df=4, p<0.002

Chi-square test 11. (zero, pronoun, Pron+NP, Dem+NP, NP)x(MnTh/category I, MnTh/category II) : $\chi_{11}^2=9.485>7.779$, df=4, p<0.1

Chi-square test 12. (zero, pronoun, Pron+NP, Dem+NP, NP)x(MjTh/category I, MjTh/category II): $\chi_{12}^2=2.36$, df=4, p<0.7

Category III. $\chi_{13}^2=32.1303$, df=4, p<0.00001 (questionable validity due to low expected values)

Chi-square test 14. MnTh/category I vs. MnTh/category III: $\chi_{14}^2=18.687$, df=4, p<0.001

Chi-square test 15. MnTh/category II vs. MnTh/category III: $\chi_{15}^2=17.513$, df=4, p<0.001

Category IV. Chi-square test 16. MjTh/category I vs. MjTh/category IV: $\chi_{16}^2=40.425$, $df=4$, $p<0.001$

Chi-square test 17. MjTh/category II vs. MjTh/category IV: $\chi_{17}^2=26.798$, $df=4$, $p<0.00002$

Category V.

Chi-square test 18. (zero, pronoun, Pron+NP, Dem+NP, NP)x(MjTh, MnTh):

$\chi_{18}^2=12.132>11.143$, $df=4$, $p<0.02$

Chi-square test 19. MjTh/category V vs. MjTh/category IV: $\chi_{19}^2=5.845$, $df=4$, $p<0.2$

Chi-square test 20. MjTh/category V vs. MjTh/category II: $\chi_{20}^2=12.184>11.345$, $df=3$, $p<0.01$

Chi-square test 21. MjTh/category V vs. MjTh/category I: $\chi_{21}^2=20.645$, $df=4$, $p<0.003$

(problematic validity)

Chi-square test 22. MnTh/category V vs. MnTh/category III: $\chi_{22}^2=13.748>13.277$, $df=4$, $p<0.01$

(problematic validity)

Chi-square test 23. MnTh/category V vs. MnTh/category II: $\chi_{23}^2=7.799>7.779$, $df=4$, $p<0.01$

(problematic validity)

Chi-square test 24. MnTh/category V vs. MnTh/category I: $\chi_{24}^2=2.599$, $df=4$, $p<0.6$ (problematic validity)

Category I. The analysis of the data in category I (two thematic participants of different global discourse status) showed that the participant's status at a global level of the discourse correlates with the choice of a referring device ($\chi_9^2=15.232>14.860$, $df=4$, $p<0.005$). Major thematic participants are encoded with zero-devices almost twice as frequently as minor ones (44.9% vs. 23.3%). The situation is reversed with pronouns: 28.3% of the minor thematic participants vs. 17.9% of the major thematic ones are referred to with pronouns. While there are no significant differences in the use of the Pron+NP device (26.7% of the minor thematic and 30.8% of the major thematic participants), Dem+NP is used predominantly for minor thematic participants: 18.3% vs. 2.6% of the major thematic participants. Full NPs are equally rare for encoding major (3.8%) or minor (3.3%) thematic participants in this category.

Category II. This category differs from category I in that there are several minor thematic participants in the episode. Isolating this category as separate may reveal differences in the

relative encoding of minor thematic participants in the presence of a globally higher participant. A chi-square test on the data from category II shows that in this category too there is a correlation between the encoding of a referent with a particular device and his status at the global discourse level ($\chi_{10}^2=17.295>11.143$, $df=4$, $p<0.02$). Major thematic participants are again referred to with zero devices more frequently than minor thematic ones (42.4% of the major thematic participants vs. 21.6% of the minor thematic ones). Pronouns are used equally to refer to either minor (11.8%) or major (12.2%) thematic participants. The main differences lie in the use of compound referring devices and full NPs. When there are multiple minor thematic participants, major thematic participants are referred more frequently with Pron+NP devices (42.4%) than minor thematic (23.5%). The Dem+NP devices are used exclusively for minor thematic participants and with a higher proportion than in category I (27.5% in category II vs. 18.3% in category I). In contrast to category I, full NPs in this category are used predominantly to refer to minor thematic participants (15.7% vs. 3% of the major thematic participants).

An additional chi-square test confirmed that the differences between the encoding of minor thematic participants in category I—where there is only one minor participant—and in category II—where there are more than one—are significant: $\chi_{11}^2=9.485>7.779$, $df=4$, $p<0.1$. As opposed to this, the differences in the encoding of major thematic participants have been shown to be insignificant ($\chi_{12}^2=2.36$, $df=4$, $p<0.7$), although the validity of the chi-square test is decreased due to the low expected values in too many cells.

Category III. In this category a minor thematic participant is the sole central figure in the episode with other major and minor participants only marginally mentioned. This makes this category perfect for isolating the factor of thematicity regardless of the participant's macro status.

The validity of the chi-square test performed on the data from this category is problematic due, again, to low expected values in many of the cells², but some clear tendencies can still be observed. Among these are (i) a higher than usual proportion of zero forms used to encode minor thematic participants (62.2%); (ii) a low proportion of Pron+NP device encoding minor participants (5.4%) and a high proportion of this device used to refer to major non-thematic participants (52.6%); (iii) referring devices from the Dem+NP class are used

² $\chi_{13}^2=32.1303$, $df=4$, $p<0.00001$

exclusively to refer to minor thematic participants, as in category II, although in lower proportions (10.8% in category III vs. 27.5% in category II vs. 18.3% in category I).

Three chi-square tests were performed to assess the differences between encoding of minor thematic participants and figures in the MnTh columns in categories I and II. The differences were shown to be significant: MnTh/category I vs. MnTh/category III: $\chi_{14}^2=18.687$, $df=4$, $p<0.001$; MnTh/category II vs. MnTh/category III: $\chi_{15}^2=17.513$, $df=4$, $p<0.001$.

Category IV. In this category there are a number of major thematic participants and only marginally mentioned major or minor non-thematic participants. Since the frequencies for the non-thematic participants are too low, no chi-square tests were performed on the data within this category. However, it was possible to analyze the encoding of major thematic participants across the categories of participant configuration I, II, and V. A comparison with category I shows that major thematic participants are encoded differently when they are the sole focus of an episode with no minor thematic participants interfering, and the difference is highly significant ($\chi_{16}^2=40.425$, $df=4$, $p<0.001$). Surprisingly, the main differences lie in the decreased use of zero forms (44.9% in category I vs. 11.5% in category IV), increased use of pronouns (17.9% in category I vs. 29.9% in category IV), increased use of Dem+NP (2.6% in category I vs. 5.1% in category IV), and in the increased use of full NPs (3.8% in category I vs. 22.3% in category IV).

A very similar situation is observed in comparing category IV with category II with respect to the encoding of major thematic participants: the differences are statistically significant ($\chi_{17}^2=26.798$, $df=4$, $p<0.00002$) and the points of similarity are identical (as has been shown earlier, the differences between encoding of major participants in categories I and II were not statistically significant (cf. chi-square test 12).

Another chi-square test was performed to compare the encoding of major thematic participants in categories IV and V, the details follow the results for category V.

Category V. This category is distinct for the number of the participants: three of the four discourse statuses are represented by more than one referents within a single episode. Minor non-thematic participants were mentioned only five times, all by means of full NPs. Seven references to major and minor thematic participants were made with plural referring expressions: zeros (71.4%) or pronouns (28.6%). These small numbers and zero-frequencies in other cells made it

impossible to include these statuses in the statistical analysis. A chi-square test on the distributional differences of referring devices across discourse statuses MjTh and MnTh was performed. The differences were shown to be significant ($\chi_{18}^2=12.132>11.143$, $df=4$, $p<0.02$), but the validity of the results is problematic due to numerous small expected values.

Six pairs of participant encodings were compared: three for major thematic participants (category V vs. category IV, category V vs. category II, and category V vs. category I) and three for minor thematic participants (category V vs. category III, category V vs. category II, and category V vs. category I). For major thematic participants, the differences between categories V and IV were shown to be insignificant ($\chi_{19}^2=5.845$, $df=4$, $p<0.2$), which is yet to be interpreted. The differences between categories V and II were shown to be significant ($\chi_{20}^2=12.184>11.345$, $df=3$, $p<0.01$). The differences between categories V and I were also shown to be significant ($\chi_{21}^2=20.645$, $df=4$, $p<0.003$); however, the validity of this test is problematic.

Since the frequencies in the MnTh column are low, none of the chi-square tests that compared this column to MnTh columns in other categories were absolutely valid. However, two pairs (V vs. III and V vs. II) were shown to be significantly different ($\chi_{22}^2=13.748>13.277$, $df=4$, $p<0.01$ and $\chi_{23}^2=7.799>7.779$, $df=4$, $p<0.01$, respectively). The differences in the third pair (V vs. I) were not significant ($\chi_{24}^2=2.599$, $df=4$, $p<0.6$)

The results of comparison between the participant configuration categories are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Results of chi-square comparing encoding of major and minor thematic participants across categories.

		Minor Thematic				
		I	II	III	IV	V
Major Thematic	I	I	S	S	—	N
	II	N	II	S	—	(S)
	III	—	—	III	—	(S)
	IV	S	S	—	IV	—
	V	(S)	S	—	N	V
			Major Thematic			

Notes:

I, II, ...V – Categories of participant configuration

S – ‘Significant’ results of a chi-square test comparing a pair of the participant configuration categories in the intersecting box

N – ‘Non-significant’ results of a chi-square test comparing a pair of the participant configuration categories in the intersecting box

DISCUSSION

The analysis supports the hypothesis that referring devices encode information about the discourse status of the participants. There are very few absolute rules for encoding of discourse status as discourse is governed by a so-called "soft" grammar. The data indicate that almost any referring device can be used for almost any discourse status. However, there are tendencies that have been shown to be significant.

First, not surprisingly, the attenuated devices, zeros and pronouns, equally mark the high thematicity of a participant at the episode level. The vast majority of zeros and pronouns refer to

thematic participants—major or minor. However, even this rule is not absolute as illustrated in (5) where abbot Varfolomej, a major participant, is not thematic in the episode, neither is he thematic in the previous episode, yet he is being referred to with a pronoun in the first sentence. This suggests that *protagonisthood*, the importance at the global level, can compensate for the referent's low thematicity, since protagonists are readily activated in the working memory.

(5)

1. # *a nyne tot Ivaško u nevo živuči v kel'e <...> / i na vsjakoe bezčinstvo i na krovoprolit'e <...> evo arximarita privodit //*

1. and now that Ivashka living in his cell ([at him in the cell]) / [and] incites him the archimandrite to every bloodshed (crime) //

2. *i u prikazščikov monastyr'skix i u krest'jan posuly emlet //*

2. and takes bribes from the monastery stewards and from the peasants //

3. *i vsjakie nepravdy činit //*

3. and does every injustice //

4. *i čto xočet / delaet v monastyre bez sobornogo prigovoru //*

4. and does what he wants in the monastery without the consent of the Council //

5. *vo vsem poslušna sebe evo arximandrita učinil zlokozn'stvom svoim //*

5. (and he) made him the archimandrite obedient to him (REFL) by means of his (REFL) slyness //

6. *i napivsja p'jan / prixodit v cerkov' Božiju //*

6. and having drunk, (he) comes to God's church //

7. *i kelarja i kaznačeja i sobornyx starcov branit //*

7. and (he) curses the Cellarer and the Treasurer and Council elders //

8. *i skarednyja vsjakija neprigožija slova v cerkvi Božii s krikom i šumom govorit #*

8. and (he) pronounces with screams and noise all kinds of obscene and improper words #

(Subbotin 1878 p. 55)

Second, the data reveal that compound referring devices show clear distributional tendencies. Pron+NP devices also correlate with the thematicity of the referent: minor

participants are referred to with this device only when they are also thematic. However, as with simple attenuated forms, the referent's status at the macro discourse level makes that referent stay in the "set of current concerns" (Yokoyama 1986) as illustrated in the first and the fifth sentences in (5): *evo arximarita 'him the archimandrite'* .

Referring expressions from the Dem+NP class show an opposite tendency: 76% of all tokens refer to minor thematic participants, whereas only 24% refer to major participants. These proportions are especially telling considering the 1:2 ratio of minor thematic participants to major thematic ones. No non-thematic participants were referred to with this device.

Third, referential choice strongly correlates with the category of participant configuration, in other words "it matters who is around". Hence the unusually high proportion of zero forms in contexts where all thematic participants are minor on the macro level (category III), higher proportions of the Pron+NP device referring to major thematic participants in the environment of several minor thematic participants (category II), and a higher proportion of the Dem+NP device referring to minor thematic participants in the same environment.

A closer examination reveals that the encoding is implemented at the clause level, with higher status participants affecting the reference to lower status participants. Thus the vast majority of zero forms encoding minor participants occur in clauses in which there is no mention of the major participant. More than half of the minor thematic participants referred to with Pron+NP are the only thematic participants in their clauses. When two thematic participants—one major, the other minor—are encoded with Pron+NP, there is often a conflict between two different viewpoints as illustrated in (6), in which the *de re* mode collides with the *de dicto* mode of narration. The example is an excerpt from an interrogation of the monk Ioakim (Meščerinov case, see Appendix) who is the major participant on the discourse level by virtue of the fact that he is the participant of the speech event of interrogation but is a non-thematic participant in the episode. Voevoda Ivan Meščerinov is the major thematic participant and the Treasurer Veniamin is the minor thematic participant who is mentioned only in this episode.

(6)

1. *a kak de **on Ivan**_i xodil v riznicu s prežnim rizničim Ven'jaminom_j / i v riznice de zatvorilis' //*

'1. And it is said when he Ivan went to the Vestry with the former Vestry-keeper Veniamin /- and (they) [0] locked the door after themselves /

2. *i posle de togo vskore_on Ivan_i togo rizničago Ven'amina_j posadil v tjur'mu //*
2. and soon after that he Ivan put that Vestry-keeper Veniamin in jail //
 3. *i v tjur'me de on rizničej_j i umer //*
3. and, according to his words ([DE]), he the Vestry-keeper died in the jail //
 4. *i posle de togo rizničago Ven'amina_j <...> ključ_i otdal on Ivan_i černomu popu Leont'ju //*
4. and after, according to his words ([DE]), that Vestry-keeper Veniamin <...> he Ivan gave the keys to a hieromonk Leontij //
 5. *i s nim Leont'em xodil <v ...> i zatvorjalsja //*
5. and with him Leontij (he) [0] went <to...> and locked themselves in //
 6. *a imali li čto ili net / pro to on ne vedaet #*
6. but whether they took anything (from the Vestry) or not / he does not know //
- (Subbotin 1878 p. 397)

Full NPs are not a popular device for non-introductory reference. The speech act of interrogation is an apparent exception to this. Most of the full NPs in the Gerontij case consist of "duty" titles (*ponomar'* 'servitor', *d'jakon* 'deacon'), that is, the author/scribe refers to the participant not as an individual in his totality, but chooses a certain aspect significant from the viewpoint of the participant's role in the reported event. In the Meščerinov case, on the other hand, the NPs consist of a title in combination with a personal name. Most of the participants referred to with a bare NP are less thematic and less important. Thus in contexts with several major participants the less important and the less thematic ones are marked for status in the discourse hierarchies with full NPs.

INTERPRETATION

The very ability of the pronoun *on* to combine with a NP and its being opposed in our texts to the demonstrative pronoun *toj* poses the question whether it could possibly be a modifier of the NP or whether it is followed by an apposition of the NP.

Historically both *onъ* and *toj* (**tъ*) were demonstrative pronouns which expressed deictic spatial relationships, *onъ* being a distal pronoun, *toj* being intermediate between the distal *onъ* and the proximate *sej*. In the pre-literacy period *onъ* was already suppletively included in the

paradigm of the personal pronoun **jb>i*, while also indicating a spatial distinction and preserving the original declension *onъ, onogo* etc. In our texts the pronoun *on* in combination with a full NP is declined as a personal pronoun. A later development of the referential system in administrative Russian can serve as evidence for the possibility of the pronoun serving as a modifier. Early narrative prose of the 17th century (fiction, in particular) marks the emergence of a new referential system which included the opposition of demonstrative pronouns *onyj* and *sej* in combination with NPs. This referential system was firmly maintained in official judicial language since the Petrine epoch. Whether the NP conjoined to pronouns served as a specification necessary for referent identification in older texts requires re-examination. Formally these constructions should be viewed not as appositive but as pleonastic (cf. Bally 1944:155). Applied to the texts examined in this paper, where compound referring expressions of the type Pron+NP encode high discourse status, such an interpretation seems to be in line with the iconicity principle of “more is better” that was operating in introductory referential choice in the same texts, as suggested in Schnittke (2000). We can also assume tentatively that our texts register a transitional stage from the personal usage to the modifying one, while the main function of the constructions in question is not a specification or disambiguation; rather, it is the marking of the participants' status in the narrative.

The referential class Dem+NP in the examined texts is used for both human and inanimate reference. It has two distinct functions, one is distant anaphoric, that is, it is used to mark co-referentiality with a referent who was not mentioned for a relatively long passage of text meaning 'that one, already mentioned above'. For example: *i temi monastyr'skimi dengami i sljuduju svoe strasti ispolnjaet / činit promysl o sebe s tem učenikom svoim černcom Irinarxom /* 'and by that money and by mica (he) [0] fulfills his own passions / and cares for himself with that disciple of his, the monk Irinarkh' (Subbotin 1878 p. 58), where the previous mention of Irinarkh occurred five episodes earlier. Another function is the marking of the participant's status in the discourse. It is remarkable that in contrast to the oldest texts (Slavonic and Old Russian) and Contemporary Standard Russian (CSR) the demonstrative *tot* is never used alone for reference in these texts. To the best of my knowledge, its function in the oldest texts remains unstudied today. The traditionally established tri-partite opposition between the proximal *sej*, distal *onyj*, and the intermediate *toj* is not registered even in the oldest text of Codex Marianis (Lekomceva 1979). According to Lekomceva *tъ* is used in this codex for reference to a character invisible to the

participants of the speech event at the moment of speech, for example, *azъ oubo krъstixъ vy vodojo a tъ krъstitъ vy duxomъ svjatymъ* ‘I indeed baptized you with water, but He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit’ (M I:8), and in certain grammatical contexts such as relative constructions or in generic definitions, for example, *blaženi čistii srcemъ jako tii boga ouzrjatъ* ‘Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God’ (Mth V:8), or in contrastive contexts. However, there are still examples in which the function of *tъ* requires a different explanation, yet uncovered, perhaps in terms of discourse structure and hierarchies, cf. the following examples: *i se pride mož kъ isou. emouže bě ime jairъ. i tъ kъnež' sъn'mištju bě* (L VIII:41); *i se mož isplъnъ prokaza. i viděvъ isa padъ nicъ moli sę emou <...> i prokaza otide otъ nego, i tъ zaprěti emou nikomuže ne gli* (L V:12-14).

In the first Slavonic grammars of Zizanij and Miletij Smotrickij *toj* is classified as the only anaphoric pronoun, while *sej* and *onъ* are listed as demonstrative (Gr. δεικτικά), and *azъ*, *ty*, *on* as "prototypical" (πρωτοτυπα) (cited in Lekomceva 1979:220).

The function of the demonstrative *tot* in CSR is similar to that of the compound referring device in our texts. It is used to refer to secondary participants who are temporarily in the focus of attention in order to avoid referential conflict (cf. Kibrik 1985, Kresin 1998). Several significant changes have, however, occurred.

First, in CSR there are strict syntactic constraints on the usage of *tot*; specifically it is used to refer to a participant who was encoded in a previous sentence as non-subject or as non-actor (Kibrik 1985 :305).³ In contrast to this, in our texts *tot*+NP is used freely, regardless of the syntactic position of its antecedent (cf. (7)).

Second, in CSR *tot* is used only once in a referential sequence, after attention has been drawn to the secondary participant; if this participant is maintained as the temporary theme of the passage, he is referred with other anaphoric devices, such as zero or a personal pronoun (Kresin 1998). In contrast to this, in our texts a secondary participant may be referred with *tot*+NP as many times as needed in a row, e.g:

³ Kibrik (1985: 303) suggests a formal definition of the *tot*-usage conditions: "Pust' imeetsja propozicija P₁. V nej est' dve IG - IG₁ i IG₂ s referentami R₁ i R₂. IG₁ i IG₂ kontrastirujut po osi sintaksičeskix ili semantičeskix rolej. Pust' IG₁ - podležaščee i/ili aktor, IG₂ = ne-podležaščee i/ili ne-aktor. Togda v propozicii P₂, neposredstvenno sledujuščej za P₁, referent R₂, esli on vystupaet v kačestve podležaščego i/ili aktora, možet kodirovat'sja leksičeski mestoimeniem *tot*".

(7) *takož' i inoj čer nec po prozvišču Jakov Solovar' vedomoj plut // i sam on arximarit Varfolomej prež' sego pro togo černca v sobornoj kel'e pri vsej sobornyx starcex govoril takie reči / tot de čer nec Ijakov takoj vor i volxv / deržit de on u sebja vo vsjakoj nečistote <...> čast' prečistago tela Xristova // a kak on arximarit takovuju zlobu pro tovo černca uvedal / tovo my ne vedaem // tolko vidim / čto tot u nevo čer nec žil <...> v trudnikax <...>*

'In the same manner another monk nicknamed Jakov of Solovki, a well-known cheat // and he the archimandrite himself said about that monk in the presence of all Council elders / that, according to his words ([DE]), monk Jakov is such a criminal and a magician / he, according to his words ([DE]), keeps in impurity <...> a part of the most pure body of Christ // and how he the archimandrite got to know such an evil about that monk / that we do not know // only (we) see / that that monk lived with him as a worker ...'

(Subbotin 1878: 61-62)

Third, in CSR the referent encoded with *tot* must fulfil one of the prominent semantic roles at the clause level which are subjecthood-prone, such as the role of an actor, experiencer, owner, etc.⁴ In our texts the participants who are referred to with *tot*+NP may perform any semantic role in the clause:

(8) *<...> i o tex by evo fedorovyx rečax tex tret'ix i evo Fedora doprosit' # i sobornye starcy postavja pered soboju slug i tovo Fedora / i ix rosprašivali porozn' (I, Interrog., 29).*

'and about those Fedor's words order (imp.) those others and him Fedor to be interrogated # and the Council elders having put before them the servants and that Fedor / interrogated them separately'.

⁴ It is argued in Kresin (1998) that *tot* must be a clause level topic. If, however, we reserve the term 'topic' to the informational structure of the clause (as is done in Kresin's paper), it is more reasonable to formulate the conditions of the *tot*-usage in terms of semantic roles. This will cover the cases of non-nominative subjects (subjectoids) such as genitive of negation, genitive of ownership, dative of experience, etc.), and at the same time will account for the unlikelihood of *tot* appearance in examples like the following:

Director vsej nakazal, a Serežu otpustil. A Serežu-to/ego-to/??togo-to kak raz i sledovalo by nakazat'.

'The manager punished everyone, but let Serezha go. But it was Serezha [*Serežu-to* EMPH. Acc.]/him [*ego-to* EMPH. Acc.]/??that (one) [*togo-to* EMPH. Acc.], who deserved to be punished [that it would be appropriate to punish]' where Serezha is the topic but neither is a subject nor a subjectoid.

CONCLUSION

The Russian third person referential system had several potential paths of development. The referential type Pron+NP, after having been transformed to a demonstrative pronoun plus NP, viz. *onyj*+NP, had all the odds in favor of its developing into an article system, that is, the regular marking of the referent's status in the universe-of-addressee. However, this development did not occur. Instead, the proximal demonstrative *ètot* plus NP was reserved in non-initial reference for marking a relatively low degree of individuation in certain contexts (see Golovačeva 1979). The distal demonstrative, on the other hand, has basically preserved the direction of development. However, while in our pre-modern texts *tot*+NP was freely used to mark thematicity of minor participants, its usage in CSR became grammatically constrained.

REFERENCES

- Bally, C. (1944). *Linguistique Générale at Linguistique Française*. 4th ed. Berne: Édition Francke
- Borkovskij, V.I. (1949). *Sintaksis drevnerusskix gramot. Prostoe predloženie*. L'vov.
- Fox B. (1987). *Discourse structure and anaphora in written and conversational English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Givón, T. (1983). *Topic continuity in discourse. A quantitative cross-language study*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Golovačeva, A.V. (1979). *Identifikacijai individuacija v anaforičeskix strukturax*. In Nikolaeva T.M. (ed.) *Kategorija opredelennosti-neopredelennosti v slavjanskix i baltijskix jazykax*. 175-203. Moscow.
- Grüning, A., & Kibrik, A. A. (2005). Modeling referential choice in discourse: A cognitive calculative approach and a neural network approach. In A. Branco, T. McEnery and R. Mitkov (Eds.). *Anaphora processing: Linguistic, cognitive and computational modelling*. Amsterdam: Benjamins 163-198.
- Kibrik, A.A. (1985). Referencial'nyj konflikt pri mestoimenno-anaforičeskoj nominacii. In *Semiotičeskie aspekty formalizacii intellektual'noj dejatel'nosti. Škola-seminar "Kutaisi 1985"*. *Tezisy dokladov I soobščeni*. 303-305. Moscow.

- Kresin, S. (1998). Deixis and thematic hierarchies in Russian narrative discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 421-435.
- Lekomceva, M.I. (1979). Semantika ličnyx i ukazatel'nyx mestoimenij v staroslavjanskom jazyke. In Nikolaeva T.M. (ed.) *Kategorija opredelennosti-neopredelennosti v slavjanskix i baltijskix jazykax*. 204-230. Moscow.
- Levinson, S. (1978). Participant reference in Inga narrative discourse. In J. Hinds (ed.), *Anaphora in discourse*. 69-135. Edmonton, Canada and Champaign, USA: Linguistic Research
- Longacre, R.E. (1983). *The grammar of discourse*. New York, NY: Plenum Press
- Mendoza, I. (2011). On demonstrative pronouns and the question of the article in 17th century Russian. *Russian Linguistics*, 35. 245–265 DOI 10.1007/s11185-011-9074-y
- Schnittke [Shnitke], E. 2000. Vybor nominacii lica pri pervom upominanii (na materiale bytovoju monastyrsjoj perepiski XVII v." In Krysin L.P. (Ed.) *Russkij jazyk segodnja*, 1. Moscow: Azbukovnik
- Savel'eva, L.V. (1962). Priloženie v drevnerusskom jazyke XIV-XVI vekov (na materiale letopisej, xoždenij, nekotoryx delovyx dokumentov). In *Voprosy teorii i metoda izučenija russkogo jazyka*, vyp. 2. 394-408. Čeboksary.
- Stecenko, A.N. (1972). *Istoričeskij sintaksis russkogo jazyka*. Moscow.
- Subbotin, N.I. (1878). *Materialy dlja istorii raskola za pervoe vremjz ego suščestvovanija*. Vol. 3, Part 3. Moscow.
- Yokoyama, O.T. (1986). *Discourse and word order. (Pragmatics and beyond series, 6)*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

APPENDIX

1. "The Priest Gerontij Conflict" (1663), as a result of which the Ecclesiarch (*ustavščik*) priest Gerontij was accused of introducing some liturgical innovations; specifically: (a) not having the cover over the lectern during the Gospel reading; and (b) ordering that the altar servitor (*ponomar'*) not come out of the altar with the candle before the Gospel reading. The initiators of the conflict were hired workers (*slugi i trudniki*). They inquired of the altar servitor—who was in charge of covering the lectern—about the "innovations". Out of fear the servitor being blamed the serving priest, Gerontij, saying that he was following his orders. As a result, Gerontij was not only shunned by all, but his life was in danger until the investigation proved his innocence.

The body of texts consists of seven pieces: three private letters, one public letter, the interrogation, and the resolution.

2. "The Abbot Varfolomej Conflict" (1666), recorded in seven documents: three petitions, one public and three private letters. Varfolomej was elected by the brethren as abbot in 1659, but in 1666-67, there were several requests to replace him. The real reason was probably his new loyalty to the Tsar's church policy. However, in the petition of 1666—the center of the conflict – Varfolomej is accused of low morals and carelessness about the monastery.

3. "The Voevoda Meščerinov Conflict" (1676). Ivan Meščerinov led the Tsar's troops into the Solovki fortress after the eight-year-long siege (1668-76). Having captured the monastery by deception, Meščerinov carried out reprisals against the rebels, leaving alive only those of them who had access to the monastery treasury. He repeatedly abused his power intimidating the monks and forcing them to give him rich presents from the treasury and sacristy. Most of the 21 documents record the testimonies of the monks, Meščerinov, and his people; others represent the epistolary genre.

Ekaterina Schnittke

National Research University Higher School of Economics, eschnittk@gmail.com

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

© Schnittke, 2015