

1. Introduction

The present study aims at revealing the essence of one of the most important diachronic changes, the functional alternation of old Russian participles. The topicality of the dissertation is given by the fact that so far the problems of Russian diachronic syntax were studied by the traditional descriptonal method, extending the principles and categories of modern Russian on a historical state of the language. The methods of the descriptonal framework however, are not suitable for the explanation of diachronic changes. On the one hand, historical texts can be perceived as closed corpora, for the analysis of which we do not dispose of linguistic competence. On the other hand, with the equipment of descriptonal linguistics we can only get a characterization of the linguistic changes, without getting an explanation for the underlying logical motivation of the alternations.

2. Introduction of the corpus

The Suzdal Chronicle, which constitutes a part of the Laurentius Chronicle serves as the basis for the present investigation. The chronicle dates back to 1377. It enumerates the history of the Suzdal Rus between 1111 and 1305. As chronicles develop through the copy of protographs, which are constituted at different times and places, before getting down to our linguistic analysis we need to investigate their historical background. Concerning the rise of the Suzdal Chronicle I took A. A. Sachmatov's¹ and M. D. Priselkov's² theories into account.

The text of the chronicle makes possible the study of participle constructions as chronicles are written on a language which is a mixture of the vernacular and of Old Church Slavonic. The hybrid nature of the chronicle's language is demonstrated by the text's phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic characteristics.

The linguistic features of the Suzdal Chronicle have been investigated by E. F. Karski³, V. I. Borkovski⁴, on syntactic grounds by L. A. Korobchinskaya⁵.

2. Introduction of the problem

2.1. Previous research

2.2.1. Previous research in Russian linguistics

The study of diachronic linguistics on Russian grounds dates back to the beginning of the 20th century, to A. A. Sachmatov's works. Sachmatov dealt with the research of manuscripts and that of dialects. At the middle of the century diachronic linguistic research declined with the spreading of the ideological linguistic theory of Stalinism, Marrism, or stadial typology. This theory was formulated against the results of comparative linguistics and the study of the Proto-

¹ Sachmatov, A. A. 1908/ 2001: Шахматов, А. А. Разыскания о русских летописях. Moscow

² Priselkov, M. D. 1940: Призелков, М. Д. История русского летописания XI-XV вв. Leningrad

³ Karski, E. F. 1926/1967: Карский, Е. Ф. (ред.) Суздальская летопись по Лаврентьевскому списку. // Полное собрание русских летописей. т. I. Moscow

⁴ Borkovski, V. I. 1931: . Борковский, В. И. О языке Суздальской летописи по Лаврентьевскому списку // Труды комиссии по русскому языку АН. СССР т. I., 1 –91.

⁵ Korobchinskaya, L. A. 1952: Коробчинская, Л. А. Дательный самостоятельный в Суздальской летописи по Лаврентьевскому списку 1377 г. // Доповіді та повідомлення Львівського держ. ун-ту. вып. 3. ч. 1. стр. 19.

Indo-European language. The difference between languages is explained by the social, financial and ideological development of mankind.

The first studies in diachronic syntax developed in the 50s and 60s of the 20th century. P. J. Chernyh⁶ can be treated as the forefather of Russian historical syntax. He devoted a 30 page chapter in his 1954 monography to the problems of syntax, where he deals with the classification of simple sentences, the structures differing from modern Russian (like for instance the second dative, nominativus cum infinitivo, or dative absolute constructions), the classification of complex sentences and the use of conjunctions.

In the first works on diachronic syntax even the classification of the boundaries of syntax posed a problem. This is reflected in F. I. Buslaev's⁷ *Историческая грамматика*, the second chapter of which is devoted to partly problems of morphology and that of syntax.

More serious monographies on historical syntax came to light in the 1960s and 70s. These works ((J. A. Sprinchak 1960⁸, Sokolova 1962⁹, Borkovskij – Kuznecov 1963¹⁰, Ivanov 1964¹¹, Stecenko 1972¹², V. I. Borkovskij 1968 1978 1983¹³). dealt with the problems of Old Russian syntax combining the method of descriptive linguistics and the results of modern Russian syntactic studies.

Compared with the above mentioned works Kotkov and Popova's¹⁴ monography on the syntax of south Russian manuscripts means a progress in this field. The authors study syntactic structures applying structural schemes on them. They differentiate between active verbal, passive verbal, verbal-adjectival, verbal-substantive and copulative schemes. They also deal with the types of adjuncts (adverbs of time, place, purpose) in detail.

2.1.2. Previous research in general linguistics

Diachronic syntax belongs to the neglected areas of general linguistics as well. The reason is this case can be found in the lack of methodological framework.

Theories of linguistics besides the description of the synchronic state try to extend their principles to the diachronic changes of the languages and this way support the validity of the theory.

Neogrammarians devoted little attention to historical syntactic changes. Syntactic alternations are explained by the functional reinterpretation of the parts of the sentence.

⁶ Chernyh, P. J. 1954: Черных П. Я. *Историческая грамматика русского языка*. Moscow

⁷ Buslaev, F. I. 1959: Буслаев, Ф. И. *Историческая грамматика*. Moscow

⁸ Sprinchak, J. A. 1960: Спринчак, Я. А. *Очерк русского исторического синтаксиса*.

Простое предложение, Kiev

⁹ Sokolova, M. A. 1962: Соколова, М. А. *Очерки по исторической грамматике русского языка*. Leningrad

¹⁰ Borkovskij, V. I., Kuznecov, P. Sz. 1963: Борковский, В. И., Кузнецов, П. С. *Историческая грамматика русского языка*. Moscow

¹¹ Ivanov, V. V. 1964: Иванов, В. В. *Историческая грамматика русского языка*. Moscow

¹² Stecenko, A. N 1972: Стеценко, А. Н. *Исторический синтаксис русского языка*. Moscow

¹³ Borkovskij, V. I. 1968: Борковский, В. И. *Сравнительно – исторический синтаксис восточнославянских языков*. Moscow

Borkovskij, V. I. 1978: Борковский, В. И. *Историческая грамматика русского языка*. Moscow

Borkovskij, V. I. 1983: Борковский, В. И. (ред.) *Структура предложения в истории восточнославянских языков*. Moscow

¹⁴ Kotkov, S. I., Popova, Z. D. 1986: Котков, С. И., Попова, З. Д. *Очерки по синтаксису южновеликорусской письменности XVII века*. Moscow

One of the inadequacies of structuralism was that it did not develop a theory for the explanation of questions of diachronic syntax. It focused its attention to the distribution of certain morphological forms.

Contemporary theories of linguistics can be divided into two types: functional (cognitive grammar, RRG) and generativist theories (government and binding theory, minimalism). These types of theories give different reasons for diachronic linguistic change. According to generative theories linguistic change is due to the incorrect acquisition of the language or to the improper setting of the parameters of a language. Only those linguistic changes can take place which do not contradict the system of linguistic universals. Syntactic changes are perceived as autonomous, independent of phonological, morphological, and semantic changes. As opposed to this, according to functional theories, changes can occur in all components of syntax. Syntactic changes are related to semantics and pragmatics. Linguistic contacts and communicative factors serve as the motivations of changes. The two types of theories make different predictions with respect to the stability and frequency of particular syntactic changes, they agree only in the slow nature of syntactic change.

Transformational-generative theories recognized that there are deeper regularities behind the surface structure of sentences. In accordance to this the theory distinguishes between deep and surface structure of sentences with transformational rules which connect them. Syntactic changes are accounted for by the alternation of syntactic rules. These changes go back to the development of three types of rules: 1. the differences between the syntactic structure of different periods in the evolution of a language in most cases goes back to the alternation of transformational rules. These rules are responsible for connecting the deep and surface structure. In the course of the evolution of language there can be addition, simplification or rearrangement. 2. the change of phrase structure rules is less identifiable. These rules determine the components of the sentences and their function. According to this, they work in the deep structure which is more stable and universal than the surface structure. The transformational model postulates changes in the deep structure as well, although their existence can be verified only indirectly. 3. The redundancy rules of the lexicon work in the deep structure too. They determine which syntactic rules can be applied to a specific vocabulary item.

The application of dependency grammar and its key concept, valency, to the description and characterization of syntactic changes provides another type of solution. The main organizer of a sentence in a semantic and syntactic sense is the bearer of valency. The theory treats mainly the verb as a valency bearer. Other parts of speech which can function as predicates can only act as parts of complex predicates. In the case of such predicates the copula is the main valency bearer, whereas the adjective or noun connected to it is only its predicative argument (?). Owing to their argument binding capacity valency bearers require the appearance of a specific number of arguments in the sentences where they function as predicates. According to these rules, dependency grammar explains the differences between the syntactic structure of linguistic periods with the change of valence bearing elements. This alternation can take place in the meaning of the valence bearing element, which is manifested in the alternation of the argument structure (arguments can be left, can become optional, or changes can happen in the number and type of required arguments). The given theory has been successfully applied for the syntactic analysis of numerous manuscripts (Greule 1973¹⁵, Ágel 1988¹⁶, Forgács 1996¹⁷).

¹⁵ Greule, A. 1973: Valenz und historische Grammatik // Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik I., 284 – 294.

¹⁶ Ágel V. 1988: Überlegungen zur Theorie und Methode der historisch –

Similarly to other functional theories Role and Reference Grammar does not treat syntactic changes autonomous, rather as the results of semantic and pragmatic changes. This theory makes possible 1. the understanding of the underlying motivation behind diachronic syntactic alternations 2. make presuppositions that can be empirically checked.

According to RRG different syntactic features are stable in different degrees diachronically. This is determined by the Principle of Diachronic Stability, which states that semantically motivated features tend to be universally more stable than pragmatically motivated ones.

Several types of diachronic changes can be distinguished outside a theoretical framework. In the dissertation reanalysis, change of markedness, grammaticalization, typological harmony, reinterpretation, restructuralization and analogy are dealt with in detail.

2.2. The problem of participles

The system of Russian participles has undergone substantial formal and functional changes since the Old Russian period.

The assignment of participles into a part of speech category is a controversial problem in linguistic literature. Russian diachronic linguists (Chernyh 1954, Borkovskij – Kuznecov 1963, Ivanov 1964) according to their semantic characteristics (similarly to verbs express activity, happening and being), argument structure and morphological features (they are formed from verbs) assign to the verb. In general linguistics (Lengyel 2000¹⁸, Kalinina 2001¹⁹) gerunds, participles and substantivized verbal forms are treated as complex part of speech forms, which combine verbal characteristics with that of the noun, adjective and adverbial.

Although Russian historical linguists agree that the suffixes of participles go back to Indo-European origin, several questions arise in connection with the origin of the system of Old Russian participles. Some researchers of Indo-European language (Wackernagel, Brugman) claim that there were only present and past active participle in the Indo-European proto language. While Semerényi is of the opinion that Indo-European participles were not verbal, but rather nominal in nature.

In Old Russian there were five types of participles: present and past active, present and past passive and the resultative or second past active participle. With the exception of the latter type all participle types had short and long/pronominal forms. In Old Russian the category of adverbial participles did not exist.

Old Russian participles had verbal (time/aspect, voice) and nominal (gender, number, case) categories. Formally participles had the category of time, but it was rather aspect, internal time. The category of voice was also formal in this period, as both active and passive participle could be formed from active or passive roots.

The system of Old Russian participles showed substantial differences compared with the present system: participles functioned as attributes, predicates, adverbs and substantively. Functional characteristics depended on the type of the participle and of whether the short or the long form of the participle was used in the structure.

synchronen Valenzsyntax und Valenzlexikographie: mit einem Verbvalenzlexikon zu den „Denkwürdigkeiten der Helene Kottannerin (1439 - 1440)“
// Lexicographica Series Maior Bd. 25. Tübingen

¹⁷ Forgács T. 1996: A valenciaelmélet nyelvtörténeti alkalmazásának elméleti és gyakorlati kérdései // Studia Altaica Supplementum 5. Szeged

¹⁸ Lengyel K. 2000: Az igenevek helye a szófaji rendszerben // Nyelvtudományi értekezések

¹⁹ Kalinina, E. J. 2001: Калинина, Е. Ю. Нефинитные сказуемые в нефинитном предложении. Москва

Accordingly, in the corpus the following functional types of participles can be found:

Adverbial function:

a) present active participle

- (1) И посла володимеръ к брату повѣдая убиство игорево (318)
Conj. V.Aor.sg.3. N.Nom. Prep. N.Dat.sg. Part.act.pres.Nom.sg. N.Acc.sg. Adj.

b) past active participle

- (2) то же слышавъ улѣбъ прибѣже ко кн-зю своѣму
Pron.Acc.sg.neutr. Partic. Part.act.praet.Nom.sg. N.Nom.sg. V.Aor.sg.3. Prep. N.Dat.sg. Pron.Dat.sg.masc.

к из-славу на супои и сказа ѣму (316)

Prep. N.Dat. Prep. N.Acc.sg. (?) Conj. V.Aor.sg.3. Pron.Dat.sg.masc.

Predicative function:

a) present active participle

- (3) ѡн же встав- полкы свои с стѣславомъ
Pron.Nom.sg.masc. Partic. Part.act.pres.Nom.sg.masc. N.Acc.pl. Pron.Acc.pl.masc. Prep. N.Instr.

а саѣмъ эха г кыеву (342)
Conj. Pron.Nom.sg.masc. V.Aor.sg.3. Prep. N.Dat.

b) past active participle

- (4) и пославъ ко андрѣви к гюргевичю ростову
Conj. Partic.act.praet.Nom.sg.masc. Prep. N.Dat. Prep. N.Dat. N.Dat.

и проси у него дщери за своѣго сыновца за стѣслава (350)

Conj. V.Aor.sg.3. Prep. Pron.Gen.sg.masc. N.Acc.sg. Prep. Pron.Acc.sg.masc. N.Acc.sg. Prep. N.Acc.

c) present passive participle

- (5) иже бѣ любимъ володимеру честен же
Pron.Nom.sg.masc. V.Aor.sg.3. Part.pass.pres.Nom.sg.masc. N.Dat. Adj.Nom.sg.masc. Partic.

§ мстислава и § всѣмъ людии (297)
Prep. N.Gen. Conj. Prep. Pron.Gen.pl.masc. N.Gen.pl.

d) past passive participle

- (6) а уже дружина моя прострашена тогда и саѣмъ
Conj. Adv. N.Nom.sg. Pron.Nom.sg.fem. Part.pass.praet.Nom.sg.fem. Adv. Conj. Pron.Nom.sg.masc.

поѣха прочь(327)
V.Aor.sg.3. Adv.

e) resultative participle

- (7) и уверни ѣму всеволодъ ушицю и микулинъ еже
Conj. V.Aor.sg.3. Pron.Dat.sg.masc. N.Nom. N.Acc. Conj. N.Acc. Pron.Acc.sg.neutr.

бѣ заяль (312)
V.Imperf.sg.3. Part.act.praet.masc.

Attributive function:

a) present active participle

(8) **си же претерпѣвши и преложис-**
 Pron.Nom.pl.neutr. Partic. Prat.act.praet.Nom.pl. Conj. V.Aor.sg.3.
На будуще житье с миро^Н (425)
 Prep. Part.act.pres.Acc.sg.neutr. N.Acc.sg. Prep. N.Instr.sg.

b) past active participle

(9) **бо тѣ^Ф днѣ^Г приде из-славъ слышавъ**
 Prep. Pron.Acc.sg.masc. N.Acc.sg. V.Aor.sg.3. N.Nom. Part.act.praet.Nom.sg.masc.
пришедшаго гюрг- и рес (321)
 Part.act.praet.Acc.sg.masc. N.Acc. Conj. V.Aor.sg.3.

c) present passive participle

(10) **друзии же уязвл-ми умираху (347)**
 Adj.Nom.pl. Partic. Part.pass.pres.Nom.pl. V.Imperf.pl.3.

d) past passive participle

(11) **и створи пам-ть избиты^Н бояро^Н (482)**
 Conj. V.Aor.sg.3. N.Acc.sg. Part.pass.praet.Dat.pl.masc. N.Dat.pl.

Substantive function:

(12) **и бор-с- с хот-щими с- спѣсти (400)**
 Conj. V.Aor.sg.3. Prep. Part.act.pres.Instr.pl. Partic. Inf.

The results of the functional characteristics of participle constructions in the manuscript can be summarized as follows:

		attributive	predicative	substantive	adverbial
Present active participle	Short form	+	+		+
	Long form	+	(+)	+	
Past active participle	Short form	+	+		+
	Long form	+		+	
Present passive participle	Short form	+	+		+
	Long form	+		+	
Past passive participle	Short form	+	+		+
	Long form	+		+	
Past active /resultative/ participle			+		

As the results of the table show, the formal distinction between short and long forms disappeared. The short form in modern Russian was retained only in the case of past passive participles. Resultative past active participles turned to verbal forms in the past tense. The category of adverbial participles /gerunds developed, and paralelly, the adverbial function of participles was driven in the backround.Only past passive participles can function as predicates with auxiliary.The attributive function became more widespread.

2.3. Dative absolute constructions

In general linguistics there are several definitions of absolute constructions. The earliest definitions (Thourot 1864²⁰, Miklosich 1883²¹) give a narrow interpretation of the structure and are restricted to the definition of absolute case. Later definitions deal with the interpretation of the „absolute clause” (Berent 1973²²) and the „absolute structure” (Lehmann 1974²³). The later concept is defined as a structure containing the declined form of a noun and a participle, and which functions as a subordinate clause.

The absolute constructions goes back to Indo-European origin. However, its reconstruction runs into difficulties, as the absolute case can be found in several languages, but it survived in numerous versions. There are several theories in connection with the rise of this construction: Vorobyov (1973)²⁴ is on the opinion that the absolute construction developed in a period, when the word order of the proto language changed from OV to VO, while Corin (1995)²⁵ claims that it was an ancient means of expressing subordinate relations.

The question arises, why the dative case is used in Old Russian absolute constructions. The reason lies in the special place of the dative case in case grammar, as this case has abstract and concrete meaning at the same time, and, as a result, it can occur both with transitive and intransitive verbs. According to another opinion (Ura 2001²⁶) in numerous languages structures with dative subjects are used, which can be interpreted as a version of the dative absolute. Russian historical linguists explain the use of the dative case by its semantics.

There are three points of view in connection with the development of DA constructions. According to the first one, the DA structure is a characteristic of the literary language, as it was borrowed from Greek. Another group of linguists acknowledges the Greek origin of the structure, but they claim, that it had its own way of development of Old Russian. While a third group of researchers claim that the structure is of Proto Slavic origin. From these three opinions the second seems to be the most acceptable.

Functionally the DA structure served as a subordinate clause. Its discourse function – according to Worth – was the slowing down of the process of narration. Stylistically the DA structure was probably more marked and elevated than structures containing a finite verb.

While studying the DA structures of the Suzdal Chronicle, similarly to other studies of the given structure, I examined the means of expression of the participial predicate, the relation of the subordinate DA clause to the main clause, and the coreferential nature of the DA subject and the main clause subject.

In the 14th century the structure underwent significant changes. The numerous irregular DA structures of the text give evidence to that.

2.4. The question of predicates

In the study of the given manuscript the division of the text into clauses poses a problem, as in written Old Russian no punctuation marks or capital letters were used between clauses. Thus, in

²⁰ Thourot, C. 1864: De la logique de Pierre d’Espagne // *Revue archéologique* 10, 267 - 281

²¹ Miklosich 1883: *Vergleichende Syntax der Slavischen Sprachen*. Vienna.

²² Berent 1973: Absolute Constructions as ‘Subordinate Clauses’ // C. Corum, T. C. Smith – Stark, and A. Weiser, ed., *You Take the High Node and I’ll Take the Low Node*, Chicago, 147 – 154.

²³ Lehmann, W. 1974: *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin, London.

²⁴ Vorobyov, V. P. 1973: . Воробьев, В. П. Дателный самостоятельный. // *Русская речь*. № 4. стр 95.

²⁵ Corin, A. R. 1995: *The Dative Absolute in Middle Bulgarian Texts*. // *Die Welt der Slaven* 42. 251 – 84.

²⁶ Ura, H. 2001: *Case*. // M. Battin, C. Collins eds. *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*.

the course of the research of the text we should keep in mind the universal principle which states, that any coherent text is built up of relating predicative units (Borkovskiy 1983).

The research of predicate, predication and predicativity goes back to the development of speech and thinking. The concept was first described by Aristotel. Since this time, these notions became the central concepts of logics and linguistics as well.

The study of predicates in logics dates back to the ancient Greeks. The research of linguistic phenomena was closely connected to logics, as they treated language as the material manifestation of the inner, conceptual world. The ancestors of the notion predicate appeared in the works of Aristotel²⁷. In his system general terms can be perceived as the ancestors of monoargumental predicates. He laid the foundations of the other ancestor of modern predicates, category, or categorial statement in his work *Categories*. Aristotel treats everything as category which can be stated about the world as true or false. Ten types of categories are defined: substance, quality, quantity, size, relation, location, time or date, state, activity, suffering, and possession.

The greatest advance in the study of predication is related to the works of Gottlob Frege. His logical grammar is based on two categories: names and sentences. He treats those meaningful expressions which are neither names, nor sentences as functors. Thus, functors are such incomplete expressions which contain one or more places to be filled. These empty places filled with an appropriate expression result in a complete unit, either a name, or a sentence. Frege differentiates between three types of functors: sentential functors (which form a complex sentence from two or more simple sentences), name functors (which form individual names from individual names), and predicates (which form sentences from individual names). Depending on the number of arguments Frege differentiates between monadic, diadic and poliadic predicates.

The concepts of predicate, predication and predicativity became widespread in linguistics from the 19th century. Although these are universal concepts, they have several definitions. They were treated differently in Russian and general linguistics: in Russian linguistics the distinction between predicate and predication on the one hand and predicativity on the other was in the centre of attention. At the same time, in general linguistics the definition of predicate depends on the theoretical framework.

The term, predicate in Russian linguistics first appeared in 1833 in the monography of A. S. Budilovich, who dealt with the research of predicative phrases. Syntax in the modern sense became a part of linguistic research in Russian linguistics only in the middle of the 19th century (through the activity of I. I. Davidov and F. I. Buslaev²⁸). At this period the term predicate does not appear in linguistic studies, but the relation between the logical structure of a statement and its linguistic form is dealt with in numerous works (V. V. Klassovsky, A. A. Dmitrievsky, A. A. Potebna²⁹). By the middle of the 20th century a part of studies focuses on predicate and predication, while the other part with predicativity.

There are two, contradictory definitions of predicativity. The representatives of the traditional view, following Aristotelian logic, perceive the sentence as the linguistic manifestation of the statement. Predicativity, in their opinion, was the relationship between the subject and

²⁷ Aristotelész 1993: *Kategóriák*. Budapest

Aristotelész 1994: *Hermeneutika*. Budapest

²⁸ Buslaev, F. I. 1858: *Буслаев, Ф. И. Опыт исторической грамматики русского языка* Moscow

²⁹ Potebna, A. A. 1958: *Потебня, А. А. Из записок по русской грамматике I. – II.* Moscow

predicate of the sentence. They treated only the verb as predicate. The representatives of the view were V. G. Admoni, V. S. Yurchenko, G. P. Uhanov.

The other interpretation of the predicate evolved parallelly with the spreading of and pragmatics. The followers of this view defined the concept in a broader sense: they claim that the main function of the predicate is the connection of the meaning of the sentence to reality, and therefore its function is not confined only in the relation between the subject and predicate (Shvedova 1971: 48³⁰). This interpretation first appeared in the works of V. V. Vinogradov. According to his definition, „the essence of the sentence is predication – the complex of categories, which express the relation of the sentence to reality from the point of view of the speaker (Vinogradov 1954: 72³¹). He claims that „predicativity is expressed not only in the predicative relation between the parts of the sentence” and that „predicativity is characteristic of the whole of the sentence, and it does not require the division of the sentence into parts (Vinogradov 1954: 72). According to Vinogradov’s view, predicativity is the feature that we attach to the subject. As such, it always contains new information, that is identical with the rheme, and it does not coincide with the predicate of the sentence. Several representatives of Russian linguistics developed Vinogradov’s view further.

With the rise of functional grammar the research of predication became again conspicuous. We find several attempts for the minimal structural unit, the predicative minimum of the sentence.

There are two interpretations in linguistic literature of structural scheme. According to the first one it contains the predicative center (i.e. the component which is directly concerned with the expression of predication, together with the obligatory arguments that are essential for the grammatical completeness of this unit. The second interpretation states that the predicative minimum besides the predicative contains all elements that are indispensable for the informative completeness of the sentence. This view appears in the works of T. P. Lomtev, J. D. Apresyan, P. A. Lekant³² (for further details see Kokorina, S. I. 1975 73³³).

Apart from the abstract nature of predicativity and predicate we can find numerous attempts for the definition of the grammatical categories expressing predication.

The notion of predicate appears in several western European and American theories of linguistics under different names.

Dependency grammar rose in the middle of the 20th century. Although the term predicate is not used in the theory, the study of this concept plays a central role. Valence theory distinguishes between two units of the sentence - the head/regent/functor and the dependent/argument. Units having grammatical function (auxiliaries, conjunctions, prepositions) are treated as functors. The central organizer of the sentence syntactically is the verb or auxiliary, semantically the valence of the verb, or of another element of the sentence.

The Standard Theory (Chomsky 1965³⁴) and the Principles and Parameters theory of Chomsky’s generative grammar treat the predicate not as a basic concept, but as part of the

³⁰ Shvedova, N. J. 1971: Шведова, Н.Ю. Входит ли лицо в круг синтаксических категорий, формирующих предикативность // Русский язык зарубежом №4. 48 – 51

³¹ Vinogradov, V. V. 1954: Виноградов, В. В. Грамматика русского языка. Moscow

³² Lekant, P. A. 1982: Лекант, П. А. Синтаксис простого предложения. Moscow

³³ Kokorina, S. I. 1975: Кокорина С. И. О реализации структурной схемы предложения.» // Вопросы языкознания №3. 73 – 83.

³⁴ Chomsky, N. 1965: Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, Mass.

configurational system. They consider only the verb as predicate. Government and Binding theory, which was developed in the 1990s, gives an extended definition of predicates. They treat all categories (including nouns, adjectives, prepositions) as predicates that have an argument structure and that give theta roles to their arguments (Fromkin 2003 117³⁵). Within the boundaries of this theory Bowers' treatment of predicates can be considered peculiar in the sense that it introduces the abstract head Pr for the handling of predicates.

In the latest version of generative grammar, minimalism, predication is defined as the monadic relation between the predicate and its argument (in most cases the subject) (Dalmi 2002³⁶).

Chomsky's system was criticised because it is based on the investigation of English, and thus it does not pay attention to the peculiarities of other languages where the verb is not the only part of speech, that can function as predicate (Dirven Radden 1987³⁷).

The lexical functional grammar (Bresnan 1982³⁸, Komlósy 1992³⁹) ascribes a central role in the organisation of the sentence to the predicate/regent, that sets in its lexical entry the number and type of the argument the appearance of which it requires. It also determines the grammatical and semantic features, the obligatory or optional nature of their arguments and also assigns them a grammatical function. The part of speech characteristics of the elements functioning as regents is language specific. For example in Russian verbs, nouns, adjectives and passive past participles can function as predicates. Predicates are treated not as isolated elements, but rather as predicate frames.

In the American linguistic theory, Role and Reference Grammar (Foley, Van Valin⁴⁰) predicates also play an important role. The theory provides a solution for non-verbal predicates. As pragmatics and semantics also play an important role in the theory, predication is considered in a broader sense. Predication is present in each sentence, independent of the appearance of a finite verb in them.

3. Aims

The aim of the dissertation is to give an explanation for the changes affecting the syntactic function of participles. The given question raises several questions. We need to find a solution for the following problems: the treatment of non-verbal predicates, the alternation of the functional categories of Old Russian predicates, the nominative case assignment of a non-finite predicate, the DA constructions. The solution of these problems provides an opportunity for the testing of the explanatory power of modern syntactic theories.

4. Methods

The analysis is carried out with the use of two theories of linguistics: on the one hand, with the help of a formal theory, minimalism, and a functional theory, Role and Reference Grammar on the other. Both theories have already been applied for solving questions of historical syntax.

³⁵ Fromkin, V. (ed.) 2003: *Linguistics. An Introduction to Linguistic Theory*.

³⁶ Dalmi G. 2002: *The Role of AGRP in Non-finite Predication*. Автореферат докторской диссертации. Budapest

³⁷ Dirven, R., Radden, G. (eds.) 1987: *Concepts of Case*. Tübingen.

³⁸ Bresnan, J 2001: *Lexical – Functional Syntax*. Oxford

³⁹ Komlósy A. 1992.: *Régensek és vonzatok*. // Kiefer F. ed. *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan 1.: Mondattan*. Budapest 301-525

⁴⁰ Van Valin R. D. Jr., W. A. Foley 1986: *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge

The above mentioned theoretical frameworks attribute linguistic changes to different sources. According to minimalism diachronic changes can happen in two areas of the lexicon – in domain V, where features can be added or lost, or in domain O.

RRG studies diachronic syntactic changes in relation to semantics and pragmatics. The stability of syntactic units is defined by the principle of diachronic stability. This principle states that semantically motivated features seem to be crosslinguistically more stable than pragmatically motivated ones.

By contrasting the results of the two theoretical frameworks we can get a more precise picture about the driving force underlying diachronic syntactic changes.

5. Results

In the course of linguistic investigation I examine the questions posed under aims in both theoretical frameworks.

The study of participial constructions in the Suzdal Chronicle shows that Old Russian participial constructions underwent reanalysis and analogical change as well. Analogy manifests through the predicative use of participles, which probably happened on the model of resultative participles. The behaviour of DA constructions also serves as an example of analogy, patterned after present and past active participles.

The formation of the category of adverbial participles is an example of reanalysis, as in the course of its functional readjustment participle construction gradually lost their morphosyntactic independence.

The application of minimalism besides predicatively functioning predicates provided an explanation for the dative case of the subject of DA constructions. The subject of adverbial participle constructions can be interpreted introducing the empty pronominal category, PRO.

Applying RRG we can solve the problem of nominative predicates in participial constructions.

In the appendix of the dissertation the list of participial constructions of the Suzdal Chronicle is listed, which provides an opportunity for the evaluation of participial constructions comparing with other texts.