Beáta Győrfi[1]
University of Szeged, Institute of Slavonic Studies, Hungary

A PUZZLING PHENOMENON OF OLD EAST SLAVIC SYNTAX: THE REFLEXIVE (EN)CLITICS IN THE TEXT OF CHRONICLES

The paper discusses the peculiarities of the OES reflexive enclitics, ся and си in the text of chronicles. It aims at revealing the frequency, distributional and syntactic features of these reflexive forms. Relying on corpus-assisted research we try to find some sort of regularity in the seemingly chaotic word order positions of ся and си. We try to shed light ont he common features of these pronouns. The application of corpus linguistics provides a useful tool for the investigation of these elements. Methodologically by investigating reflexive enclitics, we can put corpus linguistics, and the Russian National Corpus to the test.

Key words: OES chronicles, reflexive enclitics, Russian National Corpus, corpus linguistics

0. Introduction

The evolution of the reflexive clitics ся and си on first sight seems to be the „old chestnut" of Russian historical syntax. Diachronic syntacticians take the course of development of these words for granted. However, if we take a closer look at historical grammars of Russian we encounter a number of questions left open: 1) the categorial nature of ся is ambigous: it is treated either as an individual word, a reflexive pronominal enclitic, a particle, or a postfix 2) the reflexive enclitics are generally let out from the analysis of pronominal enclitics, claiming that they exhibit different properties from other pronouns 3) besides

---

[1] Szegedi Tudományegyetem BTK, Szeged, 6727 Egyetem utca 2.; blazsenyka@yahoo.com

its grammaticalization from pronoun to verbal postfix the actual syntactic behaviour of ся is still underresearched 4) relatively little attention has been paid to the investigation of ся, despite its high frequency in OES manuscripts. 5) Research focuses primarily on ся while the dative reflexive enclitic си is quite neglected.

The paper aims at revealing the frequency, distributional and syntactic features of reflexive ся and си. We will look at the common features of short form reflexives. Relying on corpus-assisted research we try to find some sort of regularity in the seemingly chaotic word order positions of ся and си. The application of corpus linguistics provides a useful tool for the investigation of these elements. Methodologically by investigating reflexive enclitics, we can put corpus linguistics to the test.

In accordance with the above objectives in the first section I will give a short overview of the previous interpretation of these elements in the linguistic literature. In the second part the material and the method of the research will be introduced. The third part contains the separate research of the short form reflexives focusing on their frequency, the syntactic positions they occupy in clauses and their relation to their hosts. In the final part conclusions are drawn and verification and amendment is made to our previous knowledge of reflexives.

1. The interpretation of short form reflexive pronouns in Russian historical linguistics

If we have a look at the scholarly literature it reflects a wide spectrum of opinions on short form reflexive pronouns.

Kuznetsov and Borkovsky (1965: 213, 273) discuss short form reflexives under the heading of pronouns and the category of voice as well. As regards pronouns they claim that the difference between short and long forms started to disappear early. As for expressing voice, they notice that ся indicated intransitivity. The mobility of this element was preserved till the 18th century. Then its merger with the verb became standardized.

Chernyh (1962: 276-77) mentions these forms peripherally discussing the verbal category of voice. Stecenko (1972) regards these elements so basic, that he does not even consider them worth mentioning. Kolesov (2005: 358-59) discusses them under the heading of pronouns in relation to full and short forms.

Selishchev (2001: 112) considers only the dative forms as enclitics, whereas he argues, that the accusative form is of ancient origin. It was not used enclitically, as it was always stressed.

Samoylenko (1962) provides a thorough examination of these forms and comes up with an original view concerning their origin and use. He assumes

that the short forms of reflexive pronouns were the primary ones and they were independent until the 11-12th centuries, i.e. they did not adjoin to the neighbouring word. In support of his opinion he argues that 1. short forms were used with prepositions 2. they were distant from the words they later adjoined to 3. they were used to express contrast. In the early period short forms outnumbered long ones. Later owing to : 1. the polyfunctional nature of these forms 2. their uninflected morphology 3. the use of ся for the expression of voice, they started to go out of use.

Yanovich (1986: 191-192) assumes that the accusative and dative forms were united as the markers of voice. He also claims that ся participated in syntactically free phrases, i.e. they could stand pre- and postpositionally.

In recent studies (Zaliznyak, 2008:28) short form reflexives are treated as enclitics. Zaliznyak set up a ranking of OES enclitics on the basis of the position they occupy in clusters. The first five ranks are taken by discourse clitics же, ли, бо, ти and бы. The sixth rank is for short form dative pronouns (ми, ти, си, ны, вы, на, ва). Accusative pronouns (мь, ть, ся, ны, вы, на, ва, и, ю, е, э, я;) occupy the seventh rank, while auxiliary clitics (есмь, есми, еси, есмъ, есме, есмо, есмы, есте, есвъ, еста) constitute the final rank. According to this classification the dative reflexive is a 6th, while ся is perceived as a 7th rank enclitic.

Looking at this short historical overview we can conclude, that some researhers perceived these forms as short pronouns, others focused on their role in the expression of voice, while latest studies underlie their enclitic nature. No consensus was reached regarding the primacy of the forms. Not much was said about the syntactic position of these forms.

2. The material and method of investigation

The analysis is carried out on XIII-XVI century OES chronicles. Chronicles represent a heterogenious genre of medieval writing as they include hagiographical elements as well as the more informal speech of princes or other historical figures. (Petruchin, 2008: 213-14; Zhivov, 1996). This heterogenity of style serves as an argument against using these texts for linguistic research. However, from a structural or compositional point of view chronicles make up a better material for linguistic analysis than the birchbark letters: 1; They have a uniform structure, as they are made up of annal entries. 2; they contain mostly well-formed clauses and sentences 3; due to their size, these manuscripts can provide an ideal amount of data for diachronic research. Owing to their stylistic uniformity, chronicles of different centuries may facilitate the investigation of diachronic trends and changes.

For the purposes of the present research I have chosen the following six OES chronicles that survived in three compendiums. The compendiums are of special interest in the sense that chronicles reflect the state of the language of

their compendiums. The following table shows the time of origin of chronicle texts, the origin of their compendiums and the number of words, or lemmas each chronicle contains.

Chronicle	Date of the text	Date of the compendium	Number of words
Galician Chronicle	1201-1260	1st quarter of the 15th century	22666
Kievan Chronicle	1119-1199	1st quarter of the 15th century	78926
Novgorod 1st Chronicle	1016-1330	mid 13 – 2nd quarter of 14 century	33608
Primary Chronicle	1110	1st quarter of the 15th century	54504
Suzdal Chronicle	1111-1305 (1377)	14. century	45931
Volhynian Chronicle	1262-1292	1st quarter of the 15th century	15787

Data is collected from the Russian National Corpus, specifically, from the Old East Slavic subcorpus. At the time I accessed it contained six chronicles with 251,422 tokens. The corpus is fully tagged for POS and morphology. However, unfortunately the corpus tagset does not recognize clitic forms.

The corpus assisted method has a couple of advantages for diachronic research. 1. It makes possible the analysis of ongoing changes; 2. it allows the investigation of morphosyntactic phenomena e.g competing forms; 3. by comparing frequencies of grammatical categories we can diagnose ongoing changes; 4. the insights can support or contradict previous theories and thus enrich previous theoretical accounts; 5. the investigation of high frequency element would be difficult if possible at all without them.

3. Analysis

I started out the investigation with a quantitative analysis of enclitic reflexive pronouns in the text of chronicles. As regards the asscusative reflexive form, I looked at its independent uses, as well as its use as a postfix, as according to grammars of OES, sporadic examples of its morphologization process can be observed as early as the 11.th century (Dombrovsky, 1975: 101).

	Number of words	Number of examples of independent *ся*	Number of examples with -ся as a postfix	Number of examples with *си*
Novgorod 1st Chronicle	33608	400	125	3
Suzdal Chronicle	45931	53	923	35
Primary Chronicle	54504	87	941	17
Kievan Chronicle	78926	240	1329	63
Volhynian Chronicle	15787	39	184	19
Galician Chronicle	22666	38	399	42

Data from the table shows that the Novgorod Chronicle contains the most examples with the independent use of ся, and the least examples in postfix function. This phenomenon can be explained by the fact, that the NC (having been preserved in the earliest compendium) reflects the earliest state of language. The number of examples in the text of the KC is also remarkable owing to its voluminous nature.

As regads the dative enclitic си, we can find the most examples in the Primary Chronicle, i.e. the earliest chronicle by its origin. Its occurence is almost twice the occurences of independent ся forms in the Volhynian and Galician Chronicles, and they occur in small numbers in the Kievan Chronicle.

On the basis of data in the table we can observe the trend that the number of independent uses of ся decreases with time. However, no similar generalization can be made about си.

3.1. The position of reflexive clitics

At first glance, the syntactic distribution of reflexive clitics seems to be chaotic, as they can preceed as well as proceed their verbal host, or can occupy a medial position inside the clause, often at a distance from the verb.

As regards the position of enclitics in Slavic, in the linguistic literature two canonical positions can be distinguished, the traditional Wackernagel Position - the position after the first stressed word or phrase of the clause and the secondary contact position - directly next to its host, i.e. the verb (Kosek et al, 2019).

Order in this apparent chaos is brought by applying the theory of clitic positions, suggested by a group of Czech linguists (Kosek et al, 2019). While observing the „competition" and/or „cooperation" between the two possible word order patterns of old Czech enclitics, they distinguish 4 positions. The author somewhat modified their theory in order to adapt it to the OES system. The possible positions of enclitics are the following:

a) The *postinitial contact position* (2PC position). In this case, the enclitic (E) occurs right after the initial phrase, which is in most cases the host (H). A peculiarity of OES: the initial is usually followed by other clitics: () H+ся

() H+E+ ся
() []+ ся+H
() [] +E+ ся+H+[]*

b) The *post-initial isolated position* (2PI position). The enclitic occurs after the initial phrase of any clausal element except its host and it is not followed by its host either:

() []+ ся+ ..... +H
() []+E+ ся+ ..... +H

c) The *non-post-initial contact position* (NPC position). The enclitic occurs anywhere except in the post-initial position and it is adjacent to its host.

() [] []*+H+ ся
() [] []*+ ся+H

d) The *non-post-initial isolated position* (NPI position). In this case, the enclitic occurs anywhere except in the post-initial position and it is not adjacent to its host, schematically

[] []*+H+[]* + ся+[]*
[] []*+ся +[]*+ H+[]*

The host is specific to the clitics in the sense that the accusative clitic attaches to a verb, while the dative form to a nominal host.

3.2. The distribution of reflexive enclitics
Previous research into reflexive enclitics suggest that the pronouns ся and си exhibit different syntactic features. Therefore, in the following section we will investigate them respectively.

3.2.1. The distribution of ся
The distributional features of *ся* were explored applying the Czech theory. The following search parameters were set for the analysis: [lemma= "ся"]. The respective positions were determined „manually".

	Post-initial contact position	Post-initial isolated position	Non-post-initial contact position	Non-post-initial isolated position
Novgorod 1st Chronicle	44% (178)	2% (8)	51% (204)	2.5% (10)
Suzdal Chronicle	54% (29)	24% (13)	11% (6)	9% (5)
Primary Chronicle	50% (44)	18% (16)	14% (13)	16% (14)
Kievan Chronicle	46% (112)	34% (82)	4% (11)	14% (35)
Volhynian Chronicle	25 % (9)	55% (20)	5% (2)	13% (5)
Galician Chronicle	80% (29)	5% (2)	3% (1)	11% (4)

As data shows, the dominant position for the accusative reflexive clitic is the post-initial contact position. As example (1) shows, *ся* stands after the initial verb and a second rank enclitic.

(1) изнемоглъ   бо   ся   бѣ.   /   ходивъ
     lose strength-pqperf.sg.3.masc.   Cl.   Cl.   Aux.aor.sg.3.   go-Partic.Act.Past. Nom. sg.masc.

на   воиноу /   а   король оугорьскыи   иде   во   оугры GC
Prep. war-N.Acc.sg. Conj. king-N.Nom.sg. Ugric-Adj.Nom.sg.masc. go-Aor.sg.3. Prep. Ugorland-Acc.

„As he had died when going to war, the Ugric king went tot he land of Ugors."

Another example for this position is represented in (2) where *ся* occupies 2P following an initial noun and two higher ranking clitics, attaching to its verbal host from the left.

(2)   Даниলови   же   приѣхавшоу.   ко   Галичю. /
      Danilo-Nom.   Cl   arrive-Partic.Act.Past.Dat.sg.masc Prep.   Galicia-N.dat.
      Галичь   бо   бѣ   ся   затворилъ. GC
      Galicia-N.Nom   Cl.   Aux.Aor.sg.3.   Cl.   close-V.pqperf.sg.3.masc.

„Danilo arrived to Galicia, for Galicia had been closed."

The second most widespread position according to our findings was the non-post-initial contact position. In (3) ся is situated left from its verbal host, молити inside the clause, while in (4) it attaches tot he verb from the right, ignoring its position in clitic clusters.

(3) всеволодъ   же.   нача   ся   молити
     Vsevolod-N.Nom.   Cl.   begin-V.Aor.sg.3.Pron.refl.Acc.   pray-V.Inf.

мьстиславу. /   и   бояры   его   подъоучивая.   /   и
Mstislav-N-Dat. and   boyar-N.Acc.pl. his   teach-Partic.Act.Pres.Nom.sg.masc.   and

дары   дая   молашеться имъ. КС
present-N.Acc.pl.   give-Part.Act.Nom.sg.masc.   pray-V.Pres.sg.3. them

„Vsevolod started to pray to Mstislav and taught his boyars and prayed to them giving them presents."

(4) и   приде /   не   оуспевъ   ницто же /
     and   come-V.Aor.sg.3.not   manage-Part.Act.Past.Nom.sg.   nothing Cl.

сильно бо   възмала   ся   вса   земла   роусская·НЛ
strongly Cl.   disturb- V.Perf.sg.3. Pron.refl.Acc.   all   land-N.Nom.sg. Russian-Adj.Nom.sg.fem.

„And he came, not having managed anything, for all the Russian lands wer strongly destroyed."

In a considerable number of examples *ся* appears after the verb, but still as a free morpheme.

(5) тоиже   зиме   престави   ся   вачеслав
Pron.Loc.sg.fem winter-N.Loc.sg. die-V.Aor.sg.3. Pron.Refl.Acc Vyacheslav-N.Nom

кыевѣ /   тъгда   же   иде   ростислав
Kiev-N.Loc.   then   Cl.   go-Aor.sg.3.   Rostislav-N.Nom.

къ   черниговоу   ис   кыева НЛ

Prep.   Chernigov N.Dat. Prep.   Kiev-N.Gen.

„That winter Vyacheslav died in Kiev and at that time Rostislav went to Chernigov from Kiev."

Sporadic examples with double ся within a clause reflect the morpho-syntactic transformation of this element:

(6) зане   бахоу   бо   тогда
     so   Aux.Imperf.pl.3.   Cl   then

налегли   половци   на   роусь. /
attack-V.Pqperf.pl.3.   Polovec-N.Nom.pl. Prep.   Rus-N.Acc

и   томоу   стояшеть. /   бьяса.
and   Pron.Dat.sg.   stand-V. Imperf.sg.3   fight-Part.Act.Pres.Nom.sg.masc

с   ними   ся   перемагая
Prep.   Pron.Instr.pl.   Pron.Refl.Acc   battle Part.Act.Pres.Nom.sg.masc

ся. КС
Pron.Refl.Acc

„So the Polovec had attacked the Rus and the Rus held out struggling and fighting them."

In certain cases ся occupies 2P after a conjunction in an isolated position from the verbal host:

(7)	а	то	ми	былъ	бъ
	and	Pron.Acc.sg.neutr.	Pron.Dat.sg.1.	Aux.Perf.sg.3.	god-Nom.
	далъ. /	ѡже	ся	єстє	сами
	give-V.Perf.sg.3.	already	Pron.Refl.Acc.	Aux.Pres.pl.2.	Pron.Nom.pl.
	зажгли. КЛ				
	burn-V.Perf.pl.2.				

„And what god had given me, you have all burnt."

The corpus provides some exceptional examples as well. Similarly to other pronominal enclitics ся in certain cases attaches to a nominal host and expresses possession:

(8)	рекоста.	/	поиди	из	новагорода	поутивлю. /
	say-V.Aor dual.3.		go-V.Imper.sg.2.	Prep.	Novgorod-N.Acc.	Putyvl-N.Dat.
а	брата		ся	игора	лиши. КЛ	
and	brother-N.Acc.sg.		Pron.Refl.Acc.	Igor-N.Acc.	leave-V.Imper.sg.2.	

„And they said, go from Novgorod to Putyvl, and leave your brother."

We can also come across some cases for the independent pronominal use of ся after a preposition, like after на in (9) and подъ in (10).

(9)	Данилъ	же	возма	на	ся	шеломъ
	Danil-Nom.	Cl.	take-V.aor.sg.3.	Prep.	Pron.Acc.sg.	armour-N.Acc.sg.
Пакославь.	/		и	ста	за	нима. GC
Pakoslav-Adj.Acc.sg.masc.			and	stand-V.Aor.sg.3.	Prep.	them-Pron.Instr.dual.

„Danil put Pakoslav's armour on himself and stood behind them."

(10)	и	наслѣдиша	землю	ту. /		и
	and	inherit-V.Aor.pl.3.	land-N.Acc.sg.	Pron.Acc.sg.fem.		and
	сѣдоша	съ	словеньми	/	покоривше	я
	stay-V.Aor.pl.3.	Prep	Slovene-N.Instr.pl.		subdue-Part.Act.Past.Nom.pl.masc	Pron.Acc.pl.masc
	подъ	ся. РС				
	Prep.	Pron.Refl.Acc.				

„And they inherited that land. And they stayed there with the Slovenes subduing them to themselves."

223

Position of си

In order to access dative reflexive clitics I gave the following settings for lexico-grammatical inquiry [lemma= "ся" & tag="SPRO, dat"]. With these settings the RNC presented all the dative reflexive pronouns – full and clitic forms - in the selected texts. From this set I manually collected the clitic forms.

The frequency of clitic and full forms is summarized in the following table:

	Dative reflexive pronouns	short form си	full forms себе, собэ, събь
Novgorod 1st Chronicle	50	6% (3)	94% (47)
Suzdal Chronicle	84	41% (35)	58% (49)
Primary Chronicle	76	22% (17)	77% (59)
Kievan Chronicle	212	29% (63)	70% (149)
Volhynian Chronicle	58	32% (19)	67% (39)
Galician Chronicle	52	80% (42)	19% (10)

The frequency of си in relation to short forms presents an interesting picture: in earlier manuscripts hardly any short forms are used, while they abound in the text of the Galician Chronicle.

As for the syntactic position of си we find the following distribution:

	Post-initial contact position	Post-initial isolated position	Non-post-initial contact position	Non-post-initial isolated position
Novgorod 1st Chronicle	-	-	-	100% (3)
Suzdal Chronicle	2% (1)	-	8% (3)	88% (31)
Primary Chronicle	-	-	17% (3)	82% (14)
Kievan Chronicle	-	-	3% (2)	96% (61)
Volhynian Chronicle	-	-	-	100% (19)
Galician Chronicle	3% (2)	-	3% (2)	90% (38)

Data from the above table suggests, the си shows a totally different distribution than in the case of ся. The dominant position in this case is the non-post initial isolated position. This is due to the widespread idiom „во своя си". It was originally a Greek calque meaning „go home" „go to his/her own place". The use of the dative enclitic is a peculiarity of Bulgarian. In the text of the VC these constructions are used extensively.

(11)	и	Сомовита	кнѧзѧ	оубиша. /	а
	and	Somovit-N.Acc.-Gen.sg.	prince-N.Acc.-Gen.sg.	prince-N.Acc.-Gen.sg.	and
сна	его	Кондрата	яша. /	и
son-N.Acc.-Gen.sg.	Pron.Gen.sg.masc.	Kondrat-N.Acc.-Gen.sg.	capture-V.Aor.pl.3.	and
полона	много	яша. /	и	тако
prisoner-N.Acc.sg.	a lot	capture-V.Aor.pl.3.	and	that way
возвратишасѧ	во	своя	**си** VC	
return-V.Aor.pl.3.	Prep.	Pron.Refl.Acc.sg.	Pron.Refl.Dat.	

„And they killed prince Somovit and captured his son, Kondrat. And they captured a lot of prisoners and that way they returned to their place."

Different versions of this expression evolved, e.g. with the preposition у (12), or with other contexts (13):

(12)	и	много зла	створивше.	възвратишасѧ
	and	a lot of evil-N.Gen.sg.	commit-Part.Act.Past.Nom.pl.	return-V.Aor.pl.3.
у	своя	**си:.** КЛ		
Prep.	Pron.Refl.Acc.sg.neutr.	Pron.Refl.Dat		

„And having commited lots of evil things, they returned to their own place."

(13)	wна	же	никако	могоущи
	Pron.Nom.sg.fem.	Cl.	in no way	can-Part.Act.Pres.Nom.sg.fem.
помощи	брату	своему	**си.** GC	
help-V.Inf.	brother-N.Dat.sg.	Pron.Dat.sg.masc.	Pron.Refl.Dat.	

„She could not help his brother."

As opposed to ся, си attaches to a nominal host. In such cases it carries a possessive meaning. This fact is responsible for the second widespread position – the non-initial contact position.

It obeys the ordering rules in clitic clusters, i.e. appears after clitics of higher ranks:

(18) матерью   бо   **си**   нарѣчашеть   ю. /
     mother-N.Instr.sg.   Cl.   Pron.Refl.Dat.   call-V.Imperf.sg.3.   Pron.Acc.sg.fem.
вѣща   емоу /   яко   не   можешь.   оудержати
say-V.Aor.sg.3.   Pron.Dat.sg.3.   that   not   can-V.Pres.sg.2.   withold-V.Inf.
града   сего. GC
town-Gen.sg.   Pron.Gen.sg.masc.

„He called her motherand told him that you cannot withold this town."

4. Conclusions

Investigating the syntactic features of the two OES short form reflexive pronouns by means of corpus-assisted analysis has led us to the following results:

The two short reflexive pronouns, ся, си show completely different syntactic distribution: ся takes a verbal host and in the majority of cases attaches to it in a clause-internal position, while си prefers nominal hosts.

The two reflexives diachronically show opposing distributions. ся was more widely used than си. Interestingly, in the ealiest compendium examples with independent ся abound, while си is barely present. Also си in later compendiums outnumbers long reflexive dative forms.

The pronoun ся exhibited a highly transitional state in the text of chronicles: it acted as a clitic, attaching to a verbal host. Although in clitic clusters it maintained it position, it cannot be treated as an enclitic, as it often preceeds the verbal host. In certain cases it functions as an independent pronoun after prepositions. In the majority of examples it followed directly its verbal host, already referring to its future function, as a postfix.

Methodologically, corpus-assisted investigation was a great help in the analysis of these forms despite the fact that in some cases the search parameters could not be set ideally for focusing exclusively on clitic forms.

References

Borkovsky,V. I. Kuznecov P. S. (1965) *Istoricheskaya grammatika russkogo jazyka. Morfologija.*
Moskva: Izd-vo. Akademii Nauk CCCP.
Chernyh, P. J. (1962) *Istoricheskaya grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moskva: Uchpedgiz
Petruhin, P. V. (2008) *Diskursivnye funkcii drevnerusskogo pluskvamperfekta (na materiale Kievskoj i Galicko-Volinskoj letopisej)* In*:* Issledovanie po teorii grammatiki. Grammaticheskie kategorii v diskurse. Moskva.

Dombrovszky J. (1975) *Istoricheskaya grammatika russkogo jazyka.* Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.

Kolesov, V. V. (2005) *Istorija russkogo jazyka.* Moskva: Prosveshchenie.

Kosek, P., Čech R., Navrátilová, O., Mačutek, J. (2019) Wackernagel's Position and Contact. Position of Pronominal Enclitics in Older Czech. Competition or Cooperation? In: Conference talk. 3. 10. - 25. 10. 2019, SLOVKO 2019. 10th International Conference NLP, Corpus Linguistics, Language Dynamics and Change, Slovak National Corpus. Bratislava.

Petrova, G. M. (2011) *Semanticheskaja i funkcionalnaja specifika mestoimjonnyh klitik v bolgarskom jazyke*. In: Gumanitarnyj vektor No 4 (28) 120-125.

Samolyenko, S. F. (1962*) Iz istorii osnov i grammaticheskih form lichnyh mestoimenij v slavjanskih*

jazykah. In: Filologicheskie nauki vol 2. 3-15.

Selishchev, A. M. (1952) *Staroslavjanskij jazyk. Uchebnoe posobie.* Moskva: Uchpedgiz.

Stecenko (1972) Istoricheskij sintaksis russkogo jazyka. Moskva: Vysshaja shkola.

Yanovich, E. I. (1986) *Istoricheskaya grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moskva: Izd-vo. Universitetskoe.

Zaliznyak, A. A. (2008) *Drevnerusskie enklitiki*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskih kultur.

Zhivov, V. M. (1996) *Jazyk i kultura v Rossii v XVIII. v*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskih kultur. 31-41