

MACIEJ WARACZEWSKI

## The use of the auxiliary verb in 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular perfect verbal forms in Old Russian documents of the 14–16<sup>th</sup> centuries

Особенности употребления вспомогательного глагола в формах перфекта во 2-м лице единственного числа в древнерусских грамотах XIV–XVI вв.

**Abstract.** The article analyses 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular perfect forms in a collection of Old Russian documents of the 14–16<sup>th</sup> centuries. The main focus is placed on their formal aspects and the transition from an analytic to synthetic form. The process itself is well-known, yet it still lacks a detailed description and fully explained reasons for its occurrence. The author, providing statistical data on the use of the auxiliary verb *byti* and explicitly expressed subject, proves its great regularity. There is a strong dependence between the two items and usually only one of them is applied with perfect constructions. This shows that the function of the auxiliary verb has been completely changed and in the period described it played only the role of a person indicator. Thus, it became redundant when the use of personal pronouns was increased. All the exceptions to this rule are scarce and can be explained with factors of a syntactical or extra-linguistic character. The author's assumptions are confirmed with statistical data and examples taken from spiritual and contractual charters of grand princes and appanage princes in the XIV–XVI centuries.

**Keywords:** perfect, auxiliary verb, subject, Old Russian documents

Maciej Waraczewski, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań – Polska, maciej.waraczewski@amu.edu.pl, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4424-3966>

In my previous article (Waraczewski) I drew attention to the peculiarities of the use of the perfect forms in the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular. A high regularity in their use was proved, showing a great dependence of the presence of the auxiliary verb *быти* on an explicitly expressed subject. Similar phenomena can be discovered in the case of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular. However, there are certain differences and peculiarities worth describing, and this is the aim of this paper.

The general directions of the development of the perfect verb forms in Russian are well-known (Šul'ga 125; Kuznecov 245; Âkubinskij 241). A formerly

analytical form, consisting of an auxiliary verb *быти* and a *л*-participial form turned into a syntactical form where the former participle became the indicator of the past tense preserving the function of the gender and number indicator. At the same time, other past forms (aorist, plusquamperfectum, imperfectum) ceased to be used, leaving the former perfect the only past form. This process is often referred to as a “revolution” in the tense system of Russian. The reasons for such a development are often explained with the peculiar semantics of the perfect forms (Markova 2010: 636–638; Markova 2013: 247–257; Gasparov 215–240). However, in the present investigation focus will be placed on the formal character of perfect forms, namely, on the connection between the use of the auxiliary verb and the subject. The importance of this connection has also been indicated by Aleksej Ivanovič Sobolevskij (239–242) and Andrey Anatol’evič Zaliznâk (240–249).

As a basis for the research, all the 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular perfect forms have been found in a collection of Old Russian documents: *Духовные и договорные грамоты великих и удельных князей XIV–XVI вв.* (later – DDG with page indication and the number of the document). There are 232 2<sup>nd</sup> person sing. perfect forms in the collection, all of them in the masculine gender. This is the first difference worth mentioning – in the case of 1<sup>st</sup> person sing. forms there were 4% of feminine forms. This shows that the testaments or contractual letters could be written by women but that they never were addressed to them. In general, the auxiliary verb is present in 91,4% of the total with only 20 forms lacking it. Also, a tendency to leave out the auxiliary verb is higher in later texts (6,1% in the text written before the half of the 15<sup>th</sup> c. and 11.9% in the ones written after it). Still, even in the latest texts the auxiliary verb is used in a significant majority of the cases. The aim of the following analysis is to verify whether there can be found a connection between the presence or absence of the auxiliary verb and the explicitly expressed subject – in this case the 2<sup>nd</sup> person sing. pronoun *ты*. The general statistical data on this is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. General statistical data

Auxiliary \ Subject	present	absent
	present	3
absent	19	3

The data presented in the table show that the most common kind of combination of syntactical units in the perfect forms is: AUX + PART (with free order of the elements), e.g. *еси изымал, отступился еси* (76,1%), and the next most frequent one being SUB + PART, e.g. *ты дал, отделил ты* (6,9%). These two

kinds of combination can be considered to be regular as well as the most “economical” ones – information about the gender and number is preserved in the participial form, while information about the person (and number) is presented by the auxiliary or the pronoun.

Those cases where both the auxiliary and the subject are used or where both of them are absent, represent only 2% of the cases and thus can be considered as irregular, not systematic ones. Below, a thorough analysis of each of these exceptions (6 in total) will be provided.

А что еси изымал бояръ или слуг и людей кашинских, да *подавал* на поруку, с тех ти порука свести, а ихъ отпустити, а кому чего на них искати, ино тому суд. (DDG 27, No. 9)

[...] Добрятинская треть, численных людей треть, так жо, господине, что мя еси пожаловал, *оутступился* мне Суходола [...] (DDG 173, No. 56)

The examples above show that the actual situation is not a lack of any linguistic element indicating the person of the verbal form but just a lack of its repetition. Before the form *подавал* there is the expression *еси изымал* and *оутступился* is preceded by *еси пожаловал*. In such a way, the person and number are expressed with an auxiliary used previously, before another participial form. This shows a syntactical feature of perfect forms: the person indicator can refer to more than one participle. However, such cases are extremely rare. Even when there are a few perfect forms in the same person in close proximity, the auxiliary and (more rarely) the subject are used in all of the cases, e.g.:

[...] да что мя *еси*, господине, князь великии, *пожаловал*, дал ми *еси* Бежитцьскыи Верхъ в отчину [...] (DDG 147, No. 48)

In the sentence above not only are there the two perfect forms in close proximity, but they even refer to a similar action. Still, the auxiliary is repeated to precisely indicate the subject.

А со князем пронским и съ его братьею любовь *взял еси ты*, князь велики Иван. (DDG 143, No. 47)

In the case given, the use of both the auxiliary and the subject seems to be surplus and thus unnecessary. At the same time it seemingly contradicts the assumption about the nature of “regular” forms made at the beginning of this paper. However, there are some aspects which can provide an explanation for such a use of both elements indicating the executant of the action.

In order to explain this unusual form, a comparison with some forms found in the 1st pers. sing. is necessary. Here, quite a common exception to the rules

proposed was the case when the auxiliary and the subject used together were accompanied by a prince's title and name (24 cases of this type in the 1<sup>st</sup> pers. sing.). An analogical situation can be found in the example discussed. Moreover, one more peculiarity of this usage should be taken into account. The very place of the subject *ты* is of an unusual nature – in 20 out of 22 cases when this word is used it is placed before the participial *л*-form. Apart from this case, there is only one more situation of this kind:

А жити ми, господине, с тобою, с великим князем, в Переславли по тому, как *отделил* меня *ты*, князь велики, и мати наша, великаа княгини. (DDG 335, No. 84)

Also in this case the 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. sing. subject precedes an official title of the prince. Due to this, it can be assumed that the above-shown construction is not so much a combination of a subject and main verb but a verb and a neighbouring phrase used to address the receiver, expressed in the Nominative case. Thus, the person of the verb is indicated in the auxiliary and it is a typical example of such a combination.

The next two examples will also be discussed together:

А что есмь был, брате, пожаловал тебе своею отчиною, городом Дмитровом с волостми, и с путми, и съ селы, и со всеми пошлинами, дал есмь был тебе в вотчину и твоимъ детям, и *ты* моее отчины Дмитрова, и с волостми, и с путми, и съ селы, и со всеми пошлинами *отступил* еси мне, великому князю [...] (DDG 180, No. 58a).

[...] што ми еси не додал моей дедины, удела деда моего, княж Володимерова Андреевича, Углека с волостми, Городца с волостми, Козельска с месты, да Гоголя, да Олексина, да купли Пересветовы, да Лисина, и *ты*, господине, князь велики, против тежь городов и волостей, моей дедины, пожаловал мя еси, своего брата молодшого, *отступил* ми ся еси, господине, свои вотчины Бежицкого Верха с волостми [...] (DDG 183, No. 58б).

In the second example, the subject and the verb again are separated with a formula directed to the addressee that, as was indicated before, favours the use of an explicitly expressed subject despite the presence of the auxiliary. In the first of them, however, it seems difficult to reveal any explanation for the mutual usage of both the subject and the auxiliary, at least similar to the ones found before. However, here it is necessary to pay attention to a very curious fact which can be revealed when a wider perspective is taken.

In fact, both of these examples come from two strongly connected texts: *Грамота в. кн. Василя Васильевича кн. Василию Ярославичу* (No. 58a) and *Грамота кн. Василя Ярославича в. кн. Василию Васильевичу* (No. 58б) in the DDG bearing even a common title: *Докончание великого князя Василя Васильевича с князем серпуховским и боровским Василием Ярославичем*. They ger-

resent an example of documents which can be referred to as “mutual documents” (“взаимные грамоты”), a name taken from an older edition of the collection of the Old Russian documents (Bahrušín 1909: 114). This is actually one document but created in two copies, not identical ones but “mutual” – the receiver of one version is the sender of the other one. Both texts are almost the same in structure and content, but all the elements referring to the two parts participating in the contract must be different. Simply, all the 1<sup>st</sup> person sing. forms in one document have an equivalent in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person sing. in the second document. In this way the two versions can be juxtaposed to see whether an unusual use of perfect forms is repeated in both of them. As it turns out, the exception shown above does have its equivalent in the other copy. The two fragments are juxtaposed in the table below.

Table 2. Document 58 comparison

No. 58a	No. 58б
[...] и ты мое отчины Дмитрова, и с волостми, и с путми, и съ селы, и со всеми пошлинами <i>отступилса еси</i> мне, великому князю [...]	[...] и яз, господине, тое твоее вотчины, Дмитрова и с волостми и со всем, как еси, господине, был мене пожаловал, <i>отступилса еси</i> , господине, тебе, великому князю [...]

The example from the document No. 58б shows that the double use of person indicator is quite natural as the verb is separated from the pronoun not only with quite a long structure “господине, тое твоее вотчины, Дмитрова и с волостми и со всем” but also with another short sentence with another subject: *как еси, господине, был мене пожаловал*. In such a situation the use of the auxiliary verb is natural as it brings back the “correct” subject of the sentence. In the sentence from 58a with the subject in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person sing. the parenthetical phrase *как еси, господине, был мене пожаловал* (which would be changed into the 1st person) is absent. Still, all the other elements of the phrase are preserved and an assumption can be made that it is caused by the influence of the analogical fragment from the other copy of the document. This proves that the uncommon use of both the subject and the auxiliary is caused by extralinguistic reasons.

There is one more unusual use of the perfect in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person sing. found in the documents. This case clearly differs from the previous ones as there is no repetition of elements indicating the person but, on the contrary, there is a lack of both – the subject and the auxiliary – and the person can only be determined with the context:

Сице убо заповеда господь нашъ Иисусъ Христосъ совершати заповеди своя, совершавшимъ же и волю его сотворившимъ сице любовне о нихъ молить и благодать подаватьъ. „Отче, прииде часъ, прослави сына твоего, да и сынъ твой прославитъ тя, яко же *дал еси* ему власть вся-

кой плоти, да всяко, яже дал еси ему, даст им живот вечный. Се же есть живот вечный, да знают тебе, единого бога, и его же посла Иисус Христа; аз прославих тя на земли, и дела соверших, еже дал еси мне, сотворю; и ныне прослави мя, отче, у тебе самого славу, яже имех у тебе, прежде мир не бысть; и явих имя твое человеком, их же дал еси мне от мира, твои беша, и мне их дал еси, и слово твое сохраниша; ныне разумеша, яко вся, елика дал мне, от тебе суть; яко глаголы, их же дал еси мне, дах им, и тии прияша и разумеша, яко от тебе изыдох, и вероваша, яко ты мя посла, аз о сих молю, ни о всем мире молю, но о тех, иже дал еси мне, яко твоя суть [...] (DDG 430–431, No. 104)

The whole fragment is presented here in order to show that the text itself is of a peculiar nature. It provides a citation from the Gospel, namely John 17:1–9. The verb *дати* in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person sing. in this fragment is used seven times more and it is always accompanied by an auxiliary. Because of this, the individual case of the lack of the person indicator might be explained as a refusal to repeat the same linguistic element as even without it, it remains clear who the agent of the action is.

However, a simpler explanation can be proposed as well. It is worth mentioning that in other sources this fragment from the Gospel does not lack the auxiliary in any of the verbs. Thus, the verb in the fragment presented has got the full form with the auxiliary: *елика дал еси мне (Новый завет Господа нашего Иисуса Христа, electronic source)*. Thus, the lack of the verb *быти* in the fragment of the document analyzed may be a simple result of a mistake committed by the writer while rewriting this fragment from the Gospel.

Taking all the facts presented into consideration, it can be stated that, as a rule, the perfect forms in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person sing. are always used either with an auxiliary verb or a personal pronoun. All the exceptions to this rule can be explained with certain phenomena, either of morphosyntactic (the presence of another person indicator) or extralinguistic (copying a structure from another document, a writer's mistake) character. Thus, in general, the presence of either of the elements is determined by the presence of the other one. In order to prove that there is little possibility to find another convincing explanation of their use, some more examples from the documents are provided below:

[...] ты, князь великии, мене *пожаловал*, *даль еси* нам въ вотчину удел дяди нашего [...] (DDG 90, No. 35)

[...] да что мя *еси*, господине, князь великии, *пожаловал*, *дал ми еси* Бежитцъскыи Верхъ в отчину [...] (DDG 146, No. 48)

[...] и что, господине, князь велики, ты меня *пожаловал* Вышегородом с волостми и съ селы въ вотчину и в вудель, как было за князем за Михаилом, опрочь тех сел, которые *еси подавал* монастырем, и бояаром, и детем боярьским, а на тех селех суд и дань моя по землѣ, да что ми *еси*, господине, *дал* Шопкову слободку так же въ вотчину и в вудел, и что, господине, отець наш, князь велики, поволил своєї боярыне [...] (DDG 274, No. 736)

[...] и ты после своего живота ту свою вотчину всю дал мне, великому князю, так же что наперед сего дал еси мне, великому князю, свою вотчину Белоозеро с волостми [...] (DDG 293–294, No. 78)

Documents No. 35 and 48 prove that the choice of the perfect form is not related to the meaning of the verb. In No. 73 it can be seen that the use of the auxiliary does not depend in any way on the forms of other verbs used in close proximity to the 2<sup>nd</sup> person sing. verbs (3<sup>rd</sup> person verbs always lacking the auxiliary). The example from document No. 78 shows that the same verb can be used both with and without the auxiliary even in the same text, but always in strong dependence on the presence of the subject.

As it was concluded in the article concerning the 1<sup>st</sup> person sing. forms in the collection of the Old Russian documents of the 14–16<sup>th</sup> centuries (Waraczewski 389), it is the personal pronoun which makes the use of the auxiliary verb either necessary or redundant and the increasing usage of the pronouns favoured the disappearance of the auxiliary. The same conclusion can be drawn in reference to the 2<sup>nd</sup> person sing. forms. However, no example of logical stress placed on the pronoun is found in their case.

## Bibliography

- Âkubinskij, Lev Petrovič. *Istoriâ drevnerusskogo âzyka*. Moskva, Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo Ministerstva Prosvešeniâ RSFSR, 1953.
- Bahrušin, Sergej Vladimirovič, ed. *Duhovnyâ i dogovornyâ gramoty knâzej velikih" i udel'nyh"*. Moskva, Tip. Vil'de, 1909.
- Bahrušin, Sergej Vladimirovič, ed. *Duhovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikih i udel'nyh knâzej XIV–XVI vv.* Moskva–Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1950.
- Gasparov, Boris Mihajlovič. “Nablûdeniâ nad upotrebleniem perfekta v drevnecerkovnoslavânskikh tekstah”. *Russkij âzyk v naučnom osvešeni*, 1 (5), 2003, p. 215–242.
- Kuznecov, Petr Savvič. *Istoričeskaâ grammatika russkogo âzyka. Morfologiâ*. Moskva, Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1953.
- Markova, Tat'âna Damirovna. “Drevnerusskij perfekt v aspekte realizacii funkcional'no-semantičeskoj kategorii temporal'nosti”. *Vestnik Čelâbinskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo universiteta*, 1, 2013, p. 247–259.
- Markova, Tat'âna Damirovna. “Osobennosti upotrebleniâ form perfekta v slavâno-russkom Prologe XVI veka”. *Vestnik Nižegorodskogo universiteta im. N.I. Lobačevskogo*, 4, 2010, p. 636–638.
- Новый завет Господа нашего Иисуса Христа, Евангелие от Иоанна*. Web. 11.10.2019. <http://www.orthodic.org/gospel/verses/book/4/chapter/17>.
- Šul'ga, Mariâ Vladimirovna, ed. *Istoričeskaâ grammatika russkogo âzyka. Morfologiâ. Glagol*. Moskva, Akademizdatcentr Nauka, 1982.
- Waraczewski, Maciej. “Osobennosti upotrebleniâ vspomagatel'nogo glagola v formah perfekta v 1-m lice edinstvennogo čisla v drevnerusskikh gramotah XIV–XVI vv.”. *Studia Rossica Posnaniensis*, vol. XLIV, 1, 2019, p. 381–389.

Zaliznák, Andrej Anatol'evič. *Drevnerusskie ènklitiki*. Moskva, Izd-vo Âzyki slavânskikh kul'tur, 2008.

#### Abbreviations used

DDG – Bahrušin, Sergej Vladimirovič, ed. *Duhovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikih i udel'nyh knâzej XIV–XVI vv.* Moskva–Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1950.