

Discourse Functions of Coordination in Old Russian

Eun-ji Song*

1. Introduction

The present paper investigates discourse functions of coordination in Old Russian (OR), specifically, narrative functions of the coordinating conjunctions *i* and *a* in seventeenth century Russian.¹ These conjunctions are actively employed in the so-called "chain-linking" construction (*cepočnoe nanizyvanie*) (Morozova 1983:105; Bruker 1990), which refers to the stringing together of clauses or sentences with the help of free use of the coordinating conjunctions, such as *a*, *i*, *že*, or *da*. Morozova (1983:109) notes that chain-linking construction is characteristic of pre-modern Russian monuments of various genres from the eleventh to the seventeenth century and is constrained by context and content more than by the genre of the text. Thus, this construction is attested not only in the description of events, but in the formulation of law, and allegedly the semantics of the text are not altered when we replace one chain-linking conjunction with another (*ibid.*). It is claimed that the choice depends on the writer's taste and stylistic color: *a* and *da*, for instance, tend to be attested in a relatively colloquial style, whereas *i* and *že* tend to be employed in literary and narrative texts (*ibid.*). The previous studies, however, do not define or characterize the chain-linking conjunctions based on OR syntactic structure. Furthermore, although chain-linking conjunctions may not indeed alter the semantics of the text, they are not randomly chose in a given text. In this paper, I shall attempt to define the level of syntactic structure on which the chain-linking conjunction functions and discuss discourse-functional

* 서울대학교 노이노문학과 강사

motivation of the chain-linking conjunctions *i* and *a* in narrative texts.

The inconsistent punctuation or the formal ambiguity in graphic codification in OR² makes the division of a text into sentences -- one of the most basic formal units in linguistic analysis -- a subjective matter. In what follows, first, I shall introduce the difficulties one encounters in segmenting a stream of discourse into the basic syntactic units due to the polyvalence of the coordinating conjunctions (section 2), and then I shall propose some distinctive discourse functions of the chain-linking conjunctions *i* and *a* in narrative discourse (section 3). Subsequently, a brief summary of the main points will follow (section 4). My analysis here, however, is not exhaustive, but only suggestive and awaits further in-depth investigation of the given topic.

2. Ambiguities in OR Syntactic Structure

With respect to seventeenth-century administrative Russian, Pennington (1980:340) notes that it is characterized by the hybrid linking of clauses and polyvalence of certain conjunctions. These syntactic features generally hold for texts of other genres and other periods of OR. Furthermore, due to this free and seemingly unconstrained use of coordinating conjunctions, non-finite verb forms can be frequently construed as finite verb forms and consequently as leading an independent sentence. Refer to the following example:

(1) I(1) egda soveršil kelejcu pomoščiju Xristovoju, i(2) pokryl, i(3) stenki vytesal, i(4) opeček zdelal, i(5) obraz vol'jašoj medjanoj prečistyja bogorodicy so Isus Xristom vnes, i(6) postavil na beloju stenke, i(7) pomoljasja emu svetu Xristu, i(8) bogorodice-svetu, i(9) rekox ko obrazu sice <Nu, svet moj Xristos i bogorodica, xrani obraz svoj i kelejcu moju i tvoju!> (E 290v)

'And[1] when I completed the cell with Christ's help, and[2] covered it, and[3] planed off the walls, and[4] made the frame of a furnace, and[5] brought the cast copper image of the Immaculate Virgin Mary, and[6] put it on the white wall, [Ø-[7]] praying to Him, Christ the Light, and[8]

Virgin Mary the Light, [Ø-[9]] I said to the image thus: <Well, my Light Christ and Virgin Mary, preserve your image, and my and your cell!>'

While the subordination invariably holds on the inter-clausal level, the coordination can be (i) inter-phrasal, (ii) inter-clausal, or (iii) inter-sentential, which are not always unambiguously delineated. The above example consists of two clauses, which are conjoined by the subordinating conjunction *egda* on the one hand, and the coordinating conjunction *i*(7) on the other. The conjunction *i*(7) seems to be redundant with no clear syntactic function of its own. Likewise, *i*(9) is a redundant conjunction linking a gerund and a main verb unless we construe the gerund as a morphological replacement of a finite verb. Coordination by the conjunction *i*(1) serves as a conjunction linking the sentence (1) with the preceding discourse. The rest of the coordinating conjunctions in (1) conjoin equal syntagmas on the phrasal level: *i*(2), *i*(3), *i*(4), *i*(5), *i*(6) conjoin VPs, whereas *i*(8) conjoins NPs. Thus, the coordination in OR is polyvalent operating at various levels and can be occasionally superfluous with no apparent syntactic function.

The difficulty of differentiating finite from non-finite verb forms due to the free use of the coordinating conjunction can be exemplified by (2) and (3) below. When a gerund and a finite verb are linked by a coordinating conjunction as if they were equal syntagmas, either the non-finite verb forms can be construed as finite, with the given conjunctions linking equal syntagmas; or the coordinating conjunctions can be construed as syntactically redundant conjunctions; or the non-finite verb forms can be rendered as in between finite independent verbs and non-finite subordinate verbs, with the given conjunctions being in between a coordinating conjunction and a syntactically redundant or dysfunctional conjunction.³

(2) Ona že prišedši i ukosne v domu eja do nošči. (M 14)
'Having come, [Ø] she tarried at her house until night.'

(3) A bogorodica ot obraza priide jako čistaja devica i naklonjasja licem ko mne a v rukax u sebja besa mučit, koj menja mučil. (E 295-295v)

'And the Virgin Mary came out from the image like a pure maiden girl and, bending her face toward me, [Ø] tortures in her hands the devil who tortured me.'

The dative absolute, as illustrated in (4) below, can be considered as an independent sentence, that is, substitute for a finite verb clause, if we construe the conjunction *i* as the conjunction linking equal syntagmas; or we may construe *i* as a syntactically redundant conjunction and retain the dative absolute as a subordinate sub-clause based on the general assumption; or the dative absolute can be construed as indeterminate between an independent sentence and a fully integrated subordinate clause, that is, as a weak subordination.⁴

(4) I žudščim im gostej. I se vo vtoryj čas nošči otvorišasja vrata bolšija. (M 14)

'And while they are waiting for the guests, behold, in the second hour in the morning the big gates opened.'

'And they were waiting for the guests, and, behold, in the second hour in the morning the big gates opened.'

Thus, as we have noted above, the free, seemingly unconstrained and unmotivated use of the coordinating conjunctions aggravates the ambiguities in OR syntactic structure.

Although the phrase-level coordinating conjunction seems to be syntactically and semantically more tightly constrained than inter-clausal and inter-sentential conjunctions, which are difficult to delineate and identify in OR text artifacts, it is not always unambiguously clear to identify VP coordination, since in OR an anaphoric pronoun topic (subject) can be easily omitted if it is a continuous topic from the immediately preceding clause or sentence. Thus, for instance, VP coordination by means of the conjunction *i* can be indeterminate among VP coordination, inter-clausal coordination, and inter-sentential coordination. Let us consider the following examples:

(5) On [=bes] že i ožive, i(1) vostal na nogi svoi, jako p'jan. I(2) reče mi bes sice [...] (E 295v)

'He [the devil] revived and[1] stood on feet as if he were drunk. And[2] the devil said to me like this [...]'

(6) Ona že sedši i(1) [Ø-ona] stul bliz sebe položi. I(2) [Ø-ona] vezena byst' mimo čudov pod carskija perexody. (M 20-20v)

'Having sat down, [Ø-[1]] she put the stool beside herself. And[2] she was brought past čudov near the Tsar's Passages.'

I(1) in example (5) can be construed as VP coordination, inter-clausal, or inter-sentential coordination, and yet VP coordination seems to be preferable, considering the close semantic connection between the two verbs, *ožive* and *vostal*, in the given context. In contrast, *i*(2) can be best construed as inter-sentential coordination: inasmuch as *on* and *bes* are coreferential, the redundant *bes* instead of zero anaphora shows that the two sentences are not well integrated syntactically. (6) illustrates two problematic usages of *i*. *I*(1) does not conjoin equal syntagmas, and this usage is very frequent in the corpus, as noted above. *I*(1) can be interpreted in three alternative ways: (i) the construal of the non-finite verb form *sedši* as finite, in which case *i*(1) is indeterminate among an VP coordinating conjunction, an inter-clausal coordinating conjunction, and an inter-sentential coordinating conjunction; (ii) the construal of *i*(1) as a syntactically redundant conjunction linking a gerund and a main clause; or (iii) the construal of *sedši* as in between an independent finite verb form and a fully dependent gerund, in which case, *i*(1) is left indeterminate. *I*(2) is also ambiguous among VP coordination, inter-clausal, and inter-sentential coordination, and yet inter-sentential coordination seems to be preferable due to the temporal gap between the event preceding and that following *i*(2). In sum, the coordinating conjunction *i* is ambiguous and indeterminate in terms of the syntactic identity of the syntagmas it conjoins.

The conjunction *a* can be inter-phrasal, inter-clausal, or inter-sentential. Intrer-phrasal conjunction *a* linking NPs is illustrated in (7):

(7) I kak skončalisja otec moj i mati moja, i az, grešnyj, idox vo grad nekij, zelo velik i mnogoljuden, a grad blagočestivoj, xristianskoj a prebyx v n nem sedm let. (E 285v-286)

'And when my father and mother passed away, I, a sinner, went to a big, populous but pious Christian town and stayed there for seven years.'

The conjunction *a* linking VPs is usually indeterminate among inter-phrasal, inter-clausal, and inter-sentential conjunction. (8) illustrates this.

(8) On muku velikuju terpel, a ne predal (M 41)

'He endured the great torture, but didn't betray the martyrs.'

The conjunction *a* in (8) can be inter-phrasal or inter-clausal, and yet due to the close semantic relationship between the parts preceding and following the conjunction as well as the absence of a lengthy complement in the second part, *a* can hardly be construed as a inter-sentential conjunction. The inter-clausal *a* is shown in (9):

9) I egda šel putem, naskočil na menja on že paki so dvema malymi piščalmi i, bliz menja byv, zapalil i pistoli, i božieju voleju na polke porox pyxnul, a piščal' ne strelila. (A 199v)

'And when I was on the way he leaped out at me again with two pistols, and being close to me he fired one, and by God's will the powder flared in the pan, but the pistol didn't shoot.'

The conjunction *a* in (9) cannot be interpreted as leading a sentence, since *božieju voleju* 'by God's will' in the preceding part is related to the clause led by the given conjunction.

Although in general the inter-sentential coordination is not always delineated from the inter-clausal or inter-VP coordination, the inter-sentential *a* is semantically more independent of the immediately preceding discourse than the inter-clausal *a*. This inter-sentential *a* usually

presents a new topic for the upcoming discourse. Some examples follow:

(10) *A živja ja v pustyne, spodobil mja bog pitatisja ot rukodelija.*
(E 296)

'And as I was living in the desert, God deigned me to feed myself by means of handicraft.'

(11) *A egda v popax byl, togda ime! u sebja detej duxovnyx mnogo,--po se vremja sot s pjat' ili s šest' budet.* (A 197v)

'And when I was a priest, I had many spiritual children--up to now it would be about five or six hundred.'

(12) *A otec Avvakum, istinnyj učenic Kristov, poneže stražet za zakon vладыki svoego i sego radi xotjaščim bogu ugoditi dovleet ego učeniya poslušati.* (M 6v-7)

'And Father Avvakum, Christ's true disciple, because he suffers for the sake of the law of his sovereign, suffice it for those who want to please God to listen to his teachings.'

Thus, it is not easy to define and identify the syntactic status of the conjuncts linked by the coordinating conjunctions due to their polyvalence. In this paper, I define the chain-linking conjunction as operating primarily on the inter-sentential level, where the writer's choice among available conjunctions is constrained to a greater extent by the global discourse organization, rather than by the local-level semantic constraints. Due to the lack of a clear analytical tool for delimiting the sentential coordination from VP and clausal coordination, however, my judgment in adducing chain-linking conjunctions below is not always unchallengeable, and yet I shall try to deal with less ambiguous cases.

3. Narrative Functions of the Chain-Linking Conjunctions

i and *a*

The chain-linking conjunction *i* is widely distributed in the corpus and

chains temporally sequential events. Here, the event or action is foregrounded rather than the participant or setting, which is demonstrated by the frequent VS element order or a zero anaphoric subject. VS element order has been associated with topicless sentence in Functional Sentence Perspective studies and in OR, the zero anaphoric subject/topic is the unmarked choice when the subject/topic is continuous from the immediately preceding discourse or from a more distant global topic in the previous discourse. Hence, the conjunction *i* downplays the switch reference of the subject or participant topic by word-order inversion or zero anaphoric subject. This conjunction usually focuses on the swift narrative advancement on the temporal plane from holistic and event-oriented point of view. The event tend to be narrated from outer and detached perspective and the reader usually gets the impression that one event occurred immediately after another with no significant break in time. Thus, the conjunction *i* imparts to the narrative a sense of continuity and accelerates the narrative. Refer to the following examples:

(13) I poslaša⁵ mene starec v tu kel'ju žiti ideže bes život: az že, grešnyj, starcu rekox sice [...] I reče mi starec [...] (E 289)
 'And the Elder sent me to live in the cell where a devil lives. I, a sinner, said to the Elder like this [...] And the Elder said to me [...]'

(14) Brat že Glebov, Boris Ivanovič'// Morozov, velmi ljubljaše snoxu svoju duxovnoju ljuboviju, siju Feodosiju. Egda [Ø] ubo prixoždaše k nemu v dom, togda on sam sretaše ju ljubezne i glagolaše: "Priidi, drug moj duxovnoj, poidi, radost' moja duševnaja!". I(1) [Øi+] sedjašči na mnog čas, besedovaxu duxovnyja slovesa. I(2)[Øi] provožajušči ju, glagolaše: "Dnes' nasladixsja pače meda i sota sloves tvoix dušepoleznyx". I(3) [Øj] mala leta poživ, osta vdovoju, imušči s soboju sirotoju syna svoego Ivanna. (M 1v-2)

'Gleb's brother, Boris Ivanovič' Morozov, loved his daughter-in-law, Feodosija, with a spiritual love. Thus, when she came to his house, he would meet her cordially in person and say: "Come, my spiritual friend, come, my spiritual joy." And[1] they, sitting for many hours, conversed in spiritual words. And[2] seeing her off, he would say: "Today I took

delight in your edifying words more than in honey or in honeycomb". And[3] having lived some time with her husband, she [Feodosija] was left as a widow, having with her her son Ivan, now an orphan.'

In example (13), the conjunction *i* is accompanied by VS order; in example (14), the conjunction *i* is followed by zero anaphora and is governed by the episode-level topic--i.e., *Boris Ivanovič'* (*i*[2])--or by the more global discourse topic--i.e., *Feodosija* (*i*[3])--or by both (*i*[1]). Thus, after the conjunction *i*, the switch reference of the topic is downplayed and the event or action is more foregrounded.⁶

The chain-linking conjunction *a* has a commentative function and underscores the writer's evaluative attitude or the background events or situations. It provides the narrative with the sense of discontinuity and usually slows down the narrative speed.

(15) **A**(1) *kak* priexal v Enisejskoj, drugoj ukaz prišel: veleno v Daury vesti--dvatcet' tysjašč i bolši budet ot Moskvvy. I otdali menja Afonas'ju Paškovu v polk--ljudej s nim bylo 6 sot čelovek: i grex radi moix surov čelovek: besprestanno ljudej žžet, i mučit, i b'jet. I ja evo mnogo ugovarival, da i sam v ruki popal. // **A**(2) s Moskvvy ot Nikona prikazano emu mučit' menja. (A 210v-211)

'But(1) when I came to Yeniseisk another decree arrived; it ordered us to carry on into Daurija--this would be more than twenty thousand versts from Moscow. And they handed me over into the troop of Afanasij Paškov; the people there with him numbered six hundred. As a reward for my sins he was a harsh man; he burned and tortured and flogged people all the time. And I had often tried to bring him to reason and here I had fallen into his hands myself. And(2) from Moscow, he had orders from Nikon to afflict me.'

The conjunction *a*(1) in front of *kak* in example (15) underscores the new temporal background for the following sequence of events, while *a*(2) stresses the narrator's background explanation outside of the main story line. Another example follows:

(16) I nekogda, posle pravila moego, s velikoju bojazniju vozleg opočinuti, moljasja priležno bogorodice, i abie svedoxsja v son. I otvorišasja sennyja dveri, a v kelejce stalo svetlo v polunošči; i paki kelejnyja dveri otvorišasja, i vnidoša v keliju ko mne dva besa i pogljadeli na menja, i // skoro vspjat' vozvratilisja is kelii i keliju moju zatvorili, i ne vest' kamo iščezoša. Az že pomyšljaju, česo radi besy ne davili mene i ne mučili i smotruju po kelejce moej tudy i sjudy. A v kelii svetlo. A ja ležu na levom boku. I vozrex na pravuju ruku, i na myšce moej ležit obraz vol'jašnoj medjanoj prečistyja bogorodicy. Az že, grešnyj, levoju rukoju xotel ego vzjat', ano i netu. A v kelii stalo temno, a ikona stoit na stene po-staromu, a serdce moe napolneno velikija radosti i veselija Xristova. Az že proslavix o sem Xrista i bogorodicu. I ot togo časa bliz godu ne vidal ni slyxal besov ni vo sne ni na jave. (E 292v-293)

'And once after the Office, having laid down to sleep with a great fear and praying to Our Lady diligently, I fell into a dream immediately. And the doors of the entrance opened and the cell became bright at midnight. And again the doors of the cell opened and two devils entered my cell and looked at me and soon went away and closed the doors of my cell and God only knows where they disappeared. I wonder why they didn't press and torment me and I look around my cell here and there. And the cell is bright. And I lie on my left side. And I looked up my right hand and on my right hand under my arm there is the icon of the Immaculate Virgin Mary cast of copper. I, a sinner, wanted to grasp it with my left hand, but it is not there. And the cell became dark, and the icon stands on the wall as before, and my heart is filled with a great happiness, even the joy of Christ. I glorified Christ and Our Lady for this. And from that hour, for nearly a year I have neither seen nor heard devils in dream or in reality.'

The conjunction *a* in the above example usually (four out of six instances) co-occurs with the historic present tense, giving the impression that the main story line is halted and the narrative speed is slowed down and the narrated events or states are viewed from inner perspective.. As we see in the above example, all instances of the conjunction *a* are exploited in describing ancillary situations accompanied by the main story line. Occasionally, the narrator's evaluative comments are found with the conjunction *a*, as in the following example.

(17) I skorbixom, dušu razdeljajušče. Umiloserdisja ž gospod' i priidoxom paki v temnicu v polunoščnoe vremja. Mati že tščesja skoro otiti. I vsem im stojaščim mati poučavše ix, nakazujušči. **A** soveršeno ne vem viny nakazanija, no eže slyšax, to i povestvuju. (M 42v)

'We grieved sharing our spirit. God had mercy on us and we came to the dungeon again at midnight. Mother tried to leave quickly. And while they all were standing Mother was admonishing them, instructing them. And I don't know the reason of the instruction, but what I have heard I will narrate.'

Thus, unlike the conjunction *i*, which is employed for more or less neutral and detached narration of sequential events on the temporal plane, the conjunction *a* marks the narrator's involved stance and inner perspective and focuses more on the ancillary description essential for the main story line and the narrator's evaluative remarks.

Polanyi (1979:209) postulates three kinds of information structure in narrative discourse: (i) event or narrative structure, (ii) descriptive structure, and (iii) evaluative structure. The event or narrative structure provides a temporal context, and time advances whenever an event takes place; the descriptive structure provides environmental or character-centered information, that is, materials indispensable for understanding what significance those events might have for the world created by the story; and the evaluative structure tells the audience what the narrator feels is crucial information in the story he is telling, without which the audience has only a mass of detail and no way of understanding what the story is really about (*ibid.*).

The conjunction *i* is mainly utilized for an event or narrative information structure forming the main skeleton or backbone of the story from a holistic point of view and detached stance, and can be simply glossed as one event occurred after another, and stresses on the iconicity of the sequence of the narrated events and the sequence of events in the real world. The conjunction *a*, by contrast, is predominantly utilized for a descriptive or an evaluative information structure, i.e., the description of the

background situations necessary for understanding the main on-line events in the story world or "the narrated" or provides evaluative commentary of the narrator belonging to the world of "the narrating" from a more involved stance. The choice of a conjunction, however, does not so much determine the information structure as it reveals the narrator's subjective construal or evaluation of the information conveyed in the narrative.

Aside from the three different kinds of information structure conveyed by these discourse-level conjunctions, there are other discourse functions performed by these conjunctions, namely, "discourse grounding" and "narrative speed." While the information structure in discourse is relevant to "what" is to be conveyed by the author, the other two discourse functions concern the authorial discourse strategy of "how" to package the information. The conjunction *i* foregrounds a sequence of backbone events and the conjunction *a* backgrounds the discourse by pausing to make evaluative comments or describe ancillary situations or events extraneous to in-sequence events.

Furthermore, by using different discourse-level conjunctions, the narrative speed is also manipulated: the conjunction *i* speeds up the narrative, presenting a sequence of events as having no significant break in time between them, by downplaying topic shift via VS element order and by focusing on the topic continuity via zero anaphora, whereas the conjunction *a* slows down the sequential event line by presenting ancillary background description or evaluation.⁷

4. Summary

To summarize, I defined the chain-linking conjunction as serving primarily on the inter-sentential level, although it is not always unambiguous to identify the syntactic status of the conjuncts linked by coordinating conjunctions. In this preliminary analysis of the chain-linking conjunctions *i* and *a*, I attempted to identify their discourse functions in terms of the information structure and the discourse strategies used to

convey the information, i.e., discourse grounding and narrative speed. The conjunction *i* is most frequently employed for event structure, whereas the conjunction *a* is employed for descriptive, as well as evaluative information structure. The conjunction *i* foregrounds sequential backbone events from outer and more detached perspective, accelerating the narrative speed, whereas the conjunction *a* backgrounds main on-line events and provides inner and more involved perspective, slowing down the narrative speed. The findings of this preliminary study may further suggest that seemingly redundant or illegitimate coordinating conjunctions in OR in syntactic texts can be reinterpreted as discourse-functionally motivated.

Notes

1. The corpus of this paper consists of the lives of three well-known Old Believers in the late seventeenth century, namely, the Archpriest Avvakum (A), the Monk Epifanij (E), and Bojarynja Morozova (M). For A and E, I used Robinson's (1963) edition, and for M, I used Mazunin's (1979) edition. The translation I provide in this paper is based on Brostrom (1979) for A, and for the other two texts, I provide my own translation.

2. The punctuations in the examples adduced are primarily based on the subjective judgements of the editors of the texts used in the corpus of this study.

3. Lakoff's (1984:487) claim that subordination (hypotaxis) and coordination (parataxis) are not to be understood in terms of dichotomy but as a continuum may be applied to OR conjunctions.

4. See Worth (1994) for a formal taxonomy of dative absolute and narrative functions of the dative absolute.

5. This is an incorrect aorist: third-person plural aorist is used for third-person singular subject.

6. In the corpus, VS element order after a chain-linking *i* is more frequent in M and E than in A. To put it another way, the downplay of

the participant, as well as the focus on a sequence of events is the function of the conjunction *i* in M and E, while in A the same conjunction merely chains narrated events, neither triggering VS element order, nor providing an event-oriented or holistic point of view, as we see in following example.

U vdovy načal'nik otnjal dočer', *i*(1) az molix ego, da že sirotinu vozvratit k materi; *i*(2) on, prezrev molenie naše, *i*(3) vozdvig na mja burju, *i*(4) u cerkvi, prišed sonnom, do smerti menja zadavili. *i*(5) az leža mertv polčasa i bol'si, *i*(6) paki ožive božim manoveniem. *I*(7) on, ustrašasja, otstupilsja mne devicy. (A 199)

'An official carried off a widow's daughter, and(1) I besought him that he should return the orphan to her mother. And(2) having scorned our entreaty and(3) having raised up a storm against me, and(4) having come in a multitude, they trampled me to death near the church. And(5) I lying as dead for more than half an hour, [Ø-(6)] returned to life with a sign from God. And(7) being terrified he yielded up the young woman to me.'

No inversion of element order is involved after *i*(1), *i*(2), *i*(5), and *i*(7). Usually the subjects (topics) after these conjunctions should be followed by the topic marker *že*, since they are shifted topics. *I*(3) and *i*(4) conjoin equal syntagmas, that is, past gerunds, while *i*(6) is a dysfunctional conjunction connecting a present gerund with a finite verb unless the present gerund is identified as a finite verb or as a particle meaning 'again..'

7. The narrative speed I discuss here is to be differentiated from the same term employed elsewhere. Usually the narrative speed is defined as the relationship between the duration of the narrated, i.e., the approximate time the events recounted go on or are thought to go on, and the length of the narrative in words, lines, or pages, etc. (Prince 1982:55). Here, however, the narrative speed is the narrative-internal, relatively and subjectively perceived sense of text speed.

References

Texts and Translation

- Archpriest Avvakum: The Life Written by Himself*. 1979. Trans. Kenneth N. Brostrom. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. 36-113.
- Povest' o bojarjnye Morozovoj: Prostrannaja Redakcija* 1979. Ed. A. I. Mazunin. Leningrad: Nauka. 127-155.
- Žizneopisanie Avvakuma i Epifanija*. 1963. Ed. A. N. Robinson. Moskva: Akademij nauk SSSR. 139-202.

Other References

- Bruker, N. I. 1990. "Konstrukcii cepnogo nanizyvanija s sintaksičeskoj časticej že." *Semantika i pragmatika jazykovyx edinic*. Dušanbe. 163-174.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1984. "The Pragmatics of Subordination." *BLS* 10: 481-492.
- Morozova, S. E., ed. 1983. *Struktura predloženiya v istorii vostočno-slavjanskix jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Pennington, A. E. 1980. *Grigorij Kotošixin, O Rosii v carstvovanie Alekseja Mixailoviča: Text and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Polanyi, Livia. 1979. "So What's the Point?" *Semiotica* 25 (3/4): 207-41.
- Prince, Gerald. 1982. *Narratology : The Form and Function of Narrative*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Worth, D. S. 1994 (1996). "The Dative Absolute in the Primary Chronicle: Some Observations." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12 (1/2): 29-46.

국문요약

고대 러시아어에서의 등위접속사의 담화기능

송 은 지

본 논문은 고대 러시아어의 이야기체 담화에서 가장 자주 사용되는 등위접속사 가운데 접속사 a 와 i 의 담화기능을 살펴본 것으로 표면적으로 잉여적이라 여겨지는 등위접속사가 사실상 이야기체 담화의 형성에 필수적인 역할을 수행함을 보임으로써 기존의 연구가 통사적 측면에서 이들 접속사를 단지 주변적으로 다루는 것에 대해 반론을 제시하고자 하였다. 우선, 본 논문에서는 구두점이 체계적이지 않은 고대 러시아어에서 문장단위를 파악하기 불가능하고 접속사가 연결하는 통사단위를 밝히기 쉽지 않음을 보인 뒤, 문장과 문장을 연결한다고 볼 수 있는 가능성이 있는 등위접속사 i 와 a 를 주된 논의의 대상으로 삼았다. 정보구조 측면에서 접속사 i 는 사건구조, 즉 시간적 순서에 따른 이야기의 전개 혹은 주된 플롯을 형성하는 반면, 접속사 a 는 배경이나 상황묘사적 정보나 서술자의 평가적인 태도나 정보를 전달하는데 사용된다. 또한, 접속사 i 가 주어 혹은 화제의 생략이나 도치로써 사건을 중립적이고 총체적인 시각에서 전달하고 서술에 속도감을 부여하여 중추적인 일련의 사건들을 전경화시키는 반면, 접속사 a 는 보다 내적이고 주관적인 관점에서 서술속도를 지연시키고 담화를 배경화시킨다.