



Indirect Speech Acts in the Speech of the Characters of the *Tale of Bygone Years*

Victor S. Savelyev

Lomonosov Moscow State University
Moscow, Russia

Косвенные речевые акты в речи персонажей “Повести временных лет”

**Виктор Сергеевич
Савельев**

Московский государственный
университет им. М. В. Ломоносова
Москва, Россия

Abstract

The article states that communication in Old Russian as well as in modern Russian discourse is characterized by the use of mono-functional and poly-functional indirect speech acts. Moreover, the important aspect that helps to specify the illocutive functions of indirect speech acts in Old Russian is their verifiability: the verbal or non-verbal response of the interlocutor as well as the frame constructions, which introduce direct speech (preposition). These constructions are also used in the middle of the utterance (interposition) or at the end of the utterance (post-position). The author of the chronicles observes the communicative purposes of both the speaker and the interlocutor, indicating that the given utterance should be regarded as an indirect speech act. By analyzing the use of mono-functional indirect speech acts in the original dialogue fragments of the *Tale of Bygone Years*, the author works out their typology. The groups of interrogative and non-interrogative indirect speech acts have been singled out, each of them having certain typical characteristics. The semantics of non-interrogative utterances in most cases is connected with the expression of indirect meanings of time and aspect of verbal forms. The use of interrogative utterances as indirect speech acts is mostly connected with the changes not only in the illocutive function, but also in the propositional meaning of the predicative unit: interrogative utterances with negations should be interpreted as affirmative non-interrogative utterances and vice versa.

The author comes to the conclusion that the use of modern mono-functional indirect speech acts is traditional, since it is identical to their functioning in Old Russian.

Key words

Tale of Bygone Years, mono-functional and poly-functional indirect speech acts

Резюме

В статье устанавливается, что для древнерусской коммуникации так же, как и для современного русского дискурса, свойственно употребление монофункциональных и полифункциональных косвенных речевых актов. При этом важным аспектом определения иллокутивных функций древнерусских косвенных речевых актов является их верифицируемость: о том, что высказывание воспринимается в качестве косвенного речевого акта, свидетельствует вербальная и/или невербальная реакция собеседника, а также то, что в рамочных конструкциях, предваряющих и завершающих реплики, автором текста указываются коммуникативные целеустановки говорящего и собеседника. Анализируя использование монофункциональных косвенных речевых актов в оригинальных (не восходящих к другим текстам) диалогических фрагментах “Повести временных лет”, автор статьи выстраивает их типологию. Выделяются группы невопросительных и вопросительных косвенных речевых актов, для каждой из которых определяются характерные для нее признаки. Семантика невопросительных высказываний в большинстве случаев связана с выражением непрямых видо-временных значений глагольных форм. Использование вопросительных высказываний в качестве косвенных речевых актов чаще всего связано с изменением не только иллокутивной функции, но и пропозитивного содержания предикативной единицы: вопросительные высказывания с отрицанием должны восприниматься в качестве утвердительных невопросительных высказываний, и наоборот. Автор приходит к выводу, что использование современных монофункциональных косвенных речевых актов имеет традиционный характер, будучи тождественным их функционированию в древнерусской речи.

Ключевые слова

Повесть временных лет, монофункциональные и полифункциональные косвенные речевые акты

1. State of the Art

One of the basic concepts used in modern communicative science is the notion of the **indirect speech act** (hereafter—ISA). The ISAs, described in terms of the theory of speech acts [СЕРЛЬ 1986], will be regarded as utterances not with direct illocutionary functions, those “arising from the literal meaning of a sentence” [ПАДУЧЕВА 2001: 44], but utterances with indirect functions. The notion of the ISA allows one to allocate within the communicative potential of an utterance, which is a set of its possible illocutionary functions (hereafter—

IF), the main (direct) one, perceived as devoid of context, and the peripheral (indirect) functions, which are realized in the ISA. The recipient should be able to distinguish between the ISAs and the direct speech acts (hereafter—DSA), and adequately interpret the communicative intention of the speaker, incidentally reconstructing the non-explicatory meanings “hidden” in the ISA. The basis of this ability is that “the use of indirect speech acts is, to a greater or lesser extent, conventionalized” [Лайонз 2003: 269].

The types of ISAs characteristic of Russian speech have been streamlined during the study of the modern discourse, which is quite natural. Meanwhile, an analysis of the Old Russian texts shows that statements with indirect IF were also used in Old Russian communication.

Let us now turn to the analysis of the dialogue fragments of the *Tale of Bygone Years* (hereafter—the *TBY*).¹

The important aspect that helps to define the illocutive functions of ISAs in Old Russian is their verifiability. On the one hand, the IF of the utterance can be established on the basis of the judgment of the response of the interlocutor, who either gives a response or commits a response action. On the other hand, the chronicle dialogue is preceded and followed by a **frame construction**, which lists the participants of the communicative act, their communicative goals and perlocutionary effect, the specific features of the given speech act, the physical conditions of communication, the author’s assessment of the dialogue, etc. For example, in the following fragment **И воевода нача ѿѣздити полкъ, кажда възлѣ бѣрегъ, оукарати новгородци, гла: “(а) Что придосте с хромьцемъ симъ, а вы, плотници сущє? (б) А приставимъ вы хоромъ рѣвити нашихъ”. Се слышавше новгородци и рѣша Гдрославу, како: (с) “Заоутра перевеземьса на нихъ. Аще кто не поидеть с**

¹ The material for this research is the *TBY* text from the Hypatian Codex published by [ПСРЛ 1908]. In cases when the text of the Hypatian Codex has certain omissions, they are reconstructed in accordance with the Khlebnikov Chronicle (the comparison of the two chronicles is given in the same edition). In cases when the interpretation of the Hypatian Codex is considered to be erroneous by the *TBY* researchers engaged in the publication of the text, footnotes are provided to the corresponding places in the Khlebnikov Codex and to the chronicles used to reconstruct the Laurentian Codex: the Laurentian, the Radziwill, and the Academic chronicles [ПСРЛ 1926]. The footnotes generally include the Khlebnikov and Laurentian Codex variations, and if only one of them is used, the absence of the second one indicates the coincidence of its interpretation with the interpretation of the Hypatian Codex. Various interpretations can be useful and even necessary for the analysis of the fragments of the *TBY*, which are difficult to analyze without consulting the texts of different chronicles.

To split the text into words, the edition of [ПСРЛ 1908] has been used. However, to split the text into sentences and to punctuate it (if punctuation marks were non-existent in the *TBY*), modern standards have been used. The parentheses after the examples specify the year of the quoted fragment (in accordance with the Byzantine chronology accepted in the *TBY*, from the creation of the world, and the timeline of Christianity). In some cases, it was necessary to give a Modern Russian translation of the corresponding fragments.

нами, то сами потнѣ”. [. . .] Гдрославъ же заоутра, исполнивъ дружинѹ, противѹ свѣтѹ перевезеса (6524/1016) the voivode of Svjatopolk utters two ISAs, which formally represent an informative question (a) and the message of an intention (b). However, the reaction of the interlocutor (c—the decision to attack the enemy) and the evaluation of the statement IF by the chronicler in the framework structure (оукарати), as well as the fact that he points to the utterance of the voivode as the cause of the reaction of the Novgorod citizens (се слышавше), confirm that (a) and (b) are indeed ISAs.

The same example shows another important feature of the Old Russian utterances: many of them are illocutionarily poly-functional, which means that the statement can be used simultaneously in several illocutionary functions in the course of one locutionary act.² For example, the utterance (a) is both an evaluative judgment (*Зачем вы пришли . . . ? = Незачем вам было приходить . . . !*) and an insult (the propositive content of the utterance should appear offensive to the interlocutor: the speaker “lowers” the social status of both the interlocutor and his leader). Statement (b) is also polyfunctional: it not only informs about the intention of the speaker but it is also an insult. While (a) is an ISA (the speaker does not expect an answer, and the interlocutor does not perceive this “question” as an actual question), then (b) is a DSA: in order to understand the offensiveness of (b), it is necessary to link it with (a) and to consider (b) as an intention motivated by a derogatory assessment of the abilities of the interlocutor (вы, плотници сѹще ⇒ приставимъ вы хоромъ рѹбить нашихъ).

In this article, we are going to turn to the analysis of mono-functional ISAs—utterances used with one IF.³ When identifying the types of ISAs, we first list the basic IF of the utterance (the one in which it could be used as a DSA), and then the indirect IF of the utterance (the one in which it is used as an ISA in the given dialogue fragment).

2. Typology of Mono-functional Indirect Speech Acts in the Speech of TBY Characters

I. Statement Concerning the Present

1. Statement Concerning the Past

(1) (a) Црѣ же наоутрѣга призва га, и рѣ црѣ: “Да глѹть осли рѹсци”. Уни же ркоша: “Тако глѣть князь нашъ: «Хочю имѣти любовь съ царѣмъ грѣцькымъ свѣршенѹ прочага вса лѣта»” (6479/971), (b) И заоутра Вльга, сѣдши в теремѣ, посла по гости, и придоша к нимъ, глѹще: “Зовесть вы Вльга на чѣть великѹ” (6453/945).

² For details, see [САВЕЛЬЕВ 2016А].

³ The issue of the illocutionarily poly-functional ISA is developed in [САВЕЛЬЕВ 2016А].

The speaker informs of an event that took place prior to the moment of speech, using the present tense. The reason for using the present tense is as follows: under the conditions of the violation of the canonical speech situation, he is guided by the time when his interlocutor gets the message. The most illustrative example in this regard is (1a): the Greek king hears the words of the Russian prince as if they were uttered in his presence.⁴

2. Statement Concerning the Intention of the Speaker

(2) **И посла къ дѣревлянѣмъ, ркүци сице: “Се оуже идү к вамъ, да пристроите мѣды многы оу города, идеже оубисте мѹжа моего, да поплачюся надъ гробомъ ѣ и створю трызну мѹжю моему”. Уни же, слышавше, свежоша мѣды многы зѣло (6453/945).**

When pronouncing the given utterance, Princess Olga is only going to visit the Drevlyane, however, as in (1a) and (1b), she focuses on the time when the interlocutor gets her message.

3. Statement Concerning the Intention of a Person Who is not Involved in the Dialogue

(3) **Оу едину ношь присла по ма князь Дѣдѹ. И придохъ к нему, и сѣдаху дружина школо его, и посади ма и рече ми: “[. . .] Да се, Василию, шлю та: ѣди к Василкови со сима штрокома, и молви ему тако: «Уже хоцеша послати мѹжа своего, и воротитса Володимеръ, то вдам ти которыи любо городъ: любо Всеволожь, любо Шеполь, любо Перемиль»”. Азъ же идохъ к Василкови и повѣдаху ему всю рѣчь Дѣдѹ. Ун же рче: “[. . .] Послю к Володимеру, да быша не прольтали крови мене дѣла. Но сему ми дивно: даеть ми градъ свои, або и Теревовль, мога волость, пождавше и ннѣ” (6605/1097).**

Prince Vasilko talks of the proposal of Prince Davyd, pointing out that the latter *is* giving him one of the cities; however, Prince Davyd has only declared his intention, the implementation of which depends on the further actions of Prince Vasilko. Thus, Prince Vasilko judges the situation as if the condition of

⁴ The use of the present tense in this type of context is not necessary (for example, *По семъ же придоша нѣмци ѿ Рима, глүще, тако: “Придохомъ послани ѿ папежа”*. И ркоша ему: “Рекъ ти папѣжь: «Земла твоя тако земла нѣ, а вѣра ваша не акы вѣра наша». [. . .]” (6494 / 986), *И рекоша новгородци Стѹполкү: “Се мы, княже, прислани к тобѣ, и рекли намъ тако: «Не хоцѣмъ Стѹполка, ни сѣа его. [. . .]»” (6610 / 1102); the choices of verbal forms in the context of distant communication are described in detail in the article [САВЕЛЬЕВ 2016Б].*

It should also be pointed out that in modern communication, when the rules of the canonical speech situation are violated, we often convey the words of another person using statements like *Александра просит Вам передать. . . , Александра говорит, что. . . , Александра обещает Вам. . . , etc.* together with the possible variants like *Александра просила Вам передать. . . , Александра сказала, что. . . , Александра обещала, что. . .*

Prince Davyd has already been fulfilled. In the preceding part of his utterance, Prince Vasilko does agree to fulfill the request of his interlocutor.

4. Call for Action

(4) (a) **Стѣславъ же и Всеволодъ посласта къ Изяславѹ, гл҃ше: “[. . .] Аще ли хоцѣши гнѣвомъ ити и погубити гра̑, то вѣси, тако намъ жаль отна стола”.** То слышавъ, Изяславъ остави лахы, иде с Болеславомъ, мало лаховъ поемъ (6577/1069), (b) **И послашася пакы кигане к Володимерѹ, гла҃ше: “Понди, княже, Киевѹ. Аще ли не поидеши, то вѣси, тако много зла оудвигнетъсѧ. [. . .]”.** Се же слышавъ, Володимеръ поиде в Киевъ (6621/1113).

Using the present tense, the speaker urges the interlocutor to perform the action (*сам знаешь > знай, прими во внимание*). It is significant that the verb used here is **вѣдѣти**: modeling the alleged mental state of the interlocutor, who supposedly knows himself what is reported, the speaker is “forcing” him to accept his point of view.

5. Call for Joint Action

(5) (a) **И съѣхаста, и рече Редѣда къ Мьстиславѹ: “Не врѹжьемъ сѧ вѣвѣ, но борьбою”.** И гаста сѧ бороти крѣпко (6530/1022), (b) Половци же, слышавше, тако идуть рѹсь, и собрашася бес числа и начаша дѹмати. И рече Рѹсова: “Просимъ мира в рѹси, тако крѣпко сѧ имуть бити с нами, мы бо много зла створохомъ Рѹскои земли” (6611/1103).

As in (4a) and (4b), in (5a) and (5b) the speaker is talking as if the desirable joint action has already been committed.

6. Institutional Statement

(6) **Придоша Стѣполкъ, и Володимеръ, и Дѣдъ Игоревичь, и Василко Ростиславичь, и Дѣдъ Стѣславичь, и братъ его Влегъ, и снашѧ Любчи на строенье мира. И гшѣ к собѣ, рекуцѣ: “Почто губимъ Рѹскюю землю [. . .]? Ѡселѣ имѣмъсѧ по едино срѣце и съблюдемъ Рѹскюю землю. Каждо держитъ вчѣчинѹ свою: Стѣполкъ — Киевъ Изяславъ, Володимеръ — Всеволожъ [. . .]”.** И на томъ цѣловаша хрестъ (6605/1097).

In uttering this (6), the speaker is establishing a norm according to which he is going to act in the future. Thus, the present tense describes what should happen after the Council of Princes in Liubech.⁵

⁵ In all fairness, it should be pointed out that the Laurentian Codex uses the form *да держитъ*.

7. Prediction

(7) Бонакъ же приѣха, повѣда Давыдови, яко: “Побѣда ны естъ на угры”. И завѣтра Бонакъ исполчивъ вон свои — Давыдово .р., а Бонакъ оу .т. стѣхъ — и разлѣли на .г. полкы и поиде ко оугромъ (6605/1097).

Using the present tense, Bonyak is talking about a victory in a battle which has not yet even started as if it were a fait accompli.

Thus, in most cases the use of the present tense in an ISA allows the speaker to describe the event that has not yet occurred as one that is taking place; to convince the interlocutor that the given event is inevitable.

II. Statement Concerning the Future

1. Statement Concerning the Present (Present Tense)

(8) (a) Пришедшо ми в Ладогу, повѣдаша ми ладожане, яко сдѣ естъ: “Ѹгда бѹдетъ тѹча велика, нахѡтъ дѣти наши глазкы стекланыи, и малы и великыи, повертаны, а дрыпа подлѣ Волховъ берѹтъ, еже выполоскываетъ вода” (6622/1114), (b) И иде въ варагы, и приде въ Римъ, исповѣда, елико наоучи и елико видѣ, и рѣ имъ: “Дивно видѣхъ землю словенскую, идѹщую ми сѣмо. Видѣхъ банѣ древаны, и пережьгѹтъ ѿ велми, и съвлекѹтсѧ, и бѹдѹтъ нази, и шболѹтсѧ мытелью, и возмѹтъ вѣники, и начнѹтъ хвостати, и того собѣ добью, шдва вылѣзѹтъ ле живы, и оболѹтсѧ водою студеною, и тако шживѹ. И тако творать по всѧ дни не мѹчими никым же [. . .]”.

Such ISAs can be found in fragments of the narrative type of the dialogue: the speaker talks about things that can happen, with the ISA contained in an initial predicative unit (hereafter—PU), which describes the condition of the emergence of such a typical situation (see 8a), or in the main part of the story, which describes the sequence of the events (see 8b). The other parts of the utterance contain DSAs with the forms of the present tense in the function of the usual present (8a: нахѡтъ дѣти наши глазкы стекланыи; 8b: тако творать по всѧ дни).

2. Statement Concerning the Present (the Present Gnomic)

(9) В се лѣѣ придоша послѣ из немецъ къ Ѹтѡславоу. Ѹтѡслав же, величашѣ, показа имъ бѧтьство свое. Уни же, видивше бесчисленное множество злѧ, и сребра, и паволѡ, рѣша: “Ѹе ни во что же кетъ, се во лежитъ мртѡво. Сего сѹтъ смѣтъе лѹчыше. Мѹжи бѡ доишѹтъ и волша сего” (6583/1075).

The ambassadors, responding to the approval of Prince Svyatoslav, point out that the warriors are more valuable, meaning not a single action in the future but their ability to commit the action.

3. Statement Concerning the Decision

(10) (a) И ре ему одинъ кудесникъ: “Княже! Конь, егоже любиши и вѣдиши на немъ, ѿ того ти оумрети”. Влегъ же примъ въ оумѣ, си рече: “Николи же всаду на конь, ни вижу его боле того”. И повѣлѣ кормити и не водити его к нему (6420/912), (b) Стѣполкъ же шканьныи, злыи оуби Стѣслава, пославъ къ горѣ Оугорькон, бѣжащю ему въ оугры. И нача помышлати, тако: “Извѣю всю братью свою и приму власть рускю единъ”. Помысли високооумьемъ своимъ, а не вѣды, тако . . . (6523/1015), (c) Изаслав же иде в лахы со имѣниемъ многимъ и съ женою, оуповаа бѣтствомъ многимъ, гла, тако: “Симъ налѣзю вога”. Еже възаша оу него лахове, показаша ему путь ѿ себе (6581/1073), (d) Азъ же идохъ к Василкови и повѣдахъ ему всю рѣчь Двѣду. Он же рче: “[. . .] Иако приде ми вѣсть, тако идуть ко мнѣ борендичи, и печенѣзи, и торци, и [. . .] помыслихъ: “На землю Ладьскю наступлю на зиму ꙗ на лѣто и возму землю Ладьскю и мщию землю Русьскю” (6605/1097).

The speaker utters his decision to perform an action in the future or to follow a certain pattern of behavior. More often than not, these utterances are addressed to the speaker himself: the narrator introduces the thoughts of the character to the reader, verbalizing his “inner speech.” This theory is backed up by the fact that it is mentioned in the framework construction that the character (10a) примъ въ оумѣ, си рече, (10b) нача помышлати и помысли високооумьемъ своимъ, (10c) иде оуповаа бѣтствомъ многимъ, (10d) приде ми вѣсть и помыслихъ. Example (10d) is the most illustrative because in this example, it is not the narrator but the character himself—Prince Vasilko—who tells his interlocutor about his thoughts, seeing them as the reason for the misfortunes he had to endure: *А иное помышление въ срѣци моемъ не было ни на Стѣполка, ни на Двѣда. [. . .] Но за мое оузнесенье — иже поидоша берендичи ко мнѣ, и веселася срѣце мое, и възвеселиса оумъ мой, — и низложи ма Бѣ и смѣри ма.*

4. Call for Action

(11) Рѣ же имъ Ольга: “[. . .] Азъ оутро пошлю по вы, вы же рѣте: «Не ѣдемъ ни на конехъ, ни пѣши идемъ, но понесете ны в лодыи», и възynesутъ вы в лодыи”. И ѿпусти га в лодью (6453/945).

The form of the future tense describes the action Princess Olga encourages her interlocutor to perform. As in (4a), (4b), (5a), and (5b), the speaker uses the ISA as a rhetorical device, allowing them to “impose” their point of view on the recipient.

5. Call for Joint Action

(12) (a) **И не вѣ в нихъ правды, и вѣста родъ на рѣ, и быша оубовицѣ в нѣ, и воевати сами на сѧ почаша. И ркоша: “Поищемъ сами в собѣ князѧ, иже бы володѣлъ нами и рѣдилъ по рѣдѣ, по правѣ”.** Идоша за море к варягѣ, к рѣси (6370/862), (b) **И вѣспаша пре паволочитыѣ, а словѣне кропинныа, и раздра га вѣтрѣ. И рѣша словенѣ: “И мемъ сѧ свой толъ стинамъ: не даны сѣуть словѣнѣ пре кропинныа”** (6415/907), (c) **И рѣ Сѣтославъ: “[. . .] И не имамъ оубѣгнути, но станемъ крѣпко, азъ же предъ вами пондѣ. Аще моя глава лажеть, тоже промыслите ѡ себѣ”.** И ркоша вои: **“Идеже глаѣ твоя лажеть, тѣ и главы наша сложѣ”** (6479/971), (d) **Сѣтославъ же приа дары и почѣ дѣмати съ дѣужиною своею, река сице: “[. . .] Но створи миръ съ цѣмъ, се во ны сѧ по дань галъ, и то буди доволно намъ. [. . .]”.** И люба бы рѣчь сѣ дѣужинѣ, и послаша лѣпшыи мѣжи къ цѣви (6479/971), (e) **И рѣ Свенгелдъ и Асмѣдъ: “Князь оуже почалъ. Потѣгнемъ, дѣужино, по князи!”** И повѣдиша дѣревьяны (6454/946), (f) **И глше Володимеръ, тако: “Сѣ стоаще чересъ рѣкѣ, оу грозѣ сен, створимъ миръ с ними”.** И присташа свѣтѣ семѣ смысленѣи мѣжи — Гѣнь и прочи. Княнѣ же не восхотѣша свѣта сего, но ркоша: **“Хошемъ сѧ бити. Постѣпимъ на ѡнѣ сторону рѣкѣ”** (6601/1093).

ISAs with the forms of the future tense are used to encourage the interlocutor to perform a joint action, the speaker and interlocutor constituting a single social group.⁶ In some cases, this group is undifferentiated (12a, 12b): the utterance of such statements demonstrates the making of a common decision concerning further actions, which labels such statements as self-addressed ones (the whole group is specified as the speaker), and which brings these statements closer to those described in (10). In some other cases, the “head” of the group appeals to all the rest. If the recipient accepts the call, the chronicler either gives his response utterance (12c: **Идеже глаѣ твоя лажеть, тѣ и главы наша сложѣ**)—a response utterance of the warriors, motivated by the second part of Prince Svyatopolk’s speech, expresses their consent to follow him to the end); or gives the response of the recipient in the frame construction (12d: **и люба бы рѣчь сѣ дѣужинѣ**); or says nothing, giving the reader an opportunity to withdraw the implicit information from the correlation of the appeal and

⁶ We believe that there is no reason to speak about the use of certain specific 1st person plural forms of the imperative, “homonymous” to the 1st person plural forms of the future tense, in the given paragraphs: otherwise researchers would have to define specific “homonymous” forms for each case of the use of verbal forms in a figurative (i.e., non-direct) sense. The morphemic structure of these forms in the chronicles shows that they are not the etymological forms of the imperative, and the use of the present or future tense forms to express inducement, as pointed out by A. I. Sobolevsky [СОБОЛЕВСКИЙ 2005: 253], seems quite natural, since we mean an action that the speaker intends to perform immediately after the speech act or in the near future, and wants to involve his interlocutor in it. The fact that these forms are not grammatically formed as imperative indicators, such as the modern *пойдем* vs. *пойдемте*, is essential.

the descriptions of the subsequent actions (12e: **и повѣдиша деревьланы**).⁷ If the recipient does not agree with the call—which is a rare case—the narrator states this in the frame construction and gives an utterance explaining the disagreement of the interlocutor (12f: **Книганѣ же не восхотѣша свѣта сего, но рекоша: “Хочемъ съ бити. Поступимъ на шнѹ сторону рѣкѣ”**).

All ISA forms of this type contain the forms of the 1st person plural, with most statements containing clichés uttered in typical communicative situations (“the discussion of ‘the search for’ the Prince”: **Поищемъ!**, **Понимемъ!**; “the speech of the headman, calling to make peace with the enemy”; **Створимъ миръ!**). It is characteristic that six of fourteen ISAs with IF “call for joint action” contain a cliché **Потагнемъ!** (**Пондемъ!**), and the information about the consent of the recipient is given as implicit information (see 12e)—this way of describing events characterizes the speech genre of “a warlord addresses his warriors before a battle.”

6. Institutional Statement

(13) **Сѣополкъ и Володимеръ посласта к Олгови, глѣша сице: “Понди Кыкву, ать радъ оучинимъ в Рѹскон земьлѣ [. . .]”. Влегъ же [. . .] не восхотѣ ити къ братома своимъ, послушавъ злыхъ свѣтникъ. Сѣополкъ же и Володимеръ рекоста к нему: “Да се ты ни на поганыхъ идещи с нама, ни на дѹмѹ, то ты и ты зло мыслиши на наю и помогати хочещи поганымъ. А Бѣ промежи нама бѹдетъ”. Сѣополкъ же и Володимеръ идоста на Волга къ Черниговѹ (6604/1096).**

Just as in (6), the speaker sets the standard (*Бог нас рассудит*), which will henceforth determine the relationship between the dissenting brothers-princes.

7. Promise (Oath)

(14) **И рече Сѣославъ: “[. . .] И не имамъ оубѣгнути, но станемъ крѣпко, азъ же предъ вами поидѹ. Аще моя глава лажеть, тоже промыслите в себѣ”. И ркоша вои: “Идеже главо твоя лажеть, ты и главы наша сложѣ” (6479/971).**

Uttering a response statement, the warriors do not report about possible future events, but swear allegiance to Prince Svyatoslav.

III. Report of an Event that did not Happen due to the Non-implementation of a Certain Condition

1. Evaluative Judgment, Condemnation of the Events of the Past

(15) **Вни же рѣша: “Разъгнѣвалъсѣ Бѣ на ѿци на и расточи ны по странѣ грѣхъ ра нашихъ, и предана бы земля наша хрѣтыаномъ”. Володимеръ же рече: “То како вы инѣхъ оучите, а сами ѿвѣржени Бѣ? Аще вы Бѣ любилъ**

⁷ The latter method of description is the most frequently used one.

ВАСЪ, ТО НЕ БЫСТЕ РАСТОЧЕНИ ПО ЧЮЖИМЪ ЗЕМЛЯМЪ. БѢДИНАМЪ ТО ЖЕ МЫСЛИТЕ ЗЛО ПРІІАТИ?” (6494/986).

The utterance states, *Вы рассеяны по чужим землям, потому что Бог не любит вас*. It should be noted that the understanding of the ISA in this case is impossible without reference to the content of the two parts of the utterance: the speaker describes a situation exactly the opposite to the one which is true (*Вы не были бы рассеяны по чужим землям vs. В действительности вы рассеяны по чужим землям*), which gives a pejorative connotation to the views expressed in the second part of the structure (*Бог любил бы вас vs. В действительности Бог не любит вас*).

All the statements given above are non-interrogative. As we can see, in most cases their use as an ISA is associated with the use of special verbal forms. Present forms are used in constructions describing events that took place prior to the moment of speech or the events that, according to the speaker, should occur in the future, and the degree of probability of their implementation is estimated differently. Future tense forms express the meaning of the usual present and the gnomic present, and are also used in the constructions describing future events, the implementation of which seems problematic to the speaker, which makes him add to them a modal evaluation. It is characteristic that the use of past tenses in mono-functional ISAs is extremely rare.⁸ Example (15) may be considered as an exception—a statement that describes the condition in which the past situation would not have emerged. Thus, the use of mono-functional non-interrogative ISAs is primarily related to the changes of the semantics of the verb forms—in terms of tenses or modality.

IV. Call for Information (Verifying Question)

1. Call for ACTION

(16) (a) И заоутра, вѣставъ, рече к сѹщимъ с нимъ оученикомъ: “Видите горы сиа? Иако на сихъ горахъ вѣснаетъ блѣтъ Бѣжиа. Имать и городъ великъ быти, и цркви мьногы имѣ Бѣ въздвигнѹти”, (b) И послаша киванѣ къ Стославу, глѹще: “Ты, княже, чюжен земли ищешь и блюдешь, а своета сѣ лишивъ. Малѣ во нѣ не възаша печенѣзи, и мѣрь твѹю и дѣтти твоихъ. Аще не придеши, ни вборониши нѣ, да паки възмѹтъ. Аще ти не жаль втѣчины своета, и мѣрь, стары сѹща, и дѣтти свой?” То слышавъ, Стославъ вборзѣ възсѣдъ на кони съ дрѹжиною своєю и приде къ Киеву, и цѣлова мѣрь свою и дѣтти своета, съжалиси ѡ бывшѣ ѡ печенѣгъ (6476/968).

Uttering an interrogative sentence, St. Apostle Andrew encourages his disciples to look in the necessary direction. The citizens of Kiev do not want to

⁸ At the same time, they can be found in the poly-functional ISA; see [СОБОЛЕВСКИЙ 2005: 253].

know if Prince Svyatoslav has pity either for his own homeland or for his loved ones, but urge him to have pity for them, and manage to put their message across: *то слышавъ, Сѣтославъ [. . .] съжалиси ѿ бывше^м ѿ печенѣгъ.*

The example (16b) is characterized by a feature already mentioned in (15) and characteristic of the majority of interrogative ISAs (both verificative and informative): the utterance with a negation should be seen as an affirmative one and vice versa (*Тебе не жаль?* > *Пожалей!*).⁹

2. Evaluative Judgment

(17) (a) *И придоша въ градъ, и рекаша людие: “Почто губите себе? Коли можете перестоати на? Аще стоите ꙗко лѣ, что можете створити намъ? Имѣмъ бо кормлю ѿ землѣ. Аще ли не вѣрете, да видите своиа учина”* (6505/997), (b) *И створиша вѣче въ гра и рѣша: “Се хочемъ помрети ѿ глада, а ѿ князѣ помочи нѣтъ. Да лѣче ли ны оумрети? Вдадимса печенѣгомъ, да кого ли оживѣ, кого ли оумрѣвати. Оуже помираемъ ѿ глада”. И тако свѣтъ створиша* (6505/997).

The speaker expresses his judgment on the impossibility of performing an action in the future (see 17a) or that it would have negative consequences (17b).

3. Reminder

(18) *Всеволодъ же исповѣда ему все бывшек. ꙗко рече ему Изяславъ: “Брате, не тужи! Видиши бо, колко са мнѣ склѣчи зла? Первое бо, не выгнаша ли мене и имѣние мое разграбиша? И паки, кѣю винѣ створилъ есмь? Не изгнаста ли вы мене, брата своа? И не блудѣ ли по чюжимъ землѣмъ, имѣния лишень быхъ, не створи зла ничтоже? ꙗко нынѣ, бра, не туживѣ. [. . .]”. И се рекъ, ѣтъши Всеволода и пове збирати воа ѿ мала до велика* (6586/1078).

It should be pointed out that the IF “reproach” detected in connection with the whole utterance (18) is derived from the correlation of this syntagm with other syntagms, complementing it: if these “additional” syntagms were not pronounced, the statement would not be understood as a reproach (cf: *И не блудѣ ли по чюжимъ землѣмъ + имѣния лишень быхъ + не створи зла ничтоже?* > *Я скитался по чужим землям, хотя и пострадал безвинно: меня лишили имущества, хотя никакого зла я не сотворил* vs. **И не блудѣ ли по чюжимъ землѣмъ* > *Я скитался по чужим землям*). Thus, this additional IF is characteristic of a complex of speech moves¹⁰ rather than of each taken individually, and therefore the ISA (18) should not be considered a poly-functional statement.

⁹ This feature of the interrogative ISA will be given more attention after the description of the ISA of the given type.

¹⁰ Read more about the elementary and complex speech moves and turns in [СОВОЛЕВСКИЙ 2005: 253].

In contrast to (18), the utterance in the same question **НЕ ВЫГНАША ЛИ МЕНЕ И ИМѢНЬЕ МОЕ РАЗГРАБИША?** is poly-functional: the speaker simultaneously reminds his brother of the past and reproaches him, and each PU, constituting a statement, is seen as a reminder and as a reproach, even if the second PU is “removed.”

The utterance **НЕ ИЗГНАСТА ЛИ ВЫ МЕНЕ, БРАТА СВОЯ?** is more difficult. On the one hand, the IF “rebuke” is set by correlating the contents of two syntagms, constituting a complex speech move (**НЕ ИЗГНАСТА ЛИ ВЫ МЕНЕ + БРАТА СВОЯ?** > *Вы поступили плохо, изгнав своего брата*). On the other hand, even if the second part of the structure is omitted, the first will be illocutionarily poly-functional due to its personal mode of address: the subject of a proposition, describing a negatively evaluated event, coincides with the recipient, and therefore this part of the statement is perceived as a reminder and as a reproach (***НЕ ИЗГНАСТА ЛИ ВЫ МЕНЕ?** > *Это вы меня изгнали*). The second part of the structure, because it is not propositive, has no illocutionary poly-functionality, but is communicatively significant: it does not allow the recipient to doubt that the speaker is turning his attention to his being involved in a negatively evaluated action.

4. Call for Information (Informative Question)

(19) (a) **И въстѹжиша люде в городѣ и ркоша: “Нѣ ли кѡ, иже бы на шнѹ страну могъ донти?”**¹¹ «аще не пристѹпите оутро подѣ городѣ, предатиса имамѣ печенѣгѡ». **И рѣ ѡдинѣ ѡтрокъ: “Азѣ могѹ пренти”** (6476/968),
 (b) **Шнѣ же изыде изѣ града съ оуздою и хожаше сквѣзѣ печенѣгы, глѡ: “Не видѣ ли конѡ никтоже?”** — бѣ во оумѣа печенѣскы, и и мнѡхѹ и своихѹ (6476/968).

ISAs (19a) and (19b), as formally negative utterances which require the validation of the stated information, are actually pronounced in order to see who can be the agent of the proposition described in the utterance (the pronouns **кто** and **никто** are used in the same function): *Нет ли кого, кто мог бы . . . ?* should be seen as *Кто может . . . ?* and *Никто не видел коня?* means *Кто видел коня?*

V. Information Required (Informative Question)

1. Evaluative Judgment

The ISAs of the given type can be observed in the *Tale of Bygone Years* most frequently. They often include pronominals in the cataphoric function, which replace the syntactic positions in the predicative units [PU]. These syntactic positions can correlate both with nouns and with proposition predicates.

¹¹ Laurentian Codex: add. и рѣ имѣ.

A. Utterances with **КТО**

(20) Мѣстиславъ же, ѡ свѣтѣ зѡутра и видѣ лежачи исѣчени ѿ своѣхъ сѣвѣръ и варягы Іарославѣ, и рѣ: “Кто сему не рѣ? Се лежитъ сѣверанинъ, а се варягъ, а своѣ дружина цѣла” (6532/1024).

The pronoun **кто** refers to the grammatical patient in the position of the subject.

B. Utterances with **ЧТО**

(21) (a) Рѣша ему: “Данъ сѣа своѣ, дамы и бѣмъ”. Унѣ же рѣ: “Аще сѣтъ бѣи, то единого себе послють бѣ, да помѣтъ сѣа моего. А вы чѣму перетеребѣете и мѣ?” И кликнуша и ѡсѣкоша сѣни подѣ ними, и тако повиша га (6491/983), (b) И се слышавѣ, Глѣбѣ въспи велми съ слезами и плачѣса по шѣци, паче же и по братѣ, и нача молитисѣ со слезами, глѣ: “[. . .] Аще бо быхъ, братѣ, видѣлъ лице твое ангѣлое, оумерѣ быхъ с тобою. Нынѣ же что ради вѣстахъ азъ единъ? [. . .]” (6523/1015), (c) И рѣша ему¹² мѣжѣ смыслѣни: “По что вы распрѣ имѣта межѣ собою, а поганинѣ гѣбѣтъ землю Рускѣю? Послѣдѣ сѣ смириѣта, а нѣтъ поидѣта противѣ имѣ, любо с миромѣ, любо рѣтъю” (6601/1093), (d) Іарополкъ же идѣше по немѣ, плачѣса съ дружиною своєю: “Учѣ, учѣ мои! Что еси бес печали пожѣ на свѣтѣ семѣ, многи напасти приемѣ ѿ людѣи и ѿ братѣа своѣа? [. . .]” (6586/1078).

The use of the pronoun **что** (21a: чѣму; 21b: что ради; 21c: по что) with or without prepositions is mainly connected with the expression of the meanings of cause and motive, but, at the same time, they cannot be differentiated. The use of the pronoun **что** in (21d), where it expresses a quantitative meaning, should be mentioned as an individual case.

C. Utterances with **КАКО**

(22) (a) И не послуша сего, помышляѣа: “Како ма хотѣтъ гѣти, ѡногды цѣловѣли хрѣстѣ, рекѣше: «Аще кто на кого вѣдетѣ, хрѣстѣ на того и мы вси?»” И помысливѣ си, перехрѣстисѣ, река: “Вола Гѣа да вѣдетѣ” (6605/1097), (b) И рече Гѣополкъ: “Братѣ, ты почни”. И рече Володимерѣ: “Како га хочѣю молвити, а на ма хотѣтъ молвити твоеѣ дружина и моѣа, рекѣше: «Хочѣтъ погѣбити смерды и ролью смердомѣ!»? [. . .]” (6619/1111), (c) И вѣпросиша колодникѣ, глѣше: “Како васѣ толка сила и многое множество, не могосте сѣ противити, но воскорѣ повѣгостѣ?” Си же ѿвѣщевахѣ, глѣше: “Како можемѣ вѣтисѣ с вами? А дружинѣ вѣздахѣ верхѣ васѣ въ ѡрѣжи свѣтѣлѣ и страшни, иже помагахѣ вамѣ!” (6619/1111).

In all ISAs, which include the pronominal adverb **како**, there can be observed predicates which consist of a modal verb and the infinitive of a notional verb. At the same time, the PU which includes **како** describes the event which is

¹² Laurentian Codex: нма.

being evaluated and the implementation of which is 'limited' by the condition, stated in the following PU.

The utterances which include the verb **ХОТѢТИ** in the present tense form refer to the intention of the subject of the proposition to take action, expressed by the infinitive, either at some time after the moment of speech (see 22a) or shortly after the given utterance was made (see 22b). In the second case, the speaker evaluates the possibility of taking the verbal action, which he, supposedly, does not dare to take (*Как же мне говорить, если . . .*): this so-called masking strategy of both speech and behavior allows him to express his point of view and, at the same time, to forestall the possible objections of the interlocutor.

In (22c) the modal verb **МОЩИ** is used. It is remarkable that although the given event took place in the past, the speaker uses the form of the present tense as in (22a) and (22b) in the meaning of the *gnomic present*.

D. Utterances with **КИИ**

(23) (a) **РѢ** же има **ІАНЫ**: “[. . .] Которому **Б҃҃҃** вѣрѣта?” **Вна** же рекоста: “**Антихръстѹ**”. **Вн** же **рѣ** има: “То гдѣ есть?” **Вна** же рекоста: “**Сѣдитъ въ безднѣ**”. **И рѣ** има **ІАНЫ**: “То кии есть **Б҃҃҃**, сѣда въ безднѣ? То есть вѣсь [. . .]” (6579/1071), (b) **Всеволодъ** же исповѣда емѹ все бывшек. **І рѣ** емѹ **Изяславъ**: “**Брате, не тѹжи! Видиши бо, колко са мнѣ склѹчи зла? Первое бо, не выгнаша ли мене и имѣнье мое разграбиша? И паки, кѹю винѹ створишь есмь? [. . .]**” (6586/1078).

The pronoun **кии** takes the position of an attribute of the noun, the truthfulness of its denotative meaning is somehow discredited by the speaker (the Magi's god is not god, thus, the fault of Izyaslav is not a fault).

E. Utterances with **КДЕ**

(24) **И се слышавъ, Глѣбъ** въспи велми съ слезами и плачаша по **ш҃҃҃ци**, паче же и по **братѣ**, и нача молитиса со слезами, **г҃ла**: “[. . .] **Аще** бо **выхъ**, **брате**, **видилъ** лице твое **ан҃глое**, оумерлъ **выхъ** с тобою. **Нынѣ** же что ради **встахъ** азъ **единъ**? **Кде** сѹть **слова** твоя, **аже** **г҃лаше** ко **мнѣ**, **брате** **мои** **любими**? [. . .]” (6523/1015).

The ISA with the pronominal adverb **кде** [where] is observed in the same passage as (21b). The use of two ISAs, one after another, allows the speaker to express the sorrow he feels after he lost his beloved brother.

F. Utterances with **ЧТО СДѢЛАТИ**

(25) **И рѣ** **варягъ**: “**Не сѹ** то **б҃зи**, но **древѹ**. [. . .] **А Б҃҃҃** **единъ** **есть**, емѹже **слѹжати** **грѣци** и **кланяютсѹ**, **иже** **створишь** **небо**, и **землю**, и **члвка**, и **звѣзды**, и **слнце**, и **лунѹ** и **далъ** **есть** **жити** на **земли**. **А си** **б҃зи** **что** **сдѣлаша**? **Сами** **дѣлани** **сѹть**. [. . .]” (6491/983).

The pronominal use of a verb can also be observed in the *TBY*: the predicative combination (predicative complex) **что сдѣлаша** replaces those predicative combinations that could have been used in the response utterance if the speaker's question had not been an ISA, implying that pagan 'gods' did nothing [*ничего не сделали*].

2. Reminding of the Past, Stating Intentions, and Describing the Current Situation and Affairs

(26) (a, b, c) **Давыдъ же, имъ вѣры лживымъ словесемъ, нача молвити на Василка, гла сице:** “(a) **Кто есть оубилъ брата твоего Ярополка,** (b) **а нынѣ мыслить на та и на ма** (c) **и сложилъся есть с Володимиромъ? Да промышлани си в своен головѣ!**” (6605/1097).

Example (26) presents a number of ISAs united by a common agent and expressed by the pronoun **кто**. Example (26a) reminds the interlocutor of an action, which the person they talk about committed earlier; (26b) states his intention; and (26c) speaks about the current situation, which is the result of his previous actions. Correlation of the propositive meanings of these three PUs should make the interlocutor consider the speaker's words as a warning (26a, 26b, and 26c cannot be regarded as a warning individually), moreover, the given IF is also typical of the PU **Да промышлани си в своен головѣ!**—the utterance, used here as a DSA.

3. Unfavorable Forecast

(27) (a) **Сѣславъ же приа дары и поч̣ думати съ дружиною своею, река сице:** “[. . .] **А Рѣкага земля далече есть, а печенѣзи с нами ратни, а кто ны поможѣ?** [. . .]” (6479/971), (b) **И рѣша оуниши Оурѣсовѣ:** “**Аще са ты боиши рѣси, но мы са не боимъ. Сихъ бо избивше, и поидемъ в землю ихъ, и приемемъ вса грады ихъ. И кто избавить ихъ ѿ насъ?**” (6611/1103), (c) **И стога Вльга лѣто цѣло, и не можаше взати города, и оумысли сице:** **посла къ городѣ, ркѣши:** “**Чего хошете досѣдѣти? [. . .] А вы хошете голодомъ измерети, не имѣнса по дань**” (6454/946), (d) **И придоша въ градъ, и рекаша людие:** “**Почто гувите себе? Коли можете перестоати на? Аще стонте .т. лѣѣ, что можете створити намъ?** [. . .]” (6505/997).

In examples (27a) and (27b), the pronoun **кто** refers to the agent. In example (27c), the pronoun **что** at the verb **досѣдѣти** replaces the object, which should be taken as a proposition (at the end of the utterance, made by Princess Olga, this proposition is verbalized: **вы хошете голодомъ измерети**). In (27d), a pronominal verb is used (comp. to 25).

It should be stressed that (27a) is a forecast unfavorable for the speaker; (27b) for the participant of the proposition who is not a communicant; and (27c) and (27d) for the interlocutor.

4. Apprehension

(28) (a) Володимиръ же рече: “То како вы инѣхъ оучите, а сами ѿвѣржени бѣте? Аще вы бѣте любилъ васъ, то не высте расточени по чюжимъ землямъ. Егда и намъ то же мыслите зло прѣати?” (6494/986), (b) Видѣвъ же мало дружины своѣя, рече в себе: “Егда, како прелѣстивше, изъвьютъ дружину мою и мене?”, бѣша бо мнози погыбли на полку. И рече: “Поиду в Русь и приведу боле дружины” (6479/971).

The speaker expresses apprehension that the event unfavorable for him can take place. At the same time, he addresses his utterance either to the interlocutor (see 28a), or to himself (see 28b): in the second case, as in (10), the narrator verbalizes the ‘inner speech’ of the character, showing its specific nature in the frame construction (рече в себе).¹³

5. Hope

(29) Она же не хоташе ити, тако в поганыя, и рече им: “Луче бы ми сде оумрети”. И рече ея братъ: “Егда како обратитъ бѣте Рускую землю в покаяние, а Грѣчкую землю избавиши ѿ лютыя рати? [. . .]” (6496/988).

In contrast to (28b), the speaker expresses his hope that the mentioned event will take place; in both cases the conjunction *егда* is used, but at the same time its meaning is so different from the meaning of a time conjunction “when” *когда* that there is a question as to whether these interrogative utterances are verificative. However, attention should be paid to the fact that both in (28) and in (29), the participants of communication speak about future events, and the possibility of their implementation is the subject the speaker is really worried about. It is the combination of two time zones—the moment of speech and the event following it—that accounts for the use of a time conjunction.

VI. Call for Information (Combination of Verifying and Informative Questions)

A number of *TBY* passages include constructions where two ISAs are used together: the verifiable question, the IF of which is ‘calling to an action,’ and the informative question, the IF of which is the ‘evaluative judgment’:

(30) (a) И рече Блудъ Гдрополку: “Видиши ли, колко вон оубрата твѣе? Намъ ихъ не беребороти. И твори миръ съ брамъ своимъ”, льста подь нѣ, се

¹³ It should be pointed out that the conjunctions *егда* and *егда* are used synonymously in the given fragments (this feature was noted by I. I. Sreznevsky, who used the contexts in the given type of ISAs as examples; see [СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ 1893: 807, 808]). Particularly, they can be used in the same sentences in various chronicles; thus, in the fragment *Ркоша же дружина Игорева*: “Да аще сице глѣть црь, то что хоцѣмъ боле того: не вивши, имати злато, и серебро, и паволокы? Егда кто вѣсть, кто долѣеть: мы ли, они ли? Или с моремъ кто свѣтенъ? Се во и не по земли ходимъ, но по глѣбинѣ морьстии, и шьча смръть вѣмъ” (6452/944), the conjunction *егда* is used in the *Нурatian Codex* and *егда* is used in the *Laurentian Codex*.

рѣ. И рѣ Ідрополкъ: “Тако бѹди” (6488/980), (b) Она же не хоташе ити, тако в поганыа, и рѣ им: “Лѹче бы ми сде оумрети”. И рѣста еи брата: “[. . .] Видиши ли, колко зло створиша рѹсь грѣкомъ? Нынѣ же, аще не идеши, то же имѹтъ творит намъ”. И ѿдва принѹдиста (6496/988), (c) І рѣ емѹ Изаславъ: “Братѣ, не тѹжи! Видиши бо, колко сѧ мнѣ склѹчи зла? [. . .]”. И се рекъ, ѹтѣши Всеволода (6586/1078).

In all of these utterances the first position is taken by the ISA in the form of the 2nd person present tense **видиши**, which forms the mental modus structure:¹⁴ the interlocutor, supposedly, evaluates the current situation himself, although in fact the speaker adduces his own point of view, which is expressed by the following ISA with the pronoun **колко**, meaning a great number/amount of the evaluated thing: (30a: *Сколько воинов?* = *Много воинов*; 30b и 30c: *Сколько зла?* = *Много зла*).¹⁵

It should be pointed out that such ‘compound’ ISAs are observed in dialogues in which the speaker, by means of changing different strategies of speech and behavior,¹⁶ tries to convince the interlocutor of something, and each time he succeeds. Thus, the chronicler regards ‘compound’ ISAs as utterances that allow him to achieve the perlocutive effect he wants in a discussion the result of which is not obvious.

*

Concluding the analysis of interrogative ISAs, let us once again discuss the feature that has been discovered when describing example (16b). As we can observe, in most cases the use of interrogative utterances as ISAs is connected with the following semantic changes in the propositions:

- if an utterance, which is understood literally, expresses a negative judgment (formally, it is expressed by the negative particle **не**), it should be interpreted as a positive one (16b: *Тебе не жаль?* > *Пожалей!*; 18: *Не скитался ли я по чужим землям?* = *Я скитался по чужим землям!*; 19a: *Нет ли кого, кто мог бы. . . ?* = *Кто может. . . ?*; 19b: *Никто не видел. . . ?* = *Кто видел. . . ?*; 20: *Кто этому не рад?* = *Все этому рады!*),

- if an utterance, which is understood literally, expresses a positive judgment, it should be interpreted as a negative one (17a: *Можете ли вы перестоять нас?* = *Вы не можете перестоять нас!*; 17b: *Лучше ли нам будет, если мы умрем?* = *Если мы умрем, нам лучше не будет!*; 21a: *Зачем вы совершаете им*

¹⁴ Compare with (16a), where the verb is used in its literal sense.

¹⁵ This reveals a pattern: in cases when, determining the number of the positively evaluated object, the speaker refers to the lack of it (see 21d: *Сколько ты без горестей пожил на этом свете?* = *Мало ты пожил на этом свете без горестей!*), and in cases when, determining the number of the negatively evaluated object, the speaker refers to its redundancy (see 30a, 30b, and 30c).

¹⁶ Concerning speech behavioral tactics, see [ВЕРЕЩАГИН, КОСТОМАРОВ 2005: 524, 525].

требы? = *Вам незачем совершать им требы!*; 21b: *Зачем я остался один?* = *Мне незачем оставаться одному!*; 21с: *Зачем вы ссоритесь?* = *Вам не следует ссориться!*; 22а: *Как же меня собираются схватить, если...?* = *Меня не могут собираться схватить, поскольку...!*; 22b: *Как же я буду говорить, если...?* = *Я не могу говорить, поскольку...!*; 22с: *Как мы можем биться с вами, если...?* = *Мы не можем биться с вами, поскольку...!*; 23а: *Какой это Бог...?* = *Это не Бог...!*; 23b: *Какой я проступок совершил?* = *Я никакого проступка не совершал!*; 24: *Где твои речи...?* = *Твоих речей больше нет...!*; 25: *Что эти "боги" сделали?* = *Эти "боги" ничего не сделали!*; 27а: *Кто нам поможет?* = *Никто нам не поможет!*; 27b: *Кто избавит их от нас?* = *Никто не избавит их от нас!*; 27с: *Чего вы хотите дождаться?* = *Ничего хорошего вы не дождетесь!*; 27d: *Что можете нам сделать?* = *Ничего нам не можете сделать!*).

Thus, as it has turned out, the feature that is so typical of modern Russian discourse has a long history and is quite traditional.

3. Conclusions

The analysis allows for the following conclusions:

1. The use of ISAs is typical not only of modern but also of Old Russian communication. ISAs in Old Russian can be used both as mono-functional and poly-functional utterances.

2. Mono-functional ISAs can be observed in 33 of 320 original (i.e., not observed in other texts) dialogue passages of the *TBY*. At the same time, more often than not, more than one ISA is used in a certain dialogue passage: the total number of mono-functional ISAs is 82 utterances.

3. The semantics of non-interrogative mono-functional ISAs (44 utterances) in most cases is connected with the expression of indirect time and aspect of verbal forms (present forms referring to events in the past, future forms to unreal events, and so forth).

4. 38 mono-functional ISAs are interrogative utterances. In the majority of cases their semantics is narrowed to the statement of a certain evaluative judgment; at the same time, in the structure of the proposition the semantic operator of negation is replaced by the semantic operator of assertion and vice versa.

5. The types of mono-functional ISAs, singled out in the course of the analysis, can be observed in modern Russian discourse as well, which allows us to assume that they are quite traditional.

Bibliography

ВЕРЕЩАГИН, КОСТОМАРОВ 2005

ВЕРЕЩАГИН Е. М., КОСТОМАРОВ В. Г., *Язык и культура. Три лингвострановедческие концепции: лексического фона, рече-поведенческих тактик и сапиентемы*, Москва, 2005.

Лайонз 2003

Лайонз Дж., *Лингвистическая семантика. Введение*, Москва, 2003.

Падучева 2001

Падучева Е. В., *Высказывание и его соотношенность с действительностью*, 2-е изд., Москва, 2001.

ПСРЛ 1908

Полное собрание русских летописей, 2: Ипатьевская летопись, 2-е изд., С.-Петербург, 1908.

——— 1926

Полное собрание русских летописей, 1: Лаврентьевская летопись, 1: Повесть временных лет, 2-е изд., Ленинград, 1926.

САВЕЛЬЕВ 2016А

САВЕЛЬЕВ В. С., “Древнерусские иллокутивно полифункциональные высказывания: сообщения о бывшем, настоящем и будущем (на материале «Повести временных лет»)”, *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 9. Филология*, 2, 2016, 79–105.

——— 2016Б

САВЕЛЬЕВ В. С., “Функции глагольных форм настоящего времени в речи персонажей «Повести временных лет»”, *Филология и человек*, 2, 2016, 127–142.

СЕРЛЬ 1986

СЕРЛЬ Дж. Р., “Косвенные речевые акты”, in: *Новое в зарубежной лингвистике*, 17, Москва, 1986, 195–222.

СОБОЛЕВСКИЙ 2005

СОБОЛЕВСКИЙ А. И., *Лекции по истории русского языка*, 5-е стер. изд., Москва, 2005.

СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ 1893

СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ И. И., *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка*, 1, С.-Петербург, 1893.

References

Lyons J., *Linguistic Semantics: An introduction*, transl. into Russian, Moscow, 2003.

Paducheva E. V., *Vyskazyvanie i ego sootnesennost' s deistvitel'nost'iu*, 2nd ed., Moscow, 2001.

Savelyev V. S., “Old Russian Utterances with Illocutionary Multifunctionality: Communications about the Past, Present and Future (on the basis of ‘The Tale of Bygone Years’)”, *Moscow State University Bulletin. Series 9. Philology*, 2, 2016, 79–105.

Savelyev V. S., “Functions of Present Tense Forms in Direct Speech in ‘The Tale of Bygone Years’”, *Filologiya i chelovek*, 2, 2016, 127–142.

Searle J. R., “Indirect Speech Acts (transl. into Russian)”, in: *Novoe v zarubezhnoi lingvistike*, 17, Moscow, 1986, 195–222.

Sobolevskiy A. I., *Lektsii po istorii russkogo iazyka*, 5th ed., Moscow, 2005.

Vereshchagin E. M., Kostomarov V. G., *Iazyk i kul'tura. Tri lingvostranovedcheskie kontseptsii: leksicheskogo fona, reche-povedencheskikh taktik i sapientemy*, Moscow, 2005.

Виктор Сергеевич Савельев, канд. филол. наук

Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова,

филологический факультет, доцент кафедры русского языка

119991 Москва, Ленинские горы, ГСП-1, МГУ, 1-й корпус гуманитарных

факультетов, филологический факультет

Россия / Russia

alfertinbox@mail.ru

Received May 25, 2016