## Variation in canonical Old Church Slavonic: the case of personal pronouns

Two problems arise when considering the Old Church Slavonic (OCS) personal pronoun system: (1) one that went almost unnoticed (with the major exception of Zaliznjak 2008), i.e. the difference in the use of long forms (such as *тьнě*) and short forms (traditionally called "clitics", such as *mi*) in the different manuscripts, and (2) the traditional one concerning the placement of short forms in the sentence (among the others: Jakobson 1935, Sławski 1946, Benacchio 1988, Radanović-Kocić 1988, Pancheva 2005, Vai 2010, Migdalski 2013, Zimmerling & Kosta 2013).

The analysis will be based on a corpus drawn from the TOROT Treebank and from the OCS section of the TITUS database: it consists of *Codex Suprasliensis* (CS), *Codex Marianus* (CM), *Codex Assemani, Codex Zographensis, Savvina Kniga* and *Psalterium Sinaiticum* (PS).

As for 1, a quantitative analysis of the data collected from the different canonical manuscripts allows to posit a significative difference between the distribution of long and short forms in the selected corpus: at one end we find CS, with a distribution conforming to that of stressed vs. unstressed pronouns; at the other end we find PS, where long forms tend to be generalized at the expense of short forms. Moreover, the choice of long forms in CM and in PS is not triggered by the Greek *Vorlage*, while CS seems to be more faithful to the Greek system: in PS and in CM it tends to be syntactically defined (e. g., short forms appearing after imperatives), while in CS it is defined by informational properties, as it is the case in Greek.

As for 2, PS shows a consistent placement of the short forms in contact postverbal position, while CS tends to generalize the preverbal placement of pronouns, even separated from the verb. CM and the other Gospel manuscripts have an intermediate position between these two extremes. The differences in the placement of pronouns are not dependent on the Greek texts: when considering the reflexive pronoun *sę* the same figures tend to appear.

The analysis of the data will be based on information structural categories: in broad focus sentences the pronouns are expected to be placed in postverbal contact position, while in argument focus structures the pronouns, being in the presupposition domain, are expected to appear in preverbal position, as the presuppositional domain is structured following communicative dynamism, where the most presupposed element appears first in the domain.

## References

Benacchio R. (1988). "I pronomi clitici nelle lingue slave dell'area balcanica". *Europa Orientalis* 7, pp. 451-469.

Jakobson R. (1935). "Les enclitiques slaves". In B. Migliorini & V. Pisani (a cura di), *Atti del III Congresso internazionale dei linguisti: Roma, 19-26 settembre 1933.* Firenze: Le Monnier, pp. 384-390.

Migdalski, K. (2013). "Diachronic Source of Two Cliticization Patterns in Slavic". In C. M. Salvesen & H. P. Helland (a cura di), *Challenging Clitics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 135-158.

Pancheva R. (2005). "The rise and fall of second-position clitics". *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 23/1, pp. 103-167.

Radanović-Kocić V. (1988). *The grammar of Serbo-Croatian clitics: a synchronic and diachronic perspective.* University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, tesi di dottorato.

Sławski F. (1946). *Miejsce enklityki odmiennej w dziejach języka bułgarskiego*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.

Vai M. (2010). "Sulla collocazione dei clitici pronominali in antico slavo ecclesiastico e in serbocroato". In G. Iannàccaro, M. Vai & V. Dell'Aquila (a cura di), *Féch, cun la o cume fuguus*: *per Romano Broggini in occasione del suo 85° compleanno, gli amici e allievi milanesi.* Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso, pp. 123-150.

Zaliznjak A. A. (2008). *Drevnerusskie ènklitiki*. Moskva: Jazyki Slavjanskix Kul'tur.

Zimmerling A. & Kosta P. (2013). "Slavic clitics: A typology". *Language Typology and Universals/Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF)* 66, pp. 178-214.