SlavVaria 1/2026. 223–240
DOI: 10.15170/SV.1/2026.223

GYÖRFI BEÁTA
(Szeged, Hungary)

Not All Clitics Are Equal: The Effect of Negation on Clitic Placement in Old East Slavic

Abstract: The paper investigates the interaction between the negative particle *ne* and the Old East Slavic clitic system, with particular attention to discourse, pronominal, auxiliary, and reflexive enclitics. Drawing on data from the historical subcorpus of the Russian National Corpus, the study examines how negation affects the placement of different clitic types and whether its influence is uniform across the clitic system.

The findings support the hypothesis that negation did not affect the Old East Slavic clitic system uniformly but contributed to its internal differentiation. From a broader historical and typological perspective, the observed patterns point to a gradual shift from a system primarily governed by second-position principles toward one exhibiting a stronger orientation to the verbal complex. This development is consistent with the diachronic restructuring of the East Slavic clitic system and the evolution of the tense-aspect system.

Keywords: Old East Slavic, negation, enclitics, proclitic *не*

Introduction

Old East Slavic featured a strict system of enclitics and a strong negative structure inherited from Proto-Slavic. Enclitics were forced to the second position by Wackernagel's Law, while the negative marker, *ne*, as a proclitic, tended toward immediate preposition to a finite verb. Consequently, a fundamental tension arises: how do these two competing prosodico-syntactic forces interact?

The study involves the investigation of two vast phenomena, that have not been widely investigated so far in historical linguistics. The application of corpus research however, opens up new perspectives in this respect as well.

Besides the investigation of the interaction between negation and the system of enclitics in 11th–15th century OES texts, I also try to highlight upon the possible differences that occur between the two registers of OES: in Old Church Slavonic and in hybrid texts.

In order to achieve the above mentioned goals, the article begins with a theoretical introduction establishing the grammatical foundations focusing on clitics in general and on the system of OES enclitics in particular. It is followed by a typological look at the universal properties of negation and specific features of negation in Slavic languages. Based on these foundations, the core

hypothesis of the study is formulated. In part six, the research method and material is introduced. Part seven is dedicated to the interaction of negation and enclitics of different classes: discourse enclitics, pronominal enclitics, the reflexive marker *ся*, and auxiliary enclitics. The final part summarizes the conclusions.

1. A Universal Typology of Clitics

Clitics constitute a unique and complex word class in the sense that, despite being tiny and seemingly insignificant elements, they interact with various levels of language–phonology, morphology, syntax, and pragmatics. Functionally, they are versatile: they can serve as discourse markers, pronouns, or auxiliaries. Regarding their position, phonologically they can attach to their host (a prosodic word) from either the left or the right, forming proclitics or enclitics, respectively. In terms of syntactic position, they can either occupy a fixed slot in the clause or attach to a specific part of it. Semantically, enclitics can be of two kinds: local, that specify the meaning of their host, which they immediately follow, and phrasal, that relate to a whole phrase and have a more general meaning. On the basis of morphology, special and simple clitics are distinguished. Special clitics are those that have paradigms (FRANKS 1999: URL, SPENCER).

According to recent research, clitization types interact with other aspects of grammar, such as tense or the presence of articles (MIGDALSKI 2013, BOŠKOVIČ 2016).

2. Enclitics in Old East Slavic

In traditional works on the history of Russian , enclitics were not considered a separate class of words for a long time–researchers limited themselves merely to studying the enclitic (short) forms of pronouns. A fully realized system of Old East Slavic (Old Russian) enclitics was reconstructed by A. A. Zaliznyak (2008), who determined their strict rank distribution based on the position of elements within clitic clusters. In total, the scholar distinguished eight ranks: the first five are occupied by discourse particles (*že, li, bo, ti, by*), the sixth by pronouns in the dative case (*mi, ti, si, ny, vy, na, va*), the seventh by pronouns in the accusative case (*mja, tja, sja, ny, vy, na, va, i, ju, e, ě, ja*), and the final, eighth rank by auxiliary verbs (*esm', esi, est'*, etc.). One of the central issues in the study of clitics remains their syntactic position within the sentence. Old East Slavic enclitics inherited the Proto-Indo-European and Common Slavic model, obeying Wackernagel's Law. This meant that they occupied the second position in the clause (the so-called 2P position), thereby marking the boundary of the first prosodic unit.

By virtue of such functional universality, discourse, pronominal, and auxiliary clitics demonstrated profound morphological, syntactic, pragmatic, and distributive differences, which necessitates their separate diachronic analysis.

3. Negation on a Universal Scale

Negation is a universal grammatical category: all known languages possess grammatical means of expressing negation.

In propositional logic, negation is defined as an operator that reverses the truth value of a proposition (MIESTAMo 2017: 405; HORN 2001: 1). Grammatical negation can be regarded as the syntactic and semantic counterpart of the logical notion of propositional negation (MIESTAMO 2005: 5). All known natural languages have grammatical devices for expressing negation.

In natural languages, negation interacts with syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, making it considerably more complex than logical negation.

From a semantic perspective, two types of negation can be distinguished: standard (sentential, phrasal, or general) negation and constituent (local or partial) negation (KLIMA 1964; PAYNE 1985; DAHL 2011: 16–17; MIESTAMO 2017: 409). In the case of standard negation, the scope of negation extends over the entire proposition or sentence. Constituent negation, by contrast, targets a nominal or adjectival phrase rather than the proposition underlying the sentence as a whole. It operates below the clause level and is manifested in negative pronouns and adverbs, derivational negation (e.g., *unhappy*, *incomplete*), and negative answers to questions (MIESTAMO 2017).

Formally, three major strategies of negation can be identified across the languages of the world: (1) morphological negation, expressed through prefixes, affixes, or infixes; (2) negation by means of negative particles; and (3) negative verbs or auxiliary verbs.

Universal tendencies can also be observed in the placement of negative markers. Typologically, negation generally follows the Neg-First Principle (JESPERSEN 1917; HORN 2001; MIESTAMO 2017: 8), according to which negative markers tend to appear as early as possible in the clause in order to facilitate processing and maximize clarity. Negative markers also tend to occur in close proximity to the finite verb.

The most important typological structural distinction concerning negation is that between symmetric and asymmetric negation. In symmetric negation, a negative clause differs from its affirmative counterpart only by the addition of a negative marker. Asymmetric negation, on the other hand, involves further structural modifications affecting such categories as verbal morphology, finiteness, tense–aspect–mood marking, person–number agreement, modality, or emphasis (MIESTAMO 2017: 9).

The last key issue I would like to mention at this point is negative concord. Negative Concord (NC) is a phenomenon in which two or more negative elements appear in the same clause but express only a single semantic negation. Two subtypes, strict and non-strict negative concord are distinguished. In strict Negative Concord languages, the presence of negative indefinites requires the appearance of a marker of sentential negation.

4. Negation in Slavic

The primary marker of negation in Slavic languages is the element *ne*, which traces back to Proto-Indo-European and was used for both standard and constituent negation (DAHL 2011: 17). In addition to *ne*, a series of negative pronouns and adverbs with the prefix *ni-* has been preserved in all Slavic languages. The *ni-* series goes back to Common Slavic and is remarkably uniform across the Slavic languages. Other negative series have also developed in the course of the evolution of individual languages. Therefore, significant changes have affected not the negation marker itself, but rather the grammatical phenomena associated with it, such as case marking and analytic constructions. (WILLIS 2013: 35).

One of the central problems in Slavic linguistics is determining the syntactic status of the element *ne*–specifically, whether *ne* is an affix or a particle. The boundary between syntactic and morphological negation in Slavic languages is often blurred because the exact same *ne* is used for both sentential negation and derivational negation (*ne znaju vs. незнакомый*).

Regarding the position of the negative particle *ne*, it acts as a proclitic in all Slavic languages. In most cases, it is positioned directly before the finite verb, forming a single phonetic unit with it. The accentual properties of *ne* vary across different branches of the Slavic languages (VAKARELIYSKA 2024). This feature leads to ordering differences in the case of negation of analytical forms.

Typologically, Slavic languages belong to languages with symmetrical negation: in most cases, an affirmative sentence differs from a negative one simply by the presence of the particle *ne*. No additional changes or auxiliary elements are required.

The phenomenon of Negative Concord deserves special attention. Modern Slavic languages are strict negative concord languages: they mandatory require the presence of the sentential negative particle *ne* alongside a negative pronoun or adverb, regardless of its position. (VAKARELIYSKA 2024, VAN DER AUWERA et al. 2021). This state of affairs, however, is not a Proto-Slavic heritage. In Old East Slavic of the 11th–12th centuries, negative words (n-words) positioned before the verb could express negation without the mandatory use of the preverbal particle *ne*; thus, this system exhibited features of non-strict negative concord. In the 15th–17th centuries, using the particle *ne* alongside preverbal negative words became the preferred option, although cases of non-strict negative concord were still encountered. Starting from the 17th century, negative concord became strict (strict Negative Concord), matching the system found in the modern Russian language (GARZONIO 2019: 11-12).

5. Hypothesis

Negation affects different types of enclitics to varying degrees. Because the negative marker is attracted to the verbal domain, it primarily influences discourse and auxiliary enclitics and the reflexive marker *ся*.

6. Materials and Methods

The interaction between negation and enclitics will be looked at applying the tool kit of corpus linguistics. The empirical data were extracted from the Old East Slavic subcorpus of the Russian National Corpus (RNC) , and the study follows the principles of corpus-based linguistic analysis (BIBER et al. 1998; BIBER 2010).

The research is carried out on a collection of 44 11th–15th century monuments containing 488,253 words. Translations, charters, and official acts produced outside the East Slavic area were excluded from the dataset. Translated texts were omitted in order to minimize source-language interference. Charters and official acts were excluded because of their highly formulaic nature and genre-specific conventions. Finally, I restricted the corpus to texts produced within the East Slavic area in order to reduce the influence of external contact-induced factors.

The texts included in the subcorpus represent two major registers of OES, as they comprise both Church Slavonic and so-called hybrid monuments, thus enabling the exploration of differences between these varieties. This personal subcorpus has served as the basis for several of my previous studies, and maintaining the same dataset makes it possible to obtain a more comprehensive picture of the nature and development of enclitics. The distribution of the texts included in the subcorpus is presented in the table below:

	Church Slavonic (CS)	**Hybrid**
Number of texts	31	13
Number of words	167077	317508

7. The Interaction of Negation and Enclitics

7.1. Negation in the Subcorpus

Referring back to 4., in the present part I am going to look at the occuring forms of negation in the subcorpus.

	не	ни	*Negative form of быти Нѣс**	*n-words ни-ни*,-и,* ADV│SPRO	*n-words не-не*,-и,* ADV│SPRO
OES	6761	1248	74	680	143
CS	2652	559	58	364	83
hybrid	4109	689	16	316	60
не/ ни + V	5726	268	-	-	.

As data confirms, the primary marker of negation was the particle *ne*. Distributionally it was more widely used in hybrid texts and in most cases, following the Common Slavic norm, it attached to a verb from the right.

(1) но Бъ҃ въ изꙋмѣньѥ положи свѣтъ ихъ
but God.NOM into astonishment.ACC put.AOR.3SG light.ACC their.GEN

и не оуспѣша ничтоже Суздальская летопись
and NEG succeed.AOR.3PL nothing

„But God cast their light into bewilderment, and they achieved nothing.”

Alongside with *ne* another negative particle, *ni* was also widespread. Functionally it was not a primary sentential negator, but rather a reinforcing negative particle. It rarely occurred on its own, rather, it followed the particle не. However, it was often used for constituent negation, even in multiple negative structures.

(2) Сице же ѥсть дш҃вныи глаголъ
thus PRT is spiritual.NOM.SG saying.NOM.SG

гс҃и азъ дх҃ъ ѥсмь
Lord.VOC I spirit.NOM.SG am.1SG

да ни ꙗсти ни пити хотѣлъ ѥсмь
that neither eat.INF nor drink.INF wished.L-PTCP.M.SG am.1SG

ни чти ни славы земныꙗ искалъ ѥсмь
neither honor.GEN nor glory.GEN earthly.GEN.SG sought.L-PTCP.M.SG am.1SG

ни телеснъıѥ не разꙋмѣх҃ похоти
neither bodily.ACC.PL NEG understood.AOR.1SG desires.ACC.PL

ни дьıаволи створихъ воли Притча о дꙋше и теле
nor devil's.GEN performed.AOR.1SG will.GEN.SG

„Thus speaks the spiritual saying: “Lord, I am a spirit. I have desired neither food nor drink; I have sought neither earthly honor nor glory; I have not known bodily desires, nor have I done the will of the Devil.”

(3) и не въспѣвше ни въ чтоже положи Киевская летопись
and NEG succeed.PTCP.NOM.PL not in what.ACC.SG in nothing put.AOR.3SG

„And they succeeded in nothing that he undertook.”

The use of *ni* shows differences across the two registers, as it is characteristic of Church Slavonic manuscripts.

The corpus contains an extensive system of negative adverbs and pronouns with the prefix *ни-*: *нимало, никомуже, ни ѿ когоже, ничтоже, николиже* and *не-*: *невидимо, недалече, нескудьно.* As the examples suggest, *ни-* attaches mainly to pronouns, while *не* to adverbs. Forms with the prefix *ни,* tend to follow the negative particle *не*, while forms with the prefix *не-* stand on their own. Both forms are typical of Church Slavonic texts.

(4) Оц҃ь же нашь феѡдосии бѣıаше ꙁапрѣти
father.NOM.SG PRT our.NOM.SG Theodosius.NOM.SG was.IMPF.3SG order.INF

вратарю да по ѿѣдениѥ ѡбѣда
gatekeeper.DAT.SG that after finishing.ACC meal.GEN.SG

не ѿверꙁати вратъ никомоуже
NEG open.INF gate.GEN.PL nobody.DAT.SG

никтоже пакъı да не входить в манастъıрь Киево-Печерский Патерик
nobody.NOM.SG further that NEG enter.PRS.3SG into monastery.ACC.SG

„And our father Theodosius used to instruct the gatekeeper that, after the meal had ended, he was not to open the gates to anyone, and that thereafter no one should enter the monastery.”

(5) **Мнѣ бо некомꙋ добꙑтка копити**
to.me DAT PRT nobody.DAT gain.GEN accumulate.INF

ни женѣ ни дѣтемъ
neither wife.DAT.SG nor children.DAT.PL

ни вꙑ иноу ꙁемлю слати Поучение Илии Иоана
nor to another.ACC land.ACC send.INF

„For me, there is no one to accumulate wealth for, neither for wife nor for children, nor to send [it] to another land for you.”

I also looked at the occurences of the negative forms of the copula быти. Statistics shows that such forms are rare and are typical of Church Slavonic texts.

(6) **Нѣсть храбрства ни дꙋмꙑ противꙋ мнѣ** Моление Даниила Заточника
NEG.be.PRS.3SG bravery.GEN.SG nor thought.GEN.SG against me.DAT

„There is no bravery, nor counsel against me.”

Data suggests, that there are sporadic examples of *ni* and n-words without the particle *ne*, strict negative control prevails in my corpus.

7.2. The interaction of discourse enclitics with the negative particle не

Discourse clitics (or discourse particles) are words that express rhetorical effects, emphasis, and the speaker's attitude, and they constitute the most widespread subtype of clitics in modern languages. They form a natural class of sentential (operator) clitics. The semantic property that unites them is that they all encode the illocutionary force of the clause. Their counterparts in modern Slavic languages also tend to occupy the second position, regardless of whether pronominal and auxiliary clitics in those languages appear in the Wackernagel position or are attached to the verb (MIGDALSKI 2018: 8).

Despite their diverse syntactic and pragmatic functions, discourse clitics share a number of universal properties. They tend to occupy a strictly fixed position within the clause (often the second position); their omission affects only the „nuance” of the utterance without rendering it ungrammatical; and, unlike other types of clitics, they do not have corresponding non-clitic stressed counterparts.

Old East Slavic employed five such discourse enclitics associated with the expression of illocutionary force: *же* (contrast or topic shift), *ли* (interrogative or disjunctive meaning), *бо* (causal meaning), *ти* (affirmative meaning or topic shift), and *бы* (desiderative meaning).

The table below shows the overall distribution of these enclitics in the OES subcorpus and in Church Slavic and hybrid texts respectively. The cells contain two numbers: the first one shows the absolute frequency of the elements, i.e. how many times they actually appear in the corpus, the second is IPM (Item per Million) value, which is the normalized frequency, that makes possible the comparison of frequencies in the case of language varieties of different lengths.

	же	бо	ли	ти	бы
OES	10 637 / 21 785 IPM	3209 / 6572 IPM	758 / 1552 IPM	126/ 258 IPM	58/ 118 IPM
CS	3529 / 21122 IPM	1820 /5666 IPM	312 / 1867 IPM	47/ 281 IPM	32 / 99 IPM
hybrid	7108 / 22130 IPM	1389 / 8313 IPM	446 / 1388 IPM	79/ 245 IPM	26 / 155 IPM
V + enclitic	1788 / 3659 IPM	1252 / 2564 IPM	161 /329 IPM	9/ 18 IPM	3/ 6 IPM

As the data shows, *же* is the most frequently used enclitic, followed by *бо*. *Же*, *бо* and *бы* prevail in hybrid texts, while *ли* and *ти* are more common in CS monuments.

Since the negative proclitic не tends to attach to a verbal host, the last row of the table shows how many times a certain enclitic attaches to a verbal host. The data suggests that only the enclitic *бо* exhibits a specific preference for verbal hosts.

In the next section I will look at the influence the negative proclitic exerts on the position of discourse enclitics.

	же	бо	ли	ти	бы
НЕ + V + Encl не, PART & V, distance: from 1 to 1 from Word 1 & же/бо/ ли/бы distance: from 1 to 1 from Word 2	39 / 79	140 / 286	53/ 180	0	2/ 4
Encl + не + V же/бо/ли/ти/бы & не, PART, distance: from 1 to 1 from Word 1 & V, distance: from 1 to 1 from Word 2	298 / 610	61 / 124	43 / 88	2 / 4	16 / 32

The data indicate that the interaction between negation and discourse enclitics is highly uneven. While some enclitics, most notably *бо* and *ли*, frequently occur after the sequence *не + V*, others, particularly *же*, overwhelmingly precede it. This suggests that the attraction of the negative

particle *не* to the verbal domain did not affect all discourse enclitics in the same way. Rather, the impact of negation appears to have been conditioned by the individual syntactic and discourse-pragmatic properties of individual enclitics. The behaviour of the enclitic *же* is especially interesting in this regard, as even in the presence of a strong proclitic–verb bond it continued to preserve its canonical second-position in the clause.

(8) не дошедшим҃ же имъ города Сохачева.
NEG having.reached.PTCP.DAT.PL PRT they.DAT city.GEN.SG Sochachev.GEN

и доумахоуть ѡ взѧтьи его Волынская летопись
and think.IMPF.3PL about taking.LOC his.GEN

„And when they had not yet reached the city of Sochachev, they were already thinking about taking it.”

(9) ингворъ же не приспѣ приѥхати к нимъ Новгородская летопись
Ingvar.NOM.SG PRT NEG manage.AOR.3SG come.INF to them.DAT.PL

„And Ingvar did not manage to come to them.”

(10) не дадѧхоуть бо из города
NEG give.IMPF.3PL PRT from city.GEN.SG

ны лѣсти в зажитье Волынская летопись
us.ACC leave.INF into plundering.ACC

„For they did not allow us to leave the city to go plundering.”

7.3. Negation and pronominal enclitics

Pronominal enclitics in Slavic languages constitute a special class of words that exhibit nominal features (gender, number, case, person) and enter into agreement relations with the verb. Originating from Common Slavic, they differ from other clitics in having full-stressed (orthotonic) counterparts.

A major difference between Old East Slavic and most modern Slavic languages (Serbian, Croatian, Slovene, Czech, Slovak, and Polish) lies in the inventory of pronominal enclitics: Old East Slavic employed only accusative and dative forms, whereas the modern languages preserve enclitics in three cases–genitive, dative, and accusative.

Unlike discourse particles, pronominal enclitics occupy a lower rank within the clitic cluster and only partially adhere to Wackernagel’s Law. While second-position placement (2P) remains the dominant pattern, these elements

frequently occur in a verb-adjacent position (V2). Their distribution differs across Slavic languages: Bulgarian and Macedonian have largely generalized the V2 pattern, Czech permits both 2P and V2 placement, whereas Polish displays free positioning. Furthermore, besides clustering pronominal enclitics are involved in a number of well-known clitic phenomena, such as clitic doubling, and climbing, making them a fruitful object of syntactic research.

I looked at the distribution of of accusative and pronominal enclitics and also the number of cases when they attached to a verbal host:

	Acc. pronom. encl.	Dat. pronom. encl.	V + Acc. pron. encl	V + Dat. pron. encl.
OES	1596/ 3268 IPM	1744/ 3571 IPM	936 / 1917 IPM	780/ 1597 IPM
CS	791 / 4734 IPM	987/ 3073 IPM	532 / 3184 IPM	415 / 2483 IPM
hybrid	805 / 2506 IPM	757 / 4530 IPM	404 / 1257 IPM	365 / 1136 IPM

As the table shows dative enclitics outnumber accusative ones, whereas accusative enclitics show a stronger preference for verbal hosts. Moreover, pronominal enclitics exhibit an uneven ditribution among registers: the Church Slavonic register is more accusative-dominant, while hybrid texts show a pre-dominance of dative forms. Despite these differences in overall frequency, verb-adjacent placement remains common for both cases across all corpora, suggesting that clitic placement patterns were relatively stable.

In examples containing the negative particle, *не* in all cases preceeds the verb. There are no examples for cases with V + не + Acc. or Dat. enclitic or не + Acc. or Dat. enclitic + V.

(11) многꙑа досадꙑ приимъ ѿ своихъ сродникъ
many.ACC.PL insults.ACC receive.PTCP.NOM from own.GEN.PL relatives.GEN.PL

не видѣхъ тѧ гс҃не мои Волынская летопись
NEG see.AOR.1SG you.ACC Lord.VOC my.NOM.SG

„Having suffered many insults from my own relatives, I did not see you, my Lord.”

(12) да не постигнет҃ тѧ см҃рть
so.that NEG overtake.SUBJ/PRS.3SG you.ACC death.NOM.SG

вєѕ покоѧнїє Повесть о беспечном царе
without repentance.GEN/ACC

„That death may not overtake you without repentance."

7.4. Negation of the reflexive accusative pronoun *сѧ*

The reflexive accusative clitic was peculiar in the sense, that even in the period investigated it was not unequivocally an enclitic. As is depicted in the table it actually functioned more frequently as a proclitic. Therefore, the impact of the negative proclitic is especially interesting in this regard.

	сѧ	*сѧ* глагол	глагол *сѧ*	*не сѧ* глагол	*не* глагол *сѧ*
OES	130 / 266	44 / 90	21 / 43	-	2 / 5
OCS	63 / 377	28 / 167	10 / 59	-	1 / 4
hybrid	67 / 208	16 / 49	11 / 34	-	1 / 3

Data shows that the negative particle occurs obligatorily directly in front of the verb, forcing the reflexive clitic to a position after the verb.

(13) нн҃ѣ же не вѣмъıи̅ сѧ в чемъ есмъı Житие Авраама
now PRT NEG know.PRS.1PL REFL in what.LOC.SG are.PRS.1PL
„But now we do not know in what state we are."

(14) и послаша в градъ к братꙋ Ст҃ославꙋ
and send.AOR.3PL to city.ACC.SG to brother.DAT.SG Sviatoslav.DAT.SG

гл҃ще не мори сѧ голодомъ
saying.PTCP.NOM.PL NEG torment.IMP.2SG REFL with.hunger.INS.SG

с дрꙋжиною Суздальская летопись
with troops.INS.SG

„And they sent [messengers] to the city to their brother Sviatoslav, saying: "Do not let yourself perish from hunger together with your retinue."

The only examples where *ся* precedes its host are cases containing a modal verb. In these instances the modal verb appears after the negative particle followed by the reflexive proclitic with its verbal host. There are 21 examples (43 IPM) containing such factors.

(15) Азъ бо ѧлсѧ по се великое дѣло
I.NOM.SG PRT undertake. L-PTCP.SG for this.ACC great.ACC.SG matter.ACC.SG

не себе дѣлѧ нъ вас҃
not self.GEN for.the.sake.of but you.GEN.PL

не смѣꙗ сѧ ѿрещи ⁘ Поучение Илии
NEG dare.PTCP/GERUND REFL refuse.INF

„For I have undertaken this great task not for my own sake, but for yours, not daring to refuse you."

(16) Сего же не могоут сѧ лишити Слово св. Григория
this.GEN.SG PRT NEG can.PRS.3PL REFL deprive.INF

„They cannot deprive themselves of this."

7.5. The interaction of negation with auxiliary enclitics

Verbal, or auxiliary, clitics are grammaticalized elements that express verbal categories (tense, aspect, mood, and person) but lack independent phonological and syntactic status.

In Old East Slavic, which possessed a rich system of past tenses (the aorist, imperfect, perfect, and pluperfect), auxiliary clitics were represented by the enclitic present-tense forms of the verb *byti* 'to be'. They were used as part of the analytic perfect construction in combination with an *l*-participle, expressing a past action that remained relevant at the moment of speech, and subsequently served as the historical basis for the development of the Modern Russian past tense through the loss of the auxiliary component.

The interaction between auxiliary clitics and negation has attracted considerable attention in Slavic linguistics. The position of negation in analytic verbal forms varies across the Slavic language family. Typically, the negative particle *ne* occurs immediately before the finite verb. However, in some languages (e.g., Slovak), in analytic past-tense forms it precedes the participle rather than the auxiliary. Generative approaches have long used the position of the negative particle to investigate the structural position of the Tense category, signaled by the auxiliary. In this regard, Rivero (1991) argues that in languages such as Czech and Slovak, Tense (and consequently the finite auxiliary) is located above Negation, whereas in languages such as Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian, Tense is located below Negation.

According to the Franks and King (2000: 271), these differences arise because some languages possess special non-clitic forms of the negative auxiliary; in others, the negative marker has special stress-assignment

properties; while in yet others, the negative marker lacks any special properties and therefore procliticizes to the highest non-clitic verb, regardless of whether that verb is finite or non-finite.

A particularly important difference concerns the position of negation in analytic past-tense constructions in Old Bulgarian and East Slavic. In South Slavic written monuments, negation typically attaches to the auxiliary verb, whereas in Old East Slavic it attaches to the lexical component of the verbal complex (ХАБУРГАЕВ 1978: 46; MIGDALSKi 2006: 104–105, 114–116; ПИЧХАДЗЕ 2020: 222). By contrast, the placement of the proclitic *ne* is straightforward in Modern Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian, which lack a system of pronominal clitics governed by strict word-order constraints. Under constituent negation, *ne* precedes the negated constituent and takes it as its host; under sentential negation, it precedes the negated finite verb form (including any auxiliary), which serves as its host (FRANKS & KING 2000: 192).

I looked at the auxilary- l-participle (V) order in my corpus.

	AUX + V	V + AUX	не + AUX + V	не + V + AUX
OES	311 / 636 IPM	480/ 983 IPM	1 / 2 IPM	36/ 73 IPM
OCS	50 / 299 IPM	124/ 742 IPM	0	11/ 65 IPM
hybrid	261 / 812 IPM	356/ 1108 IPM	1/ 3 IPM	25/ 77 IPM

Data shows, that constructions with the auxiliary in postposition slightly prevail in all three registers, moreover, they are especially predominant in hybrid texts. Looking at constructions with the negative particle, *ne* – following the pattern prognosticized in East Slavic languages – unequivocally attaches to the verbal head, i.e. the l-participle.

(17) и разꙋмѣ ꙗко не вьсталъ есть
and realize.AOR.3SG that NEG risen.L-PTCP.M.SG is.PRS.3SG

игꙋменъ ПВЛ по Ипать сп
abbot.NOM.SG

„And he realized that the abbot had not risen.”

(18) Єпс҃пъ не литоургисал҃ ѥсть
bishop.NOM.SG NEG serve.liturgy.L-PTCP.M.SG is.PRS.3SG

то не даꙗт҃ проскꙋры Ответы митрополита
that.NOM NEG give.PRS.3SG prosphora.GEN.SG

„The bishop has not served the liturgy; therefore he does not give out the prosphora.”

Therefore, negation has a determinative effect on the order of constituents with analytic forms and auxiliary enclitics.

7.6. Negation and clitic clusters

Clitic clusters are of particular importance, since they reveal important information about operation of second-position phenomena, the interaction of different classes of enclitics and the negative particle.

Within these clusters enclitics followed a rigid order. The order was specific for individual Slavic languages. The canonical chain of enclitics is exemplified by (19) where the order of discourse, pronominal and auxiliary clitics is depicted.

(19) ты же ми ѥси ѥѥ ѿстоупилсѧ Киевская летопись
you.NOM PRT me.DAT are.PRS.2SG her.ACC. particle departed.L-PTCP.M.SG.REFL

„But you have turned away from me.”

The interaction of *ne* and clitic clusters helps identify the syntactic status of the negative particle and of classes of enclitics.

(20) иже ѥсть жидовьскы хсс҃ъ бо
CONJ.which is.PRS.3SG Jewish.ADV Christ.NOM.SG PRT

не прѣдалъ ѥсть того Стязание с латиною
NEG betray.L-PTCP.M.SG is.PRS.3SG that.GEN.SG

„Which is in the Jewish manner; for Christ has not betrayed him.”

(21) Бг҃ъ бо не дал ми своихъ
God.NOM.SG PRT NEG give.L-PTCP.M.SG me.DAT own.GEN.PL

родити ꙁа мои грѣхы Волынская л
bear.INF / give.birth.INF for my.ACC.PL sins.ACC.PL

“For God has not allowed me to bear my own children because of my sins.”

(22) **Сего же не могоут сѧ лишити** Слово св. Григория
this.GEN.SG PRT NEG can.PRS.3PL REFL deprive.INF

„They cannot do without this.”

The examples suggest, that the clitic field is layered: the negative particle occupies a position lower than discourse clitics, but as a clause-level operator, it attaches to a verbal host as a proclitic. Pronominal enclitics, the reflexive *ся* and auxiliary clitics occupy the lowest layer of this hierarchy. It implies that instead of a single and unified second position OES had a stratified Wackernagel domain.

8. Conclusion

The investigation focused on a rarely studied phenomenon – the interaction of the negative proclitic particle *ne* on the OES system of enclitics.

The analysis showed that the effect of negation on different types of enclitics was not uniform. The findings confirm the initial hypothesis of the study claiming that negation affects different types of enclitics to different degrees. The more closely an enclitic is associated with the verbal domain, the stronger the influence of the negative particle on its position. Discourse enclitics prove to be the most resistant to this influence, whereas auxiliary enclitics and the reflexive particle sę exhibit the greatest sensitivity to the positional requirements imposed by negative constructions.

Across the two registers show both shared patterns and clear differences in the interaction between negation and enclitics. In both corpora, negation precedes the finite verb, but its impact on clitic placement is stronger in the hybrid register. CS texts tend to preserve more stable second-position behavior, especially for discourse clitics, while hybrid texts show greater variability and a stronger tendency toward verb-adjacent placement of pronominal and reflexive enclitics under negation. Discourse clitics remain the most resistant in both registers, suggesting a stable hierarchical distinction within the clitic system.

From a broader historical and typological perspective, the results point to a gradual shift from a system dominated by second-position (Wackernagel) principles to one with a stronger orientation toward the verb. This development is consistent with the general evolution of East Slavic syntax and the restructuring of the clitic system.

Literature

BIBER ET AL. 1998 = BIBER D., CONRAD S., REPPEN R. Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use. Cambridge, 1998. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511804489

BIBER 2010 = BIBER D. What Can a Corpus Tell Us about Registers and Genres? // The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics. London, 2010. 241–254. DOI: 10.4324/9780203856949-18

BOŠKOVIĆ 2016 = BOŠKOVIĆ Ž. On Second Position Clitics Crosslinguistically // Lako F., Žauber R. (eds.). Formal Studies in Slovenian Syntax. 2016. 23–54. DOI: 10.1075/la.236.02bos

DAHL 2011 = DAHL Ö. Typology of Negation // Horn L. R. (ed.). The Expression of Negation. Berlin, 2011. 15–44.

FRANKS 1999 = FRANKS S. Clitics in Slavic // The Slavic and East European Language Resource Center. 1999. https://slaviccenters.duke.edu/sites/slaviccenters.duke.edu/files/media_items_files/10franks.original.pdf

FRANKS & KING 2000 = FRANKS S., KING T. A Handbook of Slavic Clitics. Oxford, New York, 2000. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780195135886.001.0001

GARZONIO 2019 = GARZONIO J. Negative Concord in Russian: An Overview // Studi e ricerche. Studi di linguistica slava. 2019. 175–189. DOI: 10.30687/978-88-6969-368-7/011

HORN 2001 = HORN L.R. A Natural History of Negation. Stanford, 2001.

JESPERSEN 1917 = JESPERSEN O. Negation in English and Other Languages. Copenhagen, 1917.

KLIMA 1964 = KLIMA E.S. Negation in English // Fodor J.A., Katz J.J. (eds.). The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language. Englewood Cliffs, 1964. 246–323.

MIESTAMO 2005 = MIESTAMO M. Standard Negation. Berlin, 2005. DOI: 10.1515/9783110197631

MIESTAMO 2017 = MIESTAMO M. Negation // Aikhenvald A.Y., Dixon R.M.W. (eds.). The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology. Cambridge, 2017. DOI: 10.1017/9781316135716.013

MIGDALSKI 2006 = MIGDALSKI K. The Syntax of Compound Tenses in Slavic. Utrecht, 2006.

MIGDALSKI 2013 = MIGDALSKI K. Diachronic Source of Two Cliticization Patterns in Slavic // Challenging Clitics. 2013. 135–158. DOI: 10.1075/la.206.06mig

MIGDALSKI 2018 = MIGDALSKI K. Head Directionality in Old Slavic // Lenertová D., Meyer R., Šimík R., Szucsich L. (eds.). Advances in Formal Slavic Linguistics 2016. Berlin, 2018. 241–263.

PAYNE 1985 = PAYNE J.R. Negation // Shopen T. (ed.). Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. I. Cambridge, 1985. 197–242.

RIVERO 1991 = RIVERO M.-L. Long Head Movement and Negation: Serbo-Croatian vs. Slovak and Czech // The Linguistic Review. 1991. Vol. 8. 319–351. DOI: 10.1515/tlir.1991.8.2-4.319

SPENCER & LUIS 2012 = SPENCER A., LUIS A.R. Clitics: An Introduction. Cambridge, 2012. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139033763

VAKARELIYSKA 2024 = VAKARELIYSKA C. Negation in Slavic // Greenberg, Marc. L. and Lenore A. Grenoble, (eds.). Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics Online. Brill. 2024.
VAN DER AUWERA et al. 2021 = VAN DER AUWERA J., et al. Connective Negation and Negative Concord in Balto-Slavic // Vilnius University Open Series. 2021. Vol. 16. 45–66. DOI: 10.15388/SBOL.2021.2
WEN 2024 = WEN X. What Can the History of the English Language Research Offer? A Diachronic Corpus-Based Approach to Research in Writing Studies // Across the Disciplines. 2024. 213–236. DOI: 10.37514/ATD-J.2024.21.2-3.09
WILLIS 2013 = WILLIS D. Negation in the History of the Slavonic Languages // Willis D., Lucas C., Breitbarth A. (eds.). The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean. Vol. I. Oxford, 2013. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199602537.001.0001

ЗАЛИЗНЯК 2008 = ЗАЛИЗНЯК А. А. Древнерусские энклитики. Москва, 2008.
ПИЧХАДЗЕ 2020 = ПИЧХАДЗЕ А. А. Отрицание при составном сказуемом в древнерусском языке // Труды Института русского языка им. В.В. Виноградова 2020. № 1 (23), 222–240. DOI: 10.31912/pvrli-2020.1.14
ХАБУРГАЕВ 1978 = ХАБУРГАЕВ Г.А. Судьба вспомогательного глагола древних славянских аналитических форм в русском языке // Вестник МГУ. Сер. 9. Филология. 1978. № 4. 42–53.

Györfi Beáta, SZTE BTK Szláv Intézet. Szeged
E-mail: blazsenyka@yahoo.com