Different Heights of NegP in Old Slavic

Hakyung Jung

This paper compares the relative orders of the negation marker *ne*, the *be*-auxiliary, and participles under sentential negation in Old East and South Slavic and argues that different Slavic languages inherit distinct syntax of negation from Common Slavic, the later grammar of which is best reflected in Old Church Slavonic (OCS). Two typologically possible word orders are given in (1a) and (1c), and their derived orders by participle fronting are in (1b) and (1d), respectively. In Old Russian (OR) spoken varieties encoded in Old Novgorod birch bark letters (*BBL*), only orders (1a/b) are attested, as exemplified in (2), whereas OCS and other OR manuscripts, such as chronicles, feature (1a/b) and (1c), as shown in (3-4). In Modern South Slavic, order (1c) is the only possible option, as demonstrated by Modern Bulgarian data in (5). (1d) is impossible in all of the languages (for the reason, see Pancheva [2008]).

The most straightforward account of this distribution is to posit that the syntax of negation in OR spoken varieties was already quite different from that in OCS as early as the 11th c. OR chronicles' mixed pattern should be ascribed to the strong Church Slavonic influence in this genre: the OR data with order (1c) all involve aorist or conditional forms of the auxiliary. Given Pancheva's (2008) observation that orders (1a/b) are less frequently found in OCS than (1c), it is possible to hypothesize that an old Common Slavic grammar with (1a/b) and an innovative one with (1c) competed in OCS, and the innovative grammar has continued to Modern South Slavic. OR spoken varieties only preserved the earlier grammar as OR was already taking its own developmental path distinct from that of Old South Slavic by the 11th c.

From a formal perspective, the word orders in (1a/b) and (1c) can be interpreted to reflect different heights of NegP. In the case of OR, NegP is lower than AuxP (6), whereas in Modern South Slavic, NegP is construed to be located above AuxP (7). The NegP-over-AuxP structure in (7) cannot be assumed for orders (1a/b) since Aux^0 then would have to raise without picking up Neg^0 to TP or a higher functional structure, which would violate the Head Movement Constraint (Travis 1984). Furthermore, Modern Russian lacks verb movement to Tense (Slioussar 2007, Dyakonova 2009), which is likely to be already the case in OR. Without finite verb movement, the auxiliary preceding negation cannot originate from a position lower than negation. In addition, fused forms of the present tense *be*-auxiliary and *ne*, such as *něsi/nesi*, are virtually absent in *BBL* (only one instance) while such forms are often found in OCS and other OR manuscripts. In *BBL*, fused forms are only found with the copular *be*. Given the clitic nature of *ne* and the present tense auxiliary on the one hand and the auxiliary's precedence of *ne* on the other, the lack of the fused forms in *BBL* indicates that Aux^0 neither raises via Neg^0, constituting a complex head, nor stays below Neg^0. This supports the possibility that AuxP is higher than NegP in OR vernaculars. The lack of the fused [Neg-Aux] forms contrasts with the frequent fusion of *ne* and participles in OCS and OR chronicles, which is naturally explained by the lower position of PartP than NegP.

Alternatively, Pancheva's (2008) account assuming the T^0-final structure with a NegP-over-TP configuration can also explain the lack of order (1c) in *BBL*. However, the lack of fused [Neg-Aux] forms cannot be accounted for by her structure. The fusion of *be* and negation in *BBL* appears similar to that in Czech and Polish: in these languages, as shown in (8-9), negation fuses with the *be*-copula but not with the *be*-auxiliary. In the configuration involving the *be*-auxiliary, negation fuses with the participle, resulting in the '[Neg-Part]-Aux' order (Migdalski 2017). Czech and Polish are all T^0-initial languages. Thus, without any independent evidence in favor of the T^0-finality in OR, orders (1a/b) and the lack of fusion of the auxiliary and *ne* should be accounted for in the T^0-initial structure. I argue that the AuxP-over-NegP structure in (6) can explain the phenomena. In this respect, it is noteworthy that NegP arguably occupies a low position in Modern Russian as well (below PrP/*v*P: Bailyn 1997), which indirectly supports the AuxP-over-NegP hypothesis for OR.

REFERENCES. **BAILYN**, J. 1997. "Genitive of negation is obligatory." In *Proceedings of FASL* 4, 84-114. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. **DYAKONOVA**, M. 2009. "A phase-based approach to Russian free word order." Ph.D. diss., University of Amsterdam. **MIGDALSKI**, K. 2017. "Second position effects in the syntax of Germanic and Slavic languages." Habilitation thesis, University of Wrocław. **PANCHEVA**, R. 2008. "Head-directionality of TP in Old Church Slavonic." In *Proceedings of FASL 16*, 313-332. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. **SLIOUSSAR**, N. 2007. "Grammar and information structure: a study with reference to Russian." Ph.D. diss., Utrecht University. **TRAVIS**, L. 1984. "Parameters and effects of word order variation." Ph.D. diss., MIT.

(1)

	OCS	MBg	OR$_{(BBL)}$	OR$_{(chronicles)}$
a. Aux-Neg-Part	✓		✓	✓
b. Neg-Part-Aux (derived from [1a])	✓		✓	✓
c. Neg-Aux-Part	✓	✓		✓
d. *Part-Neg-Aux (derived from [1c])				

(2)   a. ože jeste   ne   storogovale…
          if   be$_{PRST.2PL}$ not   concluded a bargain$_{PART}$
          'If you have not concluded a bargain…'   [OR, *Gram. Psk*. 6, Zaliznjak 2004: 515]
   b. ne   vŭzęle   jesmǐ   ni   věkŭšě   ni   vidalŭ   jego.
          not   taken$_{PART}$ be$_{PRST.1SG}$ not   squirrel   not   seen$_{PART}$ him
          'I have not taken a penny, and even not seen him.'   [OR, *BBL* 736b, Zaliznjak 2004: 264]

(3)   a. jedinogo   jesi   ne   dokonǐčalŭ.
          one   be$_{PRST.2SG}$ not   completed$_{PART}$
          'you have not completed one thing.'   [OCS, *Zogr*., Mark 10: 21]
   b. i   mǐně   nikoliže   ne   dalŭ   esi   kozĭlęte…
          and me$_{DAT}$ whatsoever   not   given$_{PART}$ be$_{PRST.2SG}$ young goat
          'and you have not given me even a young goat…'   [OCS, *Zogr*., Luke 15: 29]
   c. i   jašte   ne   bišę   prěkratili   sę   dǐne ti…
          and if   not   be$_{AOR.Pf.3PL}$ suspend   refl   days those
          'and if those days had not been cut short…'   [OCS, *Zogr*., Matthew 24: 22]

(4)   a. a   knjazju   jesme   zla   ne   stvorili   nikotorago   že
          and prince$_{DAT}$ be$_{PRST.1SG}$ evils   not   done$_{PART}$ whatsoever   prtcl
          'and I have not done any evil things to the prince.'   [OR, *Novgorod Chronicle*]
   b. ože   ne   blagoslovenŭ   jestǐ   ot   velikago   sbora
          as   not   blessed$_{PART}$ be$_{PRST.3SG}$ from   great   cathedral
          'as it is not blessed from the great cathedral…'   [OR, *Novgorod Chronicle*]
   c. zdě   bo   ne   sutǐ   učili   apostoli…
          here   as   not   be$_{PRST.3PL}$ taught$_{PART}$ apostles
          'as here apostles have not taught…'   [OR, *Primary Chronicle*]

(5)   a. (Tja) ne   beše   pročela   knigata
          she   not   be$_{PAST.3SG}$ read$_{PART}$ book-the
          'She had not read the book.'
   b. *(Tja) ne pročela beše knigata
   c. *(Tja) pročela ne beše knigata   [Modern Bulgarian, Pancheva 2008]

(6) Aux-Neg-Part (Aux^0-to-T^0 or Aux^0 *in situ*)   (7)   Neg-Aux-Part (NegP-over-TP or TP-over-NegP)

(8)   a. Nepřišel   jsi.   (9)   a. Nejsi   hlupák / zdráv / na řadě.
          NEG+come$_{PART}$ be$_{PRST.2SG}$ NEG+be$_{PRST.2SG}$ idiot / healthy / on row
          'You haven't come.'   'You're not an idiot/healthy/it's not your turn.'
   b. *Nejsi   přišel.   b.*Jsi   nehlupák/nezdráv/nena řadě.
          NEG+ be$_{PRST.2SG}$ come$_{PART}$ be$_{PRST.2SG}$ NEG+idiot/NEG+healthy/NEG+on row
          [Cz, Migdalski 2017: 246]   [Cz, Migdalski 2017: 246]