V-to-T movement in Old Russian?

**Context.** It has been proposed that V-to-T movement satisfies the Extended Projection Principle (Chomsky 1995, EPP) in consistent null subject languages (e.g. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998) whereas the EPP is only satisfied by XP-merge in Spec,TP in partial null subject and non-null subject languages (e.g. Holmberg 2005, Holmberg et al. 2009). V-to-T movement is also argued to be triggered by rich subject agreement morphology (Rich Agreement Hypothesis: e.g. Vikner 1995, Rohrbacher 1999). While consistent null subject languages such as Spanish and Greek feature all these correlations, Modern Russian instantiates the exact opposite type: Modern Russian lacks V-to-T movement (Bailyn 1995), features a defective agreement system without person distinction in the past tense, and does not show consistent null subject patterns (Franks 1995, Lindseth 1998). In contrast, Old Russian forms an interesting testing ground for the given correlations: Old Russian shows consistent null subject patterns and rich subject agreement in all tenses, but it has never been investigated whether this language also demonstrates V-to-T movement. Whether Old Russian features V-to-T movement crucially bears on understanding of the EPP and the relation between morphology and syntax.

**Proposal.** I argue that colloquial Old Russian does not feature V-to-T movement, based on the low positions of lexical verbs and auxiliaries and that this grammar is inherited by Modern Russian. In contrast, formal Old Russian shows mixed patterns, reflecting multiple grammars.

**Data & Analysis.** Colloquial Old Russian, reflected in Old Novgorodian birch bark letters and Russkaja pravda, shows rigid word orders, in which finite verbs are preceded by subjects (1) and vP-level adverbs (2). The position of the perfect tense auxiliary byti is lower than second position pronominal clitics (3).

(1) аże žena NOM,F.SG sędetνV PRST.3SG po mužи, to u svoix(ъ) dětей vzет(i) častь, if wife after husband then at own children take part
‘If a wife remains in the husband’s family after his death, then she should take her share from her children.’

(2) ketъ ti bъrъžе ADV poidetь FUT.3SG vъ gъrъdъ k(ъ) tъmu žе pristavi kъne...
who TOP faster will goFUT.3SG to city to that one ptcл assign horse
‘Hand over the horse to the one who arrives at the city the earliest…’

(3) cemu mę AUX 2SG jesi ruined
why me ACC.1SG AUX 2SG ruined
‘Why did you ruin me?’

Sentence (1) from Russkaja pravda, the legal code of Kievian Rus’, states what should be done if a wife decides not to remarry when her husband dies. The first clause is thetic, describing a general, hypothetical condition, and the subject žena does not bear any contrastive interpretation. Thus, the pre-verbal position of žena is not derived by a pragmatically motivated movement. The SV order is absolutely prevalent in the colloquial Old Russian texts and the few instances of the VS order are accounted for as a result of right-dislocation of the subject as narrow focus. In example (2), the adverb bъrъžе and the verb poidetь in the middle of the sentence do not receive any emphatic interpretation that could be connected to word order. In sentence (3), the auxiliary form jesi follows the second position pronominal clitic mę. The Old Russian auxiliary, in terms of its position, is comparable to the third person singular auxiliary clitic je in Serbo-Croatian, which also follows second position pronominal clitics, as illustrated in (4).

(4) Ona mu ga je predstavila.
she NOM,3SG him DAT,3SG him ACC,3SG AUX 3SG introduced
‘She introduced him to him.’
Tomić (1996) and den Dikken (1994) propose that je remains in vP, not raising to T, in Serbo-Croatian. In
the second position clitic system, pronominal clitics occupy the specifier positions of relevant functional
phrases such as AgrP (Stjepanović 1998, Migdalski 2006). Thus, an auxiliary form that follows
pronominal clitics occupies a position lower than pronominal clitics, which should be AuxP or vP. Old
Russian features a second position clitic system, and therefore the auxiliary forms following pronominal
clitics are analyzed as remaining in AuxP. Cross-linguistically, languages that raise finite lexical verbs
while leaving finite auxiliaries in situ are unattested. This means that auxiliaries in situ imply lexical
verbs in situ in a language. In this respect, the low position of the auxiliary in colloquial Old Russian
indirectly supports the possibility that finite lexical verbs also remain in situ.

In contrast with colloquial Old Russian, the formal variety of Old Russian, reflected in chronicles,
shows conflicting patterns (Here I only list the data in favor of V-to-T for the sake of space).

(5) i pojala\textsubscript{AOR.1SG} novgorodn\textsubscript{SOM.M.PL} Volodimira se\textsubscript{REFL.DAT}.
   ‘And the Novgorodians took Volodimir to themselves.’ [\textit{Primary Chronicle}, 170]

(6) … dat\textsubscript{INF} vsegda\textsubscript{ADV} radost\textsubscript{P} gradu tomu svjatym\textsubscript{REFL.DAT} blagov\textsubscript{SBJ} Gospodnimь…
   give\textsubscript{INF} continually joy\textsubscript{ACC} [city that]\textsubscript{DAT} [holy Annunciation Lord’s]\textsubscript{INSTR}
   ‘to give joy to that city continually by Lord’s holy Annunciation…’ [\textit{Primary Chronicle}, 351]

As exemplified in (5), the VS order appears prevalent, regardless of the verb type (trans., unerg., unacc.)
in formal Old Russian (see Turner 2007). The VS order necessarily indicates verb raising past the subject.
Verb raising is also supported by the verb-adverb order. In (6), the adverb intervenes between the verb
and the direct object, which clearly indicates that the verb raises across the adverb. Finally, while the
auxiliary follows pronominal clitics, the clitic system in the language of chronicles is not the same kind as
that in colloquial Old Russian: the clitic \textit{tja} in (7) does not occupy the second position of the clause.

(7) Mnogo darix\textsubscript{AOR.1SG} tja.
   a lot bestow\textsubscript{AOR.1SG} you\textsubscript{ACC.2SG}
   ‘I bestowed many things upon you.’ [\textit{Primary Chronicle}, 154]

Implications. The compatibility of rich agreement/reference null subjects and verbs-in-situ in colloquial
Old Russian indicates that while rich agreement is related to null subject licensing, verb raising is not
related to either of them. This finding has two theoretical implications: at least in some languages, the
EPP can be met without both XP-merge in Spec,TP and X′-merge on T. In colloquial Old Russian, the
EPP is satisfied by a referential \textit{pro} with fully specified formal features and a D-feature, i.e., a \textit{pro}-as-DP
in Holmberg’s (2005) sense. In this respect, Old Russian does not belong to the Greek-type null subject
language group despite its consistent null subject patterns. Another implication of this research is that rich
agreement morphology does not trigger V-to-T, which goes against the Rich Agreement Hypothesis.

REFERENCES. Alexiadou, A. and E. Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: word order, V-movement and EPP-
Linguistica} 63, 59-97. Lindseth, M. 1998. Null-Subject Properties of Slavic Languages: With Special Reference to Russian,
the Germanic Languages}. Oxford: OUP.