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This talk addresses the issue of head directionality in Old Church Slavonic (OCS). Whereas some analyses assume that OCS was head-initial on a par with Modern Slavic (Willis 2010, Jung 2015, Jung & Migdalski 2015), some other accounts postulate that OCS was T-final (Pancheva 2005, 2008) or X₀-final in the VP-domain but X₀-initial in the CP-domain (Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Vulchanov 2008). This talk argues that there is little evidence for head-finality of OCS: the diagnostics used in support of this claim give wrong predictions when applied to the same patterns in Modern Slavic, and they are also challenged by diachronic consideration that have not been addressed by their proponents.

Pancheva (2005) assumes T-finality to account for diachronic changes in Bulgarian cliticization. She shows that while OCS and 9th-13th c. Bg had post-verbal clitics (1a), analyzed by her as left-adjoined to final T₀ (1b), in 13th-17th c. Bg pronominal clitics move to second position (2P), which she attributes to the emergence of a new T-initial grammar. As a result, pronominal clitics precede T₀ and lean onto elements in SpecCP or SpecTP (2a). From the 17th c., 2P clitics are replaced by preverbal clitics; the change correlates with a decline of obligatory topicalization to SpecTP (2b), and in consequence the clitics are not interpreted as 2P but as adjoined to functional heads below T₀ (cf. 3). Since Pancheva (2005: 146) presumes that in OB lexical verbs do not reach T₀ but only Asp₀ below T₀, her evidence for the final T₀ comes from the position of pronominal clitics (ja in 1a) with respect to the aux in T₀ (estь in 1a). I observe that this diagnostic gives conflicting results when applied to the Modern Slavic languages in which the 3rd person aux (je in 4a) follows pronominal clitics, while the other aux forms (e.g. sam in 4b) precede them. If Pancheva’s conjecture is adopted, T₀ in Modern Slavic is predicted to be final when occupied by the 3rd person singular aux, and initial otherwise. Diachronically, in OB all auxiliary forms followed pronominal clitics (Sławski 1946; see 5), as in the pattern in (1), which at first sight may support Pancheva's analysis. Yet, in the 17-18th c. the 1/2 aux forms shifted across the pronominal clitics, adopting the current distribution (Sławski 1946: 76-77). The timing of the shift poses a problem for Pancheva (2005), as it occurred when according to her Bg was T-initial, with no 2P clitics left. This means that 2P cliticization is unrelated to the alleged loss of T-finality, but rather due to the strengthening of the person feature on T, and that [-person] forms do not target T but remain in the base position, below pronominal clitics. This proposal receives support also from Polish, where 1/2 aux are above the 3rd person copula (6), and Old Russian (Jung 2015).

In her later work, Pancheva (2008) argues for T-finality in OCS on the basis of the position of negation in complex tenses. Negation is a proclitic that attracts and incorporates into the verb in Slavic (Rivero 1991). Assuming that NegP is above TP (Willis 2000), neg-part-aux orders may be indicative of a T-final structure. Since Bg permits only the neg-aux-part order, while both neg-aux-part and neg-part-aux are possible in OCS (7), Pancheva presumes the OCS variation to be indicative of competition between two grammars (T-final/T-initial). I observe that her diagnostics are challenged by OCS and Modern Slavic. In OCS, the auxiliary is obligatorily attracted by the conditional complementizer a (8a), but not by the indicative complementizer da (8b), which has repercussions for the part/aux-negation orders and shows that it was contextually dependent and not a result of statistical frequency or grammar competition. Moreover, in Czech negation attracts the participle, though it may attract the verb “be” when it is a copula, but not the aux (9), even though Czech is head-initial. Pancheva’s (2008) third argument for the T-finality comes from her estimates of the ratio of part/aux orders in OCS (10) and Bg: whereas in OCS both orders are in a balanced proportion (aux-part 59% vs. part-aux 41%), in Modern Bulgarian the aux-part order clearly prevails (aux-part 97% vs. part-aux 3%). She attributes the contrast to T-finality of OCS, in which she assumes the less common part-aux order (10b) was the basic one, and the aux-part (10a)
derived via rightward participle movement. I observe that the different ratios may have been influenced by other diachronic issues: Damborský (1967) states that in OCS the -participle was an innovation and considered too novel for biblical texts. Dostál (1954) shows that in OCS the -participle is attested sporadically: it constitutes 5% of all tense forms although it is the most common tense form in Modern Slavic. I attribute the lower ratio of part-aux patterns in Modern Bg to the loss of obligatory topicalization to SpecTP around the 17th c. noted by Pancheva (2005: 153). The fact that the -participle may topicalize to SpecTP is confirmed by the ban on subject placement in part-aux orders (Migdalski 2006; cf. 11). I further propose that the high ratio of OV orders in OCS (Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Vulchanov 2008) is also due to the obligatory topicalization, but this high ratio does not necessarily imply \( V^0 \)-finality.

(1) a. světě bo měš stvoriť ja estь
“Because a holy man has created them”

b. [TP [V' t V\( ^0 \)]] [T CL T]\( ^3 \)] (post-verbal clitics)

(2) a. [TP [TP (cl) [TP XP =CL T [Asp # Asp V Asp ]]]]

b. tova se pomoli Juda bogu that\( _{TOP} \) REFL ask\( _{PART, M, PL} \) Judas God
“Judas asked God that\( _{TOP} \)”

(3) [TP ... T\( ^0 \)...

(4) a. On mu ih je dao b. Ja sam mu ih dao

(5) a. pustila m\( _{ACC} \) sta\( _{AUX, 2, DU, I AL} \) oba carè

(6) a. My-\( _{ŚMY} \) są zadwoleńi

(7) a ne mogli bi tvoriti ničešoże

b. sego avraam\( _{NĚŠT} \) stvorił

(8) a. A by bylı sade

b. Držaaxö i da ne bi otšěl;

(9) a. Nepřišel jsi

b. Nejši zdráv

(10) a. iže běaňo prišli

b. učenici bo ego ošľali

(11) Pročela (*Paulina) beše knigata

(Bg, see Embick & Izvorski 1995)