

## Morphosyntactic Evidence for the Early Development of Animacy in Novgorod

- Claims on Old Novgorodian nominative singular masculine *o*-stem ending *-e*
  1. In the prehistoric times this ending started out as a definiteness/animacy marker (hereafter, DA).
  2. The dialect specific ending *-e* is a grammatical realization of animacy in contrast to the later development of Acc=Gen in the rest areas. Both the developments are motivated by the need to differentiate subjects from objects
  3. The ending is ultimately grammaticalized and then spread to masculine inanimate nouns in general and then through agreement to predicates, and lastly, pronouns.
  
- Evidence for the early development of animacy in Novgorod
  1. Gen=Acc was observed earlier in plural than in singular. Gen=Acc *-a* for MSC singular *o*-stem began to appear from the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century and was fixed only in 14<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> centuries.
  2. Dsg ending *-ovi* for MSC *o*-stem nouns, restricted to personal proper nouns (Nes=dicevi 238, Pav=lovi 745, k= Petr=vi 870), plus, *мужь, отьць, попъ* (popovi 831, мо'evi 531, k= at[;]hevi 424), is another way of marking animacy.
  3. Strong correlation between noun-adjective word order and 'broadly agentive' functions: 1) nominative subjects, 2) dative subjects of infinitives, 3) instrumentals of agents: A pri<sup>o</sup>d't= k nam= posly novogorodskye (ГВНП 23) vs. A tob<sup>o</sup> gospodine novgorod;skym; xl<sup>o</sup>bom; ne k=rmi ti ego (ГВНП 8).
  4. Incompatibility of the ending with the nominative object construction: one exception! a osetre im= imati po starin<sup>o</sup> (ГВНП 93) 'They are to have a sturgeon in accordance with custom.'
  
- Distribution of the nominative ending *-e*<sup>1</sup>
  - 1) nouns (*brate, xlěbe, Ivane*)
  - 2) denominal/possessive attributive adjectives (*Kiseleve, Seljatine, Novъgorodъske*)
  - 3) short-form adjectives in predicative function (*lixе, svobodne, deševe*)
  - 4) participles in *-l, -t, -n* (*vъdale, vybitъ, pogublene*)
  - 5) a few pronouns (*same, vъхе, keto, te*).
  - why does this ending not encroach into attributive short-form adjectives? (*\*velike čelověke*)
  - why do long-form adjectives not have this ending? (*\*velikei*)
  - how can we account for its exceptional occurrence in *kotorei ljubo* (725)?

<sup>1</sup> See Zaliznjak's descriptions for your reference,

- a. НГБ VIII (1986: 130–131): 1) имена в непредикативной функции (+ причастие с *-en-*), 2) прилагательные в предикативной функции, 3) перфектные причастия с *-l-*.
- b. Zaliznjak (2004: 99–100): 1) существительные, 2) прилагательные, 3) *n-, m-, l-*причастия, 4) местоимение (*vъхе, same*).

➤ Assumptions

- (1) Old Novgorodian projects the DP layer, i.e., DP hypothesis.
- (2) Possessives are derived not through word-formation, but should be dealt in terms of declension (Trubetzkoy 1937; Babyonyshev 1997)
- (3) Long-form adjectives have the definiteness marker in them, *\*-jb* (Flier 1974)

➤ Analysis

1. Possessive + common noun: possessive adjectives in [Spec, N] to [Spec, D]  
(Cf. Longobardi 1994; Sobin 2002; Rappaport 2000)

To<sup>h</sup>dorove blezoke Selqtine syno (632)      āvanove popove (319)

Mestilov; syno (68)      dvorqñine Fedore Vnezdove vn<sup>h</sup>ke (289)

- Relational adjective, *Novgorodьske* in *Nov=gorod; ske sm; rde* (562), behaves the same as possessives, due to its semantic affinity “the entity belongs to a certain place.” This also explains why the relational adjectives in *-ьsk-* can have short, as well as long inflections (Tolstoj 1957/1999: 110–111; Flier 1974).

2. Adjectives: hosted by a functional projection (Cinque 1994; Pereltsvaig 2005)

: Short-form adjectives refer to indefinite entities, thereby flatly contradicting the initial property of the ending *-e*, definiteness/animacy.

: Long-form adjectives are formed with the addition of a pronominal element to their short-form equivalents: NSg *nov-ь-ьь*, DSg *nov-u-j-emu*. Double marker *\*-ei* {*-e+jь*}.

- Ortimiene n<sup>o</sup>dobornoj (325): ‘Ортемын недоборный’ (Strachov 1997)

: Possessive adjective from Ort<sup>o</sup>m; ĭ + substantivized adjective *-oi* (< *\*ьь*)

- kotorei l [bo (725): [DP <sup>-e</sup> [CP kotoryi l [bo [TP ... ]]]] (Cf. Szucsich 2001)

: *slæpe* ‘the blind’ in Tönnies Fenne’s manual (Schaeken 1992: 290)

3. Predicate agreement: T with D, not with N (Rappaport 2006)

zam=ke k<sup>o</sup>le (247), g[rig[i ti d]ow; le sto(rov)e a po<sup>h</sup>tila priw; le (165)

" iznobo<sup>h</sup>de pogo<sup>h</sup>blene o<sup>h</sup> syhevic; (607/562)

- There is no case where a noun in *-e* appear in predicate position (Cf. Rappaport 2001).

4. Pronouns:

- 1) Demonstratives in [Spec, DP] in a lower DP (Cf. Brugè 2002)

te razd<sup>o</sup>lĭ (‘тот раздел,’ Marasinova’s Pskov document № 5)

- 2) Quantifier *v=x*e and emphatic same: [Spec, DP] in a lower DP (Cf. Progovac 1998; Rappaport 2000)

➤ Summary/implications

1. Nominative singular ending /e/ is a phonetic rendition/realization of D-feature in nominals.
2. Indefinite, i.e., short, adjectival ending is observed to be incompatible with “definite, animate” nominal ending.
3. There is a dialectal split in early East Slavic, Novgorod versus the rest, with Novgorod developing the unusual NSg desinence *-e* for personal names (always definite), which is ultimately grammaticalized and then spread to masculine *o*-stem nouns in general and then through agreement to predicates, and lastly, pronouns.

## Reference:

- ГВНП = Грамоты Великого Новгорода и Пскова. Москва-Ленинград, 1949  
НГБ VIII = В. Л. Янин, А. А. Зализняк. Новгородские грамоты на бересте (из раскопок 1977-1983гг.). Москва, 1986.
- Babyonyshev, M. (1997) "The possessive construction in Russian: a crosslinguistic perspective," *JSL* 5(2): 193–230.
- Brugè, L. (2002) "The positions of demonstratives in the extended nominal projection," in *Functional structure in DP and IP. The cartography of syntactic structures*, Volume 1, Guglielmo Cinque (ed.), 15–53, Oxford · New York: Oxford UP.
- Flier, M. S. (1974) *Aspects of nominal determination in Old Church Slavic*, The Hague·Paris: Mouton.
- Longobardi, G. (1994) "Reference and proper names: a theory of N-movement in syntax and Logical Form," *LI* 25(4): 609–665.
- Pereltsvaig, A. (2005) "On the universality of DP: a view from Russian,"
- Progovac, L. (1998) "Determiner phrase in a language without determiners," *JL* 34: 165–179.
- Rappaport, G. (2000) "The Slavic noun phrase in comparative perspective," to appear in *Comparative Slavic morphosyntax*, George Fowler (ed.), Bloomington: Slavica.
- (2001) "Extraction from nominal phrases in Polish and the theory of determiners," in *Formal Approaches to Polish Syntax*, Ewa Willim and Piotr Banski (eds.), and *JSL* 8(3).
- (2006) "Agreeing to disagree: a lexicalist explanation of agreement mismatch," Paper presented at Slavic Linguistics Colloquium (4 April 2006).
- Schaeken, J. (1992) "Zum nordrussischen Nominativ Singular auf –e im Gesprächsbuch des Tönnies Fenne (Pskov 1607)," *Studies in Russian Linguistics (= Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics)* 17: 285–293.
- Sobin, N. J. (2002) "Determiners in genitive constructions," *Lingua* 112: 597–618.
- Straxov, A. B. (1997) "Filologičeskie nabljudenija nad berestjanymi gramotami X-XIV," *Palaeoslavica* 5. 287–312.
- Szucsich, L. (2001) "The structure of relative clauses in Slavic," Paper presented at Formal Description of Slavic Linguistics 4.
- Trubetzkoy, N. S. (1937) "O pritjažatel'nyx prilagatel'nyx (possessive) starocerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka," in *Zbornik lingvističeskih i filoloških rasprava, A. Belić o četrdesetogodišnjici njegova naučnog rada posvećuju njegovi prijatelji i učenici*. 5–20, Beograd: Mlada Srbija.
- Zaliznjak, A. A. (2004) *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt<sup>2</sup>* (with new materials 1995–2003), Moscow: Jazyki Slavjanskoj kul'tury.