Krzysztof Migdalski
University of Wrocław
Generalizing second position effects in Slavic

I present an analysis of the distribution of pronominal and auxiliary clitics in Slavic, arguing that their placement is subject to the TP-parameter, and offering an alternative to Bošković's (2016) generalization concerning cliticization. The clitics assume two positions in Slavic: in Bulgarian (Bg) and Macedonian (Mac) they are verb-adjacent (see 1); in Serbo-Croatian (SC) and Slovenian they target second position (2P, see 2). Bošković (2016) observes that 2P clitics occur only in languages without articles and postulates a generalization saying that they are available in DP-less languages. He derives this generalization from the assumption that verb-adjacent clitics are D-heads, whereas 2P clitics are NPs. As functional heads cannot be stranded, verb-adjacent clitics assume a head-adjunction configuration and adjoin to V+T complexes. Conversely, 2P clitics are NPs, each of which targets an independent specifier in projections above VP. Bošković's generalization captures many derivational contrasts between the two types of cliticization, for example with respect to clitic splits (see 3) and ellipsis, which indicate that only verb-adjacent clitics cluster, forming a single constituent.

Although Bošković's (2016) generalization is empirically correct, it does not readily account for the position of auxiliary clitics, which are verbal, so they are unlikely to be D-heads and thus do not need to incorporate into the V/T complex. Regardless, they adjoin to T^0 like pronominal clitics. In Bošković's (2016) view, the adjunction occurs due to "a preference to treat them like pronominal clitics for uniformity." It is not clear how this preference can be captured formally. Furthermore, Bošković's generalization is not supported diachronically: Old Church Slavonic (OCS) and Old Serbian had verb-adjacent pronominal clitics, but they robustly allowed left-branch extraction (LBE), which is typical of DP-less languages (see 4, 5). Remarkably, in the history of Serbian verb-adjacent clitics moved to second-position, but the shift was not accompanied by a modification of the DP/NP structure. Bošković's proposal receives support from Romance languages, in which pronominal clitics resemble articles. However, in Slavic pronominal clitics show morphological resemblance to case forms (see Franks & Rudin 2005), irrespective of whether they are 2P or verb-adjacent. Semantics-wise, Runić (2013) claims that 2P clitics in SC allow both specific (6b) and non-specific (6c) reference, in contrast to pronouns in DP-languages like English (6b) and allegedly verb-adjacent clitics in Mac. As in Bošković's (2016) analysis, she attributes the semantic contrast to the D^0/NP status of verb-adjacent/2P clitics, respectively. However, DP languages such as Bg and Italian in fact permit pronominal clitics in indefinite contexts (see 7), which challenges the idea that they are D^0s.

I propose instead that the clitic placement is contingent on the availability of tense morphology. Synchronically, verb-adjacent clitics are attested only in Bg and Mac, the only Slavic languages with the simple tense forms, aorist and imperfect. Diachronically, OCS had aorist and imperfect tenses and verb-adjacent pronominal clitics, while the only 2P clitics were those expressing Force (*bo* 'because', *že* and *li* (focus/interrogation markers); see (8)). In all the Slavic languages that subsequently evolved except for Bg and Mac aorist and imperfect were lost, and the process coincided with the shift of verb-adjacent clitics to 2P (e.g. very early (the 10th c.) in Slovene (Migdalski 2016), whereas in Old SC the shift paralleled the loss of tense morphology in the respective dialects and occurred only around the 19th c. in Montenegro dialects, where the aorist was preserved longest; see (9)). I interpret the change by assuming that verb-adjacent clitics raise out of VP as XPs and are licensed by head-adjunction to T^0 (Kayne 1991). I propose that with the decline of tense morphology, TP is lost, which has repercussions for the cliticization patterns. In the absence of T^0, there is no suitable head for clitics to adjoin to and they end up in 2P, in separate maximal projections. The difference in the landing sites (head-adjunction for verb-adjacent clitics and specifiers for 2P clitics) results in derivational contrasts between the respective two types of cliticizations, captured also by Bošković's generalization (see 3).

The analysis pursued here points to a link between 2P and V2, which is also viewed as a case of T-dependency (Den Besten 1977). Moreover, it assumes that the presence of TP is subject to parametric variation (Haider 2010), and that TP may emerge or decline in language history (Van Gelderen 1993; Osawa 1999). It also relates to Bošković's (2012) proposal that TP is available only in DP-languages. Admittedly, if the DP-TP correlation holds, it could be that both Bošković's (2016) generalization and the one developed here are correct: verb-adjacent clitics are attested in languages with both tense morphology and articles. However, the presented diachronic evidence shows that the property which conditions verb-adjacent cliticization is the presence of tense morphology, rather than articles. This may in turn indicate that Bošković's generalization of the DP-TP parallelism could be a one-way correlation: languages with articles have tense morphology, but the reverse is not necessarily true.

(1)   Včera   ti   *si*   *mu*   *gi*   dal
                     yesterday you are$_{AUX}$ him$_{DAT}$ them$_{ACC}$ give$_{PART.M.SG}$
                     "You have given them to him yesterday"   (Bg, see Franks and King 2000)

(2)   Veoma (*si*   *mi*) lepu   (*si*   *mi*) haljinu (*si*   *mi*)   kupio
                     very   are$_{AUX}$ me$_{DAT}$ beautiful$_{ACC}$are$_{AUX}$ me$_{DAT}$ dress$_{ACC}$ are$_{AUX}$ me$_{DAT}$ buy$_{PART}$
                     "You've bought me a very beautiful dress"   (S-C, Tomić 1996: 817)

(3)   a.   Ti   *si*   *me*,   kao što *sam* već   rekla, lišio   *ih*   juče
                     you are$_{AUX}$ me$_{DAT}$ as   am$_{AUX}$ already say$_{PART}$ deprive$_{PART}$ them$_{DAT}$ yesterday
                     "You, as I already said, deprived me of them"   (SC; clitics may be split)
    b.   *Te   *sa*,   kakto *ti*   kazah, predstavili *gi*   na Petŭr
                     they are$_{AUX}$, as   you$_{DAT}$ told$_{AOR}$ introduced them$_{ACC}$ to Peter
                     "They have, as I told you, introduced them to Peter"   (Bg, Bošković 2001: 189)

(4)   Svętъ *bo*   mǫ̃ž stvorilъ *ja*   estъ
                     holy   because man created   them$_{ACC}$ is
                     "Because a holy man has created them"   (OCS; Pancheva 2005: 139)

(5)   Sijazi *je*   kniga pisana
                     this   is$_{AUX}$ book   written
                     "This book was written"   (Old Serbian; Radanović-Kocić 1988: 159)

(6)   a.   Speaker A: Ona želi   da *se*   uda   za Šveđanina
                             she   wants   to REFL marry   for Swede   "She wants to marry a Swede"
    b.   Speaker B: Gdje *ga*   *je*   našla?
                             where him$_{ACC}$ is$_{AUX}$ find$_{PART}$ "Where did she find him/*one?"
    c.   Speaker B: Nije *ga*   lako naći
                             not   him$_{ACC}$ easy   find$_{INF}$"It is not easy to find one/*him" (SC, Runić 2013)

(7)   a.   Vseki običa nyakoy, no ne vseki   može da *go*   zadŭrži
                     everyone loves   someone, but not everyone can   that him$_{ACC}$ keep
                     "Everyone loves someone, but not everyone can keep him"   (Bg, surface scope reading)
    b.   Kogato običaš nyakogo, tryabva da *se*   naučiš da   *mu*   proštavaš
                     when love$_{2SG}$ someone need   that REFL learn$_{2SG}$ that   him$_{DAT}$ forgive$_{2SG}$
                     "When you love someone, you need to learn to forgive him" (Bg, generic reading of *mu*)

(8)   Elisaveti *že* isplъni *sę*   vrěmę roditi   *ei*
                     Elizabeth FOC fulfilled REFL time   give-birth her$_{DAT}$
                     "And it was time for Elizabeth to have her baby"   (OCS, *Lk* 1: 57, Pancheva 2007)

(9)   a.   U kom gradu najdoh   *se*   vesel ne   malo
                     in which town   find$_{AOR.1SG}$ REFL happy NEG little
                     "In which town I was very happy"   (Croatia, 16th c., Radanović-Kocić 1988: 166)
    b.   Brižljiva *ga*   crkva ne   pušta
                     caring   him$_{ACC}$ church NEG lets
                     "The caring church doesn't let him"   (Croatia, 19th c., Radanović-Kocić 1988: 165)
    c.   Ako iguman sakrivi   *mi*
                     if prior   does-wrong me$_{DAT}$
                     "If the prior does me wrong"   (Montenegro, 18/19th c., Radanović -Kocić 1988: 166)

References: **Bošković Ž.** 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface*. Elsevier. **Bošković, Ž.** 2012. On NPs and Clauses. In *Discourse and Grammar: From Sentence Types to Lexical Categories*. De Gruyter. **Bošković, Ž.** 2016. On Second Position Clitics Crosslinguistically. In *Formal Studies in Slovenian Syntax in honor of Janez Orešnik*. Benjamins. **Den Besten, H.** 1977. On the Interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Deletive Rules. In *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*. Benjamins. **Franks, S. & T-H. King**. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. Oxford. **Franks, S. & C. Rudin** 2005. Bulgarian Clitics as K[0]-heads. In *FASL-13*. **Haider, H.** 2010. *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge. **Kayne, R.** 1991. Romance Clitics, Verb Movement and PRO. *LI* 22: 647–686; **Migdalski, K.** 2016. *Second Position Effects in the Syntax of Germanic and Slavic Languages*. Wrocław: WUWR. **Osawa, F.** 1999. The Relation between Tense and Aspect: The Emergence of the T system. *UCL Working Papers* 11: 521-544. **Pancheva, R.** 2005. The Rise and Fall of Second-Position Clitics. *NLLT* 23: 103-167. **Pancheva R.** et al. 2007. *Codex Marianus*. In *USC Parsed Corpus of Old South Slavic*. **Runić, J.** 2013. A New Look at Clitics: Evidence from Slavic. In *FASL-21*. **Tomić, O.** 1996. The Balkan Slavic Clausal Clitics. *NLLT* 14: 811-872; **Van Gelderen, E.** 1993 *The Rise of Functional Categories*. Benjamins.