Krzysztof Migdalski, University of Wrocław
Parametrizing second position effects

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. The clitics assume two positions in Slavic: in Bulgarian (Bg) and Macedonian (Mac) they are verb-adjacent (see 1) or they target second position (2P), following the clause-initial syntactic constituent (in Czech, Slovenian, Serbo-Croatian; see 2). Bošković (2016) observes that 2P clitics occur only in languages without articles and postulates a generalization saying that they are available only in DP-less languages. He derives this generalization from the assumption that verb-adjacent clitics are D-heads. Since functional heads cannot be stranded, clitics must assume a head-adjunction configuration. In consequence, D-clitics adjoin to V+T complexes, which results in the verb-adjacent configuration. Conversely, 2P clitics are NPs that target specifiers of projections above VP.

A problem with Bošković's (2016) proposal is that 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 on a par with pronominal clitics. In Bošković's (2016) view, the adjunction occurs because of "a preference to treat them like pronominal clitics for uniformity." It is not clear how this preference can be captured in formal terms. Moreover, although Bošković's proposal receives support from Romance languages, in which pronominal clitics resemble articles, in Slavic pronominal clitics show morphological resemblance to case forms (see Franks & Rudin 2005), irrespective of whether they are 2P or verb-adjacent. Finally, Bošković's generalization is not supported diachronically: Old Church Slavonic (OCS) had verb-adjacent pronominal clitics, but it robustly allowed left-branch extraction, which is typical of a DP-less languages (see 3). Moreover, in the history of some Slavic languages verb-adjacent clitics moved to second-position, but the shift was not accompanied by any modifications of the DP/NP structure.

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 Illocutionary Force (e.g. *bo* 'because', *že* and *li* (focus/interrogation markers); see 4). 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, whereas in Old S-C 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 5). 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 (cf. Kayne 1991). I also assume that TP is not a universal projection; it is subject to parametric variation (cf. Haider 2010 for German; Bošković 2012), and that it may emerge or decline in language history (cf. Osawa 1999; Van Gelderen 1993 for Old English). In the case of Slavic, I propose that TP is lost with the decline of tense morphology, 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 contrast in the landing sites (head-adjunction for verb-adjacent clitics and specifiers for 2P clitics) results in derivational contrasts between the respective two groups of languages, for instance with respect to clitic splits by parentheticals (see 6) and their mobility in the structure (cf. 7 vs. 8).

The proposal developed here provides a link to V2, another second position phenomenon. Crosslinguistically, V2 is attested only in tensed clauses (Jouitteau 2010); thus, it has been assumed that V2 represents a case of T-dependency, both in Germanic (Den Besten 1977; Roberts&Roussou 2001) and outside Germanic (e.g. in Karitiana; Storto 2003).

(1)   Včera   ti   *si*   *mu*   *gi*   dal
        yesterday you are_AUX him_CL.DAT them_CL.ACC give_PART.M.SG
        "You have given them to him yesterday"   (Bg, see Franks and King 2000)

(2) a. Veoma   lepu   haljinu   *si*   *mi*   kupio
        very   beautiful_ACC dress_ACC are_AUX me_DAT buy_PART.M.SG.
     b. Veoma lepu *si mi* haljinu kupio
     c. Veoma *si mi* lepu haljinu kupio
        "You've bought me a very beautiful dress"   (S-C, Tomić 1996: 817)

(3)   Mati   *že*   jego živĕaše blizъ   vratъ
        mother FOC   his live_IMP.3SG near gates
        "And his mother lived near the gates"   (OCS, Radanović-Kocić 1988: 152)

(4)   Elisaveti *že*   isplъni   *sę*   vrĕmę 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)

(5) 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)

(6) a. Ti   *si*   *me*,   kao što *sam*   već   rekla,   lišio
        you are_AUX me_DAT as   am_AUX already say_PART.F.SG deprive_PART.M.SG
        ih   juče
        them_DAT yesterday
        "You, as I already said, deprived me of them"   (S-C, Bošković 2001: 60)
     b. *Te *sa*,   kakto *ti*   kazah,   predstavili *gi*   na Petăr
        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)

(7) a. Milan želi da *ga*   vidi
        Milan wishes that him_ACC sees
        "Milan wishes to see him"
     b. ?Milan *ga* želi da vidi   (clitic climbing possible in S-C; Progovac 2005: 146)

(8) a. Marlon iska   da *go*   vidi
        Marlon wishes that him_ACC sees
        "Marlon wishes to see him"
     b. *Marlon *go* iska da vidi   (clitic climbing precluded in Bg; Migdalski 2006: 217)

References: **Bošković Ž**. 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface*. Elsevier. **Bošković, Ž.** 2012. On NPs and Clauses. In *Discourse and grammar*, De Gruyter. **Bošković, Ž.** 2016. On Second Position Clitics Crosslinguistically. In *Formal Studies in Slovenian Syntax*. 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*2014. **Haider, H**. 2010. *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge. **Jouitteau, M**. 2010. A typology of V2 with regard to V1 and second position phenomena. *Lingua* 120: 197–209. **Kayne, R**. 1991. Romance Clitics, Verb Movement and PRO. *LI* 22: 647–686; **Migdalski, K.** 2006. *The Syntax of Compound Tenses in Slavic*. Utrecht: LOT. **Osawa, F.** 1999. The Relation between Tense and Aspect: The Emergence of the T system. *UCL Working Papers* 11: 521-544; **Pancheva R**. et al. 2007. *Codex Marianus*. In *USC Parsed Corpus of Old South Slavic.* **Progovac, Lj**. 2005. *Syntax of Serbian: Clausal Architecture*. Slavica; **Roberts, I. & A. Roussou**. 2002. The Extended Projection Principle as a Condition on the Tense Dependency. In *Subjects, Expletives, and the EPP*. Oxford. **Storto, L**. 2003 Interactions Between Verb Movement and Agreement in Karitiana (Tupi Stock). *Revista Letras* 60: 411-433. **Tomić, O**. 1996. The Balkan Slavic Clausal Clitics. *NLLT* 14: 811-872; **Van Gelderen, E.** 1993 *The Rise of Functional Categories*. Benjamins.