

## Clitic particles and the typology of 2P languages

The paper is devoted to the interactions of particle typology and clitic typology and discusses the role of clitic particles in clusterization processes characteristic of 2P languages<sup>1</sup>.

### I. Basic definitions: intersecting and non-intersecting classifications of word classes

The cover term ‘particle’ results from a classification of word classes. It often remains vague, since many linguists define particles according to a ‘leftover principle’ as short functional words, which are neither conjunctions, prepositions, nor auxiliaries etc. For instance, in Dargwa grammars negation *ak:u* is labeled as a particle in spite of the fact it shows class-and-number agreement with the grammatical subject, cf. (1a) and (1b). It can also be the main predicate, cf. (2) or adjoin to a lexical verb in tense forms, cf. (3)<sup>2</sup>.

(1a) dila        paltar        d=AK:U.  
I (gen)    clothes        npl=NO  
‘I have no clothes’.

(1b) dila        mac:a    b=AK:U.  
I (gen)    sheep    n=HEP  
‘I have no sheep’

(2) jašti        aw-ne        na|sil        ca=d-i,        a        it:i        AK:U.  
dem.pl        shirt-pl        dirty        cop=npl-cop        and        dem.pl    NOT  
‘these shirts are dirty and those (are) not’

(3) u    imtahan-ne    kniga    b=elč-un-di?        ci-k'al        čeirR-ib-AK:U.  
you    exam-superlat    book    n=read-aorist-2sg        that-any        understand-aor-NO  
‘Did you read a textbook to the exam? Oh yes, but I didn’t understand anything’.

It seems clear that one has to exclude forms like Dargwa *ak: u* from the class of particles, since they can be classified with other word classes. Dargwa *ak:u*, despite of being of a short functional word, is a negative verb that can head a syntactic projection.

A recent monograph on particles (Nikolaeva 2008) gives no definition of particles at all. The author believes (though does not specify it) that particles are some kind of special morphemes that can combine with each other and form word-like units not consisting of roots and affixes. Such an approach is interesting but not verifiable, since one and the same element under given assumptions may belong to two or more word classes simultaneously, cf. Dargwa *ak:u* in (1)-(3), which should be described both as a particle and a verb in Nikolaeva’s terms. Exploring this path, one can only arrive at an intersecting classification of word classes. I would suggest

---

<sup>1</sup> Research is a part of the project “The typology of free word order languages” funded by the Russian Foundation for Humanities (RGNF 06-04-00203a), whose support is gratefully acknowledged.

<sup>2</sup> Dargwa examples are borrowed from (Serdobolskaya, in press). I am grateful to Natalia Serdobolskaya for the consultation. All mistakes are mine.

that a general theory of particles should rather base on some non-intersecting classification of word forms.

- Methodological claim: If particles are a natural class of word forms, a theory explaining their status in the Universal Grammar should be based on a non-intersecting classification of word classes.

I am assuming here that particles are those discourse-oriented short functional words, which are syntactically deficient:

- Particles are heads, not phrases and do not project.

Furthermore, I am claiming that the class of particles and the class of clitics intersect:

- Clitic particles and non-clitic particles may coexist in one and the same language.

## II. Clitics vs particles: phonetic and syntactic clitics

2.1. For the sake of simplicity I am assuming here that clitics are a natural class that can be defined in terms of Universal Grammar, cf. (Aikhenvald 2002). The boundaries of this class depend on what criteria one applies.

- Prosodic clitics are elements, which cannot form a phonological word without combining with other words (Halpern 1996).
- Syntactic clitics are elements, which take syntactic positions that cannot be filled by non-clitic words (EuroClitics 1999; Zimmerling 2002).

This distinction does not coincide with the distinction of ‘phonetic’ vs ‘syntactic’ clitics proposed by King & Franks. (Franks 2008) ascribes uniform phonetic features to all clitics in a given language, whereas genuine prosodic theories of clitics take into account that clitics may have different phonetic properties, e.g. be stressed/ lack stress, bear a high tone/ a low tone etc (Dybo 1975). In this paper, I am adopting syntactic criteria for cliticness.

- Prosodic factors in play: Vassiliev-Dolobko’s Law revised by Vladimir Dybo (Dybo 1975). Old Russian non-clitic word forms from the so called *enclitomena* subclass gave the accent over to a subclass of *dominant* (presumably: + High tone) clitics. In this case, stress falls on the right edge of the phonetic word (= tact group), i.e. on the last enclitic in the group. If no enclitics are present, stress falls on the leftmost proclitic in the group.

(4a) O.Rus. |и не на воз жА́ “and not on the carriage THEN”  
and not on carriage then

(4b) O.Rus. |и не на воз| “AND not on the carriage”  
and not on carriage

Non-dominant clitics (presumably: - High tone) do not take stress from *enclitomena*.

- Remnants of Vassiliev-Dolobko’s Law in Modern Russian: reflexive verbs with stems from the former *enclitomena* subclass.

Russian (archaic): |родилсѠ̄, “was born” |взялсѠ̄, “set to (work)” , |началсѠ̄ “began”, |обнялсѠ̄ “embraced”.

2.2. The classes of phonetic and syntactic clitics may overlap within one and the same language. Cf. Modern Slovenian.

- ‘Phonetic’ Slovene enclitics are unstressed but CAN be fronted.

Fig. 1: Clitic fronting of ‘phonetic’ enclitics in Slovene:

Discourse-neutral order: #XP — CL	Discourse marked order: #CL —Vf
(1a) #Rekla (1) <i>sem</i> , da pridem “I said that I will come”	(1b) # <i>Sem</i> (1) rekla (2), da pridem “I have indeed said that I will come”
lit. “said (1) <i>Aux- 1Sg</i> (2), that I-come”	быв. “ <i>Aux-1Sg</i> (1) said (2), that I-come”

- Modal verbs *morati*, *smeti*, *moči* are stressed, but DO NOT leave clausal 2<sup>nd</sup> position and CANNOT be fronted.

Fig. 2: Modal verb *morati* as a ‘syntactic’ 2P clitic in Slovene

	Word order	Examples
2-1.	#Vinf — <i>morati</i> —	#Napisati <i>mora</i> pismo. “One must write a letter”.
2-2.	*# <i>morati</i> — Vinf —	#?? <i>Mora</i> napisati pismo. “то же”
2-3.	# XP — <i>morati</i> —	#Janez <i>mora</i> napisati pismo. “Janez must write a letter”.
2-4.	*# Vinf — YP — <i>morati</i> —	#*Napisati Janez <i>mora</i> pismo. “the same”
2-5.	*# XP — <i>morati</i> —Vinf	#Danes <i>mora</i> napisati pismo. “Today (s)he must write a letter”.
2.-6.	#*XP —Vinf — <i>morati</i>	#*Danes napisati <i>mora</i> pismo. “the same”.

- The paradox is that in spite of the fact that Slov. *morati* is a strict 2P-enclitic, its 2P properties cannot be derived prosodically, since it is a stressed word.

### III. 2P languages on the world’s map

3.1. There are about 70-100 languages which have clitic clusters in clausal 2<sup>nd</sup> position. I refer to this group as 2P languages.

- Hittite, Luwian, Old Greek, Old Indian, Old Persian, Avestan, Old Novgorod Russian, (Old Norse).
- Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian, Slovene, Czech, Slovak.
- Pashto, Ossetic (East Iranian).
- Kabyle Berber, Tuareg Ahaggar (Afroasiatic).
- Lummi (Straight Salish).
- Makah, Ditidaht (Wakashan).
- Luiseño, Mayo (Uto-Aztec).
- Quiavini Zapotec (Otomangean).
- Warlpiri, Djaru (Pama-Nyungan).
- Cavineña (Tacanan)<sup>3</sup>.
- Bulgarian (South Slavic), Tagalog, Bikol, Cebuano (Central Philippine).

(5) Cav. A-ta-wa           |=taa =yatse|  
 affect-Pass-Perf    = EMPH =1Dl.Abs.  
 ‘We (me and my brother) got killed (lit. affected)’.

3.2. Most, but not all 2P languages allow for a variation “clitics after the first phonological word ~ clitics after the first maximal projection”.

Old Novgorod Russian (XI-XV centuries AD)

<sup>3</sup> The Cavineña examples are from (Guillaume 2008, forthcoming).

(6a) А [дрouжина моя] изнемогла=ся [1187] list 227 rev.  
And army-force- NomSg.F my- NomSg.F broke.down-Perf.3SgF=CL.refl.  
'And [my army force] broke down'.

(6b) \*А [дрouжина моя] =ся изнемогла.

(6c) \*А [дрouжина=ся моя] изнемогла.

(6d) \* А=ся [дрouжина моя] изнемогла.

(7a) Того=ся каю. 'I repent all that', 'I am sorry for that'.  
that-gen=CL.refl repent-1Sg.

(7b) [Того всего] каю=ся [1151] list 151 rev. 'I am sorry for all that'.  
All-gen that-gen repent-1Sg=CL.refl.

(7c) \*[Того всего] =ся каю. NOT ATTESTED.  
All-gen that-gen=CL.refl. repent-1Sg

- Fronted Vocatives, fronted Addresses, fronted Topicalized & Focalized constituents and fronted long initial constituents consisting of more than one accented word form act as Barriers in Old Novgorod Russian.

### 3.3. 2P languages and typological implications.

Four hypotheses about the distribution of clitic particles in 2P languages:

- There are no 2P languages, where clusters are restricted with clitic particles: in all 2P languages particles clusterize with pronominal clitics and auxiliaries.
- All 2P languages make use of at least two different categories of clitics — clitic pronouns, clitic particles, clitic auxiliaries etc.
- If a language only allows a single clitic element, not a cluster in clausal 2<sup>nd</sup> position, this element is a clitic particle. Cf. Gothic *-u*, Russ. *li*, Japan. *ga*.
- A combination of two particle clitics may retain its status as a particle, but tends to lose its status of a clitic. Cf. Old Russian *a + li = ali*, Old Polish *i + zhe = izhe*. Such clitic-only words are generally excluded from clausal 2<sup>nd</sup> position.

### IV. Clitic clusters in 2P languages

- A cluster is a contact string of clitics arranged in a rigid order. Clitic clusters form one phonetic word with their prosodic hosts.
- Each category of clitics has its own position (slot) in a cluster, permutations of clitics in a cluster are ungrammatical.
- 2P languages have clitic clusters in clausal 2<sup>nd</sup> position.
- Splitting of clusters and moving the whole cluster from clausal 2<sup>nd</sup> position may happen, but the rules appear to be language-specific, not type-specific.

4.1. The notion of cluster is controversial. There are at least four approaches:

A) Clusters are both prosodic and syntactic units at once. Clusterization and ordering of clitics is largely triggered by prosody (Anderson 1995; Zaliznjak 2008);

B) Clusters are both prosodic and syntactic units, but splitting of a cluster is triggered by syntax, not prosody (Zimmerling 2008);

C) Clusters are prosodic, but not syntactic units. Clitics in a cluster can be heterogeneous, some of them being true 2P clitics, the other ones being capable of moving out of the cluster and attaching to adjacent verbal heads (Franks 2008).

D) 2P languages, where contact positioning of clitics is not mandatory, lack clusters (Bošković 2002).

Bošković's view (type D theory) is not tenable, since all 2P languages allow for cluster splitting. The revision of Anderson's approach (type A theory) does not depend on category of 2P clitics, but the choice of type B vs type C theories is directly motivated by the contrast of particles and other clitics.

- Franks, Migdalski and Zaliznjak who analyse Bulgarian, Old Church Slavonic, Old Polish and Old South Russian data argue that particles are tied up to clausal 2<sup>nd</sup> position more firmly than other clitics, which often move out from this position to verb-adjacent positions.
- Migdalski claims that particles like Bulg. and OCL question marker *li* or OCL discourse particle *zhe* mark Illocutionary Force and are moved to clausal 2<sup>nd</sup> position to satisfy this category, while movement of pronominal clitics to 2<sup>nd</sup> position has no motivation, therefore they don't reach this position and stay in the VP, as in Modern Polish (Migdalski 2007).

- A simplistic account of Franks, Migdalsky and Zalizniak's theories is that Slavic 2P clitic particles are 'phonetic' enclitics which are moved to clausal 2<sup>nd</sup> position in order to check Force, while Slavic 2P clitic pronouns (in Zalizniak's theory — both clitic pronouns and clitic auxiliaries) are 'syntactic' verb-adjacent clitics.
- Clitic pronouns and auxiliaries tend to stay in the VP, since their movement to 2P lacks syntactic motivation — they don't check any features in C.
- It is therefore impossible to draw one and the same functional projection for all Slavic clitics, since their contact position in a clitic string results from different syntactic and phonetic processes (Franks, Migdalsky).
- Clitic clustering is just a surface phenomenon, the heterogeneity of Slavic clitic clusters is proved by the facts that clitic clusters allow for splitting, whereby clitic particles normally stay in 2P, while other pronominal clitics stay in the VP and don't raise to clausal 2<sup>nd</sup> position.

This theory does not work — neither on a synchronic level nor in a diachronic perspective. The splitting of clusters is an *argumentum ad contrario* – it may be explained in terms of Barrier rules.

### V Barriers in 2P languages

A Barrier is a syntactic category, which takes effect on the surface position of a single clitic/clitic cluster.

- Barriers can be 'blind': in this case they move the whole clitic cluster *n* steps to the right.
- Barriers can be sensitive to a particular type of clitics: in this case, splitting of a cluster takes place.

Fig. 3 European Portuguese

Clauses without a Barrier	Clauses with a single Barrier
Base order, enclisis [V — CL <sub>OBJ</sub> ].	Derived order, proclisis [CL <sub>OBJ</sub> — V]
O JosJ (1) <u>ofereceu</u> = <i>o</i> (2) ontem	<Eu sei> [ <sup>Bar</sup> <b>que</b> ] (1) O JosJ (2) <u><i>o</i></u> =ofereceu (3)
Joseph (1) <u>gave</u> = <i>it</i> (2) yesterday (3)	ontem

	<I know> [that] (1) Joseph (2) <u>it=gave</u> (3) yesterday
A Maria (1), O JosJ (2) <u>ofereceu=o</u> (3) ontem to Mary (1) Joseph (2) <u>gave=it</u> (3) yesterday	

### 5.1. A typology of Barriers

- Obligatory vs optional Barriers.
- Grammaticalized vs communicative Barriers.
- Cumulative (two or more Barriers count as a single Barrier) vs undoing Barriers (the second Barrier blocks the effect of the first one).
- Blind (=indiscriminating) vs selective (category-sensitive) Barriers.

### 5.2. Blind (indiscriminating) Barriers vs selective (category-sensitive Barriers) in 2P languages

- Blind Barriers just shift clitic clusters  $n$  steps to the right from clausal 2<sup>nd</sup> position.
- Selective Barriers are sensitive to the category of clitics.

### 5.3. Negation as a selective Barrier: the case of Macedonian

(8) Mac. <sup>??</sup>Ne(1)=se=Refl(2) *bespokojte!* ⇒ |<sup>Bar</sup> [Ne]|(1) *bespokojte(2)=se(3)*  
‘Don’t disturb me’, lit. ‘No-Neg. (1) = Cl.refl. disturb-Imp2Sg’

(9) Mac. Ti(1) *ne(2)=si (3)=mu (4) spomoñil(5)*  
lit. ‘You-2Sg (1) not-Neg (2) CL-Aux2Sg (3), to.him-DatSgM (4) help-Perf.3Sg.M.’  
‘You didn’t helped him’,

### 5.4. Negation as a selective Barrier: the case of Bulgarian

(10) Bulg. Дeтeтo(1) |<sup>Bar</sup> [He]|(2)=cu (3)=zo (4) *виждал (5) днес?*  
Child (1) not (2) CL-Aux2Sg (3) him-AccSgM (4) saw-2Sg (5), today  
‘The child, have you seen it today?’

(11) Bulg. \*He=лу(1)=cu (2) *ходил там* ⇒ |<sup>Bar</sup> [He]||\_\_=cu(1)=лу(2)  
Not=Cl.Quest.(1) =Cl.Aux2Sg (2) walk-Perf.3SgM there

### 5.5. Barriers and splitting of clusters in Old Novgorod Russian

- Communicative Barriers move the reflexive pronoun *-sja* out of the clitic cluster:

(12) |<sup>Bar</sup> како|=eсьмъ|| *порядиле=се, тако и живү* (Birch Bark letter 354)  
as =Cl.Aux1Sg. || arrange-Perf.1Sg.M=Cl.Refl, so and live-Pres.1Sg  
‘I live exactly as I arranged it’.

- Sporadically, the same mechanism moves clitic particles, e.g. question particle *-li* out of the clitic cluster.

(13) а оу королева|=еси мужа||слышалъ=ли о томъ чѣтномъ крѣте? (Ipatievskaja Chronicle, under 1152. list 166 rev.).

A [<sup>Bar</sup><sub>b</sub> ou koroleva]=esi<sub>a</sub> muzha // slyshal=li<sub>b</sub> o tomъ chestnomъ krestě?

And from king's = **CL.2SgAux** man // hear=**CL.Q** about that worthy cross

'Haven't you heard about this worthy cross from the king's man?'

Franks' and Migdalski's accounts are falsified by such sentences, where category-sensitive Barriers place particles to the right for pronominal/auxiliary clitics. As a result, allegedly pure 'phonetic' 2P clitics end up to the right for presumably pure 'syntactic' 2P clitics, which supposedly tend to take verb-adjacent positions. On the contrary, auxiliary clitics in (12) and (13) remain in 2P, while the question particle in (12) and (14) and reflexive clitic in (13) are either being moved to the right from 2P or don't reach 2P.

Similar examples may be found in modern Slavic languages, cf., e.g. Bulgarian sentence (14): Bulg. future particle *ще* acts as a Barrier for the question particle *ли*.

(14) Bulg. Книгата (1) | <sup>Bar</sup><sub>b</sub> [ще] | (2)=си<sub>a</sub> (3)=я<sub>a</sub> (4)|| прочел (5)=ли<sub>b</sub> (6) до утре?

Book-the (1) | <sup>Bar</sup><sub>b</sub> [**FUT**] | (2)=**AUX-2Sg** (3)=**AccFSg** (4)|| **read-Prf** (5)=**Cl.Q** (6) tomorrow  
'Will you read the book tomorrow?'

#### TRIVIA

- In a vast majority of cases a 2P clitic that leaves its cluster ends up in a contact pre- or postposition to a verbal form.

### 5.6. CONCLUSIONS

- There are no grounds to expel particles from 2P clusters, if they have a fixed slot in a cluster.
- Clusterization of 2P particles with 2P pronouns and other 2P clitics is a diagnostic feature of all 2P languages.
- One may postulate one functional projection for all 2P clitics in clitic clusters, be it Clitic Phrase or something else.
- It is necessary to go beyond the templates of clitics in a cluster and analyze the behaviour of clitics, especially the factors that trigger late placement of clitics and splitting of clusters (=Barrier rules).

### 6. CLUSTERIZATION TEMPLATES AND THE PLACEMENT OF 2P PARTICLES

One can classify 2P languages according to the placement of particles.

A) All fixed clitic particles are grouped in the left edge of the cluster. This option is typical for languages, where clitic particles are older than other 2P clitics, cf. Old Novgorod Russian.

B) Clitic particles take both the left and the right edge of the cluster. This option is typical for languages, which have added new layers of clitics, cf. Modern Slovenian.

C) Deictic clitics take a central position in a cluster. This option is rare. It is found in languages, where clitic-like pronouns lack some properties of standard clitics, cf. Old Norse (Zimmerling 2002).

D) Pure weight principle: light 2P clitics precede heavy 2P clitics, both particles and other clitics may be light or heavy. Cf. Cebuano, Central Philippine (Billings & Konopasky 2002).

E) Mixed weight principle: heavy and light 2P clitics take different slots, but all 2P particles get a uniform treatment. This option might indicate that 2P particles have been inserted into an already existing string of other 2P clitics, cf. Tagalog, Central Philippine.

### 6.1. Pure weight principle: Cebuano

- a) The monosyll. Obj.: *ku, mu, or ta*
- b) The monosyll. Subj-2Sg. *Ka*
- c) A specific set (of mostly monosyllabic) particles
- d) The monosyll. Subj-2Sg. *Ka*
- e) The other particles
- f) The monosyll. Pronouns aside from *Ka*
- g) The disyllabic pronouns

Alternations in Cebuano

(15) qadtu [[*ka na*] *ba*]? “Are going now?” ~ qadtu [*na* [ba] ka]?  
going 2Sg Sbj already Q

- In Cebuano disyllabic forms are used as clitics even if a one-syllable counterpart exists

### 6.2. Mixed weight principle: Tagalog

(i) The monosyllabic clitic must be initial in the cluster

- (16) a. Nakita *ko siya* “I saw him/her”.  
b. Nakita *mo ako* “You-Sg saw me”.  
c. Nakita *ka nila* “They saw you-Sg”.

(ii) Regardless of its syllabic weight, in Tagalog any particle must appear after any one-syllable clitic pronoun and before any two-syllable clitic pronoun in the same clitic cluster.

- (17) a. Nakita *ko na siya* “I saw him/her already”.  
b. Nakita *ka ba nila?* “Did they see you?”.  
c. Nakita *mo yata ako* “Perhaps you-Sg. saw me”.

(18) Nakita *niya ako* ~ ?Nakita *ako niya* “He/She saw me”,

- The two-syllable forms are only optionally clitics. Disyllabic subject forms can be clefted or topicalized, appearing clause-initially; such forms are not clitics (Billings & Konopasky 2002).
- Alternative proposal: disyllabic forms correspond to homonymic pairs of the type {non-clitic vs 2P clitic}.

### 6.3. All 2P particles in the left edge of the cluster: Old Novgorod Russian

Fig. 4: Clusterization Template in Old Novgorod Russian

Particles					Argument clitics		Present tense auxiliaries
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Affirm	Quest	Cause	Evid	Opt	Dative	Accusative	1-2 persons
Же	Ли	Бо	Тн	Бы	Ми, си, ти, ны, вы, на, ва	Мл, тл, сл, ны, вы, на, ва, и, ю, к, ъ, гла	Ѹсмь, кси, ксме, ксте, ксвѣ, кста

- All 2P particles before all 2P pronouns, all 2P pronouns before 2P auxiliaries

- The order of clitics within each part of the cluster directly reflect the order of their cliticization (Zimmerling 2002: 70), (Zimmerling 2008). Optative particle *ǫbi* is a recent Slavic innovation; it stands at the right edge of the particle string. Evidential particle *mu* is older and could be Balto-Slavic. This form is younger than modal and question particles *ǫce*, *mu*, *ǫo* inherited from the Proto-Indo-European: all these forms stand at the left edge of the particle string.

Two layers of Old Novgorod Russian cliticization:

- (i) XP..... CIDat ] → XP..... CIDat ] CIAcc ]
- (ii) XP..... CIDat + CIAcc ] → XP..... CIDat + CIAcc ] CIAux ]

#### 6.4. Clitic particles in both edge positions: the case of Slovene

Fig 5. Clusterization template for Slovene

Particles I	Present tense BE-auxiliaries 1-2 Sg., Du., Pl, 3Pl and Du	Clitic pronouns: Refl > Dat > Acc			Present tense form of BE-auxiliary 3Sg je, future tense formes of BE-auxiliaries	Particles II
<i>pa, bi</i>	<i>sem, si, sme, ste, so, sva, sta</i>	Refl: <i>se si</i>	Dat: <i>Mi, ti, mu, joj, nam, vam, jim</i>	Acc: <i>me, te, ga, jo, nas, vas, jih</i>	<i>je, bom, bo, bosta, boste, bodo, bova, bosta</i>	<i>ĩe</i>

- Old (Common Slavic) BE-auxiliaries stand before 2P clitic pronouns, new (late Slovene) BE-auxiliaries stand after then.
- The positions of particles are ‘marginalized’.

#### 6.5. Deictic clitics take a central position in a cluster: Old Norse (=Old West Scandinavian) and Middle Mainland Scandinavian

- Old Icelandic/Old Norwegian has a rule of clusterization, where particles *nd* “now”/ *z* “then” take the central slots: pronominal clitics stand to the left of *nd* “now”/ *z* “then”, unstressed adverbials and verbal particles stand to the right of *nd* “now”/ *z* “then”. Clitic clusters can consist of 4-5 elements lacking phrasal stress.

Fig. 6 Clusterization of clitics in the 2P/3P position in Old Icelandic (Zimmerling 2002).

# Vf —  X nd/ z<	# Vf — XP —  nd/ z<Y
Vil   <i>ek</i> (1) <i>nd</i> (2)   at vit farim b< xir til Noregs  (Far 93)	ok er Ragnhildr   <i>nd</i> (1) <i>zar eftir</i> (2) , ok er hun flytt til byggxa (Far 93)
Lit. "Want  I(1) now (2) , that we go.1.Pl.Opt. to Norway both"	lit. "and is Ragnhildr  now (1) there after (2) , and is she carried to the farmsteads"

(19) O.Ice. Ferr=3Sg.Pres. | *zat* =NOM (1) *nd* (2) *allt* (3) | sv< sem yr<ndr=Nom.Sg.  
lagxi=3Sg.Pret. til (Far 96).

Lit. "Goes | *it* (1) now (2) *all* (3) | so as yr<ndr arranged"

Middle Norwegian (ca. 1600).

- A V2/V1 language. Clitics either in 2<sup>nd</sup> position or in 3d position.
- Clitic template:

Subject pronoun > reflexive pronoun > object pronouns > deictic pronouns nu/da > negation / particle vel > postverbs > prepositions.

(20) Middle No. thi giorde |=*de=sig*| strax ferdig at drage fra Byen (PCI 99).

Lit. 'therefore made |=they=themselves| at once ready to go out of the town'

(21) Middle No. oc lade |=*sig=ikke*| myrde inde i Husit (PCI 10).

Lit. 'and let |=oneself=not| kill inside the house'

(22) Middle No. ginge |=*de=da=ind=paa*| det store skib som... (PCI 92).

Lit. 'went |*they=than=inside=on*| the large ship that...'

(23) Middle No. Oc meente |=*jeg=mig=nu*| hos hannem at vFre fri for saadan sag (PCI 27).

Lit. 'and considered |=I=myself=now| by him to-be free from such matters'.

(24) Middle No. oc befand |=*han=sig=da*| megit suag at vFre (PCI 17).

Topical initial constituents as communicative Barriers

(25) Middle No. *efter beggis deris drd<sub>T</sub>* (1) || skulde (2) |=*da* (3) | deris Srn tage Riget, efter den anden, som ectefrd vaar (PCI 124).

Lit. 'after the death of them both<sub>T</sub> (1) || should (2) |=*then* (3) | their son take the kingdom, one after the other, who is born legitimate'.

## References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2002.* Typological parameters for the study of clitics, with special reference to Tariana // *Word: a cross-linguistic typology.* / R.M.W. Dixon and A. Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Anderson, Stephen P. 1995.* Toward an Optimal Account of Second-Position Phenomena // *Optimality Theory: Phonology, Syntax, and Acquisition* / Dekkers J., F. van der Leeuw & J. van de Weijer (eds.). Oxford, OUP, 302-333.
- Billings, Lorren & Abigail Konopasky. 2002.* The role of morphology in ordering verb-adjacent clitics: from syntax to prosody in Bulgarian and Tagalog.
- Bošković, Željko 2002.* Clitics as nonbranching elements and the linear correspondence axiom // *Linguistic Inquiry* 33.2: 329-40.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 1999.* Pronouns in Germanic and Romance languages: An overview // *EuroClitics*, 63-82.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Michal Starke 1999.* The typology of structural deficiency // *Clitics in the languages of Europe* / Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1999, 145-290.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004.* Issues in adverbial syntax // *Lingua* 11 (2004), 683-710.

*EuroClitics 1999* - Clitics in the languages of Europe. Eurotyp 20-5. Ed. by Henk van Riemsdijk. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin- New York.

*Dybo, Wladimir A.* 1975 – Zakon Vassielieva-Dolobko v drevnerusskom jazyke na materiale Chudovskogo Zaveta // International journal of linguistics and poetics, vol. 18/ 1, 7-81.

*Franks, Steven.* 2008. Clitic placement, Prosody, and the Bulgarian Verbal Complex // Journal of Slavic Linguistics, vol. 16, number 1, 91-137.

*Franks, Steven & Tracy Holloway King.* 2000. A handbook of Slavic Clitics. Oxford: OUP.

*Guillaume, Antoine* 2008. Third person agreement and passive marking in Tacanan languages: a historical perspective // Syntax of the World's Languages, SWL III. Berlin, September 26-28, 2008.

*Golden Marija & M.Sheppard.* 2000. Slovene pronominal clitics // The Clitic Phenomena in European languages. John Bejamins, Amsterdam, pp. 191-207.

*Halpern Aaron. L.* 1996 - Approaching Second / A.Halpern, A. Zwicky (eds.). CSLI Publications. Stanford, California, 429-445.

*Jakobson, Roman.* 1971. Les enclitique slaves // Selected Writings, vol. II. Word and language. The Hague - Paris: 16 -22.

*Jelinek, Eloise.* 2000. Predicate Raising in Lummi, Straits Salish // The syntax of Verb Initial languages. / Andrew Carnie and Eithne Guilfoyle, eds. 213-233.

*Klavans, Judith.* 1985. The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization // Language 61, 95-120.

*Kayne, Richard.* The Antisymmetry of Syntax. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA. 1994.

*Marušić, Frank.* Positioning Slovenian clitics // SLS 2 conference, Berlin 22-26.08.2007.

*McConvell, Peter* 1996. The functions of Split-Wackernagel Clitic Systems: Pronominal Clitics in the Ngumpin languages (Pama-Nyungan family, Northern Australia) // Approaching Second/ A.Halpern, A. Zwicky (eds.). CSLI Publications. Stanford, California, 299-332.

*Migdalski, Krzysztof.* 2007. - On the emergence of the second position cliticization in Slavic // Formal Description of Slavic Languages FDSL-7. Leipzig, 69-71.

*Nash, David G.* 1986. Topics in Warlpiri Grammar. (Outstanding dissertations in linguistics). MIT.

*Nespor, Marina, and Irene Vogel.* 1986. Prosodic phonology. Dordrecht: Foris.

*Nikolaeva, Tatiana.* 2008 - Neparadigmatičeskaja lingvistika: istorija "bluzhdajushih chastic". (= A Non-paradigmatic linguistics. The story of wandering particles). Moscow, 2008.

*Pancheva, R.* The position of Tense in the Old Church Slavonic Clause // 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Slavic Linguistic Society, SLS-1. Bloomington, 8-10 September 2006.

*Roberts, Taylor.* 1997. The optimal second position in Pashto. MIT.

*Tsunoda, Tasaku.* 1988 – The Djaru language of Kimberly, Western Australia. (Pacific Linguistics, Series B - No. 78). The Australian National University.

*Wackernagel, Jakob.* 1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung // Indogermanische Forschungen 1: 333-436 . = Wackernagel Jacob. Kleine Schriften. Bd. I, Basel, 1953, 1-103.

*Werle, Adam.* 2002. Sonority-determined clitic order // WECOL 2002. MIT, Amherst.

*Zaliznjak, Andrej A.* 1993. – Зализняк А.А. К изучению языка берестяных грамот. (The language of Birch Bark letters) // В.Л. Янин, А.А. Зализняк. Новгородские грамоты на бересте; из раскопок 1984-1989 гг. (Novgorod Birch Bark Letters from excavations 1984-1989). Moscow.

*Zaliznjak, Andrej A.* 2008 – Drevnerusskie enklitiki. (Old Russian Enclitics). Moscow : Yazyki slavjanskoj kultury. Moscow.

*Zimmerling, Anton W.* 2002 – Tipologičeskij sintaksis skandinavskih jazykov. (Typological Scandinavian Syntax). Moscow : Yazyki slavjanskoj kultury.

*Zimmerling A.* Encoding strategies in Word Order: the Evidence of Slavic Languages // SLS 1 Conference, Bloomington, 8-10. September 2006.

*Zimmerling, Anton W.* 2008 – The Emergence of 2nd Position Clitics and the Order of Cliticization. Third Annual Meeting of the Slavic Linguistic Society (SLS 3). Columbus, Ohio, June 10-12, 2008.

*Zimmerling, Anton W.* 2008. – Порядок слов в славянских, германских и романских языках. (Word order in Slavic, Germanic and Romance languages). // Slavo-Germanic studies, vol.3. Sankt-Petersburg : Aletheia, 165-239.

*Zwicky A.M.* On Clitics. Bloomington. Indiana University Linguistic Club. 1977.