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**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\(^1\).

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)\(^2\).

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

\[(1b)\] dila mac:a b=AK:U.
I (gen) sheep \(n=\text{her}\)
‘I have no sheep’.

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

\[(3)\] u imtihan-ne kniga b=elc-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

---

\(^1\) 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.

\(^2\) 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 clitichood.

- Prosodic factors in play: Vassiliev-Dolobko’s Law revised by Vladimir Dybo (Dybo 1975). Old Russian non-clitic word forms from the so called enclinomena 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 ж â | “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 enclinomena.
- Remnants of Vassiliev-Dolobko’s Law in Modern Russian: reflexive verbs with stems from the former enclinomena subclass.

Russian (archaic): |родилс О, “was born” |взялс О, “set to (work)” |началс О, “began”,
|обнялс О “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 ‘phonic’ enclitics in Slovene:

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

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

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

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

- 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 2nd 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-Aztecan).
- Quiavini Zapotec (Otomangean).
- Warlpiri, Djaru (Pama-Nyungan).
- Cavineña (Tacanan)\(^3\).
- 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)

\(^3\) The Cavineña examples are from (Guillaume 2008, forthcoming).
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 2nd 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 2nd 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 2nd position.
- Splitting of clusters and moving the whole cluster from clausal 2nd position may happen, but the rules appear to be language-specific, not type-specific.
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 2nd 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 2nd position to satisfy this category, while movement of pronominal clitics to 2nd 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 2nd 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 2nd 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clauses without a Barrier</th>
<th>Clauses with a single Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base order, enclisis [V — CL_OBJ].</td>
<td>Derived order, proclisis [CL_OBJ — V]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Jos (1) ofereceu=ô (2) ontem</td>
<td>&lt;Eu sei&gt; [ftsr que] (1) O Jos (2) ô=ofereceu (3) ontem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph (1) gave=ô (2) yesterday (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3 European Portuguese
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 2nd position.
- Selective Barriers are sensitive to the category of clitics.

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

(8) Mac. ??Ne(1)=se=Refl(2) bespokojte! ⇒ |Bar [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. Детето не(1)=су(2)=го(3)=виждал(4) днес?
    Child (1) not (2) CL-Aux2Sg (3) him-AccSgM (4) saw-2Sg (5), today
    ‘The child, have you seen it today?’

(11) Bulg. *не=лю(1)=су(2) ходил там ⇒ |Bar [не](1)=су(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) |Bar како|єcьéмъ|| порáдимé=сé, такé и жíву’ (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 она королева\[=еси мужа\] слышалъ в томь честном крестѣ? (Ipatievskaia Chronicle, under 1152. list 166 rev.).
And from king’s = CL.2SgAux man // hear=CL.QQ 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):

(14) Bulg. Книгата (1) \[\text{Bar} \text{[FUT]}\] (2)=съ (3)=я (4)|| прочел (5)=и (6) до утрѣ?
Book-the (1)| Bar [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

![Clusterization Template in Old Novgorod Russian](image)

---

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Argument clitics</th>
<th>Present auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirm</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quest</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cause</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Же</td>
<td>Ад</td>
<td>Бе</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 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 бы is a recent Slavic innovation; it stands at the right edge of the particle string. Evidential particle ми is older and could be Balto-Slavic. This form is younger than modal and question particles же, ли, бо 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..... ClDat ] → XP..... ClDat ] ClAcc ]
- (ii) XP..... ClDat + ClAcc ] → XP..... ClDat + ClAcc ] ClAux]

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

Fig 5. Clusterization template for Slovene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles I</th>
<th>Present tense BE-auxiliaries 1-2 Sg., Du., Pl. 3Pl and Du</th>
<th>Clitic pronouns: Refl &gt; Dat &gt; Acc</th>
<th>Present tense form of BE-auxiliary 3Sg je, future tense forms of BE-auxiliaries</th>
<th>Particles II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pa, bi</td>
<td>sem, si, sme, ste, so, sva, sta</td>
<td>Refl: se</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>je, bom, boá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dat: Mi, ti, mu, joj, nam, van, jim</td>
<td>Acc: me, te, ga jo, nas, vas, jih</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Vf — n'd</th>
<th>X nd' z&lt;</th>
<th># Vf — XP — n'd</th>
<th>z&lt;Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vil</td>
<td>ek (1) n'd(2)</td>
<td>at vit farim b&lt;ár til Noregs (Far 93)</td>
<td>ok er Ragnhildr n'd(1) zir eftir (2), ok er hun flytt til byggxa (Far 93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit. &quot;Want</td>
<td>l(1) now (2), that we go.1.Pl.Opt. to Norway both&quot;</td>
<td>lit. &quot;and is Ragnhildr now (1) there after (2), and is she carried to the farmsteads&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(19) O.Ice. Ferr=3Sg.Pres. | zat =NOM (1) nd (2) allt (3) | sv<sem yr <adr=Nom.Sg.
lagxi=3Sg.Pret. til (Far 96).
Lit. "Goes | it (1) now (2) all (3) | so as yr <adr arranged"

Middle Norwegian (ca. 1600).
- A V2/V1 language. Clitics either in 2nd 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 (PCl 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 (PCl 10).
  Lit. ‘and let |=oneself=not| kill inside the house’

(22) Middle No. ginge |=de=da=ind=paa| det store skib som...
  Lit. ‘went |they=than=inside=on| the large ship that…’

(23) Middle No. Oc meente |=jeg=mig=nu| hos hannem at vF re fri for saadan sag (PCl 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 vF re (PCl 17).

  Topical initial constituents as communicative Barriers

(25) Middle No. efter beggis deris d'rd T (1)|| skulde (2) |=da (3) | deris Sr'n tage Riget, efter den
  anden, som ecetef'd vaar (PCl 124).
Lit. ‘after the death of them both T (1)|| should (2) |=then (3) | their son take the kingdom, one
  after the other, who is born legitimate’.
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