The talk discusses interactions of clitic typology and word order typology, with focus on the Slavic languages. Slavic word order systems with clitics will be compared with typologically similar systems attested in other areas. The general aim is to classify Slavic word order systems with clitics on the basis of syntactic constraints without sticking to hypotheses about language-specific properties of prosodically deficient elements and to provide a viable typological classification, which can be verified by data from other world’s languages.

A salient characteristics of South Slavic, West Slavic and Old East Slavic languages are constraints on the placement of the so called clusterizing clitics. Clusterizing clitics make up strings arranged in a rigid order according to a principle called Clitic Template, the permutations are excluded as ungrammatical. Cf. Old Russian Čto=ti=s’a=jesm’=byl otstupil bratu svoemu ‘That you indeed had given up these in favour of your brother’. In Slavic languages, only clause-level clitics have clusterizing properties. Slavic clusterizing clause-level clitics are represented by the following categories of elements: 1) short forms of argument and reflexive pronouns 2) auxiliaries 3) particles. Strings of clusterizing clitics have a fixed position in Slavic main and subordinate clauses and tend to take clausal-second position (2P).

There is an important research line basing on the hypothesis that prosodically deficient elements, proclitics and enclitics, are also syntactically deficient and constitute a natural class definable in UG (Zwicky 1977). Recent studies of the syntax-prosody interface show a gradual increase of the emphasis made on the prosodic component at the expense of syntax. However, some constraints on the placement of clitics directly or indirectly entail constraints on the placement on non-clitic sentence categories. If constraints of the latter type are straightforwardly explained as an outcome of the allegedly purely prosodic or merely morphological ordering of clitics, there is a risk to overlook syntactic mechanisms of linearization.

I am arguing that most Slavic languages lack grammaticalized constraints on the placement of (non-clitic) verbal forms in sentences with the basic word order, but such constraints tend to arise in sentences with derived word order, producing non-initial sequences [Verb - Clitic] and [Clitic – Verb] in main clause declaratives.

I. Approaches to word order typology:
   a. linearization of elementary binary groups,
   b. linearization of extended groups
   c. syntactic constraints on linearization and spell-out.

II. Classification of scrambling types in the Slavic languages.
   a. Scrambling of non-clitic elements.
   b. Scrambling of clitics.
III. Slavic clitic systems with sententional clitics.
   a. Clusterizing vs non-clusterizing clitics.
   b. Prosodic vs syntactic approaches to clitics.
   c. Classification of Slavic word order systems: W*-systems, W*-systems, C*-systems.
   d. Clitic Phrases and the Template Principle.
   e. Constituency conditions.
   f. Barrier Rules and a typology of Barriers.

- The Basic word order and the branching conditions.

1. Local linearization rules.
1.1. Branching conditions embody the asymmetry of the Head and Complement in elementary binary groups: the rules of linearizing Head and Complement in such groups may be called local.

Modern and Old Slavic languages use uniform in the use of local rules. The most salient branching conditions are:
- Prepositions, not postpositions (Pr + N°),
- Postposed verbal objects (V° + O),
- Preposed attributive adjectives (Adj Attr + N°)
- Postposed relative clauses (matrix clause° + relative clause).

The Greenbergian typology aims at deriving the sentence linearization formula (SVO, SOV, VSO, VOS, OSV, OVS) from the local rules and operates with statistical predictions.

1.2. If all world languages always had consistent branching, the Greenbergian typology always gave absolutely safe results. There are 3 deviating factors, due to those the linearization of a sentence is not always directly derivable from local rules:

- The diachronic factor — inconsistent branching may be due to a language drift from the parametric setting $A$ to its mirror value $\bar{A}$: at the onset and outset of this period the branching is consistent, in the middle there are deviations.
- Synchronic variance — contact/distant, base-generated/inverted word orders may coexist and have a different functional load (which is not necessarily due to the diachronic factor).
- Grammaticalization of topological templates — world's languages on a certain stage of their evolution may generalize topological templates for a segment of syntactic structure of even for a whole clause.

(1) Polish
   a. Dziewczyna (1) ta (2) jest studentką pierwszego roku N + D «This (2) girl (1) is a student of the first year».

   b. Ta (1) Dziewczyna (2) jest studentką pierwszego roku, a tamta już kończy uniwersytet «THIS (1) girl (2) is a student of the first year, <and that one already finished the university>».

1.3. Global rules = rules for linearizing extended groups (phrases), segments of a syntactic structure consisting of more than two slots, and the whole clause.
(2) S Adv V O_{indir} O_{dir}.

(3a) a. Rus. Вася быстро сделал Кате предложение.

b. Bulg. Топалов небрежно разменя пешката на e4 и попадна под сила атака.

c. Bulg. Иван бързо беше прочел книгата.

d. Bulg. ’Иван беше бързо прочел книгата.

(4) S *Adv [V_{fin} Adv V_{inf} O_{indir} O_{dir}].

a. Rus. Вася *быстро хотел быстро сделать Кате предложение.

‘Vasja wanted a proposal to Kate quickly/immediately’.

b. Bulg. Вася [быстро, хотел [быстро, сделать Кате предложение]]

(5) Rus. Вася не хотел быстро делать Кате предложение.

‘Vasja did not want to propose to Kate immediately’.

1.3. An ideal of the classical structuralism: to introduce global rules without explicitly introducing syntactic constraints on inversion.

(6)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
S & NEG & V_{fin} & Adv & V_{inf} & O_{indir} & O_{dir} \\
\hline
Вася & $\emptyset$ & Сделал & $\emptyset$ & $\emptyset$ & Kate & предложение \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

1.4. Can such a description be effective? Only if a language has highly grammaticalized templates for an extended groups or whole clauses.

(7) Pol. [DP D $^\circ$…[FP QualA … [ClassP N [NP ClassA t]]]]

(8) Pol.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
D & QualA1 & QualA2 & N & ClassA \\
\hline
Ta & Interesująca & Nowa & Gramatika & Generatiwna \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

‘This interesting new generative grammar’.

1.4. The case of Bulgarian. Bulgarian according to some descriptions has 2P clitics, while sentenceional negation, the future marker and predicate heads take positions adjacent to positions of clitics.

(9) Bulg. XP-NEG-AUX.FUT – CL – V ~ V-CL.

But the template will change drastically if we add the symbol for the clausal left sentence margin and try to establish the distance from each category to the clausal left margin.
On reasons specified, many linguistic believe that any syntactic distances (1P, 2P, 3P….) are epiphenomenal (a term used to brand pre-theoretical and non-operational approaches to language structure). Is this belief justified or hasty?

II. Scrambling

2.1. Local vs unbounded scrambling.

With local scrambling, the permutating arguments belong to one and the same verbal (predicate) head. With unbounded scrambling, the permutating arguments may belong to different heads: \([A^1 [B^2 [C^3 v^3] v^2], v^1]\). Unbounded scrambling (unfortunately for some theorists) is attested in world’s languages, cf. (10) for German subordinate clauses with embedded IPs.

   Lit. ‘that nobody [for-the-cliten]² [[the fridge]³ to repair]² to promise]² not has tried’
   ‘That nobody did not even make an attempt to promise the client to repair the fridge’

b. daß niemand [den Kühlschrank]₁ [[dem Kunden] [t₁ zu reparieren] zu versprechen] versucht hat;

c. daß [den Kühlschrank]₁ niemand [[dem Kunden] [t₁ zu reparieren] zu versprechen] versucht hat;


e. нём. daß [den Kühlschrank]₁ [dem Kunden]₁ niemand [t₁ [t₁ zu reparieren] zu versprechen] versucht hat;


(11) Ger. \([CP Comp \{SCRAMBLING\_DOMAIN \{A^1 +B^2 + C^3\} \[VP [v^3, [v^2, [v^1]]]\}] AUX \)

2.2. Short vs Long Distance scrambling.

With short scrambling, the moved element remains in the same clause. With long distance scrambling, the moved element is extracted to a higher domain.

(12) Scrambling of non-clitic elements in the Slavic languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A. Local Scrambling</th>
<th>B. Unbounded scrambling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Short Scrambling</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Long Distance Scrambling</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(13) Rus. Профессор Иванов посетил нашу лабораторию в июне (S+V+O+Adv\text{\text{Temp}}) \Rightarrow [Нашу лабораторию], профессор Иванов посетил т. в июне (O+V+S+Adv\text{\text{Temp}}).

The same relation can be shown for adjuncts, cf. Czech examples in (14)

(14) a. … že Maria profesora, [v jeho, bytě] už několikrát navštívila.
   «…that Mary has already several times visited the professor, [in his, flat] ».

b. \( \Rightarrow \) чеш. … že [v jeho, bytě] Maria profesora, t. už několikrát navštívila.

c. \( \Rightarrow \) чеш. že Maria [v jeho, bytě] profesora, t. už několikrát navštívila.

A2. Long Distance & Local Scrambling.

The scrambling condition is attested in the initial domain, but not in the final domain. This is possible if the extracted element can take only one position in the higher domain.

(15) a. Rus. Мы бы хотели, чтобы министерство назначило профессора И. куратором нашей лаборатории
   “We would like that the ministry appointed professor I. curator of our laboratory”.

b. \( \Rightarrow \) [[Профессора И. ], [мы бы хотели, [чтобы министерство назначило t, куратором нашей лаборатории]]].

Lit. ‘Professor I., we would like [that the ministry appointed t, curator of our laboratory’

Cf. also extractions out an NP with an embedded relative clause:

(16a) Bulg. Ще=бъдат [две тоалетните, [като всеки от състезателите ще=може да ползва [която пожелае]].
   «There will be two toilet rooms, [which can be used by any of the sportsmen, [who wants]]»

b. \( \Rightarrow \) [[Тоалетните], ще бъдат [две t, като всеки от състезателите ще=може да ползва [която пожелае]]].

B2. Long-Distance & Unbounded Scrambling.

(17) \([A^\circ[B^\circ[C^\circ[D^\circ\text{E}]]]]\).

Moving the blocks DE, CDE and embedding the heads \( A^\circ, B^\circ \) into lower constituents one can get orders like \([CDE], A^\circ B^\circ t_i, [[DE], C^\circ t_j], A^\circ B^\circ t_i, [[DE], \ldots A^\circ_k \ldots C^\circ t_j], t_k B^\circ t_i, \ldots A^\circ_k \ldots[[DE], C^\circ t_j], t_k B^\circ t_i\), where \( t_i,j,k \) – traces of the moved heads or blocks.

Fig 1. Long-Distance Unbounded Scrambling in Russian

(17') Rus. Арбитры\(^1\) не имели права\(^1\) [фоксировать\(^2\) победу\(^2\) «Триумфа»]i.
   ‘The referees had no right to fix the victory of ‘Triumph’’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic word order</td>
<td>([A^\circ[B^\circ[C^\circ[D^\circ\text{E}]]]]) (17a) rus. Арбитры(^1) не имели права(^1) [фоксировать(^2) победу(^2) «Триумфа»]i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived orders</td>
<td>([CDE], A^\circ B^\circ t_i), (17 b) ( \Rightarrow ) [фоксировать победу «Триумфа»]i, арбитры не имели права t.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-projective crossing of groups not involved in an immediate dominance relation are rare.

(18) \( [sAB] [y CD] \Rightarrow [sA [y C x... B]... y D] \).

Examples with disjoint constituents and embedding are generally more acceptable than examples with non-projective crossing. Cf. Russian examples (19 a-c).

(19) a. \[x Жители столицы] [любят \[y пивную продукцию Клина]].

(19) b. \[y Клина], [жиители столицы] [любят \[y пивную продукцию т.]].

(19) c. \*[y Клина], [столицы], [любят \[y пивную продукцию т.]] [x жители т.].

If one cancels a requirement that the scrambled elements must represent one and the same sentence category or the requirement that they must be hierarchically independent, Short Unbounded Scrambling can be in found in other constructions, especially in constructions with 2P clitics splitting the initial constituent, as in (20)

(20) a. Old. Rus. а и-Суждальской {Scrambling =му (1) земле (2)} Новагорода не рядити (ГВНП, №. 1, 1264 г.).

―And from Suzdal’s land (2), you (1) should not rule Novgorod‖.

b.*а [и-Суждальской земле] =му.

2.3. Clitic scrambling.

Free clitics pattern with non-clitic elements. Clusterizing clitics do not have short scrambling by definition, since they make up ordered clusters in their domain. At the same time, clusterizing clitics can be extracted into a higher clause (‘clitic climbing’) which may eventually lead to Long-Distance Unbounded Scrambling, if a higher domain has its own set of clusterizing clitics and if the moved clitics have more than one target in higher clauses.

Fig. 2 Scrambling of clusterizing clitics in the Slavic languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A. Local Scrambling</th>
<th>B. Unbounded Scrambling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Short Scrambling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Long –Distance Scrambling</td>
<td>Clitic Climbing (+)</td>
<td>Clitic Scrambling +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(21) \[ТР… [Сліп a1 b1 c1 d1 ] v1^0] [v v2 o t1].

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rusin. = (22)  
\[
\text{that}^{1} = \{=\text{REFL}^{2}=\text{to-him}^{2}\} \text{ and I went}^{1} \text{ to bow.low.}^{2}. 
\]

2.4. Long-Distance Unbounded Scrambling in Slovene.

(23) a. \{ \text{SCRAMBLING On}^{1} = \text{je}^{2} \text{hotel}^{1} \text{ nehati}^{2} \text{ hoteti}^{2} [\text{videvati}^{2} \text{ t} \text{ vsak dan}] \}^{2}. \text{He wanted to stop wanting to see her every day}.

b. \{ \text{SCRAMBLING On}^{1} = \text{je}^{2} \text{hotel}^{1} \text{# nehati}^{2} \text{ hoteti}^{2} [\text{videvati}^{2} \text{ t} \text{ vsak dan}] \}. 

c. \{ \text{SCRAMBLING On}^{1} = \text{je}^{2} \text{hotel}^{1} \# = \text{jo}^{2} \text{ nehati}^{2} \text{ hoteti}^{2} [\text{videvati}^{2} \text{ t} \text{ vsak dan}] \}. 

d. \{ \text{SCRAMBLING On}^{1} = \text{je}^{2} \text{hotel}^{1} \# = \text{jo}^{2} \text{ hoteti}^{2} [\text{videvati}^{2} \text{ t} \text{ vsak dan}] \}. 

e. \{ \text{SCRAMBLING On}^{1} = \text{je}^{2} \text{hotel}^{1} \text{ nehati}^{2} \text{ hoteti}^{2} \# = \text{jo}^{2} \text{ [videvati}^{2} \text{ t} \text{ vsak dan}] \}. 

f. \{ \text{SCRAMBLING On}^{1} = \text{je}^{2} \text{hotel}^{1} \# \text{ nehati}^{2} \text{ hoteti}^{2} \text{ [videvati}^{2} = \text{jo}^{2} \text{ vsak dan}] \}. 

III. Slavic clusterizing clitics.

3.0. Prosodic clitics and syntactic clitics.

For the aims of the paper is irrelevant, whether Slavic 2P clitics share all taxonomic properties with elements labeled ‘clitics’ in the descriptions of other world’s languages.

- Prosodic clitics are elements that cannot make a phonetic word when used in isolation and must combine with other elements (both non-clitic and clitic ones, if a language allows all-clitic words). Prosodic clitics make one phonetic word with their host.

- Syntactic clitics are elements taking positions that are reserved for prosodically and/or syntactically deficient expressions.

- There may be a mismatch of prosodic vs syntactic properties of 2P clitics.

- Bg 2P pronominal and auxiliary elements from a syntactic viewpoint are strict enclitics, since they cannot be fronted and require a spelled-out host in XP. At the same time, under certain conditions they may occur after a pause, as mentioned, e.g. in (Franks 2008: 100) and (Kosta 2009).

- In a similar way, Slovene 2P pronouns and Be-auxiliaries lack stress and are true prosodic clitics: they can be fronted in communicatively marked contexts, but the markedness of these contexts suggests that their canonical position is 2P and from a syntactic viewpoint they are mild enclitics. Slovene also has 2P modal auxiliaries like mora ‘must’ which seldom leave clausal 2P and are almost never fronted (Golden & Sheppard 2000). The paradox is that strict encliticity of Slov. mora cannot be explained by prosody, since mora is a stressed word. A similar observation on a different kind of syntactic 2P clitics in the Ukrainian dialect of Sinevir is made by Tolstaja (2000).

- Consistent prosodic theories of Slavic clitics, cf. (Dybo 1975), account for the fact that clitics are a phonetically heterogeneous class and that combinatory features of deficient elements

---

1 Example (22) is from [Браун 2008].
2 Examples (24 a-f) are from [Marušić 2007]
may differ: a subclass of Common Slavic clitics used to take stress from a subclass of non-clitic words, while another subclass of clitics did not possess this capacity. For a consistent syntactic theory all purely phonetic/prosodic features of a subclass of clitics are irrelevant — it does not matter, whether e.g. all 2P clitics are stressed or unstressed, high tonal or low tonal etc., if all of them exhibit a uniform syntactic behavior.

3.1. Clitic clusters.

**Definition:** A cluster is a string of clitics that neither allows insertion of non-clitic elements nor permutations of clitics, when they take a contact position. Ranking Rules/Template Principle predict that for each two clitics $a^\circ$, $b^\circ$ belonging to a ordered cluster $[\text{CliticP } a^\circ, b^\circ, c^\circ \ldots n^\circ]$ a linear relation of the type ‘$a^\circ > b^\circ$’ (‘$a^\circ$ precedes $b^\circ$’) can be established and no alternative ordering is permitted if $a^\circ$ and $b^\circ$ assume a contact position.

3.1. 1. If the clitics take a distant position and do not form a single string, this requirement does not hold. That is, if $a^\circ$, $b^\circ$, $c^\circ$ are clitic heads belonging to a cluster $[\text{CliticP } a^\circ, b^\circ, c^\circ \ldots n^\circ]$, sequences like $X=b^\circ(2)=c^\circ(3)=a^\circ(1)$ are excluded, if all these clitics are attached to one and the same sentence category $X$, but if $b^\circ$, $c^\circ$ attach to $X$, while $a^\circ$ attaches to $Y$, sequences like $X=b^\circ(2)=c^\circ(3) Y=a^\circ(1)$ are possible.

- Contrary to Bošković (2001:21), disjoint placement of clusterizing clitics does not by itself defy the existence of clusters if the Template Principle is not violated and syntactic configurations with cluster splitting can be proved to be derived from configurations without splitting. Rules triggering cluster splitting are called ‘Barrier Rules’ in the tradition based on Zaliznjak (1993: 288), cf. also (Zimmerling 2008).
- It is plausible that the same mechanism - Barrier Rules - also triggers configurations with the so called late clitic placement, where the whole cluster attaches not to first sentence category $X$ but to some category $Y$ to the right of $X$: $[X]... Y = a^\circ(1) = b^\circ(2) = c^\circ(3)$.

3.2. Clusterizing and non-clusterizing clitics.

Slavic languages only have clause-level clusterizing clitics and lack clusterization in non-predicative phrases. This feature is typologically common but not quite trivial.

- Some other languages allow clusterization of clitics both on the clause-level and on the phrase-level. E.g., Arawak languages Warekena (Aikhenvald 1998: 259) and Tarjana (Aikhenvald 2002: 59-60) use clitic clusters both in VP and NP, and Wakashan languages Makah and Ditidaht, according to Werle (2002), have both clausal 2P clusterizing clitics and NP-level clusterizing clitics.
- In Slavic languages this is strictly impossible: the clusterizing capacity of a Slavic clitic indicates that it is a clause-level element; in the standard case it is hosted by the first syntactic element.
3.3. The positioning of Slavic clitic clusters/clusterizing clitics has two relevant syntactic conditions:

(i) Clusterizing clitics must have a slot in a Clitic Template, available only for this particular clitic or for this type of clitics (e.g. all argument dative clitics if they take the same slot in this language). Other clitics and non-clitic words do not have slots in Clitic Templates.

(ii) Clitic clusters/clusterizing clitics have a fixed position in a clause, they attach to the clausal-initial element and form Clitic-Second orders in communicatively unmarked sentences.

3.4. Clitic Phrases.

A single clusterizing clitic taking 2P is interpreted as a manifestation of CliticP.

- I do not stipulate, whether all clitics in languages with clitic clusters should invariably be analyzed as heads (X°) or left-branching elements (X°/XP), cf. Bošković (2001), but I hope that the analysis outline here is compatible with either approach.

Two state-of-the-art generalizations:

(iii) Slavic clusterizing clitics can only be clause-level clitics and take clausal 2P with the basic word order.

(iv) Slavic languages do not have any other type of clusterizing elements, except for clausal 2P clitics. Clausal 2P elements do not clusterize with non-clitic words.

Slavic 2P clitics = ‘clusterizing clausal 2P elements, which behave as syntactic clitics and impose constraints on the placement of other sentence categories’.

3.5. Inventory of 2P Slavic clitics.

Slavic 2P clusters may include 4 different categories of clitics. A) Sentential 2P particles: from 0 up to 6 slots in a template. B) Argument Dative, Accusative and Genetive pronominal clitics: from 2 to 3 slots in a template (Browne 2008), but only two argument clitics may co-occur in a string. C) Reflexive clitics in Accusative and Dative case: from 0 to 1 slot in a template. D) Auxiliary clitics: from 1 up to 3 slots in a template, maximum 2 auxiliaries in a string.

- The extremum of 6 particles in a template is reached in late Old Russian (XVI-XVII centuries) which used clusterizing particles =li=ze=bo=ti=by=dé(i), see Zaliznjak (2008: 44) for details.
- Most modern Slavic languages retain only li in the template or eliminate all particles.
- East Slavic shows a trend to eliminate reflexive clitics from the template.
• The extremum of 3 AUX slots in a template is reached in the Ukrainian Sinevir system (see fig. 1 above).

3.6. Clause-level clitics and phrase-level clitics.

Slavic languages with clusterizing clitics always have non-clusterizing clitics. The reverse implication is false: all Slavic clusterizing clitics are clause-level clitics, while non-clusterizing clitics may both be clause-level and phrase-level elements. This distribution is not lexically driven: one and the same clitic may be clusterizing as a clause-level element and non-clusterizing as a phrase-level element.

• For instance, Slavic pronominal clitics in the dative case clusterize when used as predicate arguments but do not clusterize when used as possessive markers in NP/DPs — an option attested in Bg, Mac, OCS and Old Russian (Zaliznjak 2008: 35).
• An exact typological parallel is found in Ossetian, an Iranian language with clausal 2P-clitics. If a dative/genitive clitic is used in Ossetian as a predicate argument, it clusterizes with other 2P-clitics. If it is used as a possessive marker in NPs, it does not clusterize.
• Slavic pronominal clitics in the accusative case reveal the same duality but in a slightly different configuration. If they are used as predicate arguments, they clusterize in 2P.
• If they adjoin to preposition heads and produce special series of bound pronouns, cf. SC na=me, na=te, na=nj and similar forms in OCS and Old Russian, they do not clusterize. Even there, where bound preposition-accusative forms are morphologically identical to free accusative clitics, they retain different properties. Free accusative clitics can climb, if the language has this option, bound accusative clitics do not leave their phrase and do not climb Čavar and Wilder (1999: 445).

(25) a. SC da=je Ivan raĉunao [pp na=me] 
   That= BE.AUX.PRS.3Sg Ivan counted [on me]

   b. SC *Da=me;j=je Ivan raĉunao [pp na ti].

3.7. Geographical variation.

All present-day Slavic idioms have clitics, but clusterizing clitics are only attested in South and West Slavic areas. East Slavic languages — standard Russian, standard Belorussian and standard Ukrainian — lack clusterizing clitics and grammaticalized constraints on the placement of 2P clitics and licensing of their hosts. Such constraints are found elsewhere in South and East Slavic.

• Historically, the absence of clusterizing clitics in the East Slavic area results from decline of the short pronouns, but for synchronic typology this detail is irrelevant.

(v) Slavic languages with clusterizing pronominal clitics always have other types of clusterizing clitics. (Modern East) Slavic languages lacking clusterizing pronominal clitics lack other types of clusterizing clitics as well.
3.8. Areal types of Clitic Templates.

There are three areal types of Slavic clitic templates: they are distinguished by the location of a slot for present tense indicative BE-auxiliaries.

The West Slavic type of a clitic template locates 1-2 p. present tense indicative BE-auxiliaries immediately before the block of clitic pronouns [Refl + Dat+ Acc]. Let us refer to this slot as AUX1.

- West Slavic type of a clitic template:
  \[(26) [\text{Clitic Phrase} \cdot [\text{Clitic Phrase} \text{AUX1}] [\text{Clitic Phrase Pronouns: Refl – Dat - Acc}]]^3.\]

The Old Novgorod/East Slavic type of a clitic template locates 1-2 p. present tense indicative BE-auxiliaries immediately after the block of clitic pronouns: [\text{Clitic Phrase} \ldots [\text{Dat + Acc}]\ldots]. We refer to this slot as AUX2.

- Old Novgorod /East Slavic type of a clitic template.
  \[(27) [\text{Clitic Phrase} \ldots [\text{Clitic Phrase Pronouns: Dat - Acc}] [\text{Clitic Phrase AUX2}]]^4.\]

South Slavic languages make use of both AUX1 and AUX2. All 1-2 p. present tense indicative BE-auxiliaries and all 3 p. present tense indicative BE-auxiliaries except for 3 Sg. \(\text{=je}\) take AUX1, while 3Sg. \(\text{=je}\) takes AUX2. This peculiar split-auxiliary placement is due to the fact that 3Sg. \(\text{=je}\) was made part of the clitic template considerably later than other forms from the present tense indicative BE-paradigm (Zimmerling 2002: 82)\(^5\).

- Balcanic Slavic type of a clitic template.
  \[(28)[\text{Clitic Phrase} \ldots [\text{Clitic Phrase AUX1}] [\text{Clitic Phrase Pronouns: Refl + Dat + Acc + Gen}] [\text{Clitic Phrase AUX2}]].\]

- Late Old Russian subtype of a clitic template.
  \[(29) [\text{Clitic Phrase} \ldots [\text{Clitic Phrase Pronouns: Dat + Acc}] [\text{Clitic Phrase AUX2}] [\text{Clitic Phrase AUX4}]].\]

(30) Old Russ Čto\(=t\text{i}=\text{s’}=\text{a}=\text{jesm’}=\text{byl} \text{otstupil} \text{bratu svoemu} (1401-02 \text{AC})\(^6\). That indeed REFL-ACC BE-AUX-PRES.1Sg BE-AUX-PST give.up.PRF.3Sg,M brother.DAT.SG.M one’s.own.DAT.SG.M.

‘That you indeed had given up these in favour of your brother’.

---

3 In the West Slavic languages AUX1 also hosts conditional forms of BE, cf. Czech \(\text{bych, bys, by}\) etc.
4 In the Old Novgorod/East Slavic type of a clitic template the slot AUX2 does not host any other auxiliaries except for the 1-2 p. present tense indicative BE-forms.
5 Note that neither West nor East Slavic languages had 3p. present tense indicative BE-auxiliaries at all.
6 The example (5) is from Zaliznjak (2008: 40). The clitic \(\text{ti}\) in it is a particle, not a 2p. pronoun.
• Carpathian Ukrainian subtype of a clitic template.

(31) [Clitic Phrase … [Clitic Phrase AUX3] [Clitic Phrase AUX1] [Clitic Phrase Pronouns] [Clitic Phrase AUX2]].

(32) Ukr dial Ja=s’a [ščos’] [use] yr’ixuju. [CP ščo može vûn des’s’a=boow [i] napriw].

I REFL.-ACC now all this blame.-PRS.1SG. that maybe he here REFL.-ACC BE.-AUX.PST.3SG.M drink.-PRF.3SG.M.

‘I am still blaming him for that he probably got drunk right here’, lit. ‘that…he here=himself=had drunk’.

Fig. 3: The clitic template of the Sinevir dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUX3</th>
<th>AUX1</th>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>AUX2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bım (boom), bıs’, bısmе, bıste</td>
<td>Boo</td>
<td>(ȅ)m, (ȅ)s’, sme, ste;</td>
<td>I. — noncorrelative: mi, ti, si, mu, ji (jij), II — correlative: nam, vam, jim, nim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 Principles of Clitic Ordering in a cluster.

3.9.1. In Slavic clitic templates, 2P particles normally precede the block of pronouns & auxiliaries, irrespective of the fact, whether the auxiliaries take AUX1, AUX2 or both slots.

In the most transparent case, the blocks of 2P particles, 2P pronouns and 2P auxiliaries do not intersect in a template: clitic strings consisting of 2P particles cannot be intervened by any 2P auxiliaries and vice versa. This condition is shown in (vi): the capital letters A, B, C are for different categories of clusterizing clitics, the lowercase letters with indexes a₁, b₁, cⁿ are for particular clitics representing categories A, B, C.

\[ \text{(vi)} \quad [\text{CliticPhrase} [A\ a₁,\ a²…aⁿ] [B\ b₁,\ b²…bⁿ] [C\ c₁,\ c²…cⁿ]]. \]

3.9.2 The ONR clitic template is a close approximation to the ideal pattern (vi), except for the fact that it has only one slot for the auxiliary clitics. In this system, all 2P particles precede all 2P pronouns, and all 2P pronouns precede all 2P auxiliaries.

---

7 Fig. 1 accounts for Sinevir clitic clusters in sentences in the indicative mood.
3.9.3. SC, Bg and Mac clitic templates include a clusterizing particle \( li \) (\( a^* \)), a block of pronouns (\( b^* \)) and two distant slots for auxiliaries (\( c^* \)). One slot (AUX1) precedes the pronouns, while another slot (AUX2) is located after them, but since elements filling AUX1 and AUX2 do not co-occur the condition (vi) is not violated in (vii).

\[
\text{(vii)} \quad [\text{ClinicPhrase} \ [A \ a_1^1] \ [C \ c_1^1] \ [B \ b_1^1, b_2^1 \ldots b_n^1] \ [C \ c_2^1] \ ~^* [C \ c_1^1 [B \ b_n^1] \ C \ c_2^1]].
\]

3.10. The Categorial and the Diachronical Principles of cluster ordering.

(viii) In Slavic languages, strings generated by clitic templates conform to the Categorial Principle: a sequence of two 2P clitics a_1, a_n representing the same category A cannot be intervened by any clitic b_n representing category B.

(ix) Slavic clitic templates are assembled according to the Categorial Principle: clitics are grouped according to their taxonomic category: Particle \( \triangleright \) Pronoun \( \triangleright \) Auxiliary. The order of non-intersecting blocks in a clitic template embodies some relevant hierarchy of sentence categories.

(x) The order of clitics inside each block of 2P clitics in a clitic template is set out by the Diachronical Principle predicting that most recent clitics adjoin to the already existing clitics of the same category from the right.

4. Constituency conditions.

Slavic clusterizing clitics are best described as 2P clitics taking Comp/XP as their standard host. With the basic word order, there can be only one phrase (maximal projection) in 1P before in main clauses with clusterizing clitics.

Slavic languages possess six options for the placement of 2P clausal clitics:
A. After the first stressed word form: obligatory in ONR, optional in OCS, Old Russian, Slovak, SC.

B. After the first spelled-out constituent: optional in OCS, Old Russian, SC, obligatory in other languages.

C. After the initial proclitic: a rare option, marginally attested in Old Russian, Bg, Slovene.

D. After the complementizer in subordinate clauses: all languages.

E. After a quotation phrase: Czech, Slovene.

F. After a sentential constituent: only Slovene.

- All Slavic languages with clusterizing clitics, including Bg and Czech, ban multiple fronting of the following groups: *[V\textsubscript{fin} + O]=CL, *[S + Vf\textsubscript{fin}]=CL, *[V\textsubscript{fin} + Adv]=CL, *[S+O]=CL.

- The constraint on fronting finite verbs with their complements extends to Slavic l-participle in the perfect construction: neither fronted finite verbs nor fronted l-participles may pied-pipe their complements to XP.

- In a similar way, a combination of a subject NP and an object NP is banned under XP-fronting.

4.2. Initial ensembles in Czech and Bulgarian.

4.2.1. Clitic-Second orders may also occur in communicatively marked sentences, as e.g. in colloquial Czech:

\begin{align*}
(33) & \{\text{Contr. Topic \[XP \ [NP\ Petra] \ [PP \ do \ Francie]\] } \} (1)=bych (2) ještě poslal, ale Martina do Maďarska ani náhodou \\
& \text{‘I would send Petr to France, but never Martin to Hungary’, cf. Hana (2008).}
\end{align*}

This is due to a special parameter setting – in Czech main clauses, multi-word initial constituents serve as possible hosts for clusterizing clitics, and Czech seldom if ever makes use of derived Clitic-Third orders like * [XP \ [NP Petra] \ [PP \ do \ Francie]] (1) poslal (2) =bych (3) ještě.

4.2.2. Bulgarian.

There is an trend in Slavic studies to exclude Bg from the list of languages with 2P pronominal and auxiliary clitics and to analyze them as verb-adjacent elements, typically left-adjoined to V or VP, cf. Halpern (1996), or even as ‘agreement morphemes’ located in the verbal complex, cf. Franks (2008).

No analysis of the Bulgarian word order system can ignore the fact that there is a constraint on the number of groups preceding pronominal and auxiliary clitics. Cf. (34)

\begin{align*}
(34) & \text{a. \ʰ[Kupil \ bih]=ja knigata ‘I would rather buy this book’, lit. ‘[bought would-1Sg] = it the book’,} \\
& \text{b.*[knigata] \ʰ[Kupil \ bih]=ja, *\ʰ[Kupil-bih] \[knigata]=ja.}
\end{align*}
This gives a ground to state that the principle of 2P placement is not violated in Bg, whatever the reason may be. The constraint on a single constituent in XP is not violated in Bg and Czech: multiple XP-fronting is an additional resource that allows merging two maximal projections of the licensed type into a single topical constituent.

5. Tobler-Musaffia’s Law, 2P-clitics and VA-clitics Revisited

From a syntactic viewpoint Slavic clusterizing clitics can be classified with four types. I ignore purely prosodic factors as (im)possibility of clitic placement after a prosodic break and account only for orientation of clitics towards their hosts and for the possibility of clitic fronting.

A. Strict enclitics = TM clitics. Fronting of clusterizing clitics is impossible in any context: SC, Bg, Czech, Slovak, ONR, Sinevir dialect.
B. Mild enclitics. Fronting of clusterizing clitics is only possible in communicatively marked contexts, otherwise it is excluded: Slovene.
C. Mild proclitics or universal clitics. Fronting of clusterizing clitics is possible or obligatory in communicatively neutral contexts: Mac.
D. Strict proclitics. Procliticization to finite verbs is generalized, enclisis configurations are excluded: (?) Moliselav (Kosta 2009).


6.1. The basic word order in Slavic sentences with clusterizing clitics is not realized automatically. There are two main deviations from the basic order #XP – CL that must be classified with derived orders – a) late placement of clusters, b) splitting. Under a), the whole clitic cluster ends up to the right of clausal 2P. Under b), some clusterizing clitics remain in clausal 2P, while other clusterizing clitics end up to the right of it. These two configurations are not restricted with Slavic languages and are widely attested in other world’s languages with 2P clitics, cf. Halpern (1996).

Numerous explanations of a) and b) exist, but Barrier Theory introduced by Zaliznjak (1993: 287) and modified in (Zimmerling 2002: 88) and (Zimmerling 2009) is the only theory, which explains late placement of clusters and splitting by one and the same underlying mechanism.

• The main hypothesis is that the sentence-initial group/lexical head hosting the clitics may have properties of a Barrier and move all or some clusterizing clitics to right of clausal 2P. The first option is referred to as ‘blind’ or ‘indiscriminating’ Barrier, the second option is referred to as ‘selective’ Barrier (Zimmerling 2009).

6.2. Barrier effects or ‘Barrier Rules’, in terms of Zaliznjak (2008), are also attested in languages with VP-internal clitics, where they map configurations with verbal enclitics onto configurations with verbal proclitics or vice versa: Rouveret (1999) argues it is the case in European Portuguese main and embedded declaratives. In languages with clausal 2P clitics Barrier Rules do not change the orientation of clitics but invariably shift all or selected clitics to the right of clausal 2P. In a general form, the notion of a Barrier is rendered in (xi) and (xii)
A Barrier is a syntactic category (a lexical head or a phrase) taking effect on the position of clitics. It can change the orientation of a clitic towards the clitic host or move a clitic in a given direction n steps to the right /left of the clitic host.

In 2P languages sentence-initial Barriers are either blind and move all clusterizing clitics n steps to the right of clausal 2P or selective and split the clusters by moving some clusterizing clitics n steps to the right of clausal 2P.

To Ivan kniga-the BE.AUX.PRS.1Sg. him-DAT.3SG.M. it-ACC.3SG.F. return-PRF.1SG.M.

‘I returned the book to Ivan’.

In less than two months, Topalov has to play a match for the chess title against the world champion Anand.’

In case of shortages, you must pay me with livestock’.

‘His thick black hair curled behind the ears’.

‘Haven’t you heard about that worthy cross from the king’s man?’

‘Won’t you read the book by tomorrow?’
6.3. A generalized pattern of a main clause topicalized blind Barrier.

(xiii) \{TopicP [ XP]} – CL….V \Rightarrow \{BARRIER \{TopicP [ XP]} \} \{V_i – CL\}…t. 

6.4. Li-inversion in Bulgarian. A generalized model of the selective Barrier of the Bulgarian type.

(xiv) Bg \[BARRIER_a [XPX]}] = CL a+b+c \Rightarrow \{BARRIER_a [XPX]}] = CL b+a+c 

(43) a. Bg jade=im=se.
Eat-PRES.3SG. they-DAT.PL. REFL-ACC.
‗They are hungry‘.

b. Bg Jade =li (1)=im (2)=se (3)?
Eat-PRES.3SG. Q they-DAT.PL. REFL-ACC.
‗Are they hungry?‘

c. Bg \[BARRIER_a [NegP Ne]}=im^b (2) =li^a (1)=se^c (3) jade?
Not-PRCL. they-DAT.PL. Q REFL-ACC. eat-PRES.3SG.
‗Aren‘t they hungry?‘

d. Bg \[Ne=li^a (1)=im^b (2) =se^c (3) jade?

6.4. Multiple Barriers and Blocking of the Barrier effects

3 languages - SC, Slovak and Bg – developed a constraint on the combination of Barriers. In these languages the effect of a single initial Barrier with clitic movement may be cancelled if a second phrase with Barrier properties is added. For the data, see in (Ćavar & Wilder 1999: 452-453) and (Zimmerling 2002: 88). Typological parallels from languages with VP-internal clitics can be found in (Rouveret 1999: 641).

7. Classification of Slavic word order systems.

Following (Zimmerling 2006), I classify all Slavic word order systems with 4 types tagged W-systems, W+-systems, W*-systems and C-systems. The definitions follow below. The symbol ‘W’ stands for ‘Word’ or ‘Wackernagel’, ‘W+’ stands for ‘modified Wackernagel system’, ‘W*’ stands for ‘degraded Wackernagel system’, ‘C’ stands for ‘communicative’.
7.1. Standard W-systems

- Language L is a standard W-system if the placement of clusterizing clitics to clausal 2P is the most grammaticalized constraint on word order.

Slavic languages from this type are SC, Burgenland Croatian (Browne 2007), Slovene, Vojvodina Rusinsky (Browne 2008), Czech, Slovak, ONR, Sinevir dialect. W-systems are found in various areas in different language families. The first W-system discovered was Old Greek; its first explicit description was given by Jacob Wackernagel (1892). Other W-systems in the Indo-European family are Avestan, Sanskrit (Hock 1996), Hittite and Luwian (Anatolian), Ossetian and Pashto (Iranian). W-systems in non-Indo-European languages are, e.g. Kabile Berber (Afroasiatic), Warlpiri and Djaru (Pama-Nyungan), Lummi (Salish), cf. Jelinek (2000), Makah and Ditidaht (Wakashan), cf. Werle (2002), Quiavini Zapotec (Otomangean), cf. Lee (2000), Cavineña (Tacanan), cf. (Guillaume 2008).

7.2. W+-systems

- Language L is a W+-system if its most grammaticalized constraints on word order put clusterizing clitics into a fixed position and locate verbal forms in positions adjacent with the position of clusterizing clitics.

Slavic languages from this type are Bg and Mac. In W+-systems of the Bg/Mac subtype the position of the verb/nominal predicate is fixed if clusterizing clitics are present and not fixed otherwise. The clitics take 2P (Bg) or 1P/2P (Mac) and attract verbal forms to adjacent positions. The Bg W+-system conforms to the formula (xv):

(xv) Bg # XP — [CL — V] ~ #[V — CL]; #..... V….#

The Mac W+-system conforms to the formula (xvi).

(xvi) Mac. # XP — [CL — V] ~ #[V — CL] ~#[CL—V]; #..... V….#

- An exact parallel to the Bg W+-system is furnished by Central Philippine languages Tagalog, Bikol and Cebwano: all of them conform to the formula (xv), as demonstrated in (Billings, Konopasky 2002).

7.2.1. W+-systems of a different subtype combine the constraint on the placement of clitic cluster with the Verb-second constraint or the V2/V1 constraint. Such word order systems are attested in Old Nordic and Middle Norwegian (Zimmerling 2008: 210-215) and, according to some descriptions, in Old French. The word order in such systems conforms to the formula (xvii):

(xvii) Germanic-type W+-system: # XP — [V — CL]~ #[V — CL]

Slavic languages with the formula (xvii) are not attested.

7.3. W*-systems

- Language L is a W*-system, if the principle for placement of clusterizing clitics in clausal 2P is not absolutely restrictive and co-occurs with alternative linearization
strategies, which may eventually lead to placement of different types of clusterizing clitics according to different principles.

Typical Slavic $W^*$-systems are OCS and South Old Russian. Here clusterizing particles take 2P, clusterizing auxiliaries tend to adjoin to V or VP, while clusterizing pronouns may both pattern with particles and with auxiliaries (Zaliznjak 2008: 87-168). One more $W^*$-system is Polish, a language where BE-auxiliary normally right-adjoin to V but can clusterize with pronominal clitics in verb-initial clauses. Some clitics, as Pol. particle $by$, occur only in subordinate clauses and almost invariably take complementizers as their hosts.

- The most famous subtype of a $W^*$-system is found in Romance and Balcanic languages (cf. French, Italian, Spanish, Catalan, European Portuguese, Modern Greek, Albanian). Here clusterizing clitics (object pronouns and auxiliaries) are located in VP and neither the clitics nor their verbal hosts get a fixed position in the clause (Cardinaletti 1999). We refer to this subtype as V-systems (‘$V$’ = ‘Verb’). The only Slavic V-system is Moliseslav (Slavisano), a Croatian variety spoken in Italy (Kosta 2009).

7.4. C-systems

- Language L is a C-system, if it lacks grammaticalized constraints on the placement of sentence categories that realize automatically with every communicative structure. Slavic C-systems are Russian, Belorussian and Ukrainian. In a diachronic perspective, Slavic C-systems evolve from W-systems (Old Novgorod dialect) or $W^*$-systems (Old South Russian). The 2P condition on the placement of clitic clusters can hold both in languages with constraints on the placement of verbs (Bg, Mac and other $W^+$-systems) and in languages without such constraints (Slavic W-systems and $W^*$-systems).

7.5. The Unity and Diversity of Slavic Word Order Systems

The underlying unity of W, $W^+$ and $W^*$-systems is revealed by the fact that all of them apply the Template Principle, when clusterizing clitics assume a contact position. Historically, Slavic $W^*$-systems evolved from standard W-systems as proven for Old East Slavic by Zaliznjak (2008).

- However, the observed facts suggest that the development of all word order systems with clitic clusters in the world’s languages conforms to the Principle of Domain Shrinking. It predicts that if a language has clitic clusters in (Spec, CP) or (Spec, IP), on some later stage these clusters can migrate downwards, in terms of McConvell (1996) and end up in VP. This amounts to the syntactic shift: standard W-systems $\rightarrow W^*$-systems.
- The shift in the opposite direction, i.e. $W^*$-systems/V-systems of the Romance type $\rightarrow$ standard W-systems, is problematic, since clusters of clause-level clitics do not seem to migrate upwards: if a cluster as a unit is in its entirety generated in the VP or some projection above the VP but below IP, it is unlikely that it will raise to any higher projection, be it (Spec, CP) or a different node.
- Raising of isolated clitics and other clause-level elements to 2P (whatever the exact definition of this position in UG is), where they adjoin to the already existing clitic clusters is certainly possible – otherwise Slavic clitic templates could not be expanded.

\[\text{Cf. Pol [CP Gdy=}by=m\text{ mial czas]} \text{ ‘if I had time’, *Gdy [mial] =}by=m\text{ czas.}\]
with new kinds of auxiliaries, pronouns and particles. But raising of a complete cluster to a hierarchically higher position in the same clause lacks motivation.

The unity of W, W*-systems vs W*-systems is confirmed by the fact that they apply the same Constituency Conditions for all 2P clitics. A further difference is that W*-systems show a relevant increase of cases, where some or all clusterizing clitics stand to the right of 2P.

The crucial question is what type of rules oppose W+-systems with VA-clitics to standard W-systems lacking constraints on verb-and-clitic adjacency. Our solution is that W-systems and W+-systems differ in the use of Barrier Rules.

8. W-systems, W*-systems and Verb Movement.

In standard W-systems (SC, ONR, Slovak etc.) non-initial [V — CL] sequences in the main clauses only arise in sentences with derived word orders: such orders are triggered by a combination of a Barrier Rule and verb movement. A Barrier Rule has effect on the position of clusterizing clitics and removes them from 2P: if XP is filled by an initial group acting as a Barrier, clusterizing clitics do not reach clausal 2P (Čavar and Wilder 1999) or, under different assumptions, move out from 2P (Zaliznjak 1993: 287), (Zimmerling 2008: 226) and make it available for the moved verbs. This gives rise to the configuration \( [\text{BARRIER} [\text{XP}]] – \text{V} – \text{CL} \).

In the Bulgarian W*-system, the sequences [CL — V] ~ [V — CL] arise already with the basic word order. Contrariwise, the structure \( *[\text{BARRIER} [\text{XP}]] — \text{V} — \text{CL} \) is severely ungrammatical in Bg main clause declaratives, cf. (24).

\[
(44) \text{Bg} \quad *[\text{TopicP} [\text{XP [PP Na Ivan] [NP knigata ]}] \text{vůrmal} = sům=mu=já.}
\]

Therefore, the derived order in standard W-systems \( — [\text{BARRIER} [\text{XP}]] — \text{V} — \text{CL} \) — is a mirror image of the basic word order in the Bulgarian W*-system — \( \text{XP – CL} — \text{V} ~ [\text{XP} \text{V}] — \text{CL} \). Bg clusterizing clitics do not give up 2P in main clause declaratives but attract the verbs to clitic-adjacent positions: the verbs cannot take 2P in this type of a W*-system, it is reserved only for clitics.

Proposal:
Let us parametrize the 2P properties of Slavic clitics and analyze them in terms of feature strength. Then one can say that Bg 2P clitics are strong 2P clitics, since they never leave clausal 2P and attract Bg verbs to adjacent positions. Standard Slavic 2P clitics are weak, since they do not reach clausal 2P in derived word orders with a Barrier and give up 2P for the verb: as a result, Verb-second orders arise.

Conclusion
The unity of all three types of Slavic systems with clausal clitics and the East Slavic C-systems is revealed by the fact that none of the four systems has grammaticalized constraints on the placement of verbal forms in sentences with the basic word order. Therefore, the absence of constraints on the placement of finite verbal heads /1-participles in sentences with the basic word order seems to be the most general characteristics of the Slavic syntactic type.
Appendix:

Subordinate Clause Barriers (rare)

(45) a. Bg Toj kaza, [CP ĉe (1)=sŭm=mu=ja (2) bil dal knigata].
    He said that BE_AUX.PRS.1SG. him.DAT.3SG.M. it.ACC.3SG.F. BE.AUX.PST.3SG.M. given.-PRF.
    book-the.
    ‘He said that he had already given him the book’.

    b. Bg Toj kaza, [CP ĉe (1) {TopicP[NP knigata]_i} (2)=sŭm=mu=ja (3) bil dal ti].

Topicalized Barriers

XP — CL — V

(46) a. Bg [PP V [NP drobovete na umrelija]] =je imalo voda.
    In lungs-the of the deceased have.PREF.3SG.N. BE_AUX.PRS.3SG. water
    ‘There was water in the lungs of the deceased person’.

    *[^BARRIER [XP]] — V — CL

b. Bg *[^BARRIER {TopicP[PP V [NP drobovete na umrelija]]} imalo= je voda.
    Intended meaning: ‘As for the lungs of the deceased man, there was water’.

(47) a. Bg Imalo =li=je voda [pp v [NP drobovete na umrelija]]?
    Have.PREF.3SG.N. Q. BE_AUX.PRS.3SG. water in lungs-the of the deceased
    ‘Was there water in the lungs of the deceased person?’

    b. Bg[^BARRIER {TopicP[PP V [NP drobovete na umrelija]]}] _i imalo =li=je voda ti?
    ‘As for the lungs of the deceased man, was there water?’

Raising of a possessive clitic out of DP (Bulgarian).

(48) a. Bg Tja nameri=li [DP uţasni-te=si greški]?
    She found.PST3.SG. Q horrible-the REFL.DAT. mistakes
    ‘Did she find her horrible mistakes?’

    b. Bg Tja nameri=li=si [DP uţasni-te ___ greški]?
    She found.PST3.SG. Q REFL.DAT. horrible-the mistakes
    ‘Did she find her horrible mistakes?’

Non-clusterizing dative possessive clitics

9 Examples (48ab) and (49ab) are from Wunderlich & Schürcks (2003).
(49)  a.  Bg  *Proçetox  statja=i.  
Read.PST.1SG.  article  her.DAT.3SG.F.  

b.  Bg  Proçetox=i statja.  
Read.PST.1SG.  her.DAT.3SG.F.  article  
‘I read one of her articles’.

(50)  Old Russ  çto  vozdam=Yt  [[NP  protivou  [NP  blagodějaniju=Yt]]?  (Ipat. [1199], list 244).  
What  render.PRS.1SG  you.DAT.2SG.  for  benefaction  you.DAT.2SG.  
‘What shall I render you for your benefaction?’

(51)  Old Russ  brata=Yt  Romana  Bogъ  pojalъ  (Ipat. [1180], list 217).  
Brother.ACC.SG.  you.DAT.2SG.  Roman.ACC.SG.  God  took.PRF.3SG.M.  
‘God took from you (your) brother Roman’ OR ‘God took your brother Roman (from you)’.

(52)  a.  Russ  Ja  sebe  ne  vrag.  
I  REFL-DAT.  not  enemy  
‘I am not an enemy for myself’.

b.  Russ  *Ja  vstretil  vraga  sebe.  
I  met  enemy  REFL-DAT  
Intended meaning: ‘I met my own enemy’.

Clusterizing dative clitics (Bulgarian)

(53)  Bg  Toj=mi  =se  izkrjaska  [PP  v  [DP  uxoto ]]  
he  me.DAT.SG.  REFL-ACC  shouted.PST.3SG.  in  ear.the  
‘He shouted in my ear’.

(54)  Bg  *Az=i  mislija  [PP  za  [DP  očite ___]]  
I  her.DAT.3SG.F.  think.PRS.1SG.  for  eyes.the  
Intended: ‘I think of her eyes’.
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