

## **Parametrizing second position effects in Slavic**\*

*Krzysztof Migdalski*  
University of Wrocław

This paper examines two types of clitic placement in Slavic: second position (2P) and verb-adjacent cliticization. The placement has been accounted for in a number of ways (see Tomić 1996, Franks 1998, and Bošković 2001 for early crosslinguistic overviews), with various analyses favoring syntactic or phonological motivations for the clitic positions. Following seminal observations made by Stjepanović (1998), and Bošković (2002), it is now standardly assumed that on the syntactic side, 2P clitics are XP elements that target specifiers in the extended verbal projections, whereas verb-adjacent clitics adjoin to verbs as heads. This paper addresses an analysis developed by Runić (2013), which captures the syntactic variation in the two cliticization patterns by arguing that whereas 2P clitics are NPs, verb-adjacent clitics are D-heads. Runić's (2013) analysis follows from her descriptive generalization, which states that only languages without articles allow clitics to be used in a nonspecific context. I show on the basis of data from Slavic and Romance languages that the generalization is not correct and propose an alternative analysis. This paper is organized as follows. Section 1 presents data and main contrasts between the two types of cliticization. Section 2 overviews an analysis of verb-adjacent clitics as D-heads. Section 3 shows that clitic placement is contingent on the availability of tense morphology.

---

\* I am grateful to Hakyung Jung for comments, Giuiliana Giusti and Vesela Simeonova for discussion and providing Italian and Bulgarian data, and to the FASL audience and the reviewers for helpful feedback. All errors remain my responsibility.

### 1 Patterns of cliticization across Slavic

There are two types of cliticization patterns in Slavic. Bulgarian and Macedonian have verb-adjacent clitics, which as shown in (1), may not be separated from the verbal host by any lexical material.

- (1) a. Vera včera *mi go* dade.  
 Vera yesterday me<sub>DAT</sub> it<sub>ACC</sub> gave<sub>3SG</sub>  
 ‘Vera gave it to me yesterday.’  
 b. \*Vera *mi go* včera dade. (Bg/Mac, Franks and King 2000: 63)

By contrast, second position (Wackernagel) clitics do not impose any categorial restrictions on their host. What matters is that they immediately follow the initial syntactic constituent, which can be a full phrase, a modifier of a phrase, or a single word, as shown in (2) for Serbo-Croatian following Tomić (1996: 817).

- (2) a. Veoma lepu haljinu *si mi* kupio.  
 very beautiful<sub>ACC</sub> dress<sub>ACC</sub> are<sub>AUX</sub> me<sub>DAT</sub> buy<sub>PART.M.SG</sub>  
 b. Veoma lepu *si mi* haljinu kupio.  
 very beautiful<sub>ACC</sub> are<sub>AUX</sub> me<sub>DAT</sub> dress<sub>AC</sub> buy<sub>PART.M.SG</sub>.  
 c. Veoma *si mi* lepu haljinu kupio.  
 very are<sub>AUX</sub> me<sub>DAT</sub> beautiful<sub>ACC</sub> dress<sub>AC</sub> buy<sub>PART.M.SG</sub>.  
 ‘You’ve bought me a very beautiful dress.’

Second position cliticization is also found in Czech, Slovak, Sorbian, and Slovenian, though in some of these languages pronominal clitics undergo degrammaticalization into weak pronouns (see Jung & Migdalski 2015).

The two cliticization types presented in (1) and (2) differ not only with respect to the position of clitics in the clause structure, but also in the movement mechanism. There is substantial evidence suggesting that whereas verb-adjacent clitics adjoin to a single head, 2P clitics raise to separate specifiers via XP movement (Stjepanović 1998, Bošković 2001, Migdalski 2006). For example, 2P clitics show greater mobility in the clause structure, as shown for clitic climbing in Serbo-Croatian in (3) and (4). As first noted by Progovac (1993), the climbing is possible out of subjunctive clauses, but not out of indicative complements.

- (3) a. Milan kaže da *ga* vidi.  
 Milan says that him<sub>ACC</sub> sees  
 ‘Milan says that he can see him.’  
 b. \*Milan *ga* kaže da vidi.
- (4) a. Milan želi da *ga* vidi.  
 Milan wishes that him<sub>ACC</sub> sees  
 ‘Milan wishes to see him.’  
 b. ?Milan *ga* želi da vidi. (SC, Progovac 1993)

By contrast, movement of verb-adjacent clitics in Bulgarian is more restricted, as is typical of head-like elements. They may not climb from embedded clauses in any context, as shown in (5) and (6).

- (5) a. Manol iska da *go* vidi.  
 Manol wish<sub>3SG</sub> that him<sub>ACC</sub> see<sub>3SG</sub>  
 ‘Manol wishes to see him.’  
 b. \*Manol *go* iska da vidi. (Bg, Migdalski 2006: 217)
- (6) a. Manol kazva će *go* vižda.  
 Manol say<sub>3SG</sub> that him<sub>ACC</sub> see<sub>3SG</sub>  
 ‘Manol says that he can see him.’  
 b. \*Manol *go* kazva će vižda. (Bg, Migdalski 2006: 217)

Another contrast between the two cliticizations is related to the possibility of clitic ellipsis under identity. Stjepanović (1998: 530) observes that in the context of VP ellipsis, the lower clitic (*ga* in 7b) may be deleted to the exclusion of the higher clitic *mu*. She argues that the deletion facts indicate that each of the pronominal clitics is an independent constituent that targets a separate specifier.

- (7) a. Mi *smo mu ga* dali,  
 we are<sub>AUX</sub> him<sub>DAT</sub> him<sub>ACC</sub> give<sub>PART.M.PL</sub>  
 a i vi ste ~~*mu ga*~~ dali.  
 and also you are<sub>AUX</sub> him<sub>DAT</sub> him<sub>ACC</sub> give<sub>PART.M.PL</sub>  
 ‘We gave it to him, and you did, too.’  
 b. Mi *smo mu ga* dali, a i vi ste ~~*mu ga*~~ dali, (takodje).  
 c. \*Mi *smo mu ga* dali, a i vi ste ~~*mu ga*~~ dali, (takodje).

Conversely, no part of a clitic cluster may be deleted in Bulgarian or Macedonian, which may indicate that they all target a uniform head, forming a single constituent together, as noted by Bošković (2002: 331).

- (8) a. \*Nie *sme mu go dali*, i vie *ste*  
 we are<sub>AUX</sub> him<sub>DAT</sub> it<sub>ACC</sub> give<sub>PART.PL</sub> and you are<sub>AUX</sub>  
~~*mu go dali*~~ (sūšto).  
 him<sub>DAT</sub> him<sub>ACC</sub> give<sub>PART.M.PL</sub> too  
 ‘We gave it to him, and you did too.’
- b. \*Nie *sme mu go dali*, i vie *ste mu go dali* (sūšto).  
 c. \*Nie *sme mu go dali*, i vie *ste go mu dali* (sūšto).

This assumption about the distinct syntactic mechanisms involved in the two cliticization patterns receives more support from the possibility of clitic splits. As shown in (9a), in VP fronting in Serbo-Croatian a clause-mate pronominal clitic can be separated from the auxiliary clitic located outside the preposed VP. Moreover, clause-mate clitics may be split from each other by a parenthetical, as in (9b).

- (9) a. [*Dali ga Mariji*] *su* Ivan i Stipe.  
 give<sub>PART.M.PL</sub> it<sub>ACC</sub> Marija<sub>DAT</sub> are<sub>AUX</sub> Ivan and Stipe  
 ‘Give it to Marija, Ivan and Stipe did.’ (Bošković 2001: 50)
- b. *Ti si me, kao što sam već rekla,*  
 you are<sub>AUX</sub> me<sub>DAT</sub> as am<sub>AUX</sub> already say<sub>PART.F.SG</sub>  
*lišio ih juče.*  
 deprive<sub>PART.M</sub> them yesterday (Bošković 2001: 60)  
 ‘You, as I already said, deprived me of them.’

Bošković (2001: 189) observes that, by contrast, the corresponding clitic splits are disallowed in Bulgarian.

- (10) a. \*[*Celunala go*] *Maria e*  
 kissed him<sub>ACC</sub> Maria is<sub>AUX</sub>  
 ‘Kissed him, Maria has.’
- b. \**Te sa, kakto ti kazah, predstavili gi na Petür.*  
 they are as you<sub>DAT</sub> told introduced them<sub>ACC</sub> to P.  
 ‘They have, as I told you, introduced them to Peter.’

The data presented so far indicates that that the crucial syntactic difference between the two patterns of cliticization is not just the position that they occupy in the structure, but that it is also derivational: whereas verb-adjacent clitics head-adjoin to a single functional head, 2P clitics do not. In the remainder of this paper I will discuss two potential explanations for the variation recently argued for in the literature:

- (i) Verb-adjacent clitics share a property that forces their adjunction to a functional head (Bošković 2016).
- (ii) A functional head that verb-adjacent clitics adjoin to is missing in the languages with 2P clitics (Migdalski 2015, 2016).

## 2 Verb-adjacent clitics as D-heads

In a series of papers, Bošković (2012 and related work) argues that languages that do not have articles do not project the DP layer. This allows him to capture many systematic differences between article- and article-less languages. Bošković's assumption has a repercussion for his analysis of the structure of pronouns, which are NPs in languages without articles and Ds taking NP complements in article languages. Recently, Bošković (2016) has observed that 2P cliticization is attested only in languages without articles. Drawing on the DP/NP distinction, Bošković (2016) accounts for the contrasts between the two cliticization patterns described in Section 1 and deduces the verb-adjacency requirement of clitics in DP languages. Namely, he points out that like other functional heads, D-clitics cannot be stranded. Therefore, they must take a complement or assume a head-adjunction configuration by adjoining to V+T complexes. By contrast, given the absence of the DP layer, 2P clitics are NPs that target specifiers of functional projections.

The idea that verb-adjacent clitics are D-heads receives support from many Romance languages, in which clitics morphologically resemble determiners. Moreover, Runić (2013) observes that 2P and verb-adjacent clitics may have different interpretations with respect to specificity. As indicated in the translations of the dialogue in (11), pronouns in English can only occur in specific contexts; in non-specific environments the indefinite pronoun *one* is used (see 11c). By contrast, pronominal clitics in Serbo-Croatian can be used whether the reference is specific (see 11b) or not (see 11c) (see Mihailović 1970 for the original observations).

- (11) a. A: Ona želi da *se* uda za Šveđanina.  
 she wants to REFL marry for Swede  
 ‘She wants to marry a Swede.’  
 b. B: Gdje *ga je* našla?  
 where *him<sub>ACC</sub> is<sub>AUX</sub> find<sub>PART.F.SG</sub>*  
 ‘Where did she find him/\*one?’  
 c. B: Nije *ga* lako naći  
 not *him<sub>ACC</sub> easy find<sub>INF</sub>*  
 ‘It is not easy to find one/\*him.’ (SC, Runić 2013)

Runić argues that Bulgarian and Macedonian allow pronominal clitics only in specific contexts (see 12), on a par with pronouns in English. She suggests that the contrast obtains because second position clitics are NPs, so they do not need to be interpreted as definite, whereas verb-adjacent clitics are D-heads.

- (12) a. A: Taa saka da *se* venča za Šveđanin.  
 she wants to REFL marry for Swede  
 ‘She wants to marry a Swede.’  
 b. B: A kade *go* našla?  
 where *him<sub>ACC</sub> find<sub>PART.F.SG</sub>*  
 ‘Where did she find him?’  
 c. B: Ne e lesno da najde/\**go* najde/(eden Šveđanin)  
 not is easy to find *him<sub>ACC</sub> find* (one Swede)  
 ‘It is not easy to find one/\*him.’ (Mac, Runić 2013)

On the basis of these data, Runić (2013) proposes a generalization saying that only languages without articles allow clitics to be used in nonspecific contexts. On closer scrutiny, however, this generalization turns out to be too strong or even incorrect.

On a general level, crosslinguistically the definite article does not show uniform semantics, which may include specificity (in Polynesian and Turkish), visibility (Bella Coola), proximity (St’at’imcets; see Matthewson 1998: 25, Giusti 2015), so even if verb-adjacent pronominal clitics are D-heads, they may receive different interpretations across DP-languages. Crucially, though, Runić’s (2013) generalization is not supported by Romance DP-languages such as Italian, which permits the

occurrence of clitics in exactly the same context as Serbo-Croatian, an NP language, as shown in (13) (see also Cardinaletti & Giusti 2018).

- (13) a. A: Maria vuole sposare uno svedese.  
 Maria wants marry a Swede  
 ‘Maria wants to marry a Swede.’  
 b. B: E dove *lo* trova?  
 And where *him<sub>ACC</sub>* find  
 ‘Where did she find him?’  
 c. B: Non *lo* trovi facilmente (uno svedese)  
 not *him<sub>ACC</sub>* find easy (one Swede)  
 da queste parti.  
 in this area  
 ‘It is not easy to find one/\*him.’ (It, Giuliana Giusti, p.c.)

In some other contexts, such as in (14), clitics in Italian can be even non-referential and resume a predicate adjective.

- (14) Maria è simpatica e sua sorella non *lo* è.  
 Maria is nice and her sister not *CL<sub>M.SG</sub>* is  
 ‘Maria is nice and her sister is not.’ (It, G. Giusti, p.c.)

Moving on to Slavic, although the examples provided by Runić in (11) and (12) are taken by her to indicate that Bulgarian and Macedonian permit pronominal clitics to be used only in specific contexts, the data in (15) shows that pronominal clitics in Bulgarian may have non-specific reference, as in the case of surface scope reading of the accusative clitic in (15a) and a generic reading of the dative clitic in (15b).

- (15) a. Vseki običa njakoj, no ne vseki  
 everyone loves someone, but not everyone  
 može da *go* zadržī.  
 can that *him<sub>ACC</sub>* keep  
 ‘Everyone loves someone, but not everyone can keep him.’

- b. Kogato običaš njakogo, trjabva da se  
 when love<sub>2SG</sub> someone need that REFL  
 naučiš da *mu* proštavaš.  
 learn<sub>2SG</sub> that him<sub>DAT</sub> forgive<sub>2SG</sub>  
 ‘When you love someone, you need to learn to forgive him.’  
 (Bg, Vesela Simeonova, p.c.)

These facts may lead to the conclusion that the contrasts observed by Runić (2013) are not necessarily related to the DP/NP distinction, but rather to an independently motivated difference in the interpretation of pronouns in English and Serbo-Croatian.

Empirical evidence aside, it seems that there are a number of other conceptual problems with the assumption that verb-adjacent pronominal clitics are D-heads in Slavic (the details are discussed in Migdalski 2018). First, in contrast to Romance languages, pronominal clitics in all Slavic languages do not resemble articles, but rather morphological case forms, whether these languages have articles or not. Franks and Rudin (2005) capture this property by assuming that while pronominal clitics in Romance languages are D-heads, in Slavic they instantiate K(ase)-heads, with further parametric variation related to the presence of articles, thus with KP dominating DP in Bulgarian and Macedonian (see 16a), and with only KP present in the other Slavic languages (see 16b).

- (16) a. [KP K<sup>0</sup> [DP ...]]  
 b. [KP K<sup>0</sup> ]

Another contrast between Romance and Slavic languages is the fact that while in Romance languages clitics are pronouns, in Slavic they include also auxiliary verbs, such as the clitic form of the verb ‘be.’ It is not immediately clear how auxiliary clitics could be analyzed as D-heads. Since they are not nominal elements, they are unlikely to incorporate into the V/T complex for the purpose of case licensing. Regardless, on a par with pronominal clitics, the auxiliary clitics target and adjoin to T<sup>0</sup>. Bošković (2016) states that this happens due to “a preference to treat them like pronominal clitics for uniformity.” It is not obvious though how this mechanism of preference could be explained.

Furthermore, diachronic considerations do not seem to support the hypothesis about the D-head status of verb-adjacent clitics. Old Church Slavonic (OCS) predominantly had verb-adjacent clitics, so following Bošković's analysis, it could be a DP language. The status of NPs in OCS is a matter of debate. There are no morphologically distinct articles in OCS texts, though Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Vulchanov (2012) argue that the demonstrative *tb* may function as the definite article in some environments in *Codex Suprasliensis*, an OCS text from the 11<sup>th</sup> century. However, OCS shows many cases of Left Branch Extraction, which in general is not attested in languages with articles.

- (17) Svęť *bo* mōš stvorilъ *ja* estъ.  
 holy because man created them<sub>ACC</sub> is  
 'Because a holy man has created them.'  
 (OCS, Pancheva 2005: 139)

Left Branch Extraction is also attested in Old Serbian, which did not have articles and was on the way to become a 2P clitic language.

- (18) Sijazi *je* kniga pisana.  
 this is<sub>AUX</sub> book written  
 'This book was written.' (OS, Radanović-Kocić 1988: 159)

There seems to be no evidence for the emergence or decline of the article in the subsequent history of Serbian, including the Montenegrin dialects, which featured verb-adjacent pronominal clitics in some contexts until the 19<sup>th</sup> century and also displayed Left Branch Extraction.

- (19) Veliku *mu* knjigu otvorio.  
 great him<sub>DAT</sub> book open<sub>PART.M.SG</sub>  
 '(He) opened a great book for him.' (19<sup>th</sup> c. Montenegrin)

If Bošković's generalization applied diachronically, we could potentially expect the switch in the cliticization patterns to be accompanied by the emergence of the definite article and a modification of the DP/NP structure, reflected in the availability of Left Branch Extraction. As far as I can determine, such a correspondence is not found.

### 3 An alternative account – patterns of cliticization are subject to the TP parameter

This section summarizes an alternative analysis of the distribution of pronominal clitics in Slavic, originally developed in Migdalski (2015, 2016 and Jung and Migdalski 2015). It is based on the observation that synchronically verb-adjacent cliticization is possible only in languages that have morphological tense, whereas diachronically the shift from verb-adjacent clitics to 2P in Slavic was contemporaneous with the loss of tense morphology.<sup>1</sup> In languages such as Polish the change proceeded further and led to the reanalysis of pronominal clitics as weak pronouns.

As shown in (20) and (21), Bulgarian has two simple past tense forms, aorist and imperfect, which both can be combined with perfective and imperfective aspectual morphology.

- (20) a. Včera četjax knigata.  
 yesterday read<sub>IMP.1SG.IMPRF</sub> book-the  
 ‘I was reading the book yesterday.’  
 (Bg, imperfect tense, imperfective aspect)
- b. Vseki dan, pročetjax edna kniga.  
 every day read<sub>IMP.1SG.PERF</sub> one book  
 ‘I used to read a whole book every day.’  
 (Bg, imperfect tense, perfective aspect)
- (21) a. Včera pročetox knigata.  
 yesterday read<sub>AOR.1SG.PERF</sub> book-the  
 ‘I read the book yesterday and finished it.’  
 (Bg, aorist, perfective aspect)
- b. Včera četox knigata.  
 yesterday read<sub>AOR.1SG.IMPRF</sub> book-the  
 ‘I was reading the book yesterday.’  
 (Bg, aorist, imperfective aspect)

<sup>1</sup> Outside Slavic, the generalization receives support from Philippine languages, which have 2P clitics and express temporality by aspectual distinctions.

Except for Bulgarian and Macedonian, all the other languages lost the simple tense forms, thus losing overt tense morphology (see Todorović 2016 for a discussion of Serbian facts) and instead use compound tense structures, formed with the tenseless, non-finite *l*-participle and the auxiliary ‘be’ (marked for perfective aspect in future structures and imperfective aspect in past tense forms).<sup>2</sup>

The tense system in Bulgarian is reminiscent of the one found in Old Slavic. Moreover, OCS featured a similar pattern of cliticization, with pronominal clitics predominantly occupying verb-adjacent positions. The only clitics that uniformly occurred in 2P were the ones expressing the illocutionary force of a clause (*bo* ‘because’, *že* and *li* (focus/interrogation markers)), as shown in (22).

- (22) a. Oca moego vь těxъ dostoitъ mi byti.  
 father<sub>GEN</sub> my<sub>GEN</sub> in these be-appropriate<sub>INF</sub> me<sub>DAT</sub> be  
 ‘I had to be in my Father's house?’  
 (OCS, *Luke* 2:49, Pancheva et al. 2007)
- b. Ašte desnaě tvoě rōka sьblažnĕtъ tĕ.  
 if right your hand sin<sub>PRES.3SG</sub> you<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘If your right hand causes you to sin.’  
 (OCS, *Matthew* 5:30, Radanović-Kocić 1988: 154)
- c. Elisaveti že isplъni sĕ vrĕmę roditi ei.  
 Elizabeth FOC fulfilledREFL time give-birth her<sub>DAT</sub>  
 ‘And it was time for Elizabeth to have her baby.’  
 (OCS, *Luke* 1: 57, Pancheva et al. 2007)

In some of the Slavic languages that subsequently evolved, we observe a shift of pronominal clitics to second position. I point out in Migdalski (2015, 2016) that the change was contemporaneous with the loss of tense morphology. For example, it happened very early in Old Slovenian, in which aorist was limited to certain verb forms (Vaillant 1966: 60), and

<sup>2</sup> A reviewer asks whether the *l*-participle could be reinterpreted as a past tense form in some Slavic languages. East Slavic languages, which also lost the perfect auxiliary, could be such languages, yet they use the *l*-participle in tenseless structures, such as the subjunctive, which may indicate the *l*-participle is not a tensed form there either.

which also displays 2P clitics, as shown in the data from *The Freising Manuscripts*, the oldest Slovene manuscript from the 10<sup>th</sup>–11<sup>th</sup> c., in (23).

- (23) a. I' vueriú da mi ie na zem zuete  
and believe<sub>ISG</sub> that me<sub>DAT</sub> is<sub>AUX</sub> on this world  
beufi...  
was<sub>PAST.ACT.PART</sub>  
'And I believe that, having been in this world...'
- b. paki se uztati na zodni den.  
again REFL rise<sub>INF</sub> on judgment day  
Imeti mi ie sivuot.  
have<sub>INF</sub> me<sub>DAF</sub> is life  
'And to rise again on the day of judgement. I am to have  
life.'  
(10<sup>th</sup>–11<sup>th</sup> c. Slovene, Migdalski 2016: 266)

By contrast, the oldest Serbian texts (12th–15th c.) exhibit largely the same clitic distribution as OCS. Gradually, they move to second position, and the shift parallels the loss of tense morphology in the respective dialects. Instances of verb-adjacent clitics are still observed in the 19<sup>th</sup> c. in Montenegrin dialects, where the aorist was preserved longest.

- (24) a. Ako iguman sakrivi mi...  
if prior does-wrong me<sub>DAT</sub>  
'If the prior does me wrong...'  
(Montenegro, 18/19<sup>th</sup> c., Radanović-Kocić 1988: 166)
- b. Drugo ništa ne predstavljaju mi.  
else nothing NEG represent me  
'They are nothing else to me.'
- c. Kći nebesna usliša mi molbu.  
daughter heaven hear<sub>AOR.3SG</sub> me<sub>DAT</sub> prayer  
'The daughter of the heavens heard my prayer.'  
(Montenegro, 18/19<sup>th</sup> c., Migdalski 2018: 200)

I interpret the change by assuming, as is standard, that verb-adjacent clitics raise out of VP argument positions as XPs and are licensed by head-adjunction to T<sup>0</sup> (Kayne 1991). I propose that with the decline of tense morphology, TP is lost, which has repercussions for the cliticization patterns. In the absence of T<sup>0</sup>, there is no suitable head for

clitics to adjoin to and they end up in 2P, in distinct maximal projections. The difference in the landing sites (head-adjunction for verb-adjacent clitics and specifiers for 2P clitics) results in derivational contrasts between the respective two types of cliticizations described in Section 1.

#### 4 Conclusion

This paper has overviewed two potential analyses of 2P cliticization. The analysis adopted in this paper assumes that the presence of TP is subject to parametric variation (Haider 2010, Bošković 2012), and that TP may emerge or decline in language history. It also relates to Bošković's (2012) proposal that TP is available only in DP-languages. Admittedly, if the DP–TP correlation postulated by Bošković (2012) holds, it could be that both Bošković's (2016) generalization and the one developed here are correct: verb-adjacent clitics are attested in languages with both tense morphology and articles. However, the presented diachronic evidence shows that the property which conditions verb-adjacent cliticization is the presence of tense morphology, rather than articles. This may in turn indicate that Bošković's generalization of the DP–TP parallelism could be a one-way correlation: languages with articles have tense morphology, but the reverse is not necessarily true.

#### References

- Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax–Phonology Interface. Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Bošković, Željko. 2002. Clitics as Non-branching Elements and the Linear Correspondence Axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 329–340.
- Bošković, Željko. 2012. On NPs and Clauses. In *Discourse and Grammar: From Sentence Types to Lexical Categories*, eds. Günther Grewendorf and Thomas Ede Zimmermann, 179–242. Boston/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bošković, Željko. 2016. On Second Position Clitics Crosslinguistically. In *Formal Studies in Slovenian Syntax: In honor of Janez Orešnik*, eds. Franc Lanko Marušič and Rok Žaucer, 23–53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Giuliana Giusti. 2018. Indefinite determiners. Variation and Optionality in Italo-Romance. In *Advances in Italian Dialectology. Sketches of Italo-Romance Grammars*, eds. Roberta D'Alessandro and Diego Pescarini, 135–161. Amsterdam: Brill.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila, and Valentin Vulchanov. 2012. An Article Evolving: The Case of Old Bulgarian. In *Grammatical Change: Origins, Nature, Outcomes*, eds. Dianne Jonas, John Whitman, and Andrew Garrett, 160–178. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Franks, Steven. 1998/2010. Clitics in Slavic. *Contemporary Issues in Slavic Linguistics* 10.
- Franks, Steven, and Tracy Holloway King. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*: New York: Oxford University Press.
- Franks, Steven, and Catherine Rudin. 2005. Bulgarian Clitics as K<sup>0</sup> Heads. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The South Carolina Meeting 2004*, eds. Steven Franks, Frank Y. Gladney, and Mila Tasseva-Kurkchieva, 104–116. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 2015. *Nominal Syntax at the Interfaces: A Comparative Analysis of Languages With Articles*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing
- Haider, Hubert. 2010. *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jung, Hakyung, and Krzysztof Migdalski. 2015. On the Degrammaticalization of Pronominal Clitics in Slavic. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The First Berkeley Meeting 2014*, eds. Małgorzata Szajbel-Keck, Roslyn Burns, Darya Kavitskaya, 143–162. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Matthewson, Lisa. 1998. *Determiner Systems and Quantificational Strategies: Evidence from Salish*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2006. *The Syntax of Compound Tenses in Slavic*. Doctoral dissertation, Tilburg University. Utrecht: LOT Publications.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2015. On the Loss of Tense and Verb-adjacent Clitics in Slavic. In *Syntax over Time: Lexical, Morphological, and Information-Structural Interactions*, eds. Theresa Biberauer and George Walkden, 179–196. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2016. *Second Position Effects in the Syntax of Germanic and Slavic Languages*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2018. On Two Sources of Second Position Effects (Part 2). *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 13.4: 187–208.
- Mihailović, Ljiljana. 1970. On Differences in Pronominalization in English and Serbo-Croat. In *The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project. B. Studies 2*, ed. Rudolf Filipovic, 50–63. Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics.
- Pancheva, Roumyana. 2005. The Rise and Fall of Second-Position Clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23: 103–167.
- Pancheva Roumyana, Agnieszka Łazorczyk, Jelena Krivokapić, and Yulia Minkova 2007. *Codex Marianus*. In *USC Parsed Corpus of Old South Slavic*.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1993. Locality and Subjunctive-like Complements in Serbo-Croatian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 1: 116–144.
- Radanović-Kocić, Vesna. 1988. *The Grammar of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: A Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Runić, Jelena. 2013. A New Look at Clitics: Evidence from Slavic. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 21*, eds. Steven Franks, Markus Dickinson, George Fowler, Melissa Witcombe, and Ksenia Zanon, 275–288. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Stjepanović, Sandra. 1998. On the Placement of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: Evidence from VP Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29: 527–537.
- Todorović, Neda. 2016. *On the Presence/Absence of TP: Syntactic Properties and Temporal Interpretation*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Tomić, Olga. 1996. The Balkan Slavic Clausal Clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14: 811–872.
- Vaillant, André. 1966. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome III: Le verbe*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.