

The non-universality of TP and the syntax of clitics

Krzysztof Migdalski

University of Wrocław

A major issue in syntax addressed in recent years concerns the universality of functional projections. For instance, it is a matter of debate whether languages without articles project the DP layer. Assuming they do not, it is possible to take this idea further and postulate that if the *nominal* functional domain correlates with the *clausal* functional architecture, DP-less languages should lack the top-most layer also in the inflectional domain. This in turn implies that TP is not a universal projection (see e.g. Lin 2010 and Shon *et al.* 1996 for TP-less analyses of languages without tense morphology such as Chinese or Korean) and that in particular it is missing in DP-less languages. This has been proposed by Bošković (2010), who argues that as a result these languages lack some TP-related phenomena, such as expletives, the sequence of tenses, and certain subject/object asymmetries.

This talk will show that the idea of the non-universality of TP/DP can explain diachronic changes in the syntax of pronominal clitics in Slavic. The change involved a shift of verb-adjacent clitics to second position (2P), but it occurred only in those languages that lost tense morphology (Serbo-Croatian, Czech, Slovak, Slovene), which I analyze as the loss of TP. Old Church Slavic (OCS) had verb-adjacent pronominal clitics; the only 2P clitics were those expressing Illocutionary Force (e.g. *bo* ‘because’, *že* and *li* (focus/interrogation markers)) (see Radanović-Kocić 1988, cf. 1). OCS also had a complex system of tenses, with two simple past tenses, aorist and imperfect. In addition, aspectual distinctions (imperfective vs. perfective) were marked on all tenses and “conflicting” combinations of tense and aspect values (e.g. perf. aspect + imp. tense, cf. 2) were possible, which suggests the independence of tense/aspect systems. Compound tenses consisted of the non-tensed *l*-participle and the auxiliary BE that was marked for imperfective/perfective aspect in the present perfect/future tenses, respectively. Currently, aorist and imperfect are used only in Bulgarian and Macedonian, the only Slavic languages with articles and verb-adjacent clitics. Other Slavic languages have lost these tenses, and strikingly, the process coincided with the shift of clitics to 2P (e.g. early (the 10th c.) in Slovene; in Montenegró dialects (where aorist was preserved longest) only around the 19th c.). These languages adopted compound tenses constructed with various aspectual forms of the auxiliary BE and the *l*-participle or the infinitive to describe past and future events. This means that temporal interpretations in languages other than Bg and Mac are derived exclusively from aspect or modality. Interestingly, the process of tense weakening continues in Mac: as of the mid-20th c. aorist verbs may no longer be marked for imperfective aspect. Concurrently, clitics that occur with passive participles became reanalyzed as weak pronouns in Western Mac. and may now appear clause-initially (cf. (3)).

The loss of TP has consequences for cliticization patterns. Clitics are ambiguous categories sharing XP and X⁰ properties, which move from argument XP positions within VP and adjoin to T⁰ (Chomsky 1995: 249). The motivation for the adjunction is that they need to be licensed by adjoining to a category endowed with active ϕ -features (cf. e.g. Nash and Rouveret (2002)). Yet, once T⁰ is lost, there is no suitable head for pronominal clitics to adjoin to and they end up in 2P, in separate maximal projections. The proposal developed here receives support from a number of contrasts in the syntax of 2P-clitic languages versus Bg/Mac. First, Bošković (2001) shows that in SC clause-mate clitics may be split from each other by a parenthetical (cf. 4a)). By contrast, the split is not possible in Bb, in which clitics adjoin to T⁰ (cf. 4b). Stjepanović (1998) notes that the higher pronominal clitic may be deleted in VP-ellipsis in S-C (cf. 5), while Bošković (2002) shows that a similar operation in Bg/Mac is impossible (cf. 6). This is expected: if pronominal clitics in Bg/Mac all adjoin to T⁰, deletion of a part of the clitic cluster involves deletion of a non-constituent. Next, Progovac (1993) observes that in S-C pronominal clitics may climb from an embedded subjunctive clause to the main clause (cf. 7a). Example (7b) shows that this never happens in Bg, which is not surprising, as X⁰ elements do not raise from embedded clauses. Finally, the Person Case Constraint (PCC) strongly holds in Bg and Mac, but not in languages with 2P clitics (S-C, Slovene, cf. Rivero 2005, Lenertová 2001) that lack T⁰ (cf. 8/9). Assuming with Anagnostopoulou (2003) that the PCC results from the incompatibility of person and number feature checking on a single head, it is expected that the PCC effects will be more prominent in languages with verb-adjacent clitics.

Thus, the present account shows that the loss of morphological tense has led to radical changes in cliticization patterns in Slavic, which in turn gave rise to additional syntactic repercussions. Interestingly, what happened in Slavic seems to be the reversal of the process that occurred in Ancient

Greek, where according to Kiparsky and Condoravdi (2002), pronominal clitics shifted from 2P to verb-adjacency with the development of tenses and the emergence of the TP-layer.

- (1) Elisaveti že ispl̩ni sę vr̩mę roditi ei.
Elizabeth FOC fulfilled REFL time give-birth her_{CL.DAT}
“When it was time for Elizabeth to have her baby.” (OCS, Pancheva et al. 2007)
- (2)
- | TENSE/ASPECT | IMPERFECTIVE | PERFECTIVE |
|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| 3SG PRESENT | nesetъ | ponesetъ |
| 3SG AORIST | nese | ponese |
| 3SG IMPERFECT | nesęšaše | ponesęšaše |
| 3SG PERFECT | neslъ jestъ | poneslъ jestъ |
| 3SG FUTURE II | bōdetъ neslъ | bōdetъ poneslъ |
| 3SG PLUPERFECT | bę neslъ | bę poneslъ |
- (the verb *nesti* ‘to carry’ in different tenses in OCS, cf. Van Schooneveld 1951: 97)
- (3) a. Rečeno mu e da bide točen poveke pati
tell_{PASS} him_{DAT} is_{AUX} to be_{SUBJ} punctual more times
‘He was told to be punctual more than once.’ (Mac, Tomić 2000: 296)
- b. %Mu e rečeno da bide točen poveke pati (OK in West Mac, where aorist is less common)
- (4) a. Ti si me, kao što sam već rekla, lišio ih juče
you are_{AUX} me_{DAT} as am_{AUX} already said deprived them yesterday
“?You, as I already said, deprived me of them.” (SC, Bošković 2012)
- b. *Te sa, kakto ti kazah, predstavili gi na Petūr.
they are_{AUX} as you_{DAT} told introduced them_{ACC} to Peter
‘They have, as I told you, introduced them to Peter.’ (Bg, Bošković (2001: 189)
- (5) a. Mi smo mu ga dali, a i vi ste ~~mu~~ ~~ga~~ dali, (takodje)
we are him_{CL.DAT} it_{CL.ACC} gave and also you are him_{CL} it_{CL} gave too
“We gave it to him, and you did, too”
- b. Mi smo mu ga dali, a i vi ste ~~mu~~ ~~ga~~ dali, (takodje) (S-C, Stjepanović 1998)
- (6) *Nie sme mu go dali, i vie ste ~~mu~~ ~~go~~ dali (sūšto)
we are him_{CL.DAT} it_{CL.ACC} gave and you are him_{DAT} him_{ACC} gave too
“We gave it to him, and you did too” (Bg, Bošković 2002: 331)
- (7) a. Milan želi da ga vidi /?Milan ga želi da vidi
Milan wishes that him_{CL.ACC} sees /Milan him_{CL.ACC} wishes that see_{3SG}
“Milan wishes to see him” (S-C, Progovac 1993)
- b. Manol iska da go vidi /*Manol go iska da vidi
Manol wishes that him_{CL.ACC} sees / Manol him_{CL.ACC} wishes that sees
“Manol wishes to see him” (Bg, Migdalski 2006)
- (8) a. *Az im te preporučvam / Az te preporučvam na tjax
I them_{CL.DAT} you_{CL.ACC} recommend_{1SG} I you_{CL.ACC} recommend_{1SG} to them_{ACC}
“I am recommending her to them”
- b. Az im ja preporučvam
I them_{CL.DAT} her_{CL.ACC} recommend_{1SG} (Bg, Hauge 1999)
- (9) Ja im te preporučujem
I them_{CL.DAT} you_{CL.ACC} recommend_{1SG}
“I am recommending you to them” (S-C, Migdalski 2006)

Selected References: Anagnostopoulou, E. 2003. *The Syntax of Ditransitives*. Mouton. Bošković, Ž. 2002. Clitics as Non-branching Elements. *LI* 33:329-340. Bošković, Ž. 2010 On NPs and Clauses. Ms, UConn. Bošković, Ž. 2012. On Clitic Doubling and Second Position Cliticization: How much does D matter? Presented at *Clitics and Beyond*, 3-5 May 2012, Göttingen. Hauge, K.R. 1999. The Word Order of Predicate Clitics in Bulgarian. *JSL* 7:91-139. Kiparsky, P. & C. Condoravdi. 2002. Clitics and Clause Structure. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 2: 1-39. Lenertová, D. 2001. Czech Pronominal Clitics. Ms., Berlin. Lin, J-W. 2010. A Tenseless Analysis of Mandarin Chinese Revisited. *LI* 41: 305-29. Migdalski, K. 2006 *The Syntax of Compound Tenses in Slavic*. Ph.D. diss., Tilburg. Nash, L. & A. Rouveret. 2002. Cliticization as Unselective Attract. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 1:157-199. Pancheva R. et al. 2007. *Codex Marianus*. In *USC Parsed Corpus of Old South Slavic*. Progovac, Lj. 1993. Locality and Subjunctive-like Complements in S-C. *JSL* 1:116-144. Radanović-Kocić, V. 1988. *The Grammar of Serbo-Croatian Clitics*. Ph.D. diss., Urbana-Champaign. Rivero,

M-L. 2005. Topics in Bulgarian Morphology and Syntax: A Minimalist Perspective. *Lingua* 115:1083-1128. **Schooneveld, C.H. van 1951.** The Aspectual System of the Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian verbum finitum *byti*. *Word* 7:93-103. **Shon, Y. et al.** 1996. The functional category IP in Korean reconsidered. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 6: 351-384. **Stjepanović, S.** 1998. On the Placement of S-C Clitics. *LI* 29:527-537.