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’, ţe 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 functional domain correlates with the tenses, respectively. Currently, aorist and imperfect are used only in Bulgarian and Macedonian, the auxiliary BE that was marked for imperfective/perfective aspect in the present perfect/future 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.

Interestingly, the process of tense weakening continues in Mac: as of the mid-20th c. aorist verbs may become 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. 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 isplńi xę vręmę roditi eį. Elizabeth FOC fulfilled REFL time give-birth her\textsubscript{CLDAT} “When it was time for Elizabeth to have her baby.” (OCS, Pancheva et al. 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENSE/ASPECT</th>
<th>IMPERFECTIVE</th>
<th>PERFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3SG PRESENT</td>
<td>nesetŷ</td>
<td>ponesetŷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG AORIST</td>
<td>nese</td>
<td>ponese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG IMPERFECT</td>
<td>nesēaše</td>
<td>ponesēaše</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG PERFECT</td>
<td>nesh ţ jestŷ</td>
<td>ponesh ţ jestŷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG FUTURE II</td>
<td>bōdět nesľ</td>
<td>bōdět ponesľ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG PLUPERFECT</td>
<td>bē nesľ</td>
<td>bē ponesľ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(the verb \textit{nesti} ‘to carry’ in different tenses in OCS, cf. Van Schooneveld 1951: 97)

(3) a. Rečeno mu e da bide točen poveće pati tel\textsubscript{PASS} him\textsubscript{DAT} is\textsubscript{AUX} to be subj to punctual more times ‘He was told to be punctual more than once.’ (Mac, Tomić 2000: 296)

b. %Mu e rečeno da bide točen poveće 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\textsubscript{AUX} me\textsubscript{DAT} as am\textsubscript{AUX} already said deprived them yesterday “You, as I already said, deprived me of them.” (SC, Bošković 2012)

b. *Te sa, kako ti kazah, predstavili gi na Petur. they are\textsubscript{AUX} as you\textsubscript{DAT} told introduced them\textsubscript{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\textsubscript{CLDAT} it\textsubscript{CLACC} gave and also you are him\textsubscript{CLACC} it\textsubscript{CL} gave too “We gave it to him, and you did too” (S-C, Stjepanović 1998)

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 (sūsto) we are him\textsubscript{CLDAT} it\textsubscript{CLACC} gave and you are him\textsubscript{DAT} him\textsubscript{ACC} gave too “We gave it to him, and you did too” (Bošković 2002: 331)

(7) a. Milan želi da ga vidi /*Milan ga želi da vidi Milan wishes that him\textsubscript{CLACC} sees /Milan him\textsubscript{CLACC} wishes that see\textsubscript{SG} “Milan wishes to see him” (SC, Progovac 1993)

b. Manol iska da go vidi /*Manol go iska da vidi Manol wishes that him\textsubscript{CLACC} sees / Manol him\textsubscript{CLACC} wishes that sees “Manol wishes to see him” (Bo, Migdalski 2006)

(8) a. *Az im te preporučim / Az te preporučim I them\textsubscript{CLDAT} you\textsubscript{CLACC} recommend\textsubscript{SG} I you\textsubscript{CLACC} recommend\textsubscript{SG} to them\textsubscript{ACC} “I am recommending her to them”

b. Az im ja preporučim I them\textsubscript{CLDAT} her\textsubscript{CLACC} recommend\textsubscript{SG} (Bg, Hauge 1999)

(9) Ja im te preporučujem I them\textsubscript{CLDAT} you\textsubscript{CLACC} recommend\textsubscript{SG} “I am recommending you to them” (S-C, Migdalski 2006)
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