19. Placement and Ordering of the (En)clitics

1. Introduction

A simple definition of CLITICS would be that they are free morphemes that lack prosodic prominence and thus need a prosodic host in order to be pronounceable. As each prosodic word has an obligatory primary stress, a clitic alone cannot constitute a prosodic word on its own (cf. Hyman 2006). Clitics are (typically) functional/grammatical elements of various categories. In Slavic languages, clitics include pronouns, auxiliary verbs, prepositions, coordinators, subordinators, adverbial elements, particles, and determiners, as shown in (1). Auxiliary-verb and pronominal clitics will be called clausal clitics; clitics that operate within a noun phrase are termed nominal clitics; whereas various subordinators, coordinators, particles, and similar elements will be called operator clitics (Mišeska Tomić 2001).[1] Based on the properties and behavior of their pronominal and auxiliary clausal clitics, Timberlake (2014) splits Slavic languages into four groups: I) BCS, Slovenian, Slovak and Czech have maintained second-position (Wackernagel-type) clitics from ProtoSlavic, II) Bulgarian and Macedonian have shifted them to verb-adjacent clitics, III) East Slavic has lost this type of clitics altogether, and IV) Polish has lost the strict second-position requirement. In what follows we will concentrate on the first two groups of Slavic languages, and within them pay somewhat closer attention to the first group, where the group of clitics preserving the Common Slavic (and arguably Proto-Indo-European) Wackernagel clitic behavior is largest.

(1) a. <u>Že</u> drugič <u>ji</u>   <u>je</u>   podala <u>ta</u>   veliko žogo. Sln.

already twice she.dat aux.3s passed def big   ball

---

[1] Throughout the paper, clitics and clitic-related elements that are relevant in a particular example are underlined.

‘It's already the second time that she passed her the big ball.’

b.   Petar i   Sabina su   se   zbunili na   Novom Beogradu.   BCS

Petar and   Sabina aux.3pl refl   confused in   Novi   Beograd

‘Petar and Sabina got confused in Novi Beograd.’

Their reliance on a neighboring word and pronunciation within the same (minimal) prosodic unit – the prosodic word – makes clitics very much like affixes, except that unlike affixes, they do not have a permanent predetermined host but instead position themselves in syntactically defined positions, which is why they are sometimes called phrasal affixes (Anderson 1992). Where exactly in the clause they are pronounced depends on the syntactic context and on language-specific requirements, which leads to some clitics always attaching to items belonging to the same grammatical category and others attaching to the same linearly defined prosodic constituent; and since there can be multiple clitics with the same prosodic requirements within the same domain of their movement (ie. roughly a clause), clitics typically group together in so-called clitic clusters. We can thus start out with the following characterisation:

(2)   Clitics are phonologically dependent, stressless functional elements that appear in a fixed syntactically defined position both inside the clause and inside the CLITIC CLUSTER but otherwise behave like other independent syntactic elements.

Each part of the brief description in (2) can be relativized. In what follows, we will take a closer look at individual parts of the characterisation, one by one, and comment on each individual part of it; we will always start off by presenting the evidence for a particular aspect of this description

and then proceed to the counterarguments relativizing it.

2. Clitics are unstressed

Clitic pronouns and auxiliaries constitute a separate unstressed paradigm of pronouns or auxiliaries, as shown in (3) for Czech singular personal pronouns (the table is simplified) and in (4) for BCS auxiliary clitics. A partly similar pronominal paradigm is also found in BCS, Slovenian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Slovak, and Polish.

(3)   In Slavic languages, accusative, genitive and dative pronouns are typically the only ones with an unstressed variant. Czech full and clitic singular pronouns are given in pairs: full pronoun – clitic (cf. Lenertová 2004). Plural pronouns show "syncretism" between the clitic and the full pronoun, where the only difference is the presence/lack of stress.

	Acc	Gen	Dat
1p	mne – mě	mne – mě	mně – mi
2p	tebe – tě	tebe – tě	tobě – ti
3pF	ji – ji	jí – jí	jí – jí
3pM	jeho – ho	jeho – ho	jemu – mu
Refl	sebe – se	sebe –	sobě – si

(4)   BCS auxiliary clitics (cf. Mišeska Tomić 1996)

	1p	2p	3p
singular	jesam – sam	jesi – si	jest(e) – je
plural	jesmo – smo	jeste – ste	jesu – su

Simple prepositions are all unstressed and as such cannot be pronounced in isolation (a prosodic word needs a primary stress, so a stressless element cannot constitute a prosodic word on its own), (5). The same holds of negation, which cliticizes onto the finite verb (Franks and Holloway King, 2000: 11).

(5)   a.   <u>v</u>   sóbo   b.   <u>na</u>   hríb   c.   <u>za</u>   vráti   Sln.

                in   room   on   hill   behind door

However, these same elements that normally function like clitics sometimes *can* be stressed. The example in (6) below is set up as a case of contrastive focus on the preposition, as a result of which the preposition *za* gets stress (similarly to the contrastive stress on *behind* in the English translation).

(6)   A   čaka   <u>pred</u>   vráti?   Ne,   čaka   <u>zá</u>   vráti.   Sln.

        Q   waits   in-front   door   no   waits   behind door

        'Is (s)he waiting in front of the door? No, (s)he's waiting behind the door.'

In Slovenian (and Czech), pronominal and auxiliary clitics can also be stressed when they are pronounced in isolation and thus lack a prosodic host, e.g., if the verb phrase is reduced, as in (7c) (based on Priestly 1993 / Franks 2016), or as a result of verum focus (i.e. stress on the clitic for emphasizing the truth of the proposition), (8) (from Dvořak 2007). As seen in (7c) and (8), such stressed clitics can actually serve as hosts to other clitics; in (7c), the second pronominal clitic acts as the host of the auxiliary clitic, while in (8), the stressed negation acts as the host of

the clitic particle *pa*. Note that the order of the clitics in (7c) is the same as it is when they are unstressed inside the clitic cluster. Reversing their order would result in ungrammaticality regardless of which clitic in the attempted *ga si* sequence were stressed.

(7) a. <u>A</u> <u>si</u> <u>ga</u> videl? Sln.

      Q aux.2.sg he.acc see

      'Did you see him?'

  b. <u>Si ga</u> videl?

  c. <u>Si gá</u>?

(8) Slišim <u>té</u>, vidim <u>te</u> <u>pa</u> <u>né</u>. Sln.

      hear1.sg you.2.sg.acc see1.sg. you.2.sg.gen part neg

      'I do hear you, but I do not see you.'

In BCS and Slovenian, negation can also end up procliticized on the auxiliary clitic, with the result that the two-clitic composite becomes an (independent) stressed prosodic word (Browne 1975a,b, Schütze 1994, Mišeska Tomić 1996, Toporišič 2000 etc.).

(9) a. Ja <u>mu</u> <u>ga</u> nisam dala. BCS

      I he.dat it.acc neg-aux given

      'I did not give it to him.' (Mišeska Tomić 1996: (40c1))

  b. Nisam <u>mu ga</u> dala. (Mišeska Tomić 1996: (40c2))

In Bulgarian, too, clitics can sometimes be stressed when they immediately follow *ne* (which, in Bulgarian, forms part of the clitic group), as in (10) (Franks 2016). Depending on the prosodic

characteristics of the specific material in the noun phrase (cf. Werle 2009), prepositions can also be stressed in BCS (and similarly in Czech), when stress transfers to the clitic from its host. In (11), *Bare* (the name of the largest Sarajevo cemetery) ends up stressless, while the preposition carries the single stress of the prosodic word that includes the preposition and the proper name.

(10) a.   Áz <u>mu</u>   <u>ja</u>   dádox. b.   Áz   <u>ne</u>   <u>mú</u>   <u>ja</u>   dàdox. Bul.

        I   he.dat   it.acc gave   I   neg   he.dat it.acc gave

        'I gave him it.' (Franks, 2016: (6b))   'I did not give him it.' (Franks, 2016: (7))

(11) <u>Sá</u>   Bara se   niko ne   vraća.   BCS

      from Bare refl   noone not   return

      'Nobody comes back from Bare.'   (a line from the song "Zenica blues")

In principle, then, clitics are indeed functional elements that lack their own lexical stress, but they can sometimes receive stress from the word they cliticize onto, when there is no word to cliticize onto or when the clitic receives contrastive focus or verum focus.

3. Clitics have a fixed (syntactically defined) position

From the perspective of their position in the clause, Slavic clausal clitics can be divided into subgroups: for example, Bulgarian and Macedonian clausal clitics are verb-adjacent, BCS, Slovenian, Czech and Slovak clitics are 2nd-position clitics (also called Wackernagel clitics), and Polish pronominal clitics, which with the exception of się have also been analyzed as weak pronouns (Cetnarowska 2004), are freer in their placement, (12)–(14). The 2nd-position clitics in particular seem like a prominent linguistic feature of Slavic languages (though 2nd-position clitics are relatively common also outside the Indo-European family, e.g., they are found in Tagalog

(Austronesian family), Ngiyambaa (Pama-Nyungan family), Comanche (Uto-Aztecan family), etc. - see Bošković 2016 and the references therein).

(12)

a.	Peter	mu	ga	je	včeraj				vrnil.	Sln.
	* Peter				včeraj	mu	ga	je	vrnil.	
b.	Peter	mu	ho		včera				vrátil.	Slk.
	* Peter				včera	mu	ho		vrátil.	
c.	Petr	mu	ho		včera				vrátil.	Cze.
	* Petr				včera	mu	ho		vrátil.	
d.	Petar	mu	ga	je	juče				vratio.	BCS
	* Petar				juče	mu	ga	je	vratio.	
e.	Piotr	mu	go		wczoraj				zwrócił.	Pol.
	Piotr				wczoraj	mu	go		zwrócił.	
f.	* Petăr	mu	go	e	včera				vărnal.	Bul.
	Petăr				včera	mu	go	e	vărnal.	
	Peter	he.dat	it.acc	aux	yesterday	he.dat	it.acc	aux	returned	

'Peter returned it to him yesterday.'

(13)

a.	Včeraj	mu	ga	je	Peter				vrnil.	Sln.
	* Včeraj				Peter	mu	ga	je	vrnil.	
b.	Včera	mu	ho		Peter				vrátil.	Slk.
	* Včera				Peter	mu	ho		vrátil.	
c.	Včera	mu	ho		Petr				vrátil.	Cze.
	* Včera				Petr	mu	ho		vrátil.	
d.	Juče	mu	ga	je	Petar				vratio.	BCS

				Petar	mu	ga	je	vratio.	
	*	Juče							

	e.	?	Wczoraj	mu	go	Piotr			zwrócił. Pol.[2]
		?*	Wczoraj			Piotr	mu	go	zwrócił.
	f.	*	Včera	mu	go	e	Petăr		vărnal. Bul.
			Včera				Petăr	mu	go	e	vărnal.

Yesterday he.dat it.accaux Peter he.dat it.acc aux returned

'Peter returned it to him yesterday.'

(14) a. Peter mu ga je vrnil včeraj. Sln.

     * Peter vrnil mu ga je včeraj.

     b. Peter mu ho vrátil včera. Slk.

     * Peter vrátil mu ho včera.

     c. Petr mu ho vrátil včera. Cze.

     * Petr vrátil mu ho včera.

     d. Petar mu ga je vratio juče. BCS

     * Petar vratio mu ga je juče.

     e. ?? Piotr mu go zwrócił wczoraj. Pol.

     Piotr zwrócił mu go wczoraj.

     f. Petăr mu go e vărnal včera. Bul.

     * Petăr vărnal mu go e včera.

Peter he.dat it.acc aux returned he.dat it.acc aux yesterday

'Peter returned it to him yesterday.'

---

[2] There seems to be some variation with respect to the acceptability of such examples in Polish. Unlike our informants, a reviewer finds even the second-position variants of (13e) and (14e) perfectly acceptable, and suggests that there is even more freedom in clitic ordering in the northern varieties. See also Footnote 4 below.

In Bulgarian and Macedonian nominal clitics behave differently from the clausal clitics, which are verb-adjacent (Mišeska Tomić 1996). Nominal clitics—like the definite article and the possessive pronominal clitics—are 2nd-position clitics as they encliticize on the first prosodic word or syntactic constituent in the noun phrase, (15).

(15) a. kniga<u>ta</u>   za   lingvistika   Bul.

          book-the   for   linguistics

          'the book about linguistics'

      b. goljama<u>ta</u>   kniga za   lingvistika

          big-the   book   for   linguistics

          'the big book about linguistics'

      c. mnogu   visoki<u>ot</u>   čovek   Mac.

          much   tall-the   man

          'the very tall man'   (Mišeska Tomić, 1996: 813, fn. 6)

A remnant of the second-position placement restriction in Bulgarian may be observed also in what Avgustinova (1994: 30) calls the quasi-second-position condition, whereby a maximum of one phonologically strong element can precede a Bulgarian clitic within its constituent, ie. the verb complex, (16).

(16) a. bjax   <u>ja</u>   vidjal /   vidjal <u>ja</u>   bjax   /   <u>ja</u>   bjax   vidjal

          aux   her   seen   seen   her   aux   her   aux   seen

          'I had seen her.'   Bul.

b. * bjax vidjal <u>ja</u> / * vidjal bjax <u>ja</u>

   aux seen her seen aux her (Avgustinova, 1994: (1))

The 2nd position can be generally understood as the position after the entire first syntactic constituent. In Czech and Slovenian, clitics appear in this position regardless of the prosody of the sentence (cf. Franks and Holloway King 2000, Golden and Sheppard 2000), (17a), while in other languages, such as BCS, clitics can appear *within* a constituent and prefer a 2nd position inside the intonational phrase (if the latter is smaller than the relevant clause), (17b). As a result, when the first position is occupied by an element that is separated from the rest of the clause with an intonational boundary, such as an embedded clause (or if the intonational boundary is simply pronounced following the first syntactic constituent), clitics move to the right of the first element of their intonational phrase, effectively sitting in the third syntactic position, (17b).[3]

(17) a. Da on zamuja, <u>je</u> očitno. Sln.

         that he be-late aux clear

         'That he will be late is clear.'

      b. Da on kasni, očigledno <u>je</u>. BCS

---

[3] Similarly, if example (13d), repeated below as (i), is pronounced with an intonation break after the initial adverbial (which is possible and doesn't make the entire example sound unnatural, akin to Marković and Milićev's 2012 (ii)), the clitics need to be in what could be characterized as the third syntactic position (cf. Schütze 1994).
(i) Juče Petar mu ga je vratio. (= 13d) BCS
     Yesterday Peter he.dat it.acc aux returned
     'Peter returned it to him yesterday.'
(ii) Danima zadaje im puno problema. BCS
      days give them many problems
      'For days he's been giving them many problems.' (Marković and Milićev, 2012: 178)

that	he	be-late	clear	aux

'That he will be late is clear.'   (Browne, 1975a: 143)

The observed difference between (17a) and (17b) has been attributed to the fact that BCS

pronominal and auxiliary clitics are obligatorily enclitics, while in Slovenian and Czech they can

be either enclitics or proclitics, e.g. when in first position, they can only cliticize to the right (cf.

Toporišič 1976: 58; Orešnik 1984; Toman 1996; Bošković 2001). One exception to this strict

positioning of clitics in BCS is embedded clauses or clauses introduced by subordinating

conjunctions, which are sometimes themselves considered to be clitics (e.g. Progovac 1993

treats them as unaccented, Barić et al. 2005 claim they are accented, see also Schütze 1994). The

other exception is examples like (19), where BCS clitics can behave like the clitics of Slovenian

and Czech, and can effectively be proclitics.

(18)   Milan tvrdi # [da   <u>mu</u>   <u>ga</u>   <u>je</u>   Petar   pokazao].   BCS

        Milan claims   that   he.dat   it.acc   aux   Peter   shown

        'Milan claims that Peter has shown it to him.'   (Progovac 1993: p.134, (57))

(19)   Problemi   o   kojima   ćemo razgovarati # <u>su</u>   kompleksni   BCS

        problems   about   which   (aux)   converse   are   complex

        'The problems which we shall discuss are complex.'   (Bennett, 1987: (6))

Another prominent point of variation in 2nd-position clitics is their ability or inability to split

constituents, or as this has traditionally been described, the difference between word-second

clitics and phrase-second clitics. BCS allows word-second clitics, while Slovenian, Czech, and

Slovak do not.

(20)   a.   Taj   <u>mi</u>   <u>je</u>   pesnik napisao   knjigu.   BCS

that   I.dat   aux   poet   written   book

'That poet wrote me a book.'   (Schütze, 1994: (6a))

   b.   Lav   <u>bi</u>   <u>te</u>   <u>se</u>   Tolstoj   sigurno   uplašio. BCS

Leo   would you.gen.   refl   Tolstoi   certainly   frighten

'Leo Tolstoi would certainly get scared of you.'   (Browne 1975b, cited in

Schütze, 1994: 7)

Browne (1975b), cited in Schütze (1994), notes that breaking up a name with a clitic, as in (20b),

is perceived as an archaic feature and is uncommon in everyday colloquial BCS. From the

perspective of prescribed use, the situation differs regionally, with the Serbian norm tending to

avoid splits like those in (20), and the Croatian high-register norm favoring them (e.g. Katičić

2002; cf. Kedveš and Werkmann 2013, Frleta 2018). Variation may well be conditioned

dialectically, too; according to Browne (2010), splits like (20) are unacceptable in Burgenland

Croatian.[4]

    The first-word vs. first-phrase placement is not only a matter of registers or regional

varieties, though. Diesing and Zec (2017) show that the syntactic role of the constituent that

contains the clitic-hosting element can be critical: if the constituent hosting the clitic functions as

the predicate of the sentence, speakers tend to place the clitic after the first word (i.e. inside the

constituent), as in (21a), but if the constituent hosting the clitic functions as an argument,

---

[4] Going beyond these splits and beyond BCS: there is undoubtedly a fair amount of variation in clitic behavior
across registers and dialectal varieties of Slavic languages, so in order to avoid too many digressions, we will mostly
restrict our discussion to standard/mainstream varieties.

speakers tend to place the clitic after the first phrase (i.e. after the whole constituent), as in (21b) (see also Pešikan 1958, Bennett 1987, etc.).

(21) a.   Veliki je   pisac Lav Tolstoj.   BCS
           great   aux   writer Leo Tolstoi
           'Leo Tolstoj is a great writer.'   (Bennett, 1987: (8a))

      b.   Veliki pisac je   barometar   nacije.   BCS
           great   writer aux   barometer   of-nation
           'A great writer is a barometer of a nation.'   (Bennett, 1987: (8b))

According to Wackernagel ([1892] 2020), 2nd-position phenomena originate in Proto-Indo-European. As argued by Migdalski (2009), South Slavic pronominal (and auxiliary) clitics gradually became 2nd-position clitics as they moved to the position occupied by the operator clitics (represented in Old Church Slavonic by an interrogative particle, a complementizer and a focus particle) which were most likely inherited from Proto-Indo-European (see also Migdalski's references, Sławski 1946, and Gribble, 1988: 194; and see also Anderson (1993) for a discussion of the history of the 2nd position more generally). Bennett (1987) claims that Common Slavic had word-second clitics so that the phrase-second clitics, which follow the first syntactic constituent, are a later innovation (cf. also Hana 2007).

Nevertheless, this general description of clitic placement is not without exceptions. For example, while Slovenian clitics are generally in the second position of the clause, they can sometimes also appear in the first position (Priestly, 1993: 428). Typically, these cases can be seen as having the material in the first position deleted. (22) below shows two cases of this (see

also example (7) above). In Slovenian yes-no questions, such as (22a), the clitic-first order may have partially become a marker of matrix yes-no questions (Marušič 2018).

(22) a. ~~Ali~~ <u>Mu</u> <u>je</u> poslala pismo? Sln.

    Q he.dat aux send letter

    'Did she send him a letter?'

  b. ~~Jaz~~ <u>sem</u> mislil, da ga ne bo. Sln.

    I aux think that he.gen neg aux.fut

    'I thought he would not come.'

In examples comparable to (22), clitics can also appear clause-initially in Czech (Lenertová 2004).

It should further be noted that in a second-position language, clitics can sometimes also appear further from the beginning of the clause than the second position, as shown for Czech in Lenertová (2004). For example, a fronted topic or focus element or an emphasized element can occur between a conjunction and a clitic in embedded clauses or root questions.

(23) Věřil byste, <u>že</u> [ᵢ REVMA] <u>jsem</u> ztratil? Cze.

    Believe.sg.m aux.cd.2 that even rheumatism.acc aux.sg.1 lost.sg.m

    'Would you believe that I have even lost my rheumatism?' (Lenertová, 2004: (2))

(24) A co Ema <u>by</u> na to řekla? Cze.

    and what.acc Emma aux.cd.3 to it said.sg.f

    'And what would *Emma* say to that?' (Lenertová, 2004: (5), adapted from ČNK)

Similar observations can also be made for Slovenian, (25) (even though there are differences and the counterparts of (23) and (24) do not seem possible in Slovenian):

(25) Pravi, da   DANES   se   pa   ne   počuti niti   malo   slabo. Sln.
      say   that today.foc refl.acc ptcl neg   feel   even   little bad
      'She says that she doesn't feel even a little bit bad.'

Lastly, certain positional freedom has also been observed with clitics occurring inside adjective phrases. When Slovenian pronominal clitics are part of the adjective phrase, they can be placed further away in the adjective phrase than the 2nd position, as demonstrated with the reflexive introduced by the present participle of 'to giggle' in (26) (Marušič 2008). This is a type of deviation from the 2nd-position restriction that does not seem to be observed when the same element functions as a clausal clitic.

(26) un   v   omari   polglasno   hihitajoč   se   kreten   Sln.
      that   in   closet   semi-loudly   giggling   refl   idiot
      'that idiot giggling softly in the closet' (Marušič, 2008: (16c))

Similarly to what has just been shown for Wackernagel clitics, some deviations from their ordinary position can also be found with verb-adjacent clitics. For example, Bulgarian verb-adjacent clitics must normally precede the verb (regardless of whether this puts them in the second, third, fourth, etc. position). However, when being preverbal would result in the clitics

ending up in the initial position in the clause, the CLITIC CLUSTER will follow the verb (the so-called Tobler-Mussafia effect), (27) (Franks, 2008, 93-94). Note again that the otherwise uncanonical postverbal position here does not lead to any change of the clitic order inside the clitic cluster, which is the same in (27a) and (27b).

(27) a. Ti   si   mu   gi   pokazvala.   Bul.
          you   aux.2.sg   he.dat they.acc   shown.fem   (Franks 2008: (4a))

      b. Pokazvala   si   mu   gi.   Bul.
          shown.fem   aux.2.sg   he.dat   they.acc
          'You have shown him them.'   (Franks, 2008: (6a))

      c. * Si   mu   gi   pokazvala.   Bul.
          aux.2.sg   he.dat they.acc   shown.fem   (Franks, 2008: (6a))

Moreover, an exception to the verb-adjacent placement of Bulgarian clitics itself has been documented as well. In certain cases, the clitics can be separated from the main-verb participle, by a light adjunct (Avgustinova, 1997: 68, fn. 55), (28).

(28) Šte   sam   ti   ja   veče   dal.   Bul.
      fut-prt cl-aux.1sg you.dat her.acc already give-pcp.sg.masc
      'I shall have already given it to you.'

Regardless of their exceptional placement, clitics in atypical positions retain all other typical clitic characteristics.

4. Clitics appear in a cluster

In our definition of (second-position) clitics one of their defining properties is that they appear in a fixed syntactically defined position inside the CLITIC CLUSTER. This means, first, that we should not be able to split up a string of clitics (it being a cluster), and second, that the order of clitics within a cluster should be fixed. As was the case with the defining characteristics discussed in sections 1 and 2, it turns out that neither of these predictions is completely unproblematic.

Let us start with the relative order of multiple clitics, which can be schematized as in Zimmerling and Kosta (2013), who identify the following three templates for CLITIC CLUSTERS in Slavic (cf. Franks and Holloway King 2000):

(29) West Slavic type of clitic template:

[$_{\text{Clitic Phrase}}$ [$_{\text{Clitic Phrase}}$ AUX1] [$_{\text{Clitic Phrase}}$ Pronouns: refl – dat – acc]]

Aux1: 1–2 p. present tense indicative BE-auxiliaries and conditional forms of *be*

(30) Old Novgorod/East Slavic type of clitic template:

[$_{\text{Clitic Phrase}}$ … [$_{\text{Clitic Phrase}}$ Pronouns: dat – acc] [$_{\text{Clitic Phrase}}$ AUX2]]

Aux2: 1–2 p. present tense indicative BE-auxiliaries

(31) Balkan Slavic type of clitic template:

[$_{\text{Clitic Phrase}}$ … [$_{\text{Clitic Phrase}}$ AUX1] [$_{\text{Clitic Phrase}}$ Pronouns: refl – dat – acc – gen]

[$_{\text{Clitic Phrase}}$ AUX2]]

Aux1: all present-tense indicative BE-aux. except 3p. sg. *Je*

Aux2: 3 p. sg. pres. BE-aux. *je* (in Slovenian also all forms of future aux.)

While the existence of these templates already indicates that there is variation in the ordering of clitics, languages also differ in how pronominal clitics are ordered. In BCS, the (partial) order within the pronominal clitic phrase is … < Dat < Acc/Gen < Acc.refl …, as in (32), while in Slovenian, Czech, Slovak, and Sorbian, the order of pronominal clitics is … < Refl < Dat < Acc < Gen …, as in (33) (Browne 1974, Hana 2007).[5] The complete sequence of Czech second-position clitics as given in Hana (2007) is in (34a). (34b) shows the Slovenian sequence, with some extra details compared to the templates from Toporišič (2000) and Greenberg (2006).[6]

(32) a.   Bojim <u>ga</u>   <u>se</u>.   BCS

                    fear   he.gen refl

                    'I'm afraid of him.'

       b.   Jedu <u>mi</u>   <u>se</u>   palačinke.

                    eat   I.dat   refl   pancakes

                    'I feel like eating pancakes.'

(33) a.   Bojim <u>se</u>   <u>ga</u>.   Sln.

                    fear   refl.acc   he.gen

                    'I'm afraid of him.'

       b.   Jejo   <u>se</u>   <u>mi</u>   palačinke.

                    eat   refl.acc   I.dat   pancakes

                    'I feel like eating pancakes.'

---

[5] The dative reflexive clitic *si* is absent in the central Štokavski variety of BCS but can be found in some Croatian varieties (Browne and Alt, 2004: 33, Browne 2010). A dative reflexive clitic pronoun different from the accusative/genitive reflexive pronoun exists also in Slovenian, Czech, Slovak and Sorbian.

[6] Not all (clausal) clitics are located in the CLITIC CLUSTER. Conjunctions and complementizers sometimes are and sometimes aren't, as mentioned in section 1, and while negation is sometimes taken to be part of the CLITIC CLUSTER (e.g. Toporišič 2000), it in fact procliticizes onto the finite verb, so its position at the end of the cluster, when this is where it is found, as in (25), is just a side-effect of the verb following the CLITIC CLUSTER. When the finite verb happens not to follow the CLITIC CLUSTER, *ne* procliticizes on the verb independently of the CLITIC CLUSTER.

(34)　　a.　　　... < aux1 < eth. dat / refl < adj. dat < compl. dat < acc < gen　(Hana, 2007: 12,

(22))

　　　　　b.　　　mood < aux1 < refl. dat < refl. acc < eth. dat < dat < acc < gen < aux2

　　　　　　　　mood: mood *naj* -- "should"

　　　　aux1:　the conditional *bi*, and all present-tense indicative BE-aux. except 3p. sg. *je*

　　　　aux2: 3 p. sg. BE-aux. *je* + all forms of future aux.

　　　　eth.dat: ethical dative

　　　　compl.dat: complement dative

　　　　adj.dat: adjunct dative (e.g. possessor dative[7])

While the existence of the template does not mean that all slots will or even can be filled

simultaneously, evidence can be provided for different parts of the sequence that cumulatively

justifies the entire template. For example, (35a) attests the existence of separate slots for the

dative and accusative reflexive clitics, as well as for their relative ordering, and (35b) provides

an example with two non-reflexive dative clitics, where the first is interpreted as an ethical

dative.

---

[7] Hana (2007) gives the example in (i) for adjunct dative. Similar structures exist also in BCS, Slovenian, Slovak,
etc.
(i)　　Zbláznil　　　　se　　　jí　　　manžel.　　　　　　　　　Cze.
　　　went-crazy　　　refl.acc　she.dat　husband
　　　'Her husband went crazy.'　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Hana, 2007: (17a))

(35) a. Putin <u>si</u> <u>se</u> <u>je</u> spet predlagal za predsednika. Sln.

Putin refl.dat refl.acc aux again suggest for president

'Putin again suggested himself to himself for president.'

b. On <u>se</u> <u>ti</u> <u>mi</u> ani nepředstavil. Cze.

he refl.acc you.dat I.dat even not-introduced

'You know, he did not even introduce himself to me.' (Hana, 2007: (16a))

In addition to identifying the order of clitics, a natural question to ask is also what factors determine the order of clitics. It seems that the order is at least partially determined by syntax, but given the cross-linguistic variation in clitic-cluster internal order discussed above, which is not paralleled in non-clitic syntax, this conclusion again seems (partly) unsupported.

It should also be noted, however, that the order of clitics may not be as strict as the description above suggests. For example, Stegovec (2020) claims that the Slovenian dative and accusative clitics are not ordered within the cluster and can appear in either order, as suggested by (36).[8] The prevalent order Dat > Acc is said to be a result of various restrictions on the co-occurence of direct (accusative) and indirect (dative) object clitics in which person plays a crucial role (see Stegovec 2020 for details).

(36) a. Mama <u>mu</u> <u>ga</u> <u>je</u> opisala. Sln.

mom he.dat he.acc aux described. (Stegovec, 2020: (9a))

---

[8] Note that there is cross-speaker variation in the acceptability of similar examples. Of the three authors of this paper, one shares the reported judgments from Stegovec (2020) but two do not. It is not clear whether this is a result of regional variation or something else. A quick search of the Gigafida corpus of written Slovenian returned 112 instances of *ga mu* order and 12.850 instances of *mu ga*, suggesting that Dat > Acc is clearly the dominant order, but also that Acc > Dat probably exists as well to some degree.

b.	Mama	ga		mu	je	opisala.
	mom	he.acc		he.dat	aux	described.F

'Mom described him to him.'   (Stegovec, 2020: (9b))

Similarly, accusative and genitive pronominal clitics in BCS are reported not to have a strict ordering (Browne 1975b, Schütze 1994). Given that most of these forms are homophonous, it could also be that the two orders are simply indistinguishable.

In Polish the reflexive clitic *się* can both precede or follow the other pronominal clitics, so for example when co-occurring with the dative 3p.m.sg clitic *mu*, both *się mu* and *mu się* are acceptable, and when co-occurring with the accusative 3p.m.sg clitic *go*, we find both *się go* and *go się* (Wayles Browne p.c., Gladney 1983, Rapaport 1988). Note that this is not necessarily a deviation from the typical clitic behavior as most Polish pronominal clitics (such as both *go* and *mu*) have also been argued not to be proper clitics but rather weak pronouns (Cetnarowska 2004).

Another instance of cluster internal order variation is observed in Slovenian. The mood clitic *naj* is given as the first clitic in (34b), but as shown in (37) *naj* can also follow the first auxiliary position within the CLITIC CLUSTER without a clear interpretive effect (though perhaps with register differences). Similarly, the clitic particle *pa* can appear nearly anywhere within the cluster, (38), again perhaps with register and/or dialect differences; Franks and Holloway King (2000) report this and note that the restrictions are unclear. Marušič et al. (2011) claim that the cluster medial position is linked to specific information-structural properties of individual clitics.

(37) a.   ...,   ki   <u>bi</u>   <u>naj</u>   <u>jim</u>   bile   izdane   odločbe   za

           C   aux.cd   mood   they.dat   aux   issued   orders   for

           višja   delovna   mesta,   Sln.

           higher   positions

           '… who were supposedly issued orders for higher positions,' (Gigafida corpus)

(37) b.   Gradili <u>bi</u>   <u>naj</u>   <u>ga</u>   deset   in   nato   dvajset   let

           build   aux.cond   mood   he.acc   ten   and   then   twenty   years

           z   njim   raziskovali.

           with   he.instr   research

           'They were supposed to build it for ten and then use it for research for 20 years.'

           (Gigafida corpus)

(38) a.   Včeraj   <u>pa</u>   <u>sem</u>   <u>ga</u>   potem   kar   pojedel.   Sln.

           yesterday   part   aux.1.sg   he.acc   then   pretty-much   eat

           'And then yesterday, I just pretty much ate it.'

(38) b.   Včeraj   <u>sem</u>   <u>ga</u>   <u>pa</u>   potem   kar   pojedel.

           yesterday   aux   he.acc   part   then   pretty-much   eat

           'Yesterday I just pretty much ate it.'

(38) c.   Ponuja   le   25   litrov,   <u>bi</u>   <u>pa</u>   <u>jih</u>   lahko   še

           offer   only   25   liters   aux.cd   part   they.gen   could   even

           precej   več.

           considerably   more

           'She offers only 25 liters, but she could offer considerably more.'

As for the unsplittability of the CLITIC CLUSTER, Lenertová (2004) turns to adverbs such as *už* 'already' and *prý* 'supposedly'. Whereas some might consider these adverbs to be clitics, they are typically not considered to be part of the CLITIC CLUSTER, and Lenertová (2004) shows that they can split the CLITIC CLUSTER, (39), even if their preferred position is either immediately preceding or following the cluster (as indicated by the parenthesized *už*'s).

(39) Já (už) <u>jsem</u> <u>už</u>   jich   (už)   potkal   hodně.   Cze.

      I   AUX   already   them.GEN   met.SG.M   a lot

     'I have already met a lot of them.'   (Lenertová, 2004: (10c), adapted from ČNK corpus)

Similarly, as noted in Bošković (2001), tonic elements can sometimes split up the clitic cluster in Slovenian; while the example in (40) indeed seems marginal (as marked by Bošković), one can construct perfectly acceptable examples too, the relevant factor being that the intervening material is focused, (41). Unlike in Slovenian, such material cannot break up CLITIC CLUSTERS in BCS, (42), as this would violate the requirement for clitics to be second in their intonational phrase (Bošković 2004), but the BCS CLITIC CLUSTER can be separated by a parenthetical. According to Bošković (2001), parentheticals separate intonational phrases (marked with #), which means that clitics are then placed in the expected position in the intonation phrase, (42).

(40) ? <u>So</u>   včeraj   <u>ga</u>   pretepli?   Sln.

    aux   yesterday   he.acc beaten

    'They beat him yesterday?' (note: this expresses doubt about yesterday, Bošković, 2001:

    162, (120))

(41) (Ne,   ne,   sprašujem   te,)   če   <u>so</u>   VČERAJ   <u>ga</u>   pretepli? Sln.

      no   no   ask   you.acc if   aux   yesterday   he.acc beaten

      '(No no, I am asking you) if they beat him YESTERDAY?'

(42) ? Oni   <u>su</u>,   #kao što   sam   vam   rekla#, predstavili <u>se</u>   Petru. BCS

      they   are   as   aux   you.dat said   introduced refl.acc   Petar.dat

      'They, as I told you, introduced themselves to Petar.' (Bošković, 2001: 3, (2b))[9]

Clitics can "escape" the cluster also through preposing of the entire verb phrase as in example

(43), taken from Bošković (2001).

(43) % Dali   <u>ga</u>   Mariji   <u>su</u>   Ivan   i   Stipe.   BCS

      given   it.acc   Marija.dat   aux   Ivan   and   Stipe

      'Give it to Marija, Ivan and Stipe did.' (Ćavar 1999 cited in Bošković, 2001: 51, (89))

Clitics also move from non-finite clauses to adjoin to the CLITIC CLUSTER of the finite clause,

which is often called CLITIC CLIMBING (e.g. Browne 1974, Progovac 1993, Stjepanović 1998,

Golden 2003, Milićević 2019 among others), (44), but this movement is restricted in a number of

ways. One of the restrictions, for example, is that only one clitic of the same 'kind' (e.g. just one

dative clitic) can appear within the cluster, (45) (Orešnik 1985).

---

[9] As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer there is disagreement about this judgment. Some speakers find similar examples impossible. The same holds of example (43), which is why we add the % sign.

(44) Milan <u>mu</u>   <u>ga</u>   <u>je</u>   ukazal povabiti   <u>ga</u>.   Sln.

Milan he.dat he.acc aux   order to-invite

'Milan ordered him to invite him.'

(45) a.   Če   <u>ji</u>   pomagam   natakniti   <u>mu</u>   ovratnico … Sln.

if   she.dat help   to-put-on   he.dat collar

'If I help her put a collar on him…'

b. * Če <u>ji</u> <u>mu</u> / <u>mu</u> <u>ji</u> pomagam natakniti ovratnico …   (Orešnik, 1985: 215)

In general, clitics therefore do appear in a fixed syntactically defined position within the CLITIC

CLUSTER, but there are contexts in which the CLITIC CLUSTER can be split and there are cases in

which the positions of the clitics are not fixed. Here again, clitics showing non-typical behavior

remain clitic-like according to (all) other properties.

5. Clitics behave like other independent syntactic elements

The placement of Slavic clitics varies: Bulgarian and Macedonian pronominal and auxiliary

(clausal) clitics are verb-adjacent, BCS, Slovenian, Czech and Slovak are 2nd-position clitics, and

Polish pronominal clitics / weak pronouns are freer in their placement but still need a host; see

section 2. Operator clitics, which include clitic complementizers, various particles, etc., are

placed in the position where the operator is supposed to be located in that particular sentence.

Within Generative Grammar much of the work on the synchrony of clitics has dealt with

questions such as whether clitics are heads or phrases and what type of movement they undergo,

or what is the nature of the relation between their position of interpretation and the position of

their pronunciation. Without subscribing to any particular subtheory we will call this relation

'movement', but we will not be discussing the properties of such movement.

Some of the phenomena discussed above are indeed easiest to explain if we see this relation as movement of a syntactic element. CLITIC CLIMBING, mentioned in the previous section and exemplified again here in (46), might be the clearest case. The two pronominal clitics that are pronounced as part of the CLITIC CLUSTER of the matrix clause, in which they precede the auxiliary clitic of the matrix clause, are both arguments of (and receive theta roles from) the embedded verb *dati* "give". That they are in fact moved from the embedded clause is most obvious from the fact that the two clitics can also (under certain conditions) remain inside the embedded non-finite clause, as in (46b).

(46)　a.　Marija <u>mi</u>　<u>ga</u>　<u>je</u>　zaboravila　dati.　　　　　　　BCS

　　　　　Marija I.dat　it.acc　aux　forgotten　give.inf

　　　　　'It was Marija who has forgotten to give it to me.' (Mišeska Tomić 1996: (8))

　　b.　Marija <u>je</u> zaboravila dati <u>mi</u> <u>ga</u>.

Another case that seems equally clear in arguing for movement between the two positions involves examples with VP-preposing of the type shown in (47b) (or (43) above). Note that this example does not involve clitic climbing:

(47)　a.　Janez　<u>ji</u>　　　<u>ga</u>　<u>je</u>　prebral včeraj.　　　　　　Sln.

　　　　　Janez　she.dat　　it.acc　aux　read　yesterday

　　　　　'Janez read it to her yesterday.'　　(Golden, 2003: (27a))

　　b.　[Prebral <u>ji</u> <u>ga</u> včeraj]　<u>je</u> Janez.　　(Golden, 2003: (27e))

In (47a) the two pronominal clitics are part of the CLITIC CLUSTER in the second position, but when the verb phrase is preposed to the front of the clause, as in (47b), the two clitics (can) move as part of the fronted verb phrase and are pronounced in the second position of the preposed verb phrase, while the auxiliary clitic, which does not originate from inside the verb phrase cannot be pronounced within the preposed verb phrase but occupies the second position of the clause immediately following the preposed verb phrase. An even clearer case of the contrast between clitic movement from a clause and preposing syntactic constituents is shown in (48). In (48b) the embedded non-finite clause fronts to the beginning of the sentence, carrying with it the two pronominal clitics of the embedded non-finite clause; in (48a), on the other hand, only the clitics move.

(48)   a.   Janez <u>se</u>   <u>ji</u>   <u>ga</u>   <u>je</u>   naveličal zmeraj   samo   hvaliti. Sln.
               Janez refl   she.dat he.acc aux   tired   always   just   to-praise
               'Janez grew tired of praising him to her.'   (based on Golden, 2003: (24a))

       b.   [Zmeraj <u>ji ga</u> samo hvaliti] <u>se je</u> Janez naveličal. (based on Golden, 2003: (31a))

Clitic movement seems to obey all standard constraints on movement: for example, clitics cannot front from an embedded finite clause, they cannot front from an adjunct, they cannot move out of complex noun phrases, etc. A natural conclusion could thus be that clitic movement is a version of standard syntactic movement (or if the theory of one's choice does not include movement, some other regular syntactic relation that is assumed by the theory).

       Once again, however, this conclusion can also be relativized, as we will briefly show with just one fact. As shown in Marušič and Žaucer (2017) and in (49), clitic fronting from embedded

non-finite clauses can violate the Coordinate Structure Constraint (Ross, 1967: 89), a constraint according to which "in a coordinate structure, no conjunct may be moved nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct."

(49) Janez jo   je   hotel [[__ spoznati] in   [ji   predstaviti Petra]]. Sln.
      Janez she.acc aux   wanted   meet   and she.dat present   Peter
      'Janez wanted to meet her and present Peter to her.'

Given that clitic fronting from embedded non-finite clauses was said to be only optional, as opposed to clitic fronting to the second position of their source-clause, we might be able to conclude that the two instances of clitic fronting should be considered two separate phenomena obeying different constraints.

6. Conclusions

We presented an overview of some of the properties of Slavic clitics, with an emphasis on the South Slavic clausal clitics. At first sight, clitics seem easy to identify: they are phonologically dependent, stressless functional elements that appear in a fixed syntactically defined position, but otherwise behave like other independent syntactic elements. Yet a closer examination shows that all of the listed properties can be violated individually without affecting the rest of the characteristics that identify an element as a clitic. That is, even though clitics are lexically unstressed and typically remain without a stress also on the surface, they can receive stress in certain contexts while retaining all other typical clitic properties, that is, they do not lose their position in the clitic cluster and within the clause (cf. Franks 2016). Similarly, clitics prefer to be

in one and the same syntactic position, but when they nevertheless occur in an atypical position, they do not lose the other typical clitic properties, such as phonological dependence on the neighboring prosodic word. Instead of with their usual host (in the case of second-position clitics, either the first or the second prosodic word in the clause), they are pronounced with whatever prosodic word happens to be next to them, or instead of before the verb in Bulgarian, after the verb. So in order to provide a more accurate description of Slavic clitics, we rephrase the characterisation from (2) as (50).

(50) (*Slavic Clausal*) Clitics are *typically* phonologically dependent, stressless functional elements that *typically* appear in a fixed syntactically defined position both inside the clause and inside the CLITIC CLUSTER but otherwise *typically* behave like other independent syntactic elements.

A further complicating factor in providing an accurate uniform characterization comes from the considerable cross-linguistic variation in the behavior of Slavic clausal clitic.

Other Slavic clitics, such as operator clitics that include subordinators, coordinators and certain adverbial or particle clitics and nominal clitics, are for the most part more uniform both across various Slavic languages and language-internally.

References

Anderson, S.R (1993). Wackernagel's revenge: Clitics, morphology, and the syntax of second position. *Language*. 68–98.

Anderson, S.R. (1992). *A-Morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Avgustinova, T. (1994). On Bulgarian Verbal Clitics. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 2(1), 29–47.

Avgustinova, T. (1997). *Word Order and Clitics in Bulgarian*. Doctoral dissertation, Universität des Saarlandes.

Barić, E. et al. (2005). *Hrvatska gramatika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Bennett, D. C. (1987). Word-Order Change in Progress: The Case of Slovene and Serbo-Croat and Its Relevance for Germanic. *Journal of Linguistics,* 23(2), 269–287. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4175891

Bošković, Ž. (2001). *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena.* Brill.

Bošković, Ž. (2004). Clitic Placement in South Slavic. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 12(1/2), 37–90.

Bošković, Ž. (2016). On second position clitics crosslinguistically. In F. Marušič & R. Žaucer, eds., *Formal studies in Slovenian syntax: in honor of Janez Orešnik*, Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, Linguistik aktuell/Linguistics today, pp. 23–53.

Browne, W. (1974). On the problem of enclitic placement in Serbo-Croatian. In R. D. Brecht and C. V. Chvany, eds., *Slavic transformational syntax* (Michigan Slavic Materials 10), Ann Arbor: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Michigan, pp. 36–52.

Browne, W. (1975a). Notes on clauses as subjects. In R. Filipović, ed., *Contrastive analysis of English and Serbo-Croatian*. Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics, University of Zagreb, pp. 143–145.

Browne, W. (1975b). Serbo-Croatian enclitics for English-speaking learners. In R. Filipović, ed., *Contrastive analysis of English and Serbo-Croatian*. 105–134. Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics, University of Zagreb. [Reprinted in *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 12.1-2 (2004) 249-283.]

Browne, W. (2010). Syntactic Studies in Burgenland Croatian: the Order of Clitics. *Balkanistica*, (23), 21–41.

Browne, W. and Alt, T. (2004). *A Handbook of Bosnian, Serbian, and Croatian*. Durham, NC: Slavic and East European Language Research Center. http://www.seelrc.org:8080/grammar/pdf/compgrammar_bcs.pdf

Cetnarowska, B. (2004). The scale of pronominal strenght in Polish: An OT analysis of unstressed and weak pronouns. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 39: 39–57.

Ćavar, D. (1999). *Aspects of the syntax-phonology interface*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Potsdam.

Diesing, M. and Zec, D. (2017). Getting in the first word: Prosody and predicate initial sentences in Serbian. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 2(1), 24. 1–25, DOI: https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.204

Dvořak, B. (2007). Slovenian Clitic Pronouns and What is so Special about Them. *Slovenski jezik / Slovene Linguistic Studies,* (6), 209–233. http://dx.doi.org/10.17161/SLS.1808.4408

Franks, S. (2008). Clitic Placement, Prosody, and the Bulgarian Verbal Complex. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 1(1), 91–137. doi:10.1353/jsl.0.0011.

Franks, S. (2016). Clitics become minimal(ist). In F. Marušič & R. Žaucer, eds., *Formal studies in Slovenian syntax: in honor of Janez Orešnik*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, Linguistik aktuell/Linguistics today, pp. 91–128.

Franks, S. and Holloway King, T. (2000). *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford University Press.

Frleta, T. (2018). Pravilo „drugog mjesta" u hrvatskom jeziku ili o polu(ne)slobodnom redu riječi. *Jezik: časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, 65(1), 11–23.

Gladney. F. V. (1983). Handbook of Polish. Urbana IL: G and G Press.

Golden, M. (2003). Clitic placement and clitic climbing in Slovenian. *STUF -- Language Typology and Universals*, 56(3), 208–233.

Golden, M. and Sheppard, M. (2000). Slovene Pronominal Clitics. F. Beukema & M. den Dikken, eds., T*he Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 191–207.

Greenberg, M. L. (2006). *A Short Reference Grammar of Standard Slovene*. SEELRC Reference Grammar Network.

Gribble, C. (1988). On Clitics in Old Bulgarian and Old Russian. In A. Schenker, ed., *American Contributions to the 10th International Congress of Slavists*. Columbus: Slavica.

Hana, J. (2007). Czech clitics in higher order grammar. Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Hyman, L. M. (2006). Word-prosodic typology. *Phonology*, 23, 225–257. doi:10.1017/S0952675706000893

Katičić, R. (2002). *Sintaksa hrvatskog književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus, HAZU.

Kedveš, A. and Werkmann, A. (2013). Zanaglasnice u nastavi hrvatskoga jezika – između

predodžbe i prakse. *Rasprave*, 39(2), 457–473

Lenertová, D. (2004). Czech Pronominal Clitics. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics,* 12(1-2), 135–171.

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24599870

Marković, M. and Milićev, T. (2012). Clitic placement and the properties of the Intonational

Phrase in Serbian. In S. Halupka-Rešetar, M. Marković, T. Milićev & N. Milićević, eds.,

Selected Papers from SinFonIJA 3. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishers,

pp. 175–204.

Marušič, F. (2008). Slovenian Clitics Have No Unique Syntactic Position. In A. Antonenko, J.

Bailyn & C. Bethin, eds., *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 16: The Stony Brook*

Meeting 2007. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, pp. 266–281.

Marušič, F. (2018). Slovenski jezik II – skladnja. Class lecture notes, University of Nova Gorica.

URL: http://www.ung.si/~fmarusic/ung/sj_4/index.html

Marušič, F., Mišmaš, P. and Žaucer, R. (2011). Some notes on the Slovenian second position

conjunction *pa*. Paper presented at GLiP 7 in Wroclaw, Poland. Dec 2-4, 2011. URL:

http://www.ung.si/~fmarusic/pub/marusicetal_2011_pa_pa_glip_handout.pdf

Marušič, F. and Žaucer, R. (2017). Coordinate structure constraint: A-/A'-movement vs. clitic

movement. *Linguistica brunensia* 65.2: 69–85.

Migdalski, K. (2009). On the Emergence of the Second Position Cliticization in Slavic. In G.

Zybatow, U. Junghanns, D. Lenertová & P. Biskup, eds., *Studies in Formal Slavic*

Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics and Information Structure: Proceedings of

FDSL 7, Leipzig 2007. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 183–196.

Milićević, J. (2019). Clitic Pseudo-Climbing out of Dependent Infinitive Phrases in Serbian.

Journal of Slavic Linguistics, 27(1), 27–55. DOI: 10.1353/jsl.2019.0001

Mišeska Tomić, O. (1996). The Balkan Slavic clausal clitics. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 14, 811–872. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00133364

Mišeska Tomić, O. (2001). Operator clitics. In B. Gerlach & J. Grijzenhout, eds., *Clitics in phonology, morphology and syntax*. Vol. 36. John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 387–404. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.36.15mis

Orešnik, J. (1984). Slovenske breznaglasnice se vedejo predvsem kot proklitike. *Jezik in slovstvo,* 29(4), 129.

Orešnik, J. (1985). O naslonskem nizu v knjižni slovenščini. *Jezik in slovstvo,* 31(6), 213–215.

Pešikan, M. (1958). O mestu enklitike u rečenici. *Naš jezik,* 9, 305–311.

Priestly, T. (1993). Slovene. In B. Comrie & G. Corbett, eds., *The Slavonic Languages*. London: Routledge, pp. 388–451.

Progovac, L. (1993). Locality and Subjunctive-like Complements in Serbo-Croatian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 1(1), 116–144. [Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24599042]

Rappaport, G. C. (1988). On the relationship between prosodic and syntactic properties of pronouns in the Slavic languages. In A. M. Schenker (ed.) *American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists*. *Sofia, September 1988*. Bloomington, In: Slavica Publishers, pp. 301-27.

Ross, J. R. (1967). *Constraints on variables in syntax.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Schütze, C. T. (1994). Serbo-Croatian Second Position Clitic Placement and the Phonology-Syntax Interface. In A. Carnie & H. Harley with T. Bures, eds., *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 21, Papers on phonology and morphology*. Cambridge, Mass.: MITWPL, pp. 373–473.

Sławski, F. (1946). *Miejsce enklityki odmiennej w dziejach języka bułgarskiego.* Kraków: Polska

Akademia Umiejętności.

Stegovec, A. (2020). Taking case out of the Person-Case Constraint. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 38, 261–311. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-019-09443-0

Stjepanović, S. (1998). On the placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics: Evidence from clitic climbing and VP ellipsis. In Ž. Bošković, S. Franks & W. Snyder, eds., *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Connecticut meeting 1997*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, pp. 267–86.

Timberlake, A. (2014). The Simple Sentence. In K. Gutschmidt, S. Kempgen, T. Berger & P. Kosta, eds., *Die slavischen Sprachen Band 2 / The Slavic Languages Volume 2*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 1675–1699.

Toman, J. (1996). A note on clitics and prosody. In A. L. Halpern & A. M. Zwicky, eds., *Approaching second. Second position clitics and related phenomena. CSLI Lecture Notes 61*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications, pp. 505–510.

Toporišič, J. (2000). *Slovenska slovnica*, 4th edn. Maribor: Obzorja.

Wackernagel, J. ([1892] 2020). *On a law of Indo-European word order: Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung* (Classics in Linguistics 7). Berlin: Language Science Press.

Werle, A. (2009). *Word, Phrase, And Clitic Prosody In Bosnian, Serbian, And Croatian*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts - Amherst.

Zimmerling, A. and Kosta, P. (2013). Slavic clitics: a typology. *STUF-Language typology and universals,* 66(2), 178–214.

Abstract: This chapter presents an overview of some of the properties of Slavic clitics. In principle, clitics seem easy to identify: Clitics are phonologically dependent functional elements that appear in a fixed syntactically defined position in the clitic cluster but otherwise behave like other independent syntactic elements. But these characteristics are fraught with exceptions. We focus on these exceptions in the chapter to show that clitics although lexically stressless in certain contexts can be stressed; although they seem to have a fixed position in a sentence, they can appear in unexpected positions both within the clause and within the clitic cluster; although they are functional elements whose position is governed by universal principles, their positioning differs across Slavic languages, and that they, despite being syntactically independent elements, occasionally disobey constraints that other syntactically independent elements typically obey.