

On the Diachrony of the Clitic Cluster in Bulgarian

Tsvetana Dimitrova
Institute for Bulgarian Language, Sofia

Abstract The article traces back the formation of the clitic cluster in Bulgarian starting from the Old Church Slavonic through Middle Bulgarian up to the Early Modern Bulgarian and beyond. It offers a hypothetical two-layer structure of the cluster – with the main layer consisting of a (pronominal) core and a (verbal) periphery, and a secondary layer hosting ('quasi-clitical') elements that exhibit, both diachronically and synchronically, a behaviour that is not strictly consistent with that of the clitical elements. The language material from three corpora shows that there was no change in the positions of the elements in the core, while the observed changes in the periphery are mainly due to changes in the set of the elements (as a result of the restructuring of the pronoun system and changes in the auxiliary system, as well as the loss of some early clitics, such as the discourse markers).

Keywords Bulgarian language. Clitics. Clitic cluster. Diachrony. Corpora.

Summary 1 Introduction. – 2 Clitics in Bulgarian. – 3 Clustering: The History. – 3.1 Discourse Clitics. – 3.2 Pronominal Clitics. – 3.3 Verbal Clitics and Clitic-Like Elements.



Edizioni
Ca' Foscari

Peer review

Submitted	2021-07-21
Accepted	2021-10-15
Published	2020-12-20

Open access

© 2021 | Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public License



Citation Dimitrova, T. (2021). "On the Diachrony of the Clitic Cluster in Bulgarian". *Balcania et Slavia*, 1(1), 67-96.

1 Introduction

Slavic clitics have been the focus of attention in a number of works in the recent decades (Franks, King 2000; Franks 2017; Zimmerling 2013; Migdalski 2016; among many others), with accounts also on the diachrony of cliticization in (one or more) Slavic languages.¹

The diachrony of the Bulgarian clitics has drawn particular interest because Bulgarian is part of the Balkan *Sprachbund* and as such it exhibits verb-adjacent cliticization pattern, but also because it displays various patterns in its history.² Although it has been claimed that the position of clitics in Old Church Slavonic (OCS)³ texts mostly echoes their placement in the Greek originals, there are numerous exceptions reflecting patterns in the language of the scribes (especially in constructions without parallels in Greek; see Sławski 1946, among others). In her seminal study on the clitics in the history of Bulgarian, Pancheva (2005) argues that verb-adjacent clitics found in Old Bulgarian (and OCS) temporarily switched to second-position (up to and beyond the Middle Bulgarian period), only to become verb-adjacent again (in modern Bulgarian). Migdalski (2016) claims that in the majority of cases pronominal clitics in OCS were verb-adjacent while the second position (2P) was obligatory only for the so-called ‘operator’ clitics (discourse markers and ‘ethical datives’); he relates the verb-adjacency to the presence of tense morphology in a language.

The discussion in the present article is based on data excerpted from manuscripts that presumably reflect the diachrony of the Bulgarian language and are closer to the vernacular than to the literary language. The main aim of the article is to sketch the evolvement of the (sentential) clitic cluster in the history of Bulgarian and to check

Part of the work presented in the article was performed within the Russian-Bulgarian bilateral project *Evolution of the Grammatical Structure in Russian and Bulgarian Languages in a Contrastive Context: Corpus Analysis and Formal Grammars*. The Bulgarian part has been financially supported by the Fund of Scientific Research at the Ministry of Education and Science with a contract N02/2 from 14.06.2018. A version of the text was presented at the 25th annual conference *Derzhavin Readings* in March 2020, within the section “Contemporary and Historical Problems of Bulgarian and Slavic Studies” (with a short paper included in the proceedings). I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers of the present article for the constructive comments, as well as Andrej Bojadžiev for the discussion of some points and Iliyana Krapova for the extensive comments and suggestions. Needless to say, the Author is solely responsible for all the remaining errors.

1 Sławski 1946; Radanović-Kocić 1988; Pancheva 2005; Kosek 2011; Zimmerling 2013; Migdalski 2013; 2016.

2 Sławski 1946; Pancheva 2005; Zimmerling 2013; Migdalski 2013; 2016.

3 Here I will use the term Old Church Slavonic (OCS), which reflects the status of the language as used by the Slavic orthodox community (cf. Bujukliev et al. 1993). However, the linguistic features of the texts in the monuments are assumed to reflect those of Old Bulgarian.

whether there has been a significant change in the clustering pattern. The observations on this specific set of data confirm the old hypothesis that the clitics in Bulgarian are (and were) verb-adjacent (and also target 2P). The necessary ramification here is that any conclusions based on heterogeneous diachronic data highly depend on the sources and their analysis. The notion ‘second position’, for example, depends on syntactic constituency within the language and on the interpretation of the data that are taken into account. With diachronic texts, the segmentation is also a matter of interpretation: for the OCS data here, the texts were already segmented within the corpus used for reference; with the other data (Middle Bulgarian and Early Middle Bulgarian), however, segmentation was done aside. The difficulties with the specifics of the data remain: with the OCS data I have tried to consider variant readings if accessible, with interesting results;⁴ this should be done over all the data if possible (for example, one should consider variant readings within the texts of the damaskin collections). In order for such a task to be accomplished, however, one needs a really big and smartly annotated corpus, which is unfortunately missing at this time.

2 Clitics in Bulgarian

To define ‘what a clitic is’ is not a trivial task because, as Franks (2017, 146) puts it, “the idiosyncrasies of clitics all go in the same direction, i.e., a *negative* one”. It is easier to say what clitics are not rather than what they are, because they are – prosodically, morphologically, lexically, and syntactically – ‘deficient’. Firstly, clitics are prosodically deficient as they do not have an independent stress, but form a prosodic unit with another, prosodically ‘strong’, word. However, in many languages clitics may host the stress when preceding or following other elements that remain prosodically ‘weak’ (or may receive secondary stress). In present-day standard Bulgarian, clitics may bear stress after negation as in (1) (there is also a hypothesis for a secondary stress here; Krāsteva (2020, 119), on the basis of experimental data, claims that in interrogative sentences with negation, even when the clitics receive stress, they do not have “an independent intonational peak”).

⁴ A more detailed review cannot be supplied here but ca. 43% of the occurrences of the datives *ми* ‘I.DAT’ and *ти* ‘you.DAT’ in Codex Marianus (CM) have variant readings in other New Testament (NT) texts as witnessed in Codex Zographensis (CZ), Codex Assemani (CA) and Codex Sabbae (CSb), and/or in the respective Greek editions.

(1)

Не_ МУ	даде	книгата,	нали?
NEG_* he.DAT	gave	book.the	right

* The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: NEG, negative particle; ЕМФН, emphatic particle, e.g. *же*; NOM, nominative; GEN, genitive; DAT, dative; ACC, accusative; ReflCL, *са*; ReflPossCL, *си*; DEF, word form with a definite article; COP, copula; AUX, auxiliary; COND, conditional; INF, infinitive; IND, indicative; AOR, aorist; IMPF, imperfect; RENARR, renarrative; SUBJ, subjunctive. The elements at focus are given in bold.

Secondly, clitics are a ‘bag’ of grammatical features (Sadock 1991) and do not have lexico-conceptual features, i.e. they are also semantically deficient (Franks 2017, 154). Historically, the short dative forms of the first- and second-person singular pronouns *ми* ‘I.DAT’ and *ти* ‘you.DAT’ were already clitics in Old Bulgarian/OCS (as were the parallel pronouns in Greek, see Wackernagel 2009; Večerka 1989; 1993); other short pronominal forms, however, became clitics as a result of early attrition: 3pSg masculine accusative *е-го* (ѣ-го)⁵ ‘he.ACC’ > *го* ‘he.ACC’, with further reconsideration of *г-* as a third-person marker resulting in a generalised third-person plural with the ending *-и* (*ги* ‘they.ACC’); *еж/е* > *ж* > *я* ‘she.ACC’ (3pSg feminine accusative); *емоу* > *мой* ‘he.DAT’ (3pSg masculine and neuter dative), *еи* > *ей* > *й* ‘she.DAT’ (3pSg feminine dative), etc.; see Byjukliev et al. 1991, 234-6; Mirčev 1963, 165-6).

Thirdly, clitics are syntactically dependent although different elements may exhibit different behaviour. Clitics can be categorised into ‘simple’ (non-paradigmatic) and ‘special’ (paradigmatic) (Zwicky 1977; 1985): in present-day Bulgarian, the latter are present-tense auxiliaries/copulas, short forms of personal and possessive pronouns, which have corresponding ‘full’ (prosodically and syntactically ‘strong’) forms.

Clitics are known for their ability to clusterise – in some languages the clitic cluster has a fixed position in the clause or in the phrase (in standard Bulgarian these are the ‘special’ clitics and the ‘simple’ interrogative *ли*). The so-called Wackernagel clitics in Indo-European languages were all second-position (2P) clitics. At issue here would be the definition of the second position: whether the clitic is positioned after the first word in the sentence, as originally formulated by Wackernagel (2009), or after the first syntactic constituent (including a phrasal one) (Halpern 1995), or after the first constituent that immediately follows the so-called rhythmic-syntactic barrier of Zaliznjak (2008). Zaliznjak introduced this barrier as an ad-

⁵ Orthographic variants throughout the text are generalised if possible (e.g. *ero* = *егw*; *ми* = *ми* etc.), except for certain examples. The same is true for jotated variants (i.e. *ero* is given instead of *јеро* etc.).

ditional (and obligatory) condition to make the Wackernagel effect work for the Old Russian clitics. Additionally, the restrictions known as the Tobler-Mussafia's law (Tobler 1875; Mussafia 1888), originally formulated for the Romance languages, do not allow 'special' clitics to be first in the sentence.

All these constraints are partially valid for present-day standard Bulgarian: clitics are mostly verb-adjacent, and are found either after the verb in the first position in the clause, as in (2a), or before the verb if there is another constituent in first position, as in (2b). Although (2c) is ungrammatical with clitics following both the subject and the verb and coming third in the linear order of the clause, clitics can still be found further up in the clause following more than one constituent, as in (2d). Clitics may also land third after a preceding verb that, however, is analysed as first after the rhythmic-syntactic barrier (with other sentential element to its left), as in (2e).

(2) a.

Даде	му	я	Иван	книгата
gave	he.DAT	she.ACC	Ivan	book.DEF

b.

Иван	му	я	даде	книгата
Ivan	he.DAT	she.ACC	gave	book.DEF

c.

*Иван	даде	му	я	книгата
*Ivan	gave	he.DAT	she.ACC	book.DEF

d.

В	събота	изненадващо	Иван	му	я	даде	книгата
In	Saturday	surprisingly	Ivan	he.DAT	she.ACC	gave	book.DEF

e.

Да,	даде	му	я	книгата	Иван
Yes,	gave	he.DAT	she.ACC	book.DEF	Ivan

According to Zimmerling (2013, 89), there are different language systems regarding the position of the clitics, and Bulgarian belongs to the class of languages with so-called 'extended WP+ system', in which the clustering clitics are expected to be verb-adjacent or rather the verb in sentences with 2P clitics is expected to be clitic-adjacent, i.e.

the positional constraint here is both on the clitic(s) and on the verb.⁶ In addition, the clustering clitics are in more or less fixed position relative to the clause boundary – generally second after an element in complementiser position (conjunctions, wh-words, other relativisers, etc.) or following the first constituent that comes immediately after the so-called rhythmic-syntactic barrier of Zaliznjak (2008).

The following considerations are applicable for the discussion that follows. In the article, I assume that second-position of the clitics is the position following: (a) a specific set of conjunctions (да ‘to’, че ‘that’, ъко ‘as’, аште ‘if’, ами ‘but’); (b) wh-words; (c) other relativisers (дето, де, щото ‘that, which’);⁷ (d) a constituent in focus or topic; or (e) verbal element in first position. Sentential constituents located outside the boundary of the clause such as vocatives and some extra-sentential particles do not count as first position. Differently from other Slavic languages, clitics in Bulgarian cannot be found first in the sentence, and in spite of some exceptions in historical texts, Bulgarian clitics in general comply with the Tobler-Mussafia’s law if and only if the latter applies to the clause and not to the level of the intonational phrase (i.e. relative to the rhythmic-syntactic barrier of Zaliznjak (2008)). In what follows, we will see that these considerations are also valid for the history of Bulgarian in spite of some counter-examples.

3 Clustering: The History

The hypothesis probed in the article is that the order of the elements within the cluster is a follow-up on the diachronic development of elements targeting the second position, from left to right. Thus, the oldest clitics (2P) would be on the far left (or first) of the clustering elements, while the newest ones would land on the (far) right. Beside the special clitics and the discourse clitics, elements that are found around the cluster and are considered (semi-)part of it by some authors (see more in Zaliznjak 2008), are: the interrogative clitic *ли*, which is found on the far left but also, given that it does not impose any syntactic restrictions on the preceding element, it may show up after each of the other elements in the cluster; the old adverbial particles *и* ‘and’, *тоу* ‘then’; and the adverbs *пакъ*, *пакы* ‘again’.

6 As one of the reviewers rightly put it “a decisive factor could be the position of the verb, and in that scenario the second position requirement is irrelevant”, although there are still some exceptions, though obscure or stylistically marked.

7 These form prosodic words (linked by *_*) with the clitics in some texts – in fact, in these positions, the clitics are part of the first prosodic complex: DLv (17th c.; Mladenova, Velčeva 2013): *дѣто_мѹ_се* даде воля ономѹзи влѣкѹ. *щото_е* сегà а̀нтихрѣсть. *и_да_се* поклонѣть влѣкѹ, *че_мѹ_е* работата ка̀то на_влѣкъ.

Not all clustering elements in present-day Bulgarian show similar behaviour. Monosyllabic auxiliaries, other than the present-tense ones, such as the conditional **би** ‘would’, the past-tense **бе** ‘was/were’, the future **ще** ‘will/shall’, may also appear first in the clause. Both in present-day standard Bulgarian and in the historical data observed in the article, these auxiliaries may be found either to the left or to the right of the pronominal elements (the short forms of dative and accusative personal pronouns, the short forms of possessive personal pronouns, which have the same form as the dative personal ones, and the short reflexive pronouns – accusative **се** and dative **си**). Within the cluster, the pronominal clitics appear in a fixed order with respect to one another: the dative always precedes the accusative (with reflexives behaving in a parallel way), while the present-tense auxiliaries show a split behaviour: all persons except third person singular show up to the left of the pronominals, while the third-person singular auxiliary (e‘is.3pSg’) shows up to its right.

In the present article, I propose that the cluster is composed of a primary layer and a secondary one. The primary layer is further split into a core (pronominal) and a periphery (verbal). This is also historically motivated as the auxiliary clitics have joined the clustering elements later (present-tense auxiliary clitics are derived via attrition to the left or to the right of the remaining elements: first-person singular **е-сѣм** > **сѣм** ‘am.1pSg’; second-person singular **е-си** > **си** ‘are.2pSg’; third-person singular **е-стѣ** > **е** ‘is.3pSg’; third-person plural **сѣ-тъ** > **са** ‘are.3pPl’). The secondary layer hosts elements that are clitic-adjacent such as past-tense auxiliaries whose position also varies as in (3a) vs. (3b), as well as the conditional (see Nicolova 2008).

(3) a.

Иван	бе/беше/бил	му	го	дал.
Ivan	be.AOR/IMPF/RENARR	he.DAT	he.ACC	given

b.

Иван	му	го	бе/беше/бил	дал.
Ivan	he.DAT	he.ACC	be.AOR/IMPF/RENARR	given

In the pattern in (4), the primary layer is in bold. Some dialects have retained only present-tense AUX2, i.e. the verbal clitic is to the right (Antonova-Vasileva et al. 2016, map 144).

(4) (QU) (AUX0) **AUX1 DAT ACC AUX2** (AUX +)

The ordering in (4) illustrates the overall pattern in present-day standard Bulgarian and if we are to judge by the data discussed be-

low, it has undergone relatively few changes, which have rather affected the inventory of the elements that may appear in the respective slots rather than the pattern.

The earliest 2P clitics in Old Bulgarian/OCS are the discourse markers *же* and *бо* (the latter, however, was lost early). The pronominal clitics, which presumably joined the cluster at a later point and which build the core of the primary layer also in the history of Bulgarian, can be classified into several subclasses depending on their placement within the cluster: (1) the dative first-person singular *ми* 'I.DAT' and second-person singular *ти* 'you.DAT'; (2) the short forms of anaphoric pronouns (which would be later reanalysed as third-person pronouns): *и* 'he.ACC' (masculine singular; neuter and feminine dual), *ѡ* 'she.ACC' (feminine singular), *ѣ* 'it.ACC' (neuter singular), *ѡ* 'they.ACC' (plural, masculine and feminine), *ѣ/ѡ* 'they.DU' (neuter plural; masculine dual); the accusative short forms of the first- and second-person singular personal pronouns *мѡ* 'I.ACC' and *тѡ* 'you.ACC' (and, possibly, plurals and duals), defined as semi-clitics (Vaillant 1948, 262; Večerka 1989, 42) as they may occur in 'strong' positions – after a preposition and (rarely) at the beginning of a sentence; and reflexives *сѡ* (accusative) and *си* (dative), also found after prepositions; (3) in later texts, the inventory expands with third-person singular datives *моу* 'he.DAT' (masculine and neuter) and *ѣ* 'she.DAT' (feminine) derived from the earlier dative short forms *емоу* and *ѣи* that also tend to appear more or less adjacent to the position of the cluster in earlier texts.

Both historically and in present-day Bulgarian, verbal elements ('connectors'; Zimmerling 2013) among the clustering elements are located in the periphery of the primary layer and display variation in placement with respect to other clustering elements in that they can occupy either AUX1 or AUX2 in (5) below. These are: the monosyllabic auxiliaries of *бѣти* (optative *бѣ/би* 'would'; aorist *бѣ* 'was/were.AOR'; imperfect *бѣ* 'was/were.IMPF', which, however, may be found also in first position); the future auxiliary *ще/щѣ* 'will/shall' (with variants *ке, хте, че*, etc.) appearing not earlier than Middle Bulgarian; present-tense auxiliaries and their successors: *есмѣ* (*сѣм, смѣ*) 'am.1pSg', *еси* (*си*) '2pSg', *3pSg естѣ* (*ѣ*) 'is.3Sg', *есме* (*сме*) 'are.1pPl', *есте* (*сте*) 'are.2pPl', *сѣтъ* (*сѣ, са*) 'are.3pPl'.

The interrogative clitic *ли* (to the far left in both (4) and (5)) and adverbial particles are part of the secondary layer. These are: *ти* 'and', *и* 'and', *пак(ѣ)* 'again', *тоу* 'then', etc. The adverbs may show up on both sides of the primary layer, as indicated by the two positions of ADV in (5).

The pattern in (5) gives the relative order of the elements that tend to clusterise as witnessed in the earliest historical texts. With some changes, this order correlates with the one that has been observed by Zaliznjak (2008, 82) in the Novgorod charters. Note that not all elements that appear in bold in (5) are necessarily clitics; as will be seen below, some of them are semi-clitics, while others are clitic-like.

(5) DISC QU DISC ADV **AUX1 DAT (REFL)**⁸ **ACC AUX2** ADV

According to the so-called ‘historical principle’, the order of the clitics in the cluster mirrors the chronology in which they have become ‘weak’, a pre-condition for their later reanalysis as clitics. This principle predicts that potential members of the clitic cluster would join the clustering elements only to their right. According to Zimmerling (2013), this principle cannot explain the order but can only account for the change in the status of the elements, which is a mechanism for expanding the cluster. Observations on the data that will be discussed, however, show that this is true for a limited set of elements with relatively fixed slots, either in the clause or in the phrase – the discourse markers and the pronominal clitics, which, as mentioned above, constitute the core of the clitic cluster (while verbal elements fluctuate).⁹

The discussion is based on data that has been excerpted from texts from three diachronic corpora. For Old Church Slavonic (OCS), these are the annotated texts of two monuments – Codex Marianus (CM) and Codex Suprasliensis (CSpr) within the TOROT corpus (Haug, Eckhoff 2011a; 2011b), which are used for the numbers; variant readings here are consulted according to three monuments – Codex Zographensis (CZ), Codex Assemani (CA), and Codex Sabbae (CSb) in the TITUS database. For Middle Bulgarian, the texts used are the Legend of Troy (LTr) (14th c.; Miklošič 1871) and the Vlacho-Bulgarian Charters (VB) (15th-16th c.; Bogdan 1902) that are available in the Diachronic Corpus of the Bulgarian Language (Totomanova 2015). For Early Modern Bulgarian (EMB), the texts in two damaskins (17th c.) are used: the Damaskin of Troyan (DTr; Ivanova 1967) and the Damaskin of Lovech (DLv; Mladenova, Velčeva 2013). The texts were chosen because of their accessibility and availability¹⁰ for replica and the hypothetical closeness to the vernacular.¹¹

8 The reflexive pronoun *CA* ‘self.ACC’ exhibits ‘mixed’ behaviour of a marker that reflexivises the verb and a semi-clitic but is also found among the clustering elements as we will see later. There are a couple of examples with other accusatives, therefore the reflexive is placed within the pattern here, albeit tentatively.

9 Expectably, some orders that are present in our data are not found in present-day standard Bulgarian: for example, pronominal clitics could occupy the first sentential position that is never the case in present-day standard Bulgarian (though this phenomenon is observed in some dialects, see Iliev 2018, Tiševa 2008, among other). Also expectably, clitics were found in the absolute second prosodic position as well; in some cases, they could split a noun phrase much like what happens in present-day Serbian. This is no longer the case in standard Bulgarian.

10 Within the TOROT corpus: <http://syntacticus.org/>; the TITUS database: <https://titus.fkidl.uni-frankfurt.de/framee.htm?/index.htm>; and Diachronic Corpus of the Bulgarian Language: <https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/textcorpus/list>

11 Texts in CSpr, VB, DTr and DLv have different linguistic properties, probably following different redactions (and translations) (in the case of CSpr, DTr, DLv; the collection of VB in the Bogdan’s 1902 publication contains texts written over two centu-

3.1 Discourse Clitics

The discourse clitics *же* (a focus marker or an emphatic particle) and *бо* (a complementiser or a marker of subordination) are widely attested in OCS (with parallels in Greek; cf. Thayer 1889). These clitics usually appear in the second clausal and/or phrasal position: they are the earliest 2P clitics and both were already used as suffixes (as in *иже* ‘who/which’, *никътоже* ‘nobody’, *неже* ‘than’; *оубо* ‘therefore’, *ибо* ‘because’, etc.). Migdalski (2016) calls them “operator clitics” since they additionally ‘operate’ on the information structure of the sentence. If found together (rarely in the observed texts), the order is *же* > *бо*, as in (6a); pronominal clitics follow them (6b-c).

(6) a.

āko	же	бо	вълѣзе	къ	ѡченикомъ	CSpr, 251r, 19-20
if ⁱ	ΕΜΗ	because	entered	to	disciples	
Ὅτι	μὲν	γάρ	εἰσῆλθε	πρὸς	τοὺς μαθητὰς	

ⁱ Due to space limitation, glosses are given if there is no appropriate translation and with elements that are in focus in the article, mainly clitics (e.g., *is.AUX.3pSg*: present-tense auxiliary, *3pSg*; *be.AUX.COND*: conditional auxiliary; etc.).

b.

оунѣ	бо	ти	естъ		CM, Mt. 5,29
better	because	you.DAT	<i>is.COP.3pSg</i>		
συμφέρει	γάρ	σοι			

да	погыблетъ	единъ	оудъ	твоихъ	
to	die	one	members.GEN	your.GEN	
ἵνα	ἀπόληται	ἓν	τῶν μελῶν	σου*	

* Three Greek NT editions were consulted. Wherever possible, I supply the corresponding Greek text with variants according to other editions if they attest for variant readings with respect to the clitics. If there is no reference to an edition, the text is given according to Nestle 1904; for a discussion on editions vs. manuscripts, see Toufexis 2010.

c.

въздасть	бо	ти	са	CM, Lk. 14,14
give	because	you.DAT	Refcl	
ἀνταποδοθήσεται	γάρ	σοι		Nestle 1904
ἀνταποδοθήσεται	δέ	σοι		Tischendorf 8th ed.

ries ago, which reflect different language varieties and influences). The raw numbers given in the article show the overall trends without aiming at a thorough analysis as the data is quite heterogeneous.

во	въскрѣшение праведъныхъ
in	resurrection righteous.GEN
ἐν	τῆ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων.
ἐν	τῆ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων.

The particle **же** is used for emphatic marking of the preceding constituent and has the semantics of a weak adversative conjunction, most often translating Greek δέ ‘but, and’ – as in (7a) – and more rarely μέν ‘while’, but also (in various contexts) τέ ‘and, also’, οὖν ‘therefore’, δή ‘but, then’, γάρ ‘because’, γέ ‘in fact, only’, καὶ ‘and’. In some cases, there is no parallel element in Greek, as in (7b); see also the variation in (7c) where οὖν is translated as ‘же оубо’, only ‘оубо’ and only ‘же’ in the three manuscripts cited.

(7) a.

онъ	же	рече	имъ	врагъ	[...]	CM, CZ, Mt. 13,28
he	ЕМРН	told	they.DAT	enemy		
Онъ	же	[pe]че	ймъ	врагъ		CA
ὁ	δέ	ἔφη	αὐτοῖς,	Ἐχθρὸς		

раби же	рѣша	емоу
slaves ЕМРН	told	he.DAT
Онѣ же	рѣша	[..]
Οἱ δέ δοῦλοι	λέγουσιν	αὐτῷ

b.

[...]	приходить	же	неприѣзнь	[...]	CM, CZ, Mt. 13,19
	comes	ЕМРН	evil-one		
[...]	приходить		неприѣзнь	[...]	
[...]	ἔρχεται		ὁ πονηρὸς	[...]	

c.

егда	же оубо	придетъ	гнъ	винограда	[...]	CM, CA, Mt. 21,40
when	therefore	comes	owner	vineyard.GEN		
егда	же	придетъ	гнъ	винограда	[...]	CZ
’и эгда	оубо	приде	гъ	виноградоу	[...]	CSb
ὅταν	οὖν	ἔλθῃ	ὁ κύριος	τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος	[...]	

Both *же* and *бо* may split a constituent – see (8) where *же* separates *зѣло* ‘much’ and *зовѣштоу* ‘who is calling (him)’ (επικράζοντος).

(8)

Зѣло же зовѣштоу	ми	ѣго	много ѣ глаголѣштоу	CSpr, 21r, 28-29
much EMPH calling	I.DAT	he.ACC	much and speaking	
Ἐπικράζοντος δέ	μου	αὐτῷ	καὶ λέγοντος πολλάκις	

The complementiser *бо* (Sławski 1974, 285-6) is predominantly found after a single constituent, which can be preceded by a preposition, a conjunction or negation particle *не* (which can also precede *бо*). It translates the Greek emphatic conjunction *γάρ* ‘because’. The use of *оубо* as an emphatic particle is a very early development, mostly in interrogative sentences – *оубо* is predominantly found after a *wh*-word (Cejtlin 1994, 721-2) and translates different elements in Greek: *ἄρα μὲν* ‘then indeed’, *οὖν* ‘therefore’, *τοίνυν* ‘therefore’ (each has specific placement: *οὖν* is predominantly in 2P, and *μὲν* can be found after the definite article, i.e. phrase-internally). There are adjacent placements of *оубо* and *бо*, with variant readings as in (9).

(9)

ѣко	бо оубо	събираѣтъ	плѣвелы.	CM, Mt. 13,40
as	therefore	collect	weeds	
ѣкоже	оубо	плѣвели	събираѣтъ	CA
ѣко	оудобъ	събираѣтъ	плѣвелы	CZ
ὡσπερ	οὖν	συλλέγεται	τὰ ζιζάνια	

The constituent preceding *же* and *бо* can be a verbal element, a noun or a pronoun, an adjective, an adverbial, a *wh*-word such as *къто* ‘who’, *чѣто* ‘which/that’, *по чѣто* ‘because of which’, etc., which can be preceded by a conjunction, negation particle, and/or followed by *ми* ‘I.DAT’, *ти* ‘you.DAT’, *та* ‘you.ACC’, *са* ‘self.ACC’, etc.

In Middle Bulgarian texts observed here, both discourse markers are rare. In LTr, *же* has only 9 occurrences, and *бо* is found 7 times. The raw numbers given by Dimitrova and Bojadziev (2014) show that many later non-canonical sources exhibit higher numbers for *оубо* but not for *бо*. In VB, *бо* is missing and *же* occurs 47 times, mainly in fixed expressions such as *великъ же и малъ* ‘big but also small’ (26 occurrences) and *еще же* (12 occurrences). *же* is also found after pronominals such as the dative *ви* ‘you.2pPl’ in: *варе що ви же речет жупан Кр(ъ)стѣ и жупан Ханжш* ‘something that župan Krastyo and župan Hanush told **you**’.

In the two 17th-century damaskins, же and бо are missing (except for in citations).¹²

3.2 Pronominal Clitics, Semi-Clitic and Clitic-Like Elements

The short forms of personal and anaphoric pronouns can be grouped into three subclasses according to their cliticisation status in OCS. The raw numbers in **table 1** support the assumption that they were all on the path to becoming clitics (in some of the accounts cited above, they are already analysed as such) but there are differences as well.

The first subclass includes the datives ми 'I.DAT' and ти 'you.DAT', which are the first pronominals to exhibit the behaviour of clitics: according to Wackernagel (2009), the Greek datives μοι 'I.DAT' and σοι 'you.DAT' were clitics, hence, their corresponding pronouns in OCS ми and ти might have been clitics, as well (Večerka 1989; Wackernagel 2009, 496, fn. 8 by D. Langslow). In the data observed here, they tend to appear in 2P (ca. 73%) preceded by a verb (ca. 67% of all 2Ps; and 72% of all occurrences) or after a nominal element, an adverb, a conjunction such as да 'to', аште 'if', ъко 'as', and a wh-word (ca. 25% of all 2Ps; and ca. 21% of all occurrences). Although Migdalski (2016) claims that these were mainly ethical datives functioning as 'operator clitics', a study on these specific cases by Krapova and Dimitrova (2015) shows that many of these datives can be analysed either as affected participants, or as inalienable possessors, or as both (i.e. affected participants that are also inalienable possessors, see Minčeva 1964).

The second subclass of pronominal clitics comprises the so-called semi-clitics and can be further divided into two groups: a) the first- and second-person accusatives ма 'I.ACC' and та 'you.ACC', which appear after a preposition and in first position; and b) the third-person accusatives и 'he.ACC', ж 'she.ACC', а 'they.ACC', е 'it.ACC', ъ 'they.ACC', which often translate non-clitic Greek pronouns. Elements of both groups show a strong tendency to appear in second position, as well as post-verbally. There is a slight precedence of the second group to appear post-verbally: ca. 78% (ма, та) vs. ca. 93% (и, ж, а, е, ъ). When in second position, however, there is a clear difference between the two groups with respect to their pre-verbal placement: ca. 6% (ма, та) vs. ca. 25% (и, ж, а, е, ъ).

The third subclass of pronominals - involving pronouns that will be defined as 'clitic-like' in the present discussion - includes the short dative bi-syllabic емоу 'he.DAT', еи 'she.DAT', имъ 'they.DAT', etc.,

12 In the so-called archaic damaskins, however, both are still present, in the earlier positions.

which have ambiguous behaviour with respect to discourse markers and the first two pronominal subclasses, and whose successors in later stages of Bulgarian (мой 'he.DAT', ѝ 'she.DAT', etc.) are clitics. They are also found predominantly in second position (ca. 75%) and, (even) more often, post-verbally (ca. 92%). However, only 7% of the clitic-like pronouns are both 2P and pre-verbal – this percentage is comparable to the one seen in the preceding paragraph with respect to the first- and second-person accusatives МА 'I.ACC' and ТА 'you.ACC' (the first subclass of the semi-clitics).

These results may indicate, albeit it is a tentative proposal, that 2P cliticisation was the dominant pattern, at least during the period witnessed by these OCS texts, and that this pattern was not in competition with pre-verbal placement but could co-exist with the latter in case the word order would allow for it. The 2P pattern and the post-verbal one were not in competition either and perhaps can be seen as alternative mechanisms motivated also by word order and/or information-structure principles and/or the syntax of the original Greek text.

Table 1 Pronominal clitics, semi-clitics and clitic-like pronouns in OCS (according to CM and CSpr)

CL ⁱ	2P, pre-V ⁱⁱ	2P, post-V	2P, non-V-adjacent ⁱⁱⁱ	non-2P, pre-V	non-2P, post-V	non-2P, non-V-adjacent
МИ, ТИ	75 ^{iv}	204	26	12	97	4
ЕМОУ, ЕИ, ИМЪ	77	1053	17	23	362	7
МА, ТА, НЪ, ВЪ	83	241	15	22	194	4
И, Ж, А, Е, Ъ	49	788	11	12	278	3

i Clustering clitics are calculated as part of the cluster (as well as interrogative ли, monosyllabic adverbs и, ти, тоу), i.e. another clitic, which is part of the cluster, can precede or follow (e.g. приведѣте ми.ДАТ И.АСС СЪМО 'bring him to me here' will be calculated both for the dative ми and for the accusative и as 2P, post-V; рѣци оубо намъ чѣто ти.ДАТ С.А.REFL МЪНИТЬ 'therefore, tell us what you think' will be calculated for the dative ти as 2P, pre-V).

ii The constituent in 1P can be preceded by a coordinating monosyllabic conjunction such as и 'and', а 'but', нъ 'but', etc., and the negation не. Elements after infinitives were calculated accordingly (повелѣ ѡнѡупатъ принести врѣтиште. ѡ вѣсадити И.АСС ВЪ НѢ. 'order the proconsul to bring the back and to put it inside (in-it)' was 2P, post-V for the accusative и) but periphrastic verb constructions are not included.

iii One or more constituents (noun phrases, prepositional phrases, adverbial phrases, including non-monosyllabic adverbs such as пакъ, пакы) can be placed between the clitic/clitic cluster and the verb.

iv Numbers do not involve periphrastic constructions, first-position elements or prepositional phrases.

If clusterised, the dative МИ 'I.DAT' and ти 'you.DAT' tend to precede the accusative semi-clitics (and the reflexives), as in (10a-c). This is not true for the clitic-like datives, though, as in (10d).

(10) a.

приведѣте	МИ	И	сѣмо.	
bring	I.DAT	he.ACC	here	CM, Mt. 17,17
φέρετέ	μοι	αὐτὸν	ῶδε.	

b.

принесѣте	МИ	ѡ	сѣмо.	
bring	I.DAT	they.ACC	here	CM, Mt. 14,18
принесѣте		ᾶ	сѣмо	CA
принесѣте			сѣмо	CSb
φέρετέ	μοι	ῶδε	αὐτούς.	
φέρετέ	μοι	αὐτούς	ῶδε	Scrivener 1894

c.

ръци	оубо	намъ	чѣто	ТИ	СА	мънитъ	
tell	then	we.DAT	what	you.DAT		think	CM, Mt. 22,17
εἶπε	οὖν	ἡμῖν,	τί	σοι		δοκεῖ	

d.

назнамена	же	са	ѣмоу	вѣньць	по тѣлоу.	
indicated	ΕΜΗ	RefCL	he.DAT	wreath	on	body
Ἔσημάνθη	δὲ		αὐτοῦ	ὀστέφανος	καὶ	διὰ τοῦ σώματος.

The placement of the pronominal elements often echoes the respective placement of the parallel elements in the Greek text but with variant readings (especially if there were no corresponding constructions in Greek – Sławski 1946 – such as the reflexive constructions and periphrastic verb constructions). The verbal elements are discussed further in the article; here I will only mention that clitics and semi-clitics demonstrate similar behaviour: both may precede the auxiliary and, by transitivity, also the participle (the active l-participle as well as the passive n/m/t-participles). Both may be found in 2P, in the order X > CL > AUX > Participle, where X can be a wh-word, as in (11a), a subjunction such as да ‘to’, as in (11b), or some other functional element in first position.

(11) a.

како	и	бж	погоубили.	
how	he.ACC	are.AUX.3Sg	murdered	CM, Mk. 3,6
ὅπως	αὐτὸν		ἀπολέσωσιν.	

b.

[...]	съвѣшташа	да	и бж	оубили	CM, Mar. 3,6
[...]	consulted	to	he.ACC are.AUX.3Sg	killed	
[...]	ἐβουλεύσαντο	ἵνα	ἀποκτείνωσιν	αὐτόν.	

Semi-clitic reflexive pronoun *са* ‘self.ACC’ exhibits variation in its behaviour just like the other semi-clitic pronominals: it may appear after the (reflexive) verb (more often) but also among the clustering elements (more rarely) in a slot of another pronominal and, more specifically, in the slot of the accusative pronominals.

We have already distinguished between ‘true’ clitics (*ми* ‘I.DAT’ and *ти* ‘you.DAT’) and clitic-like pronouns (*еμου* ‘he.DAT’, etc.) above, but their different status with respect to the cliticisation behaviour also manifests with respect to *са* ‘self.ACC’: *ми* and *ти* always precedes it, as in (10c), while the clitic-like pronouns typically follow it, as in (10d) above.

If the semi-clitic *са* ‘self.ACC’, however, is found beside the elements in the core in (5), as indicated by (10c), it may also appear in 2P beside other elements as in (12) where it aspires for a slot within the cluster. In (21) below, we will see another example where *са* is placed in front of the auxiliary but also after the main verb in compound tenses in a variant reading.

(12)

коливо	са	бы	трудоилъ	CSpr, 49r, 11-12
how-much	Refcl	be.AUX.COND	worked	
Πόσα		ἄν	ἔκαμες,	

As mentioned above, semi-clitics (reflexives included) are mainly post-verbal. Pronominal non-reflexive semi-clitics, though, may also appear either post-verbally, in most cases, or in 2P. If 2P, however, is occupied by a ‘true’ discourse clitic *же* or *бо*, the semi-clitic is often post-verbal, as in the examples in (13). This may signal that these semi-clitic pronouns do not behave as clitics yet.

(13) a.

потомъ	же	обрѣте	и	ѿс.	въ църкве.	CM, Jo. 5,14
later	EMPH	found	he.ACC	Jesus	in temple	
потомъ	же	обрѣте		ѿс	въ цркѣве	CZ
Μετά	ταῦτα	εὕρισκει	αὐτόν	ὁ ἰησοῦς	ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ	

b.

седмь бо ихъ	имѣша	ѣж	женѣ.	CM, Mk. 12,23
seven because they.GEN	had	she.ACC	wife.ACC	
седмь бо	ἴμѣша	ѣж	женѣ·	CZ
οἱ γάρ ἐπτά	ἔσχον	αὐτήν	γυναῖκα.	

c.

они же оукориша	и	[...]		CM, Jo. 9,28
they EMPH rebuked	he.ACC			
καὶ ἐλοιδόρησαν	αὐτόν	[...]		
Ἐλοιδόρησαν οὖν	αὐτόν	[...]		Scrivener 1894

The inventory of clitics (and clitic-like elements) in OCS texts is rather limited. It is to be expanded in Middle Bulgarian but some forms are already attested in the early texts: for example, contracted forms of clitic-like datives, though very rarely and with variant readings, as in (14).

(14)

ἴ	въ црѣкъве	сѣшту	моу·	придоша	къ	ἦмоу	CZ, Mk. 11,27
and in	temple	being	he.DAT	came	to	he.AT	
ι	въ црѣкве	ходашту	емоу	·придѣ	къ	немоу	CM
καὶ ἐν	τῷ ἱερῷ	περιπατοῦντος	αὐτοῦ	ἔρχονται	πρὸς	αὐτόν	

The class of pronominal clitics expands in the Middle Bulgarian texts that I have considered. In LTr, the respective clitics occur in the same positions and order with the addition of third-person accusative *ro* 'he.ACC' and dative *моу* 'he.DAT', which behave as 'true' clitics. The earlier forms, however (*ero* and *емоу*), are still found in LTr but in different functions. The accusative clitic *ro* 'he.ACC' is used for direct objects only, while the genitive (genitive-accusative) *ero* predominantly expresses the possessive genitive. The dative clitic *моу* 'he.DAT' refers to external possessors and is found in 2P, while *емоу* refers to indirect object (and is found after a verb and after some prepositions such as *противѣж* 'against'). Expectably, *ero* and *емоу* do not cluster.

The clustering elements exhibit the pattern in (5), as illustrated by the examples in (15), with the core (DAT > ACC) in 2P, and the verbal elements placed to its right (in AUX2).

The numbers in **table 2** show clitics' overall preference to second position and pre-verbal placement in VB.

Table 2 Pronominal clitics in VB

	2P, pre-V	2P, post-V	2P, non-V-adjacent	non-2P, pre-V	non-2P, post-V	non-2P, non-V-adjacent
ми, ти, мою, й, им	560	43	21	14	15	2
га/го, ю, их, ме, те, ни, ви	237	18	12	8	3	2

In VB, a certain number of pronominal clitics are found after a mono-syllabic conjunction such as a 'but', и 'and', and after a pause, as well as in second prosodic position where it can split a noun phrase.

(17)

И	ми	доде	слуга	моа,	да	ми	е	VB
and	I.DAT	came	servant	my	to	I.DAT	is.AUX.3Sg	
ку̀пилъ	що	мѹ	сѹь	казал	ѿт	все		
bought	what	he.DAT	am.AUX.1Sg	said	from	all		

In the two 17th-century damaskins that are took into consideration, pronominal clitics are also found in 2P but pre-verbal and post-verbal positions are almost equally distributed. Although rarely, the cluster may split a noun phrase, as in (18d). The example in (18e) illustrates the portion of the pattern in (5): DAT ACC AUX2.

(18) a.

за_ѣдѣнь	ча_мѹ_се	ѣзѣкоренѣ	силата	ѣ_ѹнашьството	DLV
for_one	hour_	he.DAT_RefCL	eradicated	power.DEF	and_courage.DEF

b.

и	оста̀ви	си	го	на	очѣте	и	на	срѣ̀ето,	DTr
and	leave	RefIPossCL	it.ACC	on	eyes.DEF	and	on	heart.DEF	

c.

а́	любовь	не	ѣма́	нищо	ми	се	не	прида̀ва.	DTr
and	love	NEG	have	nothing	I.DAT	RefCL	NEG	lend	

d.

И	тогѣва	áγγλ ¹	мѹ	се	гнь	явѣи		DTr
and	then	angel	he.DAT	RefCL	of-God	showed up		

Ѡгѡръ	на ¹	нѣго						
from-above	over	he.ACC						

e.

[...]	амѣи	сѣи	ѹзмѣи	своáта	крѣпа,	детѡ		DTr
[...]	but	RefIPossCL	take	own	towel	that		

мѣи	А	сѣи	дáла	на	дѣль			
I.DAT	she.ACC	is.AUX.2Sg	given	on	deed			

Table 3 Pronominal clitics in DTr and DLv

	2P, pre-V	2P, post-V	2P, non-V-adjacent	non-2P, pre-V	non-2P, post-V	non-2P, non-V-adjacent
ми, ти, мою, ѣ, им...	538	418	52	26	49	3
ме, те, ны, вы...	147	58	19	4	5	1
го, я, гы, á...	586	425	44	17	33	2

To sum up, the inventory of the clitical pronouns that are found in second position and pre-verbally increases in the history of Bulgarian, mainly as a result of the changes in the inventory of pronominal elements. The accusatives го 'he.ACC', я 'she.ACC', гы 'they.ACC' and datives мой 'he.DAT', ѣ 'she.DAT' have joined the cluster after the re-analysis of the earlier forms of anaphoric pronouns.

3.3 Verbal Clitics and Clitic-Like Elements

Both in the early and in later texts, the behaviour of most monosyllabic verbal elements such as be-auxiliaries/copulas, future auxiliaries щж/ще 'will/shall', is ambiguous. They may be found in first position, including immediately after negation, and preceding the discourse clitics – as in (19), but also in 2P, within a cluster and in second prosodic position, splitting a noun phrase, as in (19b) – in parallel to the orders in the Greek text.

(19) a.

бъ	же	тоу	мѣъ	магдалынѣ.	[...]	CM, Mt. 27,61
was.COP	EMPH	there	Maria	Magdalene		
ѣhv	дѣ	ѣкеѣ	Марѣа	ѣ Маγδαληνѣ	[...]	

b.

пѣтъ	же	бъ	отъ	нихъ	боуи.	[...]	CM, Mt. 25,2
five	EMPH	was.COP	of	they.GEN	wise		
пέντε	дѣ	ѣσαν	ѣξ	αὐτῶν	φρόνιμοι		

Auxiliaries are found either to the left, or to the right of the pronominals among the clustering elements, as exemplified by the periphrastic verb constructions in (20).

(20) a.

[...]	ѣако да	бы	ѣ	ѣзбавилъ	отъ	ѣгоу.	CSpr, 280r, 26
[...]	if	to	be.AUX.COND	she.ACC	saved	from	he.GEN

b.

[...]	ѣ	въ водѣ	да	ѣ би	погоубилъ.	CM, Mk. 9,22
[...]	and	in water	to	he.ACC be.AUX.COND	murdered	
[...]	καὶ	εἰς ὕδατα,	ἵνα	ἀπολέσῃ.SUBJ	αὐτόν.	

c.

да	би	са	ихъ	кошн.ж.лъ.	CM, Lk. 18,15
to	be.AUX.COND	RefACL	they.ACC	touched	
ѣна			αὐτῶν	ἄπτηται.SUBJ	

The positions of the reflexive and the auxiliary often vary, with the former more often found in 2P, while the latter is adjacent to negation, as in (21).

(21)

добрѣѣ	би бѣло емоу	CM, Mt. 26,24
better	be.AUX.COND been he.DAT	
добрѣѣ	емоу би бѣило.	CA

добрѣе	емоу би было·	CZ
добръе	было бы емоу·	CSb
καλὸν	ἦν.IND αὐτῷ	
аште са би не родилъ	Чкъ	тъ.
If ReflCL be.AUX.COND NEG born	man	this
аще би не родилъ са	Члкъ	тъ·
аште са би не родилъ	Чкъ	тъ·
аще са би не родилъ	Члкъ	тъ·
εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη.IND	ὁ ἄνθρωπος	ἐκεῖνος.

In Middle Bulgarian, fluctuations in the positions of auxiliaries remain, as exemplified in (22) from LTr.

(22) a.

и	пойди	противъж	Ектороу	кralю,	да	
and	came	against	Hector	king	to	LTr
би	са	оставилъ	гръцкыж	воискы		
be.AUX.COND	ReflCL	left	Greek	army		

b.

[...]	и	метнж	прѣд	фарижа	егова,	
[...]	and	threw	in-front-of	Paris	his	LTr
давно	са	би	възвратилъ			
long-ago	ReflCL	be.AUX.COND	come back			

In VB, monosyllabic auxiliaries are mostly in AUX2, i.e. to the far right, where the latest clustering elements were joining, presumably, as in (23a-b), with 6 examples of the reverse order of which 5 are with *смо* 'are.1pPl' and one - with the conditional auxiliary *би* 'would' and negation particle - see (23c) (and 13 instances are with future auxiliary).

(23) a.

[...]	ере	не	ми	е	ѹзел	вражмаш	господства	ми	VB
[...]	that	NEG	I.DAT	is.AUX.3Sg	taken	enemy	master	my	

b.

a	пръгари	заприхъ	ти	добитокъ,	VB
and	burghers	shut	you.DAT	cattle	
та	ме	сѹ	молил(и)	мене.	
thus	I.ACC	Are.AUX.3Pl	asked	I.ACC	

c.

и	за	моѹ	службѹ	не	би	мѹ	мило	VB
and	for	my	service	NEG	be.COP.COND	he.DAT	dear	

vs.

ако	мѹ	не	би	платил ѿт	вола.	VB
if	he.DAT	NEG	be.AUX.COND	paid from	will	

The trend continues into the Early Modern Bulgarian with auxiliaries placed on the far right (including the present-tense ones), as in (24a-c), in contrast to the situation in present-day standard Bulgarian (compare also their positions in the dialects according to Antonova-Vasileva et al. 2016, map 144 where the majority of dialects instantiates the order AUX > DAT / ACC). There are again single instances of verbal clitics found before the pronominal ones, as in (24c). The order with respect to the reflexive, as in (24c), is the same as in present-day standard Bulgarian.

(24) a.

Защо	го	си	мъчѣль, и	защо	го	си	испѣдилъ	DTr
why	he.ACC	is.AUX.2Sg	tortured and	why	he.ACC	is.AUX.2Sg	driven away	

b.

ак'ѣь	ѡстоѣвале	право	та_e_ѣа	ѣле	DLv
if_	are.AUX.3pPl	defended	rightly	then_it_	it.Acc_ are.AUX.3pPl

c.

Затовá_	ca_e	вѣѣ	ѣ_покааніе	[...]	DLv
therefore_	Refcl_ is.AUX.3pSg	already	also_repentance	[...]	
затовá_	ca_ce	вѣѣ	ѣ_раіскыіе	[...]	
therefore_	are.AUX.2pPl_ Refcl	already	also_heavenly	[...]	

d.

а ^н мй_си_џа	о́мръсьи́ле момин'ството прѣди свáб'ата	DLV
but_ReflPossCL_are.AUX.3pPl	sinned virginity.DEF before wedding.DEF	

e.

Това́_са	дѣто_си	нѣ_џь	па́жи́ле [...]	DLV
This_are.COP.3pPl	that_RefIPossCL	NEG_are.AUX.3pPl	kept	

Negation may separate clustering elements, with the reflexive to the left and the auxiliary to the right to form two prosodic words (whose constituents are linked via ' '), as in (25a) (see also (24e) with the possessive reflexive). Pronominal clitics are in second position while auxiliaries are verb-adjacent, as in (25b-c).

(25) a.

й_още_џе	нѣ_ѐ	добрѣ́	[тѹ́ка намѣ́стил]ь [...]	DLV
and_yet_RefICL	NEG_is.AUX.3pSg	well	here arranged [...]	

b.

Зáмь догдѐ_ви	напрѣ́тъ нѣ_ѐ	прѣвáрила са́биа съмрѣ́тна	DLV
for until_you.DAT	before NEG_is.AUX.3pSg	overtook sword deadly	

c.

й_догдѐ_џа	паза́рь нѣ_ѐ	разва́лили.	DLV
and_until_RefICL	market NEG_is.AUX.3pSg	broken	

Table 4 gives the order of clustering be- and future-auxiliaries (the latter in Middle Bulgarian and Early Modern Bulgarian) and pronominal clitics, semi-clitics, and clitic-like elements with the periphrastic verb constructions. The numbers attest for variation in the placement of auxiliaries among the clustering elements with preference to the right slot AUX2 of the pattern in (5). This is also true for the future auxiliary (the form щж was attested very early: Mirčev 1956, 202; Haralampiev 2001, 149). In the texts here, the position of щж is also ambivalent (in AUX1 and AUX2), but it is negation-adjacent and also found in second prosodic position.

Table 4 Pronominals and auxiliaries with periphrastic verb constructions

	Pron > Aux	Aux > Pron	Non-adjacent
OCS	53	18	18
MB	143	10	2
EMB	103	25	4

The clitic cluster in the noun phrase is left outside the scope of the present article but its phrasal position (2P) and order is very similar to that of the clausal cluster, with the earliest clitics to the left and the latest to the right (for comparison with Greek, see Eckhoff 2018). This cluster may not be considered viable in present-day Bulgarian if we assume that the definite article is an affix. The presumed pattern of the noun-phrase clitic cluster might have been DISC > DEM/ART > POSS/GEN/DAT > (AUX). There are very early examples of demonstrative pronouns that are in second position in the noun phrase and immediately follow a nominal element in first phrasal position: these are exactly the demonstratives that may be interpreted as clitic-like articles (Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Vulchanov 2012). However, there are also examples of discourse markers followed by demonstrative pronouns, clustered in the same phrasal second position, which attests that the reanalysis has not been completed yet (as per Kurz 1963).

4 A Tentative Conclusion

The data that have been discussed in the article backs the assumption that, historically, there might have been no significant changes in the position of the elements in the core of the primary clitic cluster, i.e. the pronominal clitics, with variations happening (and still) among the elements in the verbal periphery. The earliest 2P clitics were lost, somewhat expectably, because they were non-paradigmatic unlike those that have remained. The set of elements filling the respective slots among the clustering elements was expanded as a result of the restructuring within the pronominal and verbal systems. Similar developments might have been at play for the (partial) loss of the noun-phrase cluster. A more thorough analysis of the variant readings across the monuments and constructions (matrix vs. subordinate clause, clause types, absolute constructions) is due in order to highlight the numerous intricacies of cliticisation and clitic patterns in the history of Bulgarian.

Bibliography

- Antonova-Vasileva, L.; Vasileva, L.; Vitanova, M.; Vălčeva, E.; Keremidčieva, S.; Kostova, T.; Kočev, I.; Kjaeva, E.; Smedovska, K.; Tetovska-Troeva, M.; Urumova, P. (2016). *Bălgarski dialekten atlas. Obobštavašt tom IV. Morfologija* Български диалектен атлас. Обобщаващ том IV. Морфология (Bulgarian Dialect Atlas. Generalising. Vol. 4, Morphology). Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN.
- Bogdan, I. (1902). *Documente și regeste privitoare la relațiile Țării Ruminești cu Brașovul și Ungaria în secolul XV și XVI* (Documents and Private Registers of the Romanian Counties of Brasov and Hungary in the 15th and 16th Centuries). București.
- Bujukliev, I.; Georgiev, I.V.; Davidov, A.; Dobrev, A.; Dogramadžieva, E.; Duridanov, I.; Zlatanova, R.; Ivančev, S.; Ilčev, P.; Minčeva, A.; Mirčeva, D. (1993). *Gramatika na starobălgarskija ezik* Граматика на старобългарския език (Grammar of the Old Bulgarian Language). Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN.
- Cejtlin, R.; Večerka, R.; Blagova, E. (1994). *Staroslavjanskij slovar' (po rukopisjam X-XI vekov)* Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X- XI веков) [Old Slavic Dictionary (According to Manuscripts of the X-XI Centuries)]. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, M.; Vulchanov, V. (2012). "An Article Evolving: The Case of Old Bulgarian". Jonas, D; Whitman, H, Garrett, A. (eds), *Grammatical Change: Origins, Nature, Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 160-78. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199582624.003.0008>.
- Dimitrova, T.; Bojadziev, A. (2014). "Historical Corpora of Bulgarian Language and Second Position Markers". *Proceedings of the First International Conference Computational Linguistics in Bulgaria*. Sofia: Institute for Bulgarian Language, 55-63.
- Eckhoff, H.M. (2018). "Quantifying Syntactic Influence: Word Order, Possession and Definiteness in Old Church Slavonic and Greek". *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax*. De Gruyter Mouton, 29-62. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110531435-003>.
- Franks, S. (1997). "South Slavic Clitic Placement is Still Syntactic". *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics*, 4, 111-26.
- Franks, S. (1998). *Clitics in Slavic*. Paper presented at Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax Workshop, Bloomington (IN).
- Franks, S. (2017). *Syntax and Spell-Out in Slavic*. Bloomington (IN): Slavica.
- Franks, S.; King, T.H. (2000). *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halpern, A.L. (1995). *On the Placement and Morphology of Clitics*. Dissertations in Linguistics. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Haralampiev, I. (2001). *Istoričeska gramatika na bălgarskija ezik* Историческа граматика на българския език (Historical Grammar of the Bulgarian Language). Veliko Tărnovo.
- Haug, D.; Eckhoff, H.M. (2011). "The PROIEL Corpus as a Source to Old Church Slavonic: a Practical Introduction". Baranov, V. (ed.), *Pis'mennoe nasledie i sovremennye informacionnye tehnologii* Письменное наследие и современные информационные технологии (Written Heritage and Modern Information Technologies). Iževsk: Iževskij gosudarstvennyj tehničeskij universitet, 37-55.

- Haug, D.; Eckhoff, H.M. (2011). "Making the Most of the Data: Old Church Slav-ic and the PROIEL Corpus of Old Indo-European Bible Translations". *Łódź Studies in Language*, xxiv, 411-31.
- Iliev, I. (2018). "Săpostavka meždju malomirovskija govor v Elhovsko i kajrak-lijkskija i šikirlijkskija govor v Besarabija i Priazovieto" Съпоставка между Маломировския говор в Елховско и кайраклийския в шикирлийския говор в Бесарабия и Приазовието (Comparison Between the Malomir Di-alect in the Elhovo Region and the Kayrakli and Shikirli Dialects in Bessara-bia and the Azov Region). *Dzjalo*, 6(12). https://www.abcdar.com/mag-azine/XII/Iliev_1314-9067_XII.pdf
- Ivanova, A. (1967). *Trojanski damaskin* Троянски дамаскин (The Damaskin of Troyan). Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN.
- Kosek, P. (2011). *Enklitika v češtině barokni doby* (Enclitics in the Czech Lan-guage of the Baroque Period). Brno: Host.
- Krapova, I.; Dimitrova, T. (2015). "Genitive-Dative Syncretism in the History of the Bulgarian Language. Towards an Analysis". *Studi Slavistici*, 12, 181-208. https://doi.org/10.13128/Studi_Slavici-17976.
- Krăsteva, H. (2020). "Sравнение na prozodičnite osobenosti na klitičnija kompleks v sąobštitelni i vāprositelni izrečenija v bălgarskija ezik" Сравнение на прозодичните особености на клитичния комплекс съобщителни и въпросителни изречения в българския език (A Comparison of the Pro-sodic Features of the Clitic Cluster in Bulgarian Declarative and Interro-gative Sentences). *Bălgarski ezik* Български език (Bulgarian Language), 77(3), 112-21. <https://doi.org/10.47810/bl.67.03.09>.
- Kurz, J. (1963). "Problema člena v staroslavjanskom jazyke" Проблема члена в старославянском языке (The Problem of the Article in Old Church Sla-vonic). *Issledovanija po sintaksisu staroslavjanskogo jazyka* Исследования по синтаксису старославянского языка (Studies in the Old Church Sla-vonic syntax). Praha: Československa akademie věd, 121-82.
- Migdalski, K. (2013). "Diachronic Source of Two Cliticization Patterns in Slav-ic". Salvesen, C.M.; Helland, H.-P. (eds), *Challenging Clitics*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 135-58. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.206.06mig>.
- Migdalski, K. (2016). *Second Position Effects in the Syntax of Germanic and Slavic Languages*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Miklošič, F. (1871). "Trojanska priča" (The Legend of Troya). *Starine* (Antiqui-ty), 3, 147-88.
- Minčeva, A. (1964). *Razvoj na datelnija pritežatelen v bălgarskija ezik* Развой на дателния притежателен падеж в българския език (The Development of Dativus Possessivus in the Bulgarian Language). Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN.
- Mirčev, K. (1963). *Istoričeska gramatika na bălgarskija ezik* Историческа гра-матика на българския език (Historical Grammar of the Bulgarian Lan-guage). Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Mladenova, O.; Velčeva, B. (2013). *Loveški damaskin. Novobălgarski pametnik ot XVII vek* Ловешки дамаскин. Новобългарски паметник от XVII век (The Damaskin of Lovech. Modern Bulgarian monument of the 17th cen-tury). Sofia: NBKM.
- Mussafia, A. (1888). "Enclisi o proclisi del pronome personale atono quale ogge-to". *Romania*, 27, 145-6.
- Nestle, E. (1904). *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt.

- Nicolova R. (2008). *Bălgarska gramatika. Morfologija* Българска граматика. Морфология (Bulgarian Grammar. Morphology). Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski".
- Pancheva, R. (2005). "The Rise and Fall of Second-Position Clitics". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 23, 103-67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-003-2510-y>.
- Petersen, U. (2016). *Tischendorf's 8th Edition Greek New Testament with Morphological Tags*. Based on G. Clint Yale's Tischendorf text and on Dr. Maurice A. Robinson's Public Domain Westcott-Hort text. DiMedia, Department of Communication, Aalborg University.
- Radanović-Kocić, V. (1988). *The Grammar of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: A Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective* [PhD dissertation]. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Scrivener's Textus Receptus* (1894). With Morphology. Prepared by M.A. Robinson. Bellingham 2002.
- Sławski, F. (1946). *Miejsce enklityki odmiennej w dziejach języka bułgarskiego* (The Placement of Enclitics in the History of the Bulgarian Language). Krakow: Nakładem Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności.
- Sławski, F. (1974). *Słownik prasłowiański* (Dictionary of the Proto-Slavic Language). Tom I, A-B. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii nauk.
- Thayer, J.H. (1889). *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. New York: American (Harper).
- Tiševa, J. (2008). "За бългáрските езикови острови" За българските езикови острови (On the Bulgarian Language Islands). *Plovdivski universitet "Paisij Hilendarski" – Naučni trudove. Filologija* Пловдивски университет "Паисий Хилендарски" - Научни трудове. Филология (Plovdiv University "Paisii Hilendarski" - Research Papers. Philology), 46(1), 133-45.
- Tobler, A. (1875). *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik. Erste bis funfte Reihe*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Totomanova, A.-M. (2015). "Проектът 'Informatika, gramatika, leksikografija' i digitalnata obrabotka na srednovekovni slavjanski tekstove" Проектът "Информатика, граматика, лексикография" и дигиталната обработка на средновековни славянски текстове (The Project "Informatics, Grammar, Lexicography" and the Digital Processing of Mediaeval Slavic Texts)". *Sbornik dokladi i materiali ot zaključitelnata konferencija po proekta "Informatika, gramatika, leksikografija"* Сборник доклади и материали от заключителната конференция по проекта "Информатика, граматика, лексикография" (Proceedings of the Final Conference of the Project "Informatics, Grammar, Lexicography"). Sofia: Grafis, 5-16.
- Toufexis, N. (2010). "One Era's Nonsense, Another's Norm: Diachronic Study of Greek and the Computer". Bodard, G.; Mahony, S. (eds), *Digital Research in the Study of Classical Antiquity*. Aldershot, 105-20.
- Vaillant, A. (1948). *Manuel du vieux slave*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves.
- Večerka, R. (1989). *Altkirchenslavische (Altbulgarische) Syntax*. Bd. I, *Die lineare Satzorganisation*. Freiburg.
- Večerka, R. (1993). *Altkirchenslavische (Altbulgarische) Syntax*. Bd. II, *Die innere Satzstruktur*. Freiburg.
- Wackernagel, J. (2009). *Lectures on Syntax. With Special Reference to Greek, Latin and German*. Ed. by D. Langslow. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Zaimov, Y.; Capaldo, M. (1982-83). *Suprasălski ili Retkov sbornik* Супрасълски или Ретков сборник (Suprasălski or Retkov Collection), vols 1-2. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN.
- Zaliznjak, A.A. (2008). *Drevnerusskie enklitiki* Древнерусские энклитики (Old Russian Enclitics). Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskich kul'tur.
- Zimmerling, A.V. (2013). *Sistemy porjadka slov slavjanskih jazykov v tipologičeskom aspekte* Системы порядка слов славянских языков в типологическом аспекте (Word-Order Systems in Slavic Languages in a Typological Perspective). Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskich kul'tur.
- Zwicky, A.M. (1985). "Clitics and Particles". *Language*, 61(2), 283-305. <https://doi.org/10.2307/414146>.
- Zwicky, A.M. (1977). *On Clitics*. Bloomington (IN). https://web.stanford.edu/~zwicky/on_clitics.pdf.

