

### Gradients of pronominal and verbal deficiency

Cardinaletti and Starke's (C&S, 1999) work on the hierarchy of grammatical categories classifies pronouns into strong pronouns, weak pronouns, and clitics, depending on their syntactic strength. C&S argue for a tripartite system, which consists of one strong and two deficient forms, on the basis of their distinct distribution and syntactic behavior. The deficient variants are argued to be the default options, following C&S's "Minimise Structure" principle. Cetnarowska (2003, 2004) departs from C&S's system and proposes a quadripartite scale, with an additional class of strong unstressed pronouns (1). Her main motivation comes from the availability of pronominal elements in Polish, which are unstressed but can be topicalized (2a) and coordinated with NPs (2b), contrary to C&S's predictions.

**Proposal and Analysis.** We show that (i) C&S's tripartite division is insufficient, and that (ii) C&S' "Minimise Structure" principle is not supported by diachronic data. Concerning (i), we modify Cetnarowska's (2003, 2004) reanalysis of C&S on the basis of Old Russian data. In contrast to Modern Russian, which lacks pronominal or auxiliary clitics, Old Russian (11<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> cc.) featured full and reduced dative and accusative pronouns, as well as 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person reduced forms of auxiliary *be*, analyzed as clitics (Zaliznjak 2004, 2008). A detailed analysis of these forms, however, provides support for more nuanced distinctions with respect to strength than the clitic/non-clitic division. First, orthotonic forms such as *mene* and *tebe* are clearly strong pronouns, occurring with empathic stress. Second, reduced dative and accusative pronouns such as *mi* and *mę*, traditionally analyzed as clitics, are in fact weak pronouns, given that while they cannot be coordinated or topicalized, they can appear after prepositions, as shown in (3). Third, the reduced reflexive pronoun *sę* should be classified as a full-fledged clitic. It undergoes grammaticalization into a suffix, which is evidenced by its occasional appearance in a post-verbal position, as compared in (4a and b). Finally, auxiliaries in the present tense match the distribution of Cetnarowska's (2004: 39) "unstressed strong pronouns," as they are not reduced morphologically but appear in unstressed positions. As shown in (5a and b), the auxiliary in Old Russian functions as a subject pronoun on a par with strong subject pronouns such as *azъ* 'I' and *ty* 'you,' just like accusative and dative clitics are paired with their strong counterparts (see Zaliznjak 2004: 179, Kwon 2009: 161). Like strong pronouns, it takes full morphology and is not tied to second position or verb-adjacent position (Jung 2017). Cetnarowska's unstressed pronouns are morphosyntactically identical with their stressed counterparts, differing from them only in terms of stress, which raises a possibility that stressed and unstressed pronouns form a single class which can be pronounced without stress whenever necessary. The Old Russian data indicate that there can be a distinct, non-reduced class that is inherently unstressed but syntactically free in the pronominal system. This system is not based on the strong-weak dichotomy as in C&S's and Cetnarowska's proposals, but it consists of multiple grades with different degrees of syntactic deficiency.

Concerning (ii), we show that C&S' "Minimize Structure" principle, which stipulates that weak pronouns are the default options, is challenged by Slavic data. Diachronically, we observe a shift from verb-adjacent to second position clitics in Serbo-Croatian (Radanović-Kocić 1988, Migdalski 2016), which correlates with the syntactic strengthening of pronominal clitics. In Russian and Polish, the former pronominal clitics have been reinterpreted as weak pronouns. Thus, in comparison to clitics in South Slavic, weak pronouns in Modern Polish show freedom of distribution across the clause (6a), permit both dat-acc and acc-dat orders (6b), and can be split from each other (6c; see Rappaport 1988, Witkoś 1998, Cetnarowska 2003, 2004). Moreover, native speakers increasingly allow their clause-initial placement, especially for the combinations of the dative and the reflexive clitic (6d). Synchronically, we observe a similar strengthening of pronominal forms in Macedonian. In most contexts, they are verb-adjacent, like in Bulgarian, but in structures with passive participles, they may be scrambled across the clause (compare Bg in (7a) with Mac in (7b)), and some speakers allow

them clause-initially (see (7c); cf. Korubin 1974, Tomić 1997; 2000, Baerman and Billings 1998, Franks 1998, Bošković 2001), on a par weak pronouns in Polish. These facts pose a challenge for C&S’s “Minimise Structure” principle. They also indicate that processes of language change may disregard principles related to the economy of representations.

- (1) strong (stressed) pronouns > unstressed pron > weak pron > clitic pron  
*WAS* [+stress] ‘you<sub>GEN.PL</sub>’    *was* [-stress]    *go* ‘him’    *się* ‘refl.cl.’  
 (Cetnarowska 2004:14)
- (2) a. *Was* NIE da się zapomnieć. b. Widziałem *was* I mamę w kinie.  
 you<sub>GEN.PL</sub> NEG manage REFL forget<sub>INF</sub> saw you and mom in cinema  
 ‘One cannot forget you.’/‘I saw you and mom in the cinema.’ (Pl, Cetnarowska 2004: 46)
- (3) *postrъčътъ užъ na mę i na moe deti.*  
 provoke<sub>3SG</sub> already against me<sub>ACC</sub> and against my children  
 ‘(He) then provokes against me and against my children.’ (OR. Zaliznjak 2004: 302)
- (4) a. *poklanęju ti sę.*  
 bow<sub>1SG</sub> you<sub>DAT</sub> REFL<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘I bow to you.’ (OR. Ibid: 271)
- b. *zando gne ne možemъ nicimъ jemu udobriti sę.*  
 because lord NEG can<sub>1PL</sub> by nothing him<sub>DAT</sub> satisfy<sub>INF</sub>  
 ‘because, oh lord, we can satisfy him by no means.’ (OR. Ibid: 592)
- (5) a. a togo źb **jesmi** ne znaju, u kogo kupiъ.  
 and that FOC be<sub>1SG</sub> NEG know<sub>1SG</sub> from whom buy<sub>PART.M.SG</sub>  
 ‘And I don’t know from whom I bought.’ (OR. Zaliznjak 2004: 179)
- b. a ženy ne vidělъ **jesi** budešъ vъ sně.  
 and woman<sub>GEN</sub> NEG see<sub>PART.M.SG</sub> be<sub>2SG</sub> be<sub>FUT.2SG</sub> in dream  
 ‘And you will not have seen a woman in a dream.’ (OR. Ibid.)
- (6) a. Piotr (*go*) dziś (*go*) widział (*go*) w kinie.  
 Piotr him<sub>ACC</sub> today him<sub>ACC</sub> see<sub>PART.M.SG</sub> him<sub>ACC</sub> in cinema  
 ‘Piotr saw him today in the cinema.’
- b. Tak, w końcu *jej go/ go jej* pożyczyła.  
 yes, in end her<sub>DAT</sub> it<sub>ACC</sub> it<sub>ACC</sub> her<sub>DAT</sub> lend<sub>PART.F.SG</sub>  
 ‘Yes, she indeed eventually lent it to her.’
- c. Jan *mu* wczoraj chciał *go* wynając a nie sprzedać.  
 Jan him<sub>DAT</sub> yesterday want<sub>PART.M.SG</sub> it<sub>ACC</sub> rent<sub>INF</sub> but not sell<sub>INF</sub>  
 ‘Jan wanted to rent it to him rather than sell it yesterday.’
- d. %Mi się wydaje, że...  
 me<sub>DAT</sub> REFL seems that  
 ‘It seems to me that...’ (Pl)
- (7) a. Na Petūr *mu e* kazvano mnogo pūti da būde točen.  
 to Peter him<sub>DAT</sub> is tell<sub>PASS</sub> many times that be<sub>SUBJ.3.SG</sub> punctual  
 ‘Peter was told many times to be punctual.’ (Bg)
- b. Na Petreta (*mu e*) od strana na komisijata (*mu e*)  
 to Peter<sub>DAT</sub> him<sub>DAT</sub> is from side of commission-the him<sub>DAT</sub> is  
 poveќе pati (*mu e*) rečeno da bide točen.  
 more times him<sub>DAT</sub> is tell<sub>PASS</sub> to be<sub>SUBJ.3.SG</sub> punctual  
 ‘Peter was more than once told by the commission to be punctual.’ (Mac)
- c. %*Mu e* rečeno da bide točen poveќе pati.  
 him<sub>DAT</sub> is tell<sub>PASS</sub> to be<sub>SUBJ</sub> punctual more times  
 ‘He was told to be punctual more than once.’ (Mac, Tomić 2000: 296–299)