

Code-Switching Romanian-Serbian Clitics
SinFonIJA 14 | Wednesday, September 22nd, 2020 | Novi Sad, Serbia
Vanessa Petroj, Bryn Mawr College

Code-switching: alternating elements from two (or more) languages in natural speech produced by bilinguals (usually in bilingual communities).

Data: Geographic and Demographic Information

All the data comes from interviews, elicited speech, and grammaticality judgements of Romanian-Serbian bilinguals (age: college) from Uzdin, Serbia, a culturally Romanian village with a Romanian ethnic majority.

Background:

Uzdin is a village in Vojvodina, Serbia, with a Romanian ethnic majority of over 70%, with federal and public offices recognizing both Romanian and Serbian as the official languages. Signs and announcements throughout the village are also displayed in both languages.

Uzdin has one K-8 school where students are given the option of attending classes in the Romanian or the Serbian cohort, where the primary language of instruction is Romanian and Serbian respectively. In the Romanian cohort, Romanian language is taught as a native language and Serbian is as a non-native language. In contrast, the Serbian cohort only offers Serbian as a native language, with no option for Romanian as a non-native language. While there are generally options for classes in either language, kindergarten and some 1-8 classes may be bilingual. After completing their elementary education, students attend high schools and colleges in neighboring towns or cities, some of which also offer classes in Romanian (though these are rare).

There is no current written form of the dialect spoken in Uzdin (*dialectul bănăţean* or 'the Banat dialect'), and with the decreasing population in combination with intermarriage, Serbian media, and globalization, this dialect changes from generation to generation. While people who identify ethnically as Romanian are bilingual in Romanian and Serbian, they overwhelmingly code-switch between Romanian and Serbian in informal daily interactions.

Major Questions:

- How do Romanian and Serbian clitics behave in CS?
- How does the presence of “foreign” elements affect the verb in CS?
- Which properties are relevant in permitting/banning certain constructions from being legitimate in CS?
- Whether and how do linguistic mechanisms adapt to yield CS constructions
- Given the specific properties of all elements involved, is word/phrase-internal CS a possibility with these elements in this language pair?

For ease of exposition, **Romanian** elements will be indicated in **bold** and *Serbian* in *italics*.

Relevant Properties and Underlying Assumptions About Clitics in Romanian & Serbian:

Guiding constraint:

A. Code switching within phonological words that are morphosyntactic heads (X⁰s) is illicit.

(Bandi-Rao & den Dikken, 2014)

- most interactions discussed here include Romanian and Serbian auxiliaries, pronominal clitics and verbs
- the verb can be either Romanian or Serbian in CS (Petroj 2020):

(1) **Am** **trecut / položi** **ispit-ul.**
 have.1SG-AUX passed-PTCP / passed.F.SG-PTCP exam-the.M.SG
 'I passed the exam.'

	ROMANIAN CLITICS	SERBIAN CLITICS
TYPE	<i>Pronominal clitics</i> : D elements	<i>Pronominal clitics</i> : N elements
POSITION	<i>Verbal clitics</i> : clustering around the auxiliary or lexical verb (Dobrovie-Sorin, 1994; Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea 2013)	<i>Second-position clitics</i> : second position in an I-Phrase without an adjacency requirement to any specific element (Bošković 1997, 2001, Talić 2017)
INCORPORATION	<i>Pronominal clitics</i> : incorporate syntactically into the verb (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994) <i>Auxiliary clitics</i> : no incorporation (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994)	<i>Pronominal clitics</i> : no incorporation (Bošković 2001) <i>Auxiliary clitics</i> : incorporate (and may optionally excorporate in certain circumstances) (Bošković 1997, 2001).

Table 1: Relevant characteristics and properties of Romanian and Serbian clitics

	Host:	Romanian verb	Serbian verb
Romanian auxiliary clitics		✓	✓
Romanian pronominal clitics		✓	✗
Serbian auxiliary clitics		✗	✓*
Serbian pronominal clitics		✗	✓*
* ⇔ both the verb and the phonological host is Serbian			

Table 2: Relevant CS possibilities

Romanian Auxiliary Clitics

- Romanian auxiliaries cluster around and generally precede the lexical verb, as in (2)
- they can occur sentence-initially (Romanian is a pro-drop language), and they agree in person and number with the subject

(2)	a. (Eu)	am	plecat.	b. (Eu)	voi	pleca.
	I	have.1SG-AUX	left-PTCP	I	will.1SG-AUX	leave
	'I left.'			'I will leave.'		

- here: 'perfect simple' tense which include the auxiliary 'have' and the participle of the lexical verb

(3)	a. (Eu)	Am	luat	examen-ul
	I	have.1SG-AUX	passed-PTCP	exam-the.M.SG
	'I passed the exam.'			
	b. (Tu)	Ai	cemat	taxi?
	you	have.2SG-AUX	called-PTCP	taxi
	'Did you call a taxi?'			
	c. (Ei-Ele)	Or	împrumutat	bani.
	they.M/they.F	have.3SG-AUX	borrowed-PTCP	money.M
	'They borrowed money.'			

(Romanian)

- Romanian auxiliaries are the only clitics that can participate in CS by being combined with the verb from the non-input language (i.e., Serbian), as illustrated in (4):

(4)	a. Am	<i>položila</i>	<i>ispit-ul</i>
	have.1SG-AUX	passed.F.SG-PTCP	exam-the.M.SG
	'I passed the exam.'		
	b. Ai	<i>zvala</i>	<i>taxi?</i>
	have.2SG-AUX	called.F.SG-PTCP	taxi
	'Did you call a taxi?'		
	c. Or	<i>pozajmili</i>	bani.
	have.3PL-AUX	borrowed.M.PL-PTCP	money.M
	'They borrowed money.'		

(Romanian-Serbian)

(Romanian-Serbian)

(Romanian-Serbian)

A. Code switching within phonological words that are morphosyntactic heads (X⁰s) is illicit.

(Bandi-Rao & den Dikken, 2014)

- Romanian auxiliaries may be phonologically hosted by the verb, but do not undergo syntactic incorporation with it (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994)
- **CS between Romanian auxiliary clitics and Serbian verbs is possible because they are not forming a syntactic head with the Serbian verbs, only a phonological one.**

Romanian Pronominal Clitics

- D elements that undergo syntactic incorporation with the inflected verb

	FULL FORM	CLITIC WEAKENING ¹	
		Obligatory	Optional
PROCLITIC²	o / îl aduc her/him.ACC-CL bring.1SG		o-aduc/l-aduc her/him.ACC-CL bring.1SG
ENCLITIC		trimit e-l/o send.2SG-IMP-him/her.ACC-CL am cântat -o have.1SG-AUX sung-PTCP-her.ACC-CL as cânta -o would.1SG sung-PTCP-her.ACC-CL	

- as opposed to auxiliary clitics, pronominal clitics are not permitted when hosted by the Serbian verb

(5) a. **Am** **adus-o.**
 have.1SG-AUX brought-PTCP-her.ACC-CL
 'I brought it/her.' (Romanian)

b. ***Am** **donela-o.**
 have.1SG-AUX brought.F.SG-PTCP-her.ACC-CL
 'I brought it/her.' (Romanian-Serbian)

(6) a. **L-aduc.** b. ***L-donosim.**
 him-it.ACC-CL-bring.1SG him/it.ACC-CL-bring.1SG
 'I am bringing it-him.' (Romanian-Serbian)

¹ Which form of the clitic is used in Romanian is morphophonologically conditioned, the details which do not matter for current purposes.

² Obligatory clitic weakening of proclitics is only observed with auxiliary verbs.

(7)	a. îl him/it.ACC-CL	aduc. bring.1SG	b. *îl him/it.ACC-CL	<i>donosim.</i> bring.1SG	
	'I am bringing it-him.'				(Romanian-Serbian)

Why are Romanian pronominal clitics not permitted with the Serbian verb?

- Romanian pronouns are D elements (and Serbian are N elements); this distinction extends to clitics, as well (Runić 2014); Romanian clitics pronouns are D elements, while Serbian clitic pronouns are N elements
- though Serbian verbs can take DP arguments (see (1)), they cannot host Romanian pronominal clitics
- however, Romanian pronominal clitics are not completely disallowed with Serbian verbs
- when the Romanian pronominal clitic is hosted by the Romanian auxiliary, it is permitted (8)

(8)	a. L-am him/it.ACC-CL-have.1SG-AUX	<i>čitala.</i> read.F.SG-PTCP	b. I-am him/her.DAT-CL-have.1SG-AUX	<i>pevala</i> sang.F.SG-PTCP	
	'I read it.'		'I sang to him-her.'		(Romanian-Serbian)

- one issue to account for here concerns the fact that Serbian and Romanian clitics generally occur in different surface order; however, this is not always the case
- in the imperative examples in (9) and (10), they do occur in the same word order:

(9)	a. <i>Pozovi</i> call.2SG-IMP	<i>ga.</i> him.ACC-CL	b. <i>Pozovi</i> call.2SG-IMP	<i>je.</i> her.ACC-CL	
	'Call him.'		'Call her.'		(Serbian)

(10)	a. Sună-l call.2SG-IMP-him.ACC-CL		b. Sună-o call.2SG-IMP-her.ACC-CL		
	'Call him.'		'Call her.'		(Romanian)

- still, even in these cases, the Serbian verb cannot host the Romanian clitic, as in (11):

(11)	a. *Pozovi-l call.2SG-IMP-him.ACC-CL		b. *Pozovi-o call.2SG-IMP-her.ACC-CL		
	'Call him-her.'				(Romanian-Serbian)

- another question also arises whether purely phonological factors could be relevant here
- in (12a), the Serbian 3MSG clitic *ga* follows the verb 'freeze', and the Romanian counterpart *-l* follows the Romanian verb 'freeze' in (12)b). Interestingly, when the Romanian 3MSG clitic attempts to encliticize onto the Serbian verb in (13c), the construction is ungrammatical.

(12)	a. <i>Zaledi</i> freeze.2SG-IMP	<i>ga.</i> him/it.ACC-CL	b. Îngheață-l freeze.2SG-IMP	<i>-him/it.ACC-CL</i>	
	c. *Zaledi-l freeze.2SG-IMP	<i>-him/it.ACC-CL</i>			
	'Freeze it.'				(Romanian-Serbian)

- however, (13) shows us something different
- not surprisingly, like in (12c), when the Serbian verb attempts to host the Romanian clitic in (13c), the construction is ungrammatical.

(13) a. *Zaledi* *je* b. **Îngheaț-o**
 freeze.2SG-IMP her.ACC-CL freeze.2SG-IMP-her.ACC-CL

c. **Zaledi-o*
 freeze.2SG-IMP -her.ACC-CL
 'Freeze her.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

- interestingly, the attempted CS form from (13c) is phonologically identical to the 3FSG past participle of the Serbian verb *freeze*, given in isolation in (14a) and in a sentence in (14c).

(14) a. *zaledio* b. **zaledi-o*
 frozen.M.SG-PTCP freeze.2SG-IMP -her.ACC-CL

c. *Zaledio* *se* *pakao.*
 frozen.M.SG-PTCP REFL-CL hell.M
 'Hell has frozen.'

(Serbian)

- this suggests that we are not dealing here with purely phonological incompatibility between the elements from the two participating languages
- what is more, the form from (14a) used in CS as the masculine participle form of the verb 'freeze' in (15) is grammatical.³

(15) **S-o** *zaledio* **lac-ul.**
 REFL-has-AUX frozen.M.SG-PTCP lake-the.M.SG
 'The lake has frozen.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

- the reason is syntactic in nature, given that even phonologically compatible cases are not permitted.

³ Such cases are not exceptional. Below, the clitic and the verb cluster from (i) pattern just like *zaledio* from above; in (ia), the object clitic *l-* encliticizes onto a Romanian lexical verb in an optional clitic-weakening context. Not surprisingly, in (iib), when the Serbian verb acts as the syntactic host for the Romanian pronominal clitic, the structure is ungrammatical:

(i) a. **L-învăță.** b. ***L-uči.**
 him.ACC-CL-teaches him.ACC-CL-teaches

'(S)he teaches him-it.

(Romanian-Serbian)

Here, just like it was the case with *zaledio*, *luči* has an independent meaning in Serbian, which can be translated as 'produce' or 'secrete (hormones).' This is illustrated in (iia) with *luči* used in a Serbian sentence and in (iib) in CS. As illustrated, when *luči* is used as a participle, it is acceptable in CS.

(ii) a. *Ovaj hormon* *se* *luči* *u* *toku* *trudnoće.*
 this.M.SG hormone.M REFL-CL produces in duration pregnancy

'This hormone is produced during pregnancy.'

(Romanian)

b. **Hormon-ul să** *luči.*
 hormone-the.M.SG REFL produces
 'This hormone is (being) produced.'

(Serbian)

- however, within the syntactic reasons, there are many cases where Serbian verbs can take DP arguments. Therefore, the categorial selection can then be eliminated as a factor here.
- what matters: pronominal clitics and the verb form an X⁰ constituent in Romanian (Bredermeier 1976; Kok 1985, 1989; Dobrovie-Sorin 1994; i.a.); the Romanian clitic then must undergo incorporation into the Serbian verb in order to be hosted by it in CS⁴. this, however, raises an obstacle specifically related to CS: Recall the constraint on CS formalized by Bandi-Rao and den Dikken (2014) whereby CS within phonological units, but not syntactic ones is allowed⁵.

Serbian Clitics

- Serbian pronominal and auxiliary clitics are second position (2P) clitics; they occur in the second position of their Intonational phrase (I-phrase) (which often, but not always, corresponds to their clause)⁶ (Bošković 2001, Radanović-Kocić 1996)
- Enclitics -- they can encliticize to any element as long as this is the initial element of the I-phrase; anything can either precede or follow Serbian pronominal clitics, as long they are second in their I-phrase⁷.
- Serbian pronominal clitics do not undergo incorporation with the verb

(16) a. *Mi mu se predstavljamo.*

⁴ Recall also that Serbian verbs cannot host Romanian clitics, regardless of whether they occur in a clitic weakening context or not. Contexts involving clitic weakening and those that do not involve clitic weakening can be taken to reflect different ways of phonological interaction between the clitic and the host, which may have a reflex in the prosodic structure itself (Talić, 2019). This is apparently not relevant here. What is relevant is that both cases are the same in the syntax - the clitic incorporates into the verb; hence, they are both excluded in the relevant CS cases.

⁵ Recall that the word-internal CS including a Serbian noun+(u)l combination is allowed, as discussed in Chapter 2. However, this did not violate the constraint from above since the noun and -(u)l are merged through Affix Hopping, which is a phonological process. They are not located in the same head position in the syntax here; they are in fact separated in the syntax.

⁶ There is a proposed hierarchical theory of the prosodic structure which has the following levels: prosodic (phonological) word, phonological phrase, intonational phrase (I-phrase), and utterances (Nespor & Vogel (1982, 1986), Selkirk (1986), and Hayes (1986), a.o.). Following this standard assumption, I assume that each clause can be mapped to one I-phrase, unless it is interrupted by another element that can form its own intonational domain.

⁷ In fact, the clitics themselves can be separated, as in the ellipsis examples in (50) (see Bošković 2001 for a case where the pronominal clitics both surface but are not adjacent):

<i>?Mi</i>	<i>smo</i>	<i>mu</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>dali,</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>vi</i>	<i>ste</i>
we	are.1PL-AUX	him.DAT-CL	it.ACC-CL	given.M.PL-PTCP	and	also	you	are-2PL.AUX
<i>mu</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>dali</i>		<i>(takodje).</i>				
him.DAT-CL	it.ACC-CL	given.M.PL-PTCP		too				

‘We have given it to him, and so have you.’

(Bošković 2001) (Serbian)

we him.DAT-CL REFL-CL introduce.1PL
'We are introducing ourselves to him.'

b. *Zaštomu se Milan predstavlja.*
why him.DAT-CL REFL-CL Milan introduces
'Why is Milan introducing himself to him.'

c. *Ona tvrdi da mu se Milan predstavlja.*
she claims that him.DAT-CL REFL-CL Milan introduces
'She claims that Milan introduces himself to him.'

d. *Zašto je otišao?*
why is-AUX left.M.SG
'Why did he leave?'

(Serbian)

- while there are syntactic and distributional differences between Romanian and Serbian pronominal clitics, there are contexts where the word order in examples involving clitics overlaps between the two languages

(17) a. *Nazovi ga!*
call.2SG-IMP him.ACC-CL
'Call him!'

b. *Sună-!*
call.2SG-IMP-him.ACC-CL

(18) a. *Ona ga gleda.*
she him.ACC-CL watches
'She is looking at him.'

b. *Ea îl privește*
she him.ACC-CL watches

Serbian Pronominal Clitics

- when it comes to CS, Serbian pronominal clitics cannot be hosted by a Romanian element

(19) a. **Prietena mea ga sună.*
friend.SG my.F.SG him.ACC-CL calls

b. **Sună ga (prietena mea).⁸*
calls him.ACC-CL friend.F my.F.SG
'My friend is calling him.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

- even when the verb is Serbian, as in (20), Romanian elements cannot act as phonological hosts for Serbian pronominal clitics:

(20) **Prietena mea ga zove.*

⁸ Note that both languages allow postverbal subjects and pro-drop.

friend.F my.F.SG him.ACC-CL calls
 'My friend is calling him.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

- as 2P clitics, Serbian pronominal clitics may need a Serbian phonological host preceding them
- interestingly, even when the host is Serbian, as in (21a), or when the clitic is linearly adjacent to Serbian elements, as in (21b) clitics are still not allowed:

(21) a. **Moja drugarica ga des sună.*
 friend.F.SG my.F him.ACC-C often calls

b. **Moja drugarica ga često sună.*
 friend.F.SG my.F him.ACC-CL often calls
 'My friend calls him often.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

In fact, only when both the host and the verb are Serbian, as in (22), the structure is grammatical.

(22) a. *I-am spus că moj prijatelj ga*
 him-her.DAT-CL-have.1SG-AUX told that my.M.SG friend.M him.ACC-CL

stalno zove
 often calls

'I told him-her that my friend calls him often.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

b. *Moj drug mu donosi pocrăi.*
 my.M.SG friend.M him.DAT-CL bring.3SG cookies.F

'My friend brings him cookies.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

B. In CS, Serbian pronominal clitics are allowed only if the verb and the host are Serbian. Moreover, the verb must be Serbian even when it is not the host. In all other cases, Serbian pronominal clitics are not permitted in CS.

- the question is why B holds
- the host alone cannot be the issue since even when the host is Serbian, as in (21), the sentence is still bad
- on the other hand, Bandi-Rao and den Dikken's (2014) constraint on CS below a X^0 constituent can also not be the reason since the Serbian pronominal clitics do not incorporate syntactically with the verb.
- in addition, Serbian subjects (i.e., NPs) and Romanian verbs can be combined as shown in , so the issue has to be specific to internal arguments.

(23) *Moja drugarica doarme.*
 my.F.SG drugarica.F.SG sleeps

'My friend is sleeping.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

Petroj (2020)

- the issue at hand here seems to be related to case
- Petroj (2020) observes that Romanian verbs do not assign case to their noun complements (in CS)
- Serbian noun can be a complement of a Romanian verb in CS and bear default nominative case
- while Serbian verbs can assign case in CS, they do not have to; instead, a noun can occur with default nominative case as a complement of a Serbian verb in CS

- (24) a. **Am** *nazvala* **şpitar-ul.**
have.1SG-AUX called.F.SG-PTCP hospital-the.M.SG
- b. **Am** **sunat** **şpitar-ul.**
have.1SG-AUX called-PTCP hospital-the.M.SG
'I called the hospital.' (Romanian-Serbian)
- (25) a. **Am** *nazvala bolnica.*
have.1SG-AUX called.F.SG-PTCP hospital.NOM.F.SG
- b. **Am** **sunat** *bolnica.*
have.1SG-AUX called-PTCP hospital.NOM.F.SG
'I called the hospital.' (Romanian-Serbian)
- (26) a. **Am** *nazvala bolnicu.*
have.1SG-AUX called.F.SG-PTCP hospital.ACC.F.SG
- b. ***Am** **sunat** *bolnicu.*
have.1SG-AUX called-PTCP hospital.ACC.F.SG
'I called the hospital.' (Romanian-Serbian)
- (27) a. *Nazvala sam bolnicu.*
called.F.SG-PTCP am-AUX hospital.ACC.F.SG
- b. ***Nazvala sam bolnica**
called.F.SG-PTCP am-AUX hospital.NOM.F.SG
'I called (the) hospital.' (Romanian-Serbian)

- the contrast between (25b) and (26b) confirms that the complement of a Romanian verb can *only* have default case.
- while *bolnica* shows case distinctions, the noun *bolnica* with its default (nominative) case is the only possibility as the object of the Romanian verb in (25b) and (26b)
- with the Serbian verb, both default nominative and accusative are possible, as shown by (25a) and (26a)
- this is in contrast to fully Serbian examples in (27), where only accusative is possible.

C. In CS, Romanian verbs can only take Serbian nominal complements with default case.

D. In CS, Serbian verbs can take Serbian nominal complements with default case or with accusative case.

- the situation becomes more intriguing when pronouns are involved.
- ungrammatical cases like (28a), where the Romanian verb takes a Serbian accusative pronoun, are expected – having seen that the Romanian verb does not assign case to its complements (nouns and, apparently, pronouns, as well)
- interestingly, while Serbian noun objects bearing default case were permitted with a Romanian verb, Serbian pronouns are not allowed at all, as illustrated in (28b):

(28) a. ***Am** **sunat** *nju.*
have.1SG-AUX called-PTCP her.ACC
'I called her.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

b. ***Am** **sunat** *ona.*
have.1SG-AUX called-PTCP she.NOM
'I called she.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

- note that a nominative pronoun is also not possible as a complement of a Serbian verb, as shown in (20):

(20) a. ***Am** *zvala* *nju.*
have.1SG-AUX called.F.SG-PTCP her.ACC

b. ***Am** *zvala* *ona.*
have.1SG-AUX called.F.SG-PTCP she.NOM
'I called she.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

- finally, Serbian subject pronouns are also not permitted with a Romanian verb:

(30) a. ***Ja** **am** **citit** **o** **carte.**
I have.1SG-AUX read-PTCP a.F.SG book.F
'I read a book.'

b. ***Ti** **sun** **acasă.**
you call.2SG home
'You're calling home.'

(Romanian-Serbian)

- regarding the impossibility of Serbian pronouns occurring with Romanian verbs (Infl), I suggest that perhaps nominative on Serbian pronouns is not just default, but real case that needs to be assigned.
- since Romanian verbs cannot assign case, Serbian pronouns are not possible and this explanation can be extended to subject pronouns
- if pronouns are not allowed for case reasons, by extension, pronominal clitics are also not possible with Romanian verbs for the same reason -- Romanian verbs cannot assign case to nominal elements. Since pronouns and pronominal clitics in Serbian need case, they cannot occur with a Romanian verb.

- like Serbian pronominal clitics, Serbian auxiliaries are not allowed with Romanian verbs
- in (31a), the auxiliary clitic is the only Serbian element in the structure.:

(31) a. ***Prieten-ul** **meu** *je* **adus** **pocărați.**
 friend-the.M.SG my.M.SG is-AUX brought-PTCP cookies.F

- in (31b), in addition to the auxiliary, the subject (i.e., the phonological host of the clitic) is also Serbian.

b. **Moj* *drug* *je* **adus** **pocărați.**
 my.M.SG friend-the.M is-AUX brought-PTCP cookies.F

- in (31c), the auxiliary and the verb are both Serbian. In all these cases, the constructions are ungrammatical

c. ***Prieten-ul** **meu** *je* *doneo* **pocărați.**
 friend-the.M.SG my.M.SG is-AUX brought.M.SG-PTCP cookies.F
 ‘My friend brought cookies.’ (Romanian-Serbian)

- like Serbian pronominal clitics, Serbian auxiliaries are only allowed if both the host and the verb are Serbian

(32) a. *Moj* *drug* *je* *doneo* **pocărați.**
 my.M.SG friend-the.M.SG is-AUX brought.M.SG-PTCP cookies.F
 ‘My friend brought cookies.’

b. **I-am** **spus** **că** *zvao* *je* *moj* *drug.*
 him-her.DAT-CL-have.1SG-AUX told that called.M.SG-PTCP is-AUX my.M.SG friend.M
 ‘I told him-her that my friend called.’ (Romanian-Serbian)

- Bošković (1997, 2001) argues that the Serbian auxiliary clitic and the verb form a complex head.
- in particular, he argues that in (63a), the participle head-adjoins to Aux.
- after the incorporation, the auxiliary can optionally excorporate, which happens in (33b):

(33) a. *Zaspao* *je.* b. *On je* *nesmetano* *zaspao.*
 fell-asleep.M.SG-PTCP is-AUX he is-AUX unhindered fell-asleep.M.SG-PTCP
 ‘He fell asleep.’ ‘He fell asleep unhindered.’

(Serbian)

- given this and the Bandi-Rao and den Dikken’s (2014) ban on CS below X⁰, I suggest that Serbian auxiliaries cannot occur with Romanian verbs because incorporation of the Serbian auxiliary with the Romanian verb would be required, which violates this constraint.
- note that although excorporation can follow the incorporation in question, what is relevant is that the complex head is formed at some point, which would include incompatible elements (i.e., a Serbian auxiliary clitic and a Romanian lexical verb).
- while this explains why Serbian auxiliaries can only occur with Serbian verbs, it is not completely clear why the phonological host also needs to be Serbian with both Serbian auxiliary and pronominal clitics.

- given that there are no syntactic reasons for this, I assume that this has to do with the second-position effect.⁹

Conclusion

- ✓ **Romanian auxiliary clitics** can occur in CS with Romanian and Serbian verb hosts because they do not undergo syntactic incorporation with the verb.
- ✓ **Romanian pronominal clitics** cannot be hosted syntactically by the Serbian verb because, as argued by Bandi-Rao & den Dikken (2014), CS below X^0 is illicit.
- ✓ **Serbian pronominal clitics** can only occur if the phonological and syntactic host is Serbian, which is due to case reasons whereby Serbian clitics can only have their case assigned by Serbian verb.
- ✓ **Serbian auxiliary clitics** cannot occur with Romanian hosts due to the CS under X^0 constraint and possibly due to additional phonological reasons.
- ✓ As demonstrated by the Romanian-Serbian CS data, **word-internal or phrase-internal CS** is possible so long as the CS elements form a phonological but not a syntactic head at any point in the derivation.

References:

- Bandi-Rao, S., & den Dikken, M. (2014). Light switches: On v as a pivot in codeswitching, and the nature of the ban on word-internal switches. In J. MacSwan (Ed.), *Grammatical theory and bilingual codeswitching* (pp. 161–184). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bošković, Ž. (1997). *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: An economy approach*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bošković, Ž. (2001). *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface: Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Elsevier.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. (1994). *The Syntax of Romanian. Comparative Studies in Romance*. Koster, J. & van Riemsdijk, H. (Eds.), New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. & Giurgea, I. (Eds.). (2013). *A Reference Grammar to of Romanian*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Petroj, V. (2020). *Ignoring Language Barriers: Romanian and Serbian in Interaction*. (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Connecticut.
- Runić, J. (2014.) *A new look at clitics, clitic doubling, and argument ellipsis: Evidence from Slavic* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Connecticut.
- Talić, A. (2013). *Extraordinary Complement Extraction (Handout)*. Presented at LSALAA 2013. Paris, France.

⁹ It might be the case that the clitic has certain phonological properties which require a Serbian host to be realized. One possibility is the following. As discussed in Bošković (1997, 2001), Serbian clitics must be second in their I-phrase. One way to look at it is that Serbian clitics must be adjacent to an I-phrase boundary. But since they are enclitics, they also must have a host in front of them. It is possible that they project their I-phrase boundary adjacency requirement onto their host then, and that this kind of percolation of a phonological requirement is possible also only if the host is also Serbian. At any rate, these potential phonological incompatibilities between the Serbian (auxiliary) clitics and Romanian hosts will be left for future research.

Talić, A. (2017). *From A to N and Back: Functional and Bare Projections in the Domain of N and A. (Doctoral Dissertation)*
University of Connecticut.