1. Introduction

In this paper, we focus on the distribution of the universal quantifier във (“all”) in Old Bulgarian, which displays a high degree of word order variation with respect to N and the other possible nominal elements, especially demonstratives, possessive adjectives and possessive phrases and other kinds of adjectives, as shown by the different patterns represented in (1):

(1) a. при народък всекъде сели N Q Dem
    “in the presence” crowd, LOC,m. all, LOC,m. this, LOC,m.
    (CS 149, 15)

b. всичко множество се Q N Dem
    all, ACC,n. multitude, ACC,n. this, ACC,n.
    “all this multitude” (CS 31, 18)

c. тя всичко една  Dem Q N
    “all this guilt”
    this, N,f. all, N,f. guilt, N,f.
    (CS 415, 28)

d. ношта онзи всичко N Dem Q
    “all that night”
    night, ACC,f. that, ACC,f. all, ACC,f.
    (CS 265, 5)

e. съдържание всичко своев N Q PossA
    “all of one’s/his own trial”
    trial (judging), ACC,m. all, ACC,m. own, PAan, ACC,m.
    (CS 257, 22)

f. плътта това всичко N PossA Q
    “all your flesh”
    flesh, Pl,N,f. your, PA, Pl,N,f. all, Pl,N,f.
    (CS 233, 23)

g. всичко живота уязвима Q N A
    “all man’s life”
    all, GEN,n. life, Nominaliz,GEN,n. man, DA,GEN,n.
    (CS 288, 29-30)

h. всичко уязвимо живее Q A N
    “all human life”
    all, ACC,n. (of) man, DA, ACC,n. life, Nominaliz, ACC,n.
    (CS 253, 14-15)

i. претълпете всичко седемина N Q A
    “all the devil seduction”
    seduction, ACC,f. all, ACC,f. (of) devil, DA, ACC,f.
    (CS 525, 8)

In the course of the discussion, we will support three main claims. The first one is related to the development of the general structure of Old Bulgarian Nominal Expressions and the other two more specifically regard the synchronic and diachronic analysis of всичко.

We claim that at this stage, Old Bulgarian is developing a left peripheral area inside the Nominal Expression around a functional head (Cl) which can host nominal clitics in Wackernagel
position, parallel to what happens in the clause. The structures in (2) depict the current language for the clause as analysed by Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Hellan (1999), and for the DP by Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (1999). The reader is referred to Kiparsky (1995) for a discussion of the evolvement of CP in Indo-European and for the split between Germanic languages and other Indo-European languages:

(2) a. (Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Hellan 1999)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[ClP2 Cl [ClP1 Cl [CP C]]]}
\text{Knigata dadoxte li mu ja na Ivan?}
\text{Book-the gave.2pl Cl_wh Cl_him Cl_it to Ivan}
\text{“Did you give the book to Ivan?”}
\end{align*}
\]

b. (Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti 1999)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[ClP2 Cl [ClP1 [Cl D [NP]]]]}
\text{Na Ivan [xubavite mu [ knigi]]]
\text{To Ivan good-the Cl_his books}
\text{“Ivan’s good books”}
\end{align*}
\]

c. \[
\begin{align*}
\text{Na Ivan [ClP1 [Cl knigite mu] [ knigi]]}
\text{To Ivan book-the Cl_his}
\text{“Ivan’s books”}
\end{align*}
\]

In both cases (2a) and (2b-c) the upper portion of the structure (CP and DP) is optionally preceded by (at most) two projections (ClP1, ClP2) headed by a functional head the lower of which (Cl1) hosts a clitic or a clitic cluster. The result is that the clitic (cluster) appears as second, phonologically encliticized either on a constituent in SpecClP1 (such as \textit{xubavite} in (2b)) or on the lexical head also moved to Cl1 for independent reasons (e.g. the lexical V \textit{dadoxte} in (2a) or the lexical N \textit{knigite} in (2c)). ClP1 can in turn be preceded by another constituent in SpecClP2 (such as the DP \textit{knigata} in (2a) or the PP \textit{na Ivan} in (2b-c)). Notice that Cl2 is always empty, and we take it to be filled by a discourse feature related to topicality (possibly contrastive topic, but we do not pursue this further here).

Our second claim regards the syntactic label of \textit{kak} which we claim to be ambiguous: Q or QA. At this stage the very same morphological form \textit{kak} can be syntactically labelled Q (a quantifier heading its own projection and selecting DP as its complement (3a), or labelled QAP (a high AP inserted in the intermediate functional layer of the DP (3b).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{3} & \quad \text{a. [Q [D [NP]]]} \\
& \quad \text{b. [D [QAP [NP]]]}
\end{align*}
\]

Being that D is not necessarily filled at this stage, the linear orders enhanced by the two structures are in most cases the same. It is important to notice that at this same stage the enclitic demonstrative is developing into an affixal morpheme, which will have the distribution of a definite article. This property interacts with our third claim: \textit{kak} is specializing for the Q status and losing the QA status. The demonstrative clitic inserted in the Wackernagel position at this stage of the language is turning into an inflectional morpheme. This inflectional morpheme becomes part of the AP inflection and of the Q inflection. The linear orders are given in (4):
Parallel to what happens with any other kind of AP, the enclitic demonstrative is often found on 
\textit{вс}. However, due to the specialization of \textit{вс} as a Q, it is not reanalyzed as an (adjectival)
inflectional morpheme, but as an agreement morpheme which overtly marks the structural 
dependency of the DP with Q, as is also the case of DP and Q in other languages (cf. Section 2 
below). The situation at this point in the development is still unsettled but (4b) will eventually 
win over (4a). The analysis of the Modern Bulgarian counterpart of \textit{вс} will be given in section 
2 following Giusti and Dimitrova Vulchanova (1996).

1.2 Methodological procedures

With languages that only have a written record, it is particularly difficult to find evidence for the 
hypotheses suggested by the data in the corpus, especially if they concern quite delicate matters 
such as the positioning of adjectives/DP-constituents. Thus we rely on the following 
methodological procedures:

- We use patterns of relative ordering of pairs of items to establish the position in the 
hierarchy of each element. E.g. if A precedes B and B precedes C, we conclude that A 
- We derive statistically marked orders from discourse driven displacements to left 
peripheral positions. This point is crucial in our discussion, since we claim that the left 
periphery of the Old Bulgarian DP is developing into its current structure which is 
pivoted by a CIP.
- We apply to Old Bulgarian the analyses of the categories under discussion in modern 
Bulgarian and in general to languages that present the same word orders, on the 
assumption that all languages (all the more two stages of the same language) share a 
great part of their structure (UG) and the differences are to be captured by different 
settings of the same parameters.
- The previous three procedures allow us to establish diagnostics for the categories under 
discussion relevant to Old Bulgarian and exclude those that can be used for other 
languages but are not relevant to Old Bulgarian for independent properties of this 
language.
- Following the hypothesis that an unstable system is characterised by the coexistence of 
competing grammars (cf. Kroch 1989, 1994), we provide competing analyses for a given 
word order which may have coexisted in the speakers’ minds at this stage of the 
language. As argued by Roberts (2007), orders that suggest parameter ambiguity tend to 
be resolved by the next generation of speakers by re-setting the parameter (a re-analysis), 
who inference from the input an underlying grammar which is different from the 
gramar of the previous generation. This process is diachronically well-attested and 
believed to drive diachronic change.
- Finally we try to formulate some hypotheses for why certain syntactically ambiguous 
orders have later turned to be analysed unambiguously.
1.3. The corpus
Our analysis is based on data from the electronic corpus of around 10,000 nominal expressions from Codex Suprasliensis (11th c.), one of the earliest written Slavic manuscripts (Vulchanov & Dimitrova-Vulchanova 2005), available as a pdf-file at the following address: http://www.hf.ntnu.no/hf/adm/forskning/prosjekter/balkansim/databases.html

2. Quantity items as ambiguous categories.

The ambiguity in categorial status of quantity items is by no means exceptional and has been observed for different kinds of quantifiers in many older and modern languages (cf. e.g. Classical Greek (Manolessou 2000), Hebrew (Shlonsky 1991, 2004), Serbo-Croatian and other Slavic languages (Giusti and Leko 1996) Romance and Germanic languages (Giusti 1991, Cardinaletti and Giusti 2006). Here, we cannot give an adequate argumentation in favour of this proposal, which would take a presentation on its own. We just present the structures we are going to use and refer to the literature for the arguments that support it. In (5)-(6) we observe the structural position of a Q which takes a full DP as its direct complement. As a consequence, if Q is a universal quantifier it selects a definite DP and precedes an article or a demonstrative, as shown in (5). But if Q is an existential quantifier which selects an indefinite DP, it does not co-occur with an article or a demonstrative, because indefiniteness in the languages under consideration is realized with a Ø-article, as shown in (6):

(5) a. [QP tutti [DP gli/questi studenti bravi]]
   b. [QP all [DP the/these good students]]

(6) a. [QP molti [DP Ø studenti bravi]]
   b. [QP many [DP Ø good students]]

In (7) we see the case of a QAP, which is inside a DP and is therefore preceded by a determiner:

(7) a. [DP questi/i [[QAP molti] studenti bravi]]
   b. [DP these/the [[QAP many] good students]]

Notice that in Italian and English, the ambiguous quantity items are apparently a subset of existential quantifiers (many, few, numerals). But there is no evidence to draw any kind of correlation between adjectival status and this subclass of quantifiers, since formal semantic properties bear no consequences for syntactic status and vice versa. For example among German universal quantifiers, we can find all (“all”) in (8) which is unambiguously a Q, ganz (lit. “whole”, but also interpreted as “all”) which is unambiguously a QA in (9), and beide (“both”) which is ambiguously a Q or a QA in (10). In (11) we find that in German viele is ambiguous as in Italian (molti) and English (many):

(8) a. [QP all [DP die guten Studenten]] (German, cf. Giusti 1991)
    all the.pl good.pl. students
   a’. [QP alle [DP (die) guten Studenten]]
      all.pl (the.pl) good.pl. students
   b. *[DP die [[QAP allen] guten Studenten] „all the students“
      „all the students“
Some diagnostics for the different status of a quantity item are given by checking the relative position of the quantifier with respect to other nominal elements. We will observe that many of these diagnostics cannot be straightforwardly applied to Old Bulgarian, due to the lack of an obligatory overt D at this stage of the language. The relevance of each kind of diagnostics to Old Bulgarian will be just hinted at in this section and will be exemplified in section 4.

2.1. Position with respect to other nominal elements

If in a language nothing moves inside the QP, Q precedes all elements of the DP. In (12a-a’) we observe the case of Italian, in (12b-b’) we observe the case of German, as analysed by Giusti (1991):

(12) a. tutti questi bravi ragazzi vs. a’. *questi tutti bravi ragazzi
b. alle diese Kinder vs. b’. *diese allen Kinder cf. (8/9b)

This test cannot be applied across-the-board to Old Bulgarian, which allows for some displacements inside the DP, including permutations both in the pre-nominal and post-nominal position, as well as left-branch extractions, like many modern Slavic languages.

2.2 Position with respect to articles

As observed by Giusti (1994), if the determiner is a free-morpheme, as German *d-, a QAP such as \textit{ganz} must be preceded by it, (13a); if the determiner is enclitic on a high adjective, as Romanian \textit{-ul}, a QAP such as \textit{ambi} will be inflected for it, (13b), in contrast to a Q, such as \textit{amîndoi}, which precedes the first element in the DP inflected for the definite article (13b’):

(13) a. die ganzen Kinder
“all the children” vs. a’. *ganz die Kinder
b. ambi bâieți
“both children” vs. b’. amîndoi bâieții
both children-the
(Romanian, cf. Giusti 1993)
This diagnostics is quite tricky in Old Bulgarian. At this stage, the inflectional article which is present today (and is in many ways parallel to the inflectional article of Romanian, cf. Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti 1998) is not yet fully fledged, even if the demonstrative has already developed as a clitic in second position and can mark the second position in the DP. Unfortunately, the co-occurrence of във във with such a clitic demonstrative cannot be taken as a diagnostics for the syntactic label of във във, since the clitic is second to any kind of nominal element, including Q and QA (cf. Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Vulchanov, in press/a).

2.3. Co-occurrence with a pronoun

Assuming that a pronoun is a full DP (as it cannot co-occur with (most) adjectives), we expect that Q can cooccur with a pronoun, while QAP cannot, as shown for Italian and German in (14):

(14)  a. tutti noi / noi tutti vs. а’. *numerosi noi
b. wir alle /*alle wir vs. b’. *wir ganze(n) /*ganze(n) wir
   “we all / all of us” (Italian vs German cf. Giusti 1991)

If we can show that adjectives of the relevant kind cannot cooccur with pronouns in Old Bulgarian, we can use this as a safe diagnostics. A hint that this is the case is the contrast between QA and Q in another Slavic language, namely Bosnian, (cf. Giusti and Leko 1994, 2006):

(15)  a. Vidio sam mnogo studenata/ njih.
   (I) saw many students-GEN PL/ them-GEN PL
b. Vidio sam ih mnogo.
   (I) saw them-CL GEN PL many
(16)  a. Vidio sam mnoge studente/ *njih.
   (I) saw many-ACC PL students-ACC PL/ them-ACC PL
b. Vidio sam (*ih) mnoge.
   (I) saw them-CL ACC PL many-ACC PL
   “I saw a lot of students/them”

In Bosnian, the same root mnog- is categorically ambiguous between the Q and QA status. It is however possible to straightforwardly disambiguate the label by looking at the inflection: a Q (e.g., mnogo in (15)) does not inflect for gender, number and case, while a QA (e.g., mnoge in (16)) does.

2.4. DP-movement to SpecQP

Assuming that SpecQP can host movement of the whole DP, in certain cases depending on the language, Q can follow the whole DP constituent. For example, in German a pronoun must precede the quantifier, a DP cannot; while in Hebrew the two orders are optional also for DPs. QAPs behave like high adjectives (they are prenominal even in Romanian, cf. ambi in (13b) above):
This diagnostics is again very tricky, since the head-noun in Old Bulgarian can move quite high to the left of all adjectives. However, it is quite interesting to see that the presence of \text{p}άκλακ seems in general to block head movement. This may be related to its Q-status. Since we know that Qs in some cases do dispense with definite articles (cf. German (8), (10) above, as well as Bulgarian (24) below) we may conclude in a theory internal fashion that when the noun is to the left of the \text{p}άκλακ it is a full DP in SpecQP rather than an N moved across such a high constituent.

2.5. Discontinuous positions

Assuming that DP is the minimal portion of structure that can be affected by movement, if Q is external to DP, then Q is the only nominal element that can be found in discontinuous order with respect to the rest of the DP, QAP cannot:

\begin{align*}
\text{(18) a.} & \quad \text{Die Kinder sind alle weg. vs. a'. *Die Kinder sind ganze(n) weg cf. (8-9)} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Kinder sind viele weg. vs. b'. *Die Kinder sind viele(n) weg cf. (11)}
\end{align*}

This diagnostics is again rather tricky in Old Bulgarian, which in parallel to other modern Slavic languages with no article displays discontinuous Nominal Expressions with different kinds of nominal modifiers including APs. We hypothesise, in line with Boskovic (2008), that discontinuity in the DP domain strongly correlates with the presence/absence of the article and the structure of the top functional layer of the NE. This observation, however, should not be taken as straightforward support for the proposal that lack of definite article in a language signals total lack of the DP projection in that language, since it may be reduced to different properties of D° and SpecDP.

The fact that all these diagnostics cannot give a straightforward result explains the instability of the system. The language learners in fact could not easily find clear evidence of the Q or AP status in the language at that stage.

The status of \text{p}άκλακ can however be detected in a way that is proper to Old Bulgarian syntax. Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Vulchanov (in press/b) claim that definiteness is expressed at this stage of the language by N-movement to the highest functional head. We therefore expect a quantity AP to follow N; on the contrary, we expect a Q to (immediately) precede N in a definite NE.
3. A comparison between Modern Bulgarian and Old Bulgarian

Let us now introduce the structure of the Modern Bulgarian Nominal Expression and compare it with the Old Bulgarian counterparts.

3.1. Modern Bulgarian

Modern Bulgarian has an enclitic definite article which displays a Wackernagel behaviour and must appear on the first element of the definite DP (19a-b). The adjective always precedes the noun, both in definite and in indefinite noun phrases cf. (19a) with (19c) and (19b) with (19d). No indefinite article is necessary:

(19) a. goljamo momče A+art N (cf. Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti 1998)
    b. *momčeto goljamo N+art A b’. momčeto N+art
    c. goljamo momče A N
    d. *momčeto goljamo N A d’. momče N

We adopt Longobardi’s (1994) proposal according to which an argument has DP status and assume that all NEs in (19) are DPs. If this is the case, the data above show that in Modern Bulgarian the DP must be filled by an element carrying the definite article, if it is interpreted as definite. If it is interpreted as indefinite, no article appears and the DP is empty (or filled by the same lexical element which would otherwise host the article).

Modern Bulgarian does not display any determiner spreading, contrary to other Balkan languages (and in particular contrary to Greek). The definite article does not co-occur with demonstratives. We can have only one article per NE, if the expression ought to be processed as referring to one referent only. Notice that an overt article is necessary, if a possessive clitic is inserted.

The NE-internal word order is rather fixed. The head noun never moves to the left of a modifying adjective. And the hierarchy of nominal modifiers is as expected following work by Cinque (1994) and by many others after him:

(20) a. novata Ivanova durvena kušta
    new-the Ivan.Gen.AP wooden house
    b. durvenata (*Ivanova) kušta
    c. Ivanovata (*nova) kušta
    d. kuštata (*noval/ *Ivanova/ *durvena)

The only possible freedom in word order in the Bulgarian Nominal Expression is provided by the possibility of fronting a possessor for discourse purposes (Focalizing or Topicalizing it). What is important to notice is that the fronting position is above DP but inside the nominal constituent, and that it creates a Wackernagel effect for a resumptive possessive clitic.
Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti (1999) analyse the possibility of fronting the possessor with internal resumptive clitic as evidence for a peripheral area in the NE parallel to the one which is found in the clause. In (2b) above, we gave the structure of the modern Bulgarian DP, which we now repeat in (22) below.

Keep in mind that the extended projection creating a left peripheral area of the nominal expression is not sensitive to the DP or QP status of the nominal expression it extends, as will be exemplified in (27) below. For this reason, the presence of a clitic (in Old Bulgarian the anaphoric demonstrative in its evolvement towards the status of an article is in many respects a clitic in the Wackernagel position) cannot discriminate the DP vs QP status of the nominal expression:

The head of the lower portion of the left periphery is the position of the possessive clitic. Its specifier is filled by the first element in the NE, the upper specifier can host a fronted (contrastive) topic.

That the Wackernagel position is higher and different from any other position in the Bg NE, is also suggested by the effect we have in coordinate prenominal adjectives, where only the first conjunct displays the definite article (23):
3.1.5. Vsički in Modern Bulgarian

We conclude our overview of the Modern Bulgarian NE with the syntax of the universal quantifier vsički which is specialized for the Q status but still presents some at first sight ambiguous orders. The data and the analysis is taken from Giusti and Dimitrova-Vulchanova (1996). The optionality of the article (-te) in (24a) may suggest that vsički is either an adjective or a determiner, as represented in (24a′), but the complementary distribution with the article in (24b-c) may suggest that it is a D, as represented in (24b′). However, both hypotheses are contradicted by the data in (25), which cannot be accounted for either by the adjectival status or by the determiner status. Instead, they are accounted for if we hypothesize the Quantifier status with the additional assumption that the inflectional morpheme expressing definiteness is optionally present on Q if the DP follows (25a) and is obligatory present on Q if the DP or part of it moves to SpecDP (25b-d), as depicted in the relevant structures:

(24) a. vsički(te) xubavi knigi a′. [DP QAP+art [AP [NP]]]
   b. *vsički(te) knigite b′. [DP [D°Q(+art)] […[NP]]]
   c. *vsički(te) xubavite knigi

(25) a. vsički(te) tezi knigi a′. [Q(+)art] [DP Dem [NP]]
   b. tezi knigi vsički*(te) b′. [Q(+)art] [DP Dem [NP]]
   c. knigite vsički*(te)
   d. tezi vsički*(te) knigi d′. [Q(+)art] [DP Dem [NP]]
Notice that in Bulgarian no AP (with or without a determiner) can precede vsički, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (26):

(26) a. *xubavi(te) vsički(te) knigi
    b. *negovi(te) vsički(te) knigi
    c. *Ivanovi(te) vsički(te) knigi

The ungrammaticality of (26) and the strict adherence to the adjectival hierarchy reported in (20) suggest that the left periphery of the nominal expression (ClP2) depicted in (23) cannot host an AP. In fact, it can only host a possessive PP, as in (27) where we observe that if a PP is present it is higher than the quantifier and does not intervene between Q and DP:

(27) a. na Ivan vsičkite mu tezi novi knigi
to Ivan all-the his.CL these new books
b. vsički (*mu) knigi
all (*his.CL) books
c. na Ivan vsički tezi mu novi knigi
to Ivan all these his.CL new books
d. *vsički novite mu knigi
e. knigite mu vsičkite

To conclude, in modern Bulgarian, vsički is a quantifier and not a quantity adjective, even if it has an inflectional paradigm that is somewhat similar to an adjective. This may in fact have developed from its ambiguous status in Old Bulgarian, as we will argue for in the next section.

3.2. Old Bulgarian
With the present-day situation in mind, let us now draw our attention to the language of Codex Suprasliensis (11th c.), which displays a rather unstable situation.

Old Bulgarian displays a number of determiners тъ, ч, омъ which can appear as strong independent pronouns or inside the nominal expression, both in demonstrative uses and as the evolving article. The sentence in (28) below provides an example of the strong demonstrative used as a pronoun, while (29) illustrates intra-nominal use of the three main roots, с-, т-, and н-.

(28) амът [to] в’рша[н]ь[ъ]
if this say, 1.pl what, ACC,n. he, N,m. want, 3,sg
“If what we say is what he wants...” (CS 380, 1-2)

(29) a. вси [to] се
all, ACC,n. det, ACC,n. place (village), ACC,n.
    (OB, CS 207, 4)

b. духов[ъ] [на]
spirit, GEN,m. det, GEN,m. impure, GEN,m.
    (OB, CS 173, 11)

c. огър [на]
that, GEN,m. fire, GEN,m.
3.2.1. The demonstrative in Old Bulgarian

Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Vulchanov (in press/a,b) claim that, at this stage the demonstrative in second position has already lost the deictic function of the strong demonstrative to the discourse anaphoric function which is also possible with demonstratives but which is characteristic of definite articles. A counterpart of this change in interpretive features is the change in its syntactic-morphological status. The strong demonstrative is a maximal projection in SpecDP (cf. Giusti 1997, 1996 for Germanic, Giusti 2001 for Romance, and Roussou and Roberts (1999) for a general proposal), while the newly formed morpheme is a clitic. This clitic demonstrative coexists with a strong counterpart which is spelled in the same way as the weak one.1 The Modern language displays a reinforced morpheme (to-zi/tà-zi), which replaces the OB demonstrative exactly due to the weakening of the clitic to the extent that it becomes the definite article which is an inflection on nouns or adjectives. The article thus follows a standard path of development, and Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Vulchanov (in press/b) propose a change of the type syntactic clitic > phonological clitic (special clitic) > morpheme. Further support to this claim is found in work by Svane (1961, 1962) who documents that already in the 13th century the postposed definite article is not only phonologically/morphologically shaped, but also has a highly regular use.

The properties of the demonstrative in OB which interact with the syntax of οὗτος are the following. It is not obligatory, as shown in (30), but in some cases, it appears as the translation of the definite article (31). These two properties suggest that, on the one hand, it does not have the full function of a definite article yet (it is not obligatory), however what it shares with such an element is the discourse anaphoric function (witnessed by the Greek original). This function is also possible for the demonstrative in NT Greek, as example (32) may indicate:

(30) a. ἰδοὺ γαρ ἢ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος
   (of) he, D,m is glory, N,f and power, N,f. (CS 81, 25-26)
   b. ὁ ὁ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος
   (of) who, D,m. glory, N and power, N.n.
   “whose is the glory and the power”

(31) a. ἡ θεομάχου τὸν αἴρετος
   lord, N,m. that, Art,N,m.      (CS 86, 23)
   b. ὁ κράτων
   Art, N,m. might
   “the lord”

(32) a. ὁ ὁ ὡς στηθομᾶγχος τὸν αἴρετος 
   about God-fighting, LOC,f. this, LOC,f. foolish, LOC,f. heresy, LOC,f. (CS 188, 28-29)
   b. τῆς θεομάχου ταύτης νεωτέρας αἴρεσεως
   Art, GEN,f. God-opposing this, GEN,f. youthful heresy

Finally, (33) is one of the many examples which show that the second position of the demonstrative is due to internal properties of the syntax of this element (it is a clitic in ClP) and not to contact with NTGreek:

---

1 This is not so surprising. This is in fact the case in modern English which spells strong and weak pronouns in the same way.
The clitic vs strong status of the demonstrative appears to correlate with its interpretation: The strong position in (34a) corresponds to deictic first mention interpretation, while the clitic in (34b) corresponds to anaphoric second mention:

(34) a. 

Dem A N
these, Pl,N,f. wild, Pl,N,f. goat, Pl,N,f.
“these (deictic/first mention) wild goats”

b. 

N Dem A
wild, Pl,ACC,f. these, Pl,ACC,f. goat, Pl,ACC,f.
“the wild goats (second mention of same referent)”

That this demonstrative in Wackernagel position is approaching an article-like status is not only supported by the cases in which the NTGreek original only has a definite article (31) and no demonstrative, but also in (35) where the first conjunct of the NTGreek text πᾶσαν τὴν ημέραν only has the article, and its Bulgarian translation has тък in second position, while, in contrast, in the second conjunct the first position тък translates a postnominal demonstrative ἐκείνην from the Greek text:

(35) Q N Dem & Dem N
all, ACC,m. day, ACC,m. that, ART,ACC,m. and that, ACC,f. night, ACC,f.

πᾶσαν τὴν ημέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην Q art N & art N Dem
all Art day, ACC,f. and Art night that, ACC,f.

A third piece of evidence for the developing affixal status is provided by the case of adjectives in coordination whereby the demonstrative appears after the first conjunct, parallel to the behaviour of the definite article in modern Bulgarian, as in (34a), and that it appears as second after an AP which has in turn moved out of the DP into the PP, as in (34b):

(36) a. 

A Dem and A N
godless, ACC,n. that, ACC,n. and evil, ACC,n. proclamation, Nominaliz,ACC,n.
“the godless and evil proclamation”

b. 

A and A Dem
little, GEN,n. that, GEN,n. P (because of) giving, Nominaliz,GEN,n.
“because of the little contribution”

The example in (36b) suggests that the article on the rise already has the status of an enclitic or even of an affix at this stage, since it appears to have encliticised prior to movement (typical affixal behaviour) and to have moved pied-piped with the adjective.

To summarize: the demonstrative in second position is a clitic in Wackernagel position, very similar to the position of the clitic possessive observed in (22)-(23) above. If this is the case, we expect the demonstrative to immediately follow both a Q and a QA. In fact we know that the Wackernagel position dominates the whole nominal expression including QP, and we
have no reason to believe that at this stage the Old Bulgarian DP could have a left periphery dominated by Q (an element which is on its way to acquiring this syntactic status, but is still ambiguously adjectival in nature).

3.2.2. Properties of the strong demonstrative

A strong demonstrative can appear in prenominal (37a), postnominal phrase-final position (37b), and even in discontinuous position (37c).

(37) a. си́х, ма̀лъ̀хъ, бра̀та мо̀ху́
    this, Pl,GEN,m. young, Pl,GEN,m. brother, Pl,GEN,m. my, PA,Pl,GEN,m.
    “these young brothers of mine”

b. пръ́въ̀, стъ́ръ̀, ма̀лъ̀, о́̀къ̀
    first, Ordin,Pl,INST,m. holy, Pl,INST,m. man, Pl,INST,m. that, Pl,INST,m.
    “these primary holy men”

c. то̀л, ко̀просил, отъ̀, [V [P DP.gen] [ t N]]
    that, GEN,f. ask, Pl,3. from Lord, GEN,m. blessing, GEN,f.
    “because (they) asked this blessing from (the) lord”

3.2.3. The position of the head noun

The word order is much freer than it is in MB, an in particular, definiteness seems to be expressed by N-movement (cf. Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Vulchanov, in press/b). Out of 10.000 nominal expressions present in the corpus 4.820 (48%) are N-initial, to these we must add 640 expressions (6%), which display partial N-movement, as shown in (37a) above.

This is in fact the most reliable diagnostics to show that the presence of Q influences the word order greatly in an interesting way, as we observe in the next section.

4. The ambiguous syntactic nature of въ̀щъ́

In this section, we present all possible orders where the lexical item въ̀щъ́ is found and suggest a syntactic (and semantic) analysis of each. We single out statistically marked orders from unmarked orders. The statistically unmarked orders are discussed and compared to different instances of markedness.

In the whole corpus of around 10 000 expressions we found 386 occurrences of въ̀щъ́ co-occurring with nominals (in this figure occurrences in isolation are not included). 369 are prenominal and only 27 are postnominal. This suggests that the head noun or the whole nominal constituent rarely moves to the left of въ̀щъ́. Since, definite nominal expressions otherwise display partial, but predominantly full N-to-D movement, we take this as evidence of the emerging QP layer of the NE with въ̀щъ́ as a lexical head. We address this further below. The table in (38) below lists all prenominal occurrences of въ̀щъ́ with frequencies and their possible underlying structure(s). In all cases except when въ̀щъ́ occurs with a pronoun (38b), the ambiguous categorial label gives rise to two possible structures. This must have been a source of instability in the system:
Commenting each case separately we can observe that a complete ambiguity is represented in the 234 occurrences of \[\nu \text{'s} \ N\] in (38a). Since both Q and QA inflect and precede N, there is no hint to distinguish between the two categories. This also applies when there is an intervening determiner, as in (38c), since the determiner in question can be interpreted as the clitic demonstrative in second position, preceded by a QAP, or as the strong form marking the DP-initial position, thus giving rise to a Q > DP analysis. The position of the determiner in (38d) does not help us immediately since it could be either interpreted as the evolving suffixal article on N in a [QP Q DP] or as a postnominal strong demonstrative in a perfectly ambiguous structure. However, if we take Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Vulchanov's (in press) observation that in Old Bulgarian definiteness can be expressed by partial N-movement, and that this movement is dispensed with by the presence of the universal Q, we may take the cases in which N is preceded by at least all adjectival modifiers (38e,h,l,o,p,s,t) more likely as cases of [Q DP]. Notice in particular that (38s) seems to provide the basic order for (38t) which is a left dislocation of an argument of the nominal expression, as is still possible in Modern Bulgarian (c (22)-(23) above).

In (39) below we list the postnominal occurrences of ꙉ俸 which are of low frequency compared to pre-nominal uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>ꙉ俸 &gt;</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>QAP</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ꙉ俸 &gt; N</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ꙉ俸 &gt; Pers.Pron.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ꙉ俸 &gt; Dem &gt; N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP Det N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ꙉ俸 &gt; N &gt; Dem</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP N Dem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ꙉ俸 &gt; A &gt; N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP AP N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ꙉ俸 &gt; A &gt; N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>AP QAP N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. ꙉ俸 &gt; (Part) &gt; N &gt; A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP (Part) N AP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. ꙉ俸 &gt; A.part &gt; N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP PartAP N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. A.part &gt; ꙉ俸 &gt; N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>AP QAP N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. ꙉ俸 &gt; (A) &gt; PA &gt; N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP (AP) PossAP N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ꙉ俸 &gt; N &gt; PA &gt; (Part)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP N PossAP (Part)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. ꙉ俸 &gt; N &gt; Part</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP N Part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. ꙉ俸 &gt; (Rel.CL) &gt; (A) &gt; (DP.gen) &gt; N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP (Rel.CL AP) DP.gen N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. ꙉ俸 &gt; A &gt; A &gt; N &gt; AdnGEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP AP N DP.gen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. ꙉ俸 &gt; N &gt; AdnGEN &gt; (Part)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP AP N DP.gen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. ꙉ俸 &gt; AdnINST &gt; N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP DP.instr N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. ꙉ俸 &gt; N &gt; DP.dat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>QAP N DP.dat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. DP.dat &gt; ꙉ俸 &gt; N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DP.dat Q</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>DP.dat QAP N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total prenominal ꙉ俸 369
Since QA is a “high” adjective and this kind of adjectives appear towards the left of the nominal expression both in Modern Bulgarian (cf Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti 1998) and possibly in Old Bulgarian as well, we can safely exclude cases such as (39i,l) from the QAP analysis, as we also exclude (39b), where ancock occurs with a pronoun. Following Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Vulchanov's claim that definiteness can be expressed in Old Bulgarian by N-movement, which is dispensed with in the presence of the universal Q ankan, we take (39e,f,g) as unambiguous instances of QA, crossed by N-movement. All the others are ambiguous cases. (39c) can either be an instance of DP movement (with a clitic or strong demonstrative) to SpecQP, or an instance of N-movement across QA and encliticization of the demonstrative to N. (39d) is also perfectly ambiguous since possessive adjectives are also very high and may precede a QA; while on the other hand the order N possA could be again a full DP with head movement, in turn moved to SpecQP. (39h) could only be analysed as a QP if the Adnominal genitive can be extraposed (as seems to be the case), otherwise the only possible analysis of ancock would be of a QA.
A comparison with the Greek text shows that the Old Bulgarian text is quite autonomous from the New Testament Greek text, as we had the chance to observe with the distribution of demonstratives. In the examples in (38), we clearly see that παντός in NTGreek is also ambiguous between a QAP and a Q, but the Old Bulgarian text does not reproduce the corresponding status of the quantifier. In Bulgarian the structure is ambiguous between a parallel analysis as [QAP+art [N]] and as [Q [Dem N]], while in NTGreek there is always only one underlying analysis at a time:

(40) a. Πάντα το Παντός τόπου [DP QAP+art [N]] / [QP Q [DP Dem N]]
   all, ACC,n. that, ACC,n. place (village), ACC,n.
   (τὰ δικαιώματα τού παντός τόπου) [DP art [QAP [N]]] (CS 207, 4)
   Art. possession rights Art. all place,

b. Πάντα το Μέρη [DP QAP+art [N]] / [QP Q [DP Dem N]]
   all, N,m. that, N,m. place, N,m.
   πάντα ή άγορά [QP Q [DP Dem N]] (CS 125, 28)
   All Art, N,f. market place

Further evidence of the ambiguity is found in the example in (39) below. If the determiner есъ precedes П, it has moved to SpecPP, however this linearisation is possible both if П is higher than QAP, and if SpecQP is an escape hatch:

(41) есъ, асъя есъоовъ есъоовъ есъоовъ “because of all these accusations”
   these, Pl,GEN,f. P (because of) all, Pl,GEN,f. accusation, Pl,GEN,f. (CS 402, 28-29)

In Modern Bulgarian there is rich evidence that SpecQP indeed has the function of an escape hatch for phrasal movement out of the nominal domain (cf. Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti 1996). We also have preliminary evidence that this phenomenon might have its roots already in Old Bulgarian. In our data we have 3 examples of adnominal Gen/Dat DPs preceding есъ (the patterns in i. and l. above). We have also found examples in other texts of fully-fledged DPs immediately preceding Q (въкъ), whereby the DP retains its base order. In (42) below we give two such examples from a later text.

(42) a. мнозсъствъсъвъ мнозсъствъсъвъ мнозсъствъсъвъ (SM, 2v, 18-20)

b. еръстъсъ еръстъсъ еръстъсъ (SM, 5c, 7-8)
   passionate, N,n. accusation, N,n. all, N,n.

To summarize our results, the statistically unmarked case is by far the Q > N pattern (234) which, together with the pattern Q > personal pronoun (14) makes up for around 70% of total uses in our corpus. The Q > N pattern is ambiguous between a Q DP analysis and a QAP N analysis, while the Q personal pronoun is unambiguously Q DP, according to the diagnostics we suggested in 2.3 above. Moreover, we also have evidence that definite NEs at this stage overwhelmingly display N-(to-D) movement as a mechanism of marking definiteness. On the basis of these facts we hypothesized that in all patterns with phrase-initial въкъ, if the constituents display their base order, and if N has not moved, this is a sign that in these contexts въкъ is already functioning as a Q head heading its own projection, its very presence pre-
empting N-movement and making the whole expression definite, very much in parallel with the modern language, as seen in section 3.1.5 above. In contrast, where N has moved partially (Q > N > PA/AP), but not by-passing \textit{вся}, this may be a sign that \textit{вся} is the highest AP in the DP projection. So, a pattern like \textit{вся} > N > dem is most likely an instance of QAP N dem due to the observed partial N-movement. In the postnominal occurrences of \textit{вся} we find further evidence supporting this hypothesis. The most frequent and, we may conclude, unmarked order is N > \textit{вся} which, in all likelihood, displays N-movement to mark definiteness. Most of the other postnominal patterns can be reduced to this general pattern and be subsumed under this analysis, especially the ones in which N immediately precedes \textit{вся} leaving other NE constituents behind (e.g., N > \textit{вся} > AdnGenDP/AP/PA). In contrast, cases where the whole DP has moved can be taken as evidence of Q head status. Such cases are still rare in our data, but we have found some clear examples in other texts from around that period. The example in (43) illustrates an instance of the Q DP structure. Observe that the DP retains its base order, and no N-movement needs to obtain.

(43) \textit{вся} > N > dem

Reliable evidence of QAP status could have come from instances of co-ordination with other APs, as demonstrated in the example with \textit{много} (many) in (44) below, which has retained the QAP status in Modern Bulgarian, too. We have not been able to find comparable examples with the universal quantifier, which we take as evidence that already at this stage the two quantifiers are selecting their future syntax, and that \textit{вся} is opting for the Q head status.

(44) \textit{много} > N > dem

Finally, in (45) below we see an example of quantifier float which cross-linguistically suggests clear Q head status. In OB, however, this diagnostics is not so certain, since other modifiers (e.g., APs) can be extracted or left in situ, thus creating discontinuous contexts.

(45) \textit{много} AdnD > N > dem

5. Conclusions
A language with rich nominal morphology can afford having no lexicalized functional heads in the NE, such as articles or even prepositions. The semi-functional status of demonstratives, lexical prepositions and quantifiers can change from the status of a constituent in a functional specifier to the status of a clitic element, or lexical head, or functional head.

(46) At this stage the Old Bulgarian NE displays the following properties:
- The demonstrative is ambiguously strong or deficient, and the deficient version is developing into a clitic, which will later turn into a definite article (an inflectional morpheme with no deictic features).
The deficient status of the demonstrative is related to the existence of a Wackernagel position inside the NE, which at the moment can only host discourse particles, the still rare occurrences of the emerging dative possessive clitic, and the clitic demonstrative.

What we call “Wackernagel position” is a restructuring of the left peripheral area of the DP projection which allows for re-ordering of words due to discourse features. The Wackernagel effect of “second position” is obtained when this area can/must only have a single specifier position filled and a single functional head attracting a head-like element. In this scenario, the quantifier *âüñü* has already developed its quantifier status, however still coexisting with its adjectival status. This gives rise to a high number of possible word orders, some of which are compatible with more than one structural analyses and converge in maintaining its ambiguous status.

Being a lexical head, the quantifier *âüñü* can either select a DP complement with its left periphery, or can have its own left periphery projected. This further increases the possible word orders, as we have observed.
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