

# A Tale of 2<sup>nd</sup> Position) Clitics

Bridget D. Samuels  
University of Southern California

## 1. Introduction

In attempting to understand the road from syntax to phonology, the linguist immediately faces some difficulty in defining the object of study. Unfortunately, it is not always immediately obvious when something is a PF phenomenon: natural language data do not come labeled as belonging to syntax, phonology, or semantics, nor must they necessarily belong to one of these domains to the exclusion of the other two. This makes topics which lie at the confluence of all three domains particularly susceptible to analyses that differ radically in their basic assumptions. Here, I investigate one such case, second position (2P) cliticization. I use a ‘minimal pair’ of closely-related languages—Serbo-Croatian (SC) and Slovenian (SI)—as the point of departure for this investigation. I argue that 2P is a purely syntactic notion and that the different clitic-related behavior exhibited by these languages is also syntactically driven. Finally, I propose a phase-based account of the 2P clitic phenomenon in these languages.

## 2. Preliminary data

In both SC and SI, clitic pronominals and auxiliary forms of *biti* ‘to be’ cluster together in a location that we may pre-theoretically call 2P or Wackernagel’s Position. The SC example below demonstrates that, although many deviations from the basic SVO word order are possible due to scrambling and movement for topic/focus reasons, an enclitic—here, the 3.SG present auxiliary, *je*—nevertheless must occupy 2P.<sup>1</sup>

- (1) a. Jovan     **je**     voleo Mariju     (SC)  
      Jovan.NOM AUX.3SG loved Marija.ACC  
      ‘Jovan loved Marija’  
      b. Jovan **je** Mariju voleo  
      c. Voleo **je** Mariju Jovan  
      d. Voleo **je** Jovan Mariju  
      e. Mariju **je** Jovan voleo  
      f. Mariju **je** voleo Jovan  
      g. \***Je** Jovan voleo Mariju

In SC, 2P clitics never arise in initial position, i.e., they are strictly enclitic.<sup>2</sup> This stands in contrast to SI, in which clitics can appear initially, in both interrogative and declarative contexts (Golden & Sheppard, 2000:196).

---

\* I am indebted to Cedric Boeckx, Youngmi Jeong, Arsalan Kahnemuyipour, Terje Lohndal, and Christine Salvesen for discussions on the topic of clitics, and also to audiences at the University of Syracuse, NAPhC 7, and WCCFL 31 for their helpful comments. Special thanks go to all the native speakers consulted, particularly Kay Sušelj and Peter Jurgec, for their patient help with judgments.

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the text, clitics that are relevant to the phenomenon under discussion appear in **bold**, and I have standardized the glosses across data sources to eliminate unnecessary detail. All Slovenian data comes from the author’s consultation with native speakers from Ljubljana, unless otherwise noted.

<sup>2</sup> There are, however, proclitics elsewhere in the language, for example negation and prepositions.

- (2) a. **Ga** še nisi srečal? (SI)  
3.M.ACC yet NEG.AUX.2SG met  
'Haven't you met him yet?'  
b. Nisi **ga** še srečal?
- (3) a. **Sem ga** že oddal. (SI)  
AUX.1SG 3.M.ACC already mailed  
'I have already mailed it.'  
b. Oddal **sem ga** že.

*Prima facie*, an analysis in which all the clitics in the previous examples sit in C seems to be available. However, Bošković (1995, 2001), Franks (2000), and Marušič (To appear) (among others) argue extensively against such an account, and we will return to their arguments in a later section. I also set aside the case of the SC interrogative particle *li*, which is often discussed in the context of 2P cliticization. This particle is demonstrably a complementizer and appears only in C.

Bošković (2001) reviews an extensive amount of literature concerning 2P clitics and argues for a 'weak phonology' approach: auxiliary and pronominal clitics move in the syntax (for reasons to be discussed later), and phonology filters out illicit configurations. These illicit configurations include clitics that are 'stranded' (cf. Lasnik's (1981) Stranded Affix Filter) by virtue of not having a phonological host. A condition precluding stranded clitics straightforwardly rules out (1-g), under the assumption that enclitics in this language can only lean left. In SI, sentence-initial clitics are permitted because in the absence of a host to the left, they can lean to the right. The observed difference between SC and SI in this regard seems to rely on some relatively shallow parameter or lexical property of enclisis vs. proclisis vs. optionality.

Of course, this is not to say that 2P clitics can appear anywhere *except* clause-initially. In both SC and SI, word orders such as the following are also disallowed, even though it would appear that the enclitics in these structures could find hosts to their left.

- (4) a. \*Voleo Mariju **je** Jovan (SC)  
loved Marija.ACC AUX.3SG Jovan.NOM  
b. \*Mariju Jovan voleo **je**

Nevertheless, in more complex sentence structures, clitics may surface after some delay (examples from Bošković 2001).

- (5) a. Sa Petrom Petrovičem, srela **se** samo Milena (SC)  
with Petar Petrović met REFL only Milena  
'With Petar Petrović, only Milena met'  
b. Znači da, kao što rekoh, oni **će** sutra doći  
means that as that said they AUX.3PL.FUT tomorrow arrive  
'It means that, as I said, they will arrive tomorrow'  
c. Ja, tvoja mama, obećala **sam ti** sladoled  
I your mother promised AUX.1SG 2SG.DAT ice cream  
'I, your mother, promised you an ice cream'

Bošković (2001) notes that in each of the cases in (5), the enclitics appear in 2P after some type of heavy constituent (fronted constituent, appositive, parenthetical, etc.). Cross-linguistically, each of these items has been argued to constitute its own Intonational Phrase (Selkirk, 1978). Bošković takes these data to show that the phonological process of cliticization is blocked by Intonational Phrase boundaries (indicated by commas in (5)) and hypothesizes that SC clitics must be right-adjacent to an Intonational Phrase boundary, yet since they are enclitic or suffixlike, they cannot be *immediately* adjacent to that boundary, or they would find no host to the left. The way clitics can meet the condition on adjacency indirectly is by undergoing Morphological Merger at PF with (i.e., cliticizing to) a host element that is itself adjacent to the boundary. This host element can be a word or, as we will see later, a phrase.

It should not be unexpected, given the fact that SI allows sentence-initial clitics as in (2) and (3), that clitics come immediately after the heavy constituent in cases like (6).

- (6) a. S Petrom Petrovičem, **se je** srečala samo Milena (SI)  
with Petar Petrovič REFL 3SG.AUX met only Milena  
'With Petar Petrovič, only Milena met'
- b. Pomeni da, kot **sem** rekel, **bodo** oni prišli jutri  
means that as AUX.1SG said AUX.3PL.FUT 3PL.NOM arrive tomorrow  
'It means that, as I said, they'll arrive tomorrow'
- c. Jaz, tvoja mama, **sem ti** obljubila sladoled  
I your mother AUX.1SG 2SG.DAT promised ice cream  
'I, your mother, promised you an ice cream'

Bošković (2001:154) claims based on (5) and (6) that “the difference between Slovenian and SC is clearly prosodic. . . . [B]oth Slovenian and SC clitics are lexically required to be right adjacent to an I-phrase boundary. However, in contrast to SC clitics, which are suffixes, Slovenian clitics can be either prefixes or suffixes.” We will see in the next section that there is one major difference with respect to clitic behavior between SC and SI that is not explained by this or any other prosodic parameter, but rather stems from a syntactic difference between the two languages.

### 3. Syntax constrains 2P behavior

One difference in clitic behavior which seems completely orthogonal to the proclisis vs. enclisis issue is the fact that a clitic can split a noun phrase in SC, as in (7), but in SI this is not permitted.<sup>3</sup>

- (7) a. Veliko kuču **je** kupila (SC)  
big house AUX.3SG bought  
'She bought a big house.'
- b. Veliko **je** kuču kupila
- (8) a. Veliko hišo **je** kupila (SI)  
big house AUX.3SG bought  
'She bought a big house.'
- b. \*Veliko **je** hišo kupila

Such data have been adduced in support of the claim that clitics in SI actually come after the first phrase within their domain, and cannot come after the first word (Golden & Sheppard, 2000; Diesing & Zec, 2011). However, splitting a nominal phrase as in (7-b) is only available in SC if there is focus on *veliko* 'big,' indicating that this pattern has deeper roots than a simple word-versus-phrase parameter would allow. Moreover, this pattern does not hold for all types of constituents, only nominal ones. Diesing & Zec (2011) report on the basis of corpus and experimental evidence that splitting a predicate is the discourse-neutral option in SC, while putting the clitic after the predicate is only allowed with VP focus.<sup>4</sup> The same holds for SI.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Some Slovenian speakers I have consulted find (8-b) to be acceptable. The same speakers also find left-branch extraction in the absence of clitics to be acceptable in examples such as (16), consistent with judgments reported by Bošković (2012). Such a dialect is still consistent with the conclusion presented here regarding the tight relationship between clitic placement and independent syntactic facts, and indeeds lend support to it. Marušič & Žaucer (2010) and Bošković (2009) both report that left-branch extraction examples in SI are, at best, degraded relative to similar cases in SC but perhaps less completely unacceptable than such cases in English.

<sup>4</sup> Interestingly, focus seems to affect clitic placement in other languages as well. Kahnemuyipour & Megerdooimian (2011) report that the Eastern Armenian auxiliary clitic can only appear on elements outside vP, namely subjects and sentential adverbs, in cases where those elements bear focus.

<sup>5</sup> Golden & Sheppard (2000:200) report that this word order is only acceptable in SI for adjectival predicates, not nominal or prepositional ones, and that SC differs from SI in allowing predicates that contain nouns to be split. The derivations of these structures require more attention than I can give them here, but the important point is that the difference between languages in this regard is not prosodic. Rather, it stems from the interaction of restrictions on predicate movement and left-branch extraction.

- (9) a. Veoma **je** važan taj zadatak (SC)  
 very AUX.3SG important this task  
 ‘This task is very important.’  
 b. #Veoma važan **je** taj zadatak
- (10) a. Zelo **je** pomembna ta naloga (SI)  
 very AUX.3SG important this task  
 ‘This task is very important.’  
 b. #Zelo pomembna **je** ta naloga

Taking the syntactic differences between SC and SI into account, the reason for the pattern of data in (7)-(10) becomes more apparent: as critics of prosodic inversion have long noted, clitics cannot simply split constituents to meet their prosodic needs (i.e., PF movement is disallowed). Rather, part of the ostensibly split constituent must move independently in the syntax, after which a clitic may end up in between the extracted portion and the remnant. It is in this view unsurprising to find a context in which clitics cannot split a constituent, and therefore cannot come after the first word in the domain. This is the case for prepositional phrases. Preposition stranding is disallowed in both SC and SI (SC example in (11) from Stjepanović 2008; see also Merchant 2001 on SC).

- (11) a. Protiv čega je Petar glasao? (SC)  
 against what AUX.3SG Petar voted  
 ‘What did Petar vote against?’  
 b. \*Čega je Petar glasao protiv?
- (12) a. Proti čemu je Peter glasoval? (SI)  
 against what AUX.3SG Peter voted  
 ‘What did Peter vote against?’  
 b. \*Čemu je Peter glasoval proti?

Correspondingly, a clitic cannot split a preposition from its object (SC example in (13) from Bošković 2001).

- (13) a. \*Prema **su** Mileni Milan i Jovan išli (SC)  
 toward AUX.3PL Milena Milan and Jovan walked  
 ‘Toward Milena, Milan and Jovan walked.’  
 b. Prema Mileni **su** Milan i Jovan išli  
 c. Milan i Jovan **su** išli prema Mileni
- (14) a. \*Proti **sta** Mileni Milan in Jovan šla (SI)  
 toward AUX.3DUAL Milena Milan and Jovan walked  
 ‘Toward Milena, Milan and Jovan walked.’  
 b. Proti Mileni **sta** Milan in Jovan šla  
 c. Milan in Jovan **sta** šla proti Mileni

Following the same logic, splitting a noun from an associated adjective, as in (7-b), is expected to correlate with the possibility of left-branch extraction in SC. Indeed, this correlation has been noted by Wilder & Čavar (1994), Progovac (1996), and Bošković (2001), among others (see Werle 2009 on dialectal variation within SC). Specifically with regard to (7-b), this should mean that the adjective *veliko* ‘big’ can move for focus reasons, and the clitic just happens to end up between it and the remnant of the nominal phrase. We can show that such movement occurs independent of clitics, as in the clitic-free example (15) with focus on *lijepo* ‘beautiful’:

- (15) Lijepo gleda kuće (SC)  
 beautiful watches houses  
 ‘Beautiful houses, (s)he is watching.’

In contrast, left-branch extraction is prohibited in at least some dialects of SI (recall Footnote 3). This is demonstrated independent of clitics in (16). This difference between SC and SI is reflected in the behavior of their 2P clitics, yet has gone largely unremarked upon in the literature on clitics in SI.

- (16) a. Lepe hiše gleda (SI)  
 beautiful houses watches  
 ‘Beautiful houses, (s)he is watching.’  
 b. \*Lepe gleda hiše

The pattern observed in (9) and (10) is similarly paralleled by the fact that SC bans full VP fronting (Vicente, 2007), so in the absence of VP-focus, splitting is the only option. The same is true for SI.

To sum up this section, there is strong evidence that syntax constrains clitic placement in both languages. The difference between SC and SI with respect to the examples presented here cannot be explained by any prosodic difference between the two languages. Rather, it should be attributed to differences in what types of movement are independently allowed in the syntax (e.g., whether left-branch extraction is permitted). In what follows, I discuss the syntactic placement of clitics in more detail.

#### 4. Getting to second position

To take a concrete example of why we cannot take a purely prosodic approach to the differences between SC and SI, let us consider the parameter schema proposed by Golden & Sheppard (2000:205) in the tradition of Klavans (1985), which attempts to account for the data presented here in §2 (see also Marušič To appear for the Optimality Theory equivalent).

		<b>domain</b>	<b>dominance</b>	<b>precedence</b>
(17)	SI	CP-phrase	initial	suffix/prefix
	SC	I-phrase	initial	suffix

In other words, they claim that SI places clitics relative to a syntactic boundary, while SC employs a prosodic boundary. This domain parameter was intended to explain the difference between SC and SI illustrated in (5)-(6), specifically that clitics can come immediately after a heavy constituent in SI but are ‘delayed’ to 2P after such a constituent in SC. I see no reason, though, why this aspect of the data pattern cannot be attributed simply to the availability of proclisis in SI (i.e., the precedence parameter), and the domain parameter seems to do no other work.

Given this, I contend that utilizing a single set of primitives to define 2P makes more sense from both theoretical and empirical perspectives than positing a domain parameter for which there is no evidence, and that syntactic domains should be used for this purpose rather than prosodic ones. First, having two distinct ways to derive very similar 2P behavior seems difficult from the perspective of language acquisition: how would a learner determine whether her language places clitics relative to a syntactic constituent or a prosodic one? The evidence is subtle at best, particularly considering that, in any theory, prosodic constituents are built from and nearly (perhaps even completely; see Footnote 7) isomorphic to syntactic constituents such as CPs. Second, a great deal of evidence in the previous two sections shows that clitic placement is subject to constraints on syntactic movement in both languages, while the data in §3 in particular are unexplained by prosodic parameters such as (17). Third, a syntax-based treatment would situate these languages nicely in the cross-linguistic typology of clitic types if Roberts (2010) and Kahnemuyipour & Megerdooimian (2011) are correct to argue that cliticness is intimately associated with phasehood, and that clitics can be oriented in 2P in the CP and vP domains.<sup>6</sup> The parallelism here is strongly appealing if SC and SI clitics—as these authors indeed suggest—sit in 2P within a higher phase. In the remainder of the present work, I sketch out an account which shares some elements with but diverges in important respects from the phase-based proposal for SC from Roberts (2010).

##### 4.1. Where do clitics go?

Many of the examples presented in the preceding sections are immediately amenable to the idea that 2P in SC and SI means second within the CP phase, since the clitics come second in the sentence. The examples involving heavy constituents in (5) and (6) must also be accounted for syntactically, as is necessary anyway for SI under the Golden & Sheppard (2000) analysis. One need not look far

<sup>6</sup> Kahnemuyipour & Megerdooimian also explicitly argue against a prosodically-based account of the placement of clitics in Eastern Armenian, which has a 2P-within-vP auxiliary clitic.

for a plausible explanation. Appositives, parentheticals, relative clauses, and topicalized elements—constituents that delay clitics—are not just special in their intonational phrasing. The long-standing intuition that such material is in some sense ‘extra-clausal’ or ‘off the main derivational cascade’ has been expressed in many syntactic theories. In cyclic transfer theories (e.g., following Uriagereka’s (1999) multiple spell-out and/or Chomsky’s (2001) phases), each of these types of material has been argued to constitute a separate spell-out domain and may even be introduced by a different kind of Merge (pair Merge; see Chomsky 2004) than other syntactic objects. If clitics cannot enter these domains and cannot cliticize across a spell-out domain boundary, then (5)-(6) can be explained without any recourse to prosodic constituency.<sup>7</sup>

We can begin to narrow down the possible landing sites for 2P clitics by showing that they are able to escape the vP phase. Bošković (1995:247) demonstrates that a 2P clitic in SC can come higher than the adverb *pravilno* ‘correctly,’ and that in such cases, the adverb is ambiguous between a manner reading and a sentential, subject-oriented reading.

- (18) Jovan **je** pravilno odgovorio Mariji (SC)  
 Jovan AUX.3SG correctly answered Marija  
 ‘Jovan gave Marija a correct answer.’ (manner reading)  
 ‘Jovan did the right thing in answering Marija.’ (sentential reading)

Golden & Sheppard (2000:197) also show that clitics can appear higher than the sentential adverb *očitno* ‘apparently’ in SI.

- (19) Peter **ji ga** očitno vedno hvali (SI)  
 Peter 3SG.F.DAT 3SG.M.ACC apparently always praises  
 ‘Peter apparently always praises him to her.’

Under the standard assumption that sentential adverbs are merged outside vP, the clitics must also be outside vP in (18)-(19). Migdalski (2006) has argued that subjects appear in Spec,TP in discourse-neutral SVO clauses in SC; they have no special topic or focus properties to suggest that they are A'-moved. Thus, clitics in cases like (18), which are lower than the subject, appear to sit in T and not C. Migdalski’s account should straightforwardly extend to SI as well, though due to limited space I cannot recap it here.

Marušič (To appear) gives evidence based on multiple-*wh* questions that clitics in SI can also sometimes appear higher than TP. It is assumed for SI (a multiple-*wh*-fronting language) that the first *wh*-word is in Spec,CP, while subsequent *wh*-words are adjoined to TP. Thus, the clitics sandwiched between the *wh*-words must be between these two projections (Marušič suggests that the clitics are adjoined to C in such cases).

- (20) Kdo **mi je** kje kaj posodil? (SI)  
 who me AUX.3SG where what lended  
 ‘Who lended what to me where?’

There is at least one more good reason to believe that clitics do not simply appear in one fixed position such as C or T. The following adverbs appear in a fixed order in SI (Marušič, To appear):

- (21) a. Janez spet nepretrgoma meče petarde  
 Janez again non-stop throws firecrackers  
 ‘Janez again non-stop throws firecrackers.’  
 b. \*Janez nepretrgoma spet meče petarde

Following Cinque (1999), assume that these adverbs are in fixed positions. If this is the case, then the clitics must be located in different positions in (22).

<sup>7</sup> The idea that cliticization is blocked by a spell-out domain should be seen as an amendment of Bošković’s (2001) statement that cliticization cannot cross an Intonational Phrase boundary. Note however that I have argued previously on the basis of various phonological patterns in other languages that Intonational Phrases are completely isomorphic to spell-out domains, in which case this amendment ultimately reflects a distinction without a difference (Samuels, 2009, 2011).

- (22) a. Janez **jih** spet nepretrgoma meče (SI)  
 Janez 3PL.ACC again non-stop throws  
 ‘Janez is again non-stop throwing them.’  
 b. Spet **jih** nepretrgoma meče  
 again 3PL.ACC non-stop throws  
 ‘He is again non-stop throwing them.’  
 c. Nepretrgoma **jih** meče  
 non-stop 3PL.ACC throws  
 ‘He is non-stop throwing them.’

The same pattern holds in SC, and again it can be confirmed that the adverbs are rigidly ordered (M. Simonović, p.c.):<sup>8</sup>

- (23) a. Jovan **ih** opet neprekidno baca (SC)  
 Jovan 3PL.ACC again non-stop throws  
 ‘Jovan is again non-stop throwing them.’  
 b. Opet **ih** neprekidno baca  
 again 3PL.ACC non-stop throws  
 ‘He is again non-stop throwing them.’  
 c. Neprekidno **ih** baca  
 non-stop 3PL.ACC throws  
 ‘He is non-stop throwing them.’

In summary, it appears to be the case that clitics can appear in a range of positions: at the highest, they co-locate with complementizers such as *da* ‘that’ and (in SC) the interrogative *li*, and at lowest, they are lower than the lowest adverbs in (22)-(23). As Kahnemuyipour (2009) argues, however, such manner adverbs differ cross-linguistically in whether they appear within vP or outside of it, so (pending future research) the lower bound for the clitics under discussion here is not yet entirely clear: it could be T, or it could be lower still. As an absolute lower bound, the dative and accusative clitics are arguments that should be base-generated in vP, so these positions would constitute the lowest copies of pronominal clitics available for spell-out. The auxiliary clitics are likely base-generated in T (following Roberts 2010), where they must anyway check their  $\phi$ -features.<sup>9</sup>

For a potential phase-based analysis, it is notable here that the positions we have just discussed span three spell-out domains: the ‘edge’ phase of CP, the complement of C (which includes the edge of

<sup>8</sup> Bošković (1995) attempts to establish that clitics can appear low in SC by showing that variants of (18) in which the participle crosses the adverb is no longer ambiguous. This is consistent with the inability of participles to cross sentential adverbs in SC. That is to say, the adverbs in the examples below can only have a manner reading. Bošković claims on this basis that the participle and clitic must be lower than in (18).

- (i) a. Jovan **je** odgovorio pravilno Mariji (SC)  
 Jovan AUX.3SG answered correctly Marija  
 ‘Jovan gave Marija a correct answer.’ (manner reading)  
 ‘\*Jovan did the right thing in answering Marija.’ (sentential reading)  
 b. Odgovorio **je** pravilno Mariji  
 answered AUX.3SG correctly Marija  
 ‘He gave Marija a correct answer.’ (manner reading)  
 ‘\*He did the right thing in answering Marija.’ (sentential reading)

Unfortunately this diagnostic is inconclusive, as Roberts (2010) notes, particularly if Legate (2008) is correct that SC participles can appear in C in cases such as (i-b) when there is no sentential adverb or negation to block them from doing so (contra Bošković 1995, who claims that participles never move all the way to C). The same pattern of judgments holds in SI (data not shown). Still, even if the clitics in (18) and (i) are all in the same position, that cannot be said for the clitics that interleave with adverbs in (22)-(23).

<sup>9</sup> Bošković (2012) and Migdalski (In press) argue that languages with 2P clitics do not have either DP or TP in their repertoire. However, both remain silent concerning the position of auxiliary clitics and it is not immediately obvious what the ramifications of such an analysis are, or specifically how checking of  $\phi$ -features is to be done in such a system. I will not pursue this analysis here.

vP), and potentially the complement of v, assuming the accusative pronominal clitic is base-generated there as a non-clitic direct object would be, though there is no particular reason to believe that it is ever pronounced in this lowest phase. It seems quite difficult given this state of affairs to argue that 2P is one particular position that can be pinpointed; even Roberts (2010), who attempts a phase-based analysis of SC in which clitics are attracted to C, is forced to admit that multiple heads within the left periphery could probe/host clitics. I will pursue an alternative analysis: that these clitics must sit second within the highest phase that has phonological content. This strikes me as a more cautious move given that it has not been shown conclusively that all of the positions in which clitics appear are outside of the middle field, and indeed there is reason to believe that clitics can surface in T. As our understanding of SC and SI syntax improves, it should be possible to articulate this view further.

#### 4.2. *Why do clitics move?*

My idea that clitics sit in 2P within the highest ‘occupied’ phase is in the spirit of Franks (2000), who essentially claims that 2P clitics come second in the highest projection within the clause, under the assumption that only the structure that is needed is actually projected (e.g., there is no CP in a main-clause declarative). The notorious property of clitic clustering (all the clitics within a clause appear together, even though there are demonstrably hierarchically ordered) follows from the fact that clitics get picked up one by one and piggyback on a verb/participle. Roberts (2010) argues that both pronominal and auxiliary 2P clitics incorporate into a verb because of defectivity: pronominal clitics consist only of interpretable  $\phi$ -features that need to value the uninterpretable  $\phi$ -features on the verb, but have no other features; auxiliary clitics are not themselves defective, but probe a defective v.<sup>10</sup> Cliticization is under this account driven by Agree, which is accomplished via movement.

With respect to the differences between SC and SI, the notion that there is a fundamental difference between SC’s strict enclitics and SI’s more ambivalent enclitics/proclitics appears irreducible to other principles and must be lexically specified. Nevertheless, proclisis is a marked option in main clauses even in SI. One way to think about this is that in the usual declarative main clause, nothing appears in the CP-edge phase. Clitics would then typically be pronounced in the C-complement phase, enclitic to a subject in Spec,TP, a participle in T, or an adverb in a nearby functional projection. Taking the proclisis option would mean pronouncing the clitics in C, alone in their spell-out domain. One could speculate about why this would be a marked option: for example, these clitics would not find a host within their spell-out domain, but multiple clitics could perhaps lean on each other. I leave further investigation of this issue for future research.

Diachronically, Jakobson (1971[1935]) argued that proclisis can emerge as a language loses inflected clitics, suggesting that SI may be the innovative language in this regard. Furthermore, as Bošković (2001:164ff) notes, the best evidence against proclisis is negative. Interestingly, SC may be embarking on a change in this direction as well, though so far the only evidence comes from auxiliary clitics (particularly the third person singular *je*, which is losing its cliticness; see Stjepanović 1999; Bošković 2001). Examples such as (24) illustrate that ‘non-delay’ is already possible after some heavy constituents in SC; the clitic in this example behaves like the SI clitics in (6), not the well-known SC ‘delay’ examples in (5).

- (24) [Problemi o kojima ćemo razgovarati] **su** kompleksni (SC)  
 problems about which AUX.1PL.FUT converse AUX.3PL complex  
 ‘The problems that we will discuss are complex.’

It is easy to see how *su* in (24) could be analyzed as a proclitic. Indeed, this non-delay or ‘proto-procliticization’ as we may call it, which looks like the normal state of affairs in SI, is sometimes the only option in SC (M. Despić, p.c.).

<sup>10</sup> I remain agnostic as to whether clitics in SC and SI are D elements, as Roberts (2010) claims, which would potentially make them the only D elements within these languages. Roberts suggests that D clitics can escape vP whereas pure  $\phi$  clitics cannot, thereby deriving the difference between the 2P clitics discussed here and the verb-oriented clitics in the Romance languages.



- (25) a. Djevojka, koju Ivan voli, **je** fina (SC)  
 girl who Ivan loves AUX.3SG pretty  
 ‘The girl, who Ivan loves, is pretty.’  
 b. Punca, ki jo Ivan ljubi, **je** lepa (SI)  
 girl who Ivan loves AUX.3SG pretty

Regarding the more syntactically-oriented differences between SC and SI noted earlier, we may conclude that the availability of moving out of a left branch and into a focus projection (within the middle field or the left periphery) in SC opens up the possibility of pronouncing a higher copy of a clitic simply by providing a prosodic host in a higher position; as described above, the clitics will without any further stipulation move into/through the head of this projection after they incorporate with the verb. I leave open whether this difference between languages can be derived from deeper principles, such as perhaps the presence or absence of D in these structures.

## 5. Conclusions

I have used two closely-related South Slavic languages, Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian, as a case study here to investigate the question of what exactly constitutes “second position.” There are several differences in where enclitics can appear in these languages, attributable to two things: (a) the availability of proclisis in Slovenian, and (b) the permissibility of some types of syntactic movement that are not allowed in Slovenian, specifically left-branch extraction in focus and other contexts, in Serbo-Croatian. All evidence points to the domain of second-position cliticization in these languages as being governed by syntactic domains rather than prosodic ones. Specifically, I argue that clitics appear in whatever head position is second in the highest spell-out domain that contains a host to satisfy the clitics’ prosodic needs. This process is mediated by standard highest-copy pronunciation and the Stranded Affix Filter. Such an account has the advantages of eliminating a layer of prosodic mapping between syntax and clitic placement, unifying the analysis of clitic phenomena in the languages under discussion, and lending support to an emerging view that domains of cliticization are derived from cyclic spell-out domains or phases.

## References

- Bošković, Željko (1995). Participle movement & second position cliticization in Serbo-Croatian. *Lingua* 96, 245–266.
- Bošković, Željko (2001). *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Elsevier.
- Bošković, Željko (2009). The NP/DP analysis and Slovenian. *Proceedings of the University of Novi Sad Workshop on Generative Syntax* 1, 53–73.
- Bošković, Željko (2012). On NPs and clauses. Grewendorf, Günther & Thomas Ede Zimmerman (eds.), *Discourse & grammar: from sentence types to lexical categories*, Mouton de Gruyter, 179–242.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001). Derivation by phase. Kenstowicz, Michael (ed.), *Ken Hale: a life in language*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1–52.
- Chomsky, Noam (2004). Beyond explanatory adequacy. Belletti, Adriana (ed.), *Structures & beyond: the cartography of syntactic structures*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 104–131.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). *Adverbs & functional heads: a cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Diesing, Molly & Draga Zec (2011). Interface effects: Serbian clitics. Runner, Jeffrey (ed.), *Experiments at the interfaces*, no. 37 in *Syntax & Semantics*, Emerald, Bingley, UK, 1–30.
- Franks, Steven (2000). Clitics at the interface. Beukema, Frits & Marcel den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic phenomena in European languages*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–46.
- Golden, Marija & Milena Sheppard (2000). Slovene pronominal clitics. Beukema, Frits & Marcel den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic phenomena in European languages*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 191–207.
- Jakobson, Roman (1971[1935]). Les enclitiques slaves. *Selected writings II: word & language*, Mouton, The Hague.
- Kahnemuyipour, Arsalan (2009). *The syntax of sentential stress*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Kahnemuyipour, Arsalan & Karine Megerdooian (2011). Second-position clitics in the vP phase: the case of the Armenian auxiliary. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42:1, 152–162.
- Klavans, Judith L. (1985). The independence of syntax & phonology in cliticization. *Language* 61:1, 95–120.

- Lasnik, Howard (1981). Restricting the theory of transformations. Hornstein, Norbert & David W. Lightfoot (eds.), *Explanation in linguistics*, Longmans, London, 152–173.
- Legate, Julie Anne (2008). Warlpiri & the theory of second position clitics. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26, 3–60.
- Marušič, Franc (To appear). Positioning Slovenian clitics. *Proceedings of SLS 2*.
- Marušič, Franc & Rok Žaucer (2010). Clitic doubling in a determinerless language with second position clitics. Zybatow, Gerhild, Philip Dudchuk, Serge Minor & Ekaterina Pshehotskaya (eds.), *Proceedings of FDSL 7.5*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 101–115.
- Merchant, Jason (2001). *The syntax of silence: sluicing, islands, & the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof (2006). *The syntax of compound tenses in Slavic*. LOT, Utrecht.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof (In press). Diachronic source of two cliticization patterns in Slavic. Salvesen, Christine Meklenborg & Hans Petter Helland (eds.), *Challenging clitics*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Progovac, Ljiljana (1996). Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the second position. Halpern, Aaron L. & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics & Related Phenomena*, Stanford: CSLI, 411–428.
- Roberts, Ian (2010). *Agreement & head movement: clitics, incorporation, & defective goals*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Samuels, Bridget (2009). *The structure of phonological theory*. Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Samuels, Bridget (2011). *Phonological architecture: a biolinguistic perspective*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. (1978). On prosodic structure & its relation to syntactic structure. Fretheim, Thorstein (ed.), *Nordic prosody*, Trondheim: TAPIR, vol. 2, 111–140.
- Stjepanović, Sandra (1999). *What do second position cliticization, scrambling, & multiple wh-fronting have in common?* Ph.D. thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.
- Stjepanović, Sandra (2008). P-stranding under sluicing in a non-P-stranding language? *Linguistic Inquiry* 39:1, 179–190.
- Uriagereka, Juan (1999). Multiple spell-out. Epstein, Samuel David & Norbert Hornstein (eds.), *Working minimalism*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 251–282.
- Vicente, Luis (2007). *The syntax of heads & phrases: a study of verb (phrase) fronting*. No. 154 in LOT Dissertation Series, LOT, Utrecht.
- Werle, Adam (2009). *Word, phrase, & clitic prosody in Bosnian, Serbian, & Croatian*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.
- Wilder, Chris & Damir Čavar (1994). Long head movement? verb movement and cliticization in Croatian. *Lingua* 93, 1–58.

# Proceedings of the 31st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Robert E. Santana-LaBarge

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2014

## Copyright information

Proceedings of the 31st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics  
© 2014 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-462-1 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.  
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

## Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.  
To place an order, go to [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com) or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA  
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, [sales@cascadilla.com](mailto:sales@cascadilla.com)

## Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com). Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Samuels, Bridget D. 2014. A Tale of 2<sup>nd</sup> Position) Clitics. In *Proceedings of the 31st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Robert E. Santana-LaBarge, 381-390. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com), document #3041.