Clitics: Introduction

Philipp Weisser

Universität Leipzig
philipp.weisser@uni-leipzig.de

2. November 2018

Clitics are...

Clitics are...

- ... a useful tool to reveal syntactic structure and constituency, word internal structure and phonological word or phrase boundaries.

Clitics are…

- … a useful tool to reveal syntactic structure and constituency, word internal structure and phonological word or phrase boundaries.
- … as well as a highly challenging topic at the crossroads of syntax, morphology and phonology.

Clitics are…

- … a useful tool to reveal syntactic structure and constituency, word internal structure and phonological word or phrase boundaries.
- … as well as a highly challenging topic at the crossroads of syntax, morphology and phonology.
- … a mess.

➤ Virtually every tradition has its own views on what the term *clitic* refers to.

➤ Virtually every tradition has its own views on what the term
clitic refers to.

- In Romance linguistics, the term typically refers to weak
pronominal elements that attach to a/the verb in one way or
another:

  (1)   **Me=les=**dóna
         $1=3.\textsc{pl}=\text{give}.3\textsc{sg}$
         'She gives them to me'   Barcelona Catalan

➤ Virtually every tradition has its own views on what the term *clitic* refers to.

- In Romance linguistics, the term typically refers to weak pronominal elements that attach to a/the verb in one way or another.
- In Slavic linguistics, the term is used for the little elements that cluster together after the first word or constituent:

(2)   Ti=**si**=**ga**   video juče.
           you=AUX.2SG=HIM seen yesterday
           'You saw him yesterday.'   Serbian

➤ Virtually every tradition has its own views on what the term *clitic* refers to.

- In Romance linguistics, the term typically refers to weak pronominal elements that attach to a/the verb in one way or another.
- In Slavic linguistics, the term is used for the little elements that cluster together after the first word or constituent:
- In Finnic linguistics, the term refers to phrasal affixes, i.e. affixes that attach to phrases rather than words.

(3) a. Ta   jook-sis [jõe   ja   puu]-**ni**
         3SG run-3SG [river and tree]-TERM
         'He went to the river and the tree.'
     b. Ilma   [raha-ta   ja   lootuse-ta]   on elu raske
         without money-ABESS and hope-ABESS is life hard
         'Life is hard without money and hope.'   Estonian

➤ In Nevis, Joseph, Wanner & Zwicky (1994), the authors identify 11 different notions, in which the term *clitic* is used in the literature.

↪ Many of these uses are related to or pick out an arbitrary set of the criteria we will see in the next set of slides.

➤ In Nevis, Joseph, Wanner & Zwicky (1994), the authors identify 11 different notions, in which the term *clitic* is used in the literature.

↪ Many of these uses are related to or pick out an arbitrary set of the criteria we will see in the next set of slides.
↪ It should be kept in mind that the term is problematic and when we encounter the term, we should try to figure out what the term means in a given source.

➤ The term *clitic* goes back at least to the seventeenth century descriptions of languages like Latin and Ancient Greek and translates to "leaner"

➤ The term *clitic* goes back at least to the seventeenth century descriptions of languages like Latin and Ancient Greek and translates to "leaner"

➤ This indicates the traditional view that these elements are phonologically deficient.

➤ The term *clitic* goes back at least to the seventeenth century descriptions of languages like Latin and Ancient Greek and translates to "leaner"

➤ This indicates the traditional view that these elements are phonologically deficient.

➤ Thus, the traditional notion is essentially a phonological one:

Clitics are…
… phonologically deficient elements requiring a phonological host.

➤ This deficiency is often contrasted with fully articulated versions of the same element.

(4)   a.   He would=ve said so.
          b.   He would have said so.

(5)   a.   Geh-st=e   nach hause?
                 go-2SG=2SG.PRO to   home
          b.   Geh-st du   nach hause?
                 go-2SG 2SG.PRO to   home
                 'Are you going home?'   German

➤ Unfortunately, it is - in many cases - not possible to simply treat these as simple variants of their fully accented counterparts.

➤ Unfortunately, it is - in many cases - not possible to simply treat these as simple variants of their fully accented counterparts.

➤ It has been noticed that these elements often show different morphosyntactic behavior in terms of placement.

➤ Unfortunately, it is - in many cases - not possible to simply treat these as simple variants of their fully accented counterparts.

➤ It has been noticed that these elements often show different morphosyntactic behavior in terms of placement.

- Clitic pronouns in French occupy a different position than their non-clitic counterparts or full DPs:

(6)   a.   Je la=vois
             I   her   see
        b.   Je vois la   femme de mes rêves.
             I   see   the woman of my   dreams
        c.   *Je vois=la.
        d.   *Je la femme de mes rêves vois.

➤ The first one to notice the peculiar placement properties of these phonologically weak items was (presumably) Jacob Wackernagel in his (1892) paper *"Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung"*.

[1]He attributes this observation partly to Abel Bergaigne (1877).

10 / 30

➤ The first one to notice the peculiar placement properties of these phonologically weak items was (presumably) Jacob Wackernagel in his (1892) paper *"Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung"*.

➤ He notes that these phonologically deficient elements in Ancient Greek often cluster together in the second position of the clause:[1]

(7)   polees=te=min ērēsanto hippēes phoreein
        many=and=it prayed   riders carry
        'And many riders prayed to carry it.'
                                                    Iliad 4.143

---

[1]He attributes this observation partly to Abel Bergaigne (1877).

➤ Wackernagel notes that this position is only available to these phonologically deficient items.

➤ And even more peculiar, these elements often split up elements that belong together *and* occur far away from elements they belong to.

(8)   polees=te=min ērēsanto hippēes phoreein
        many=and=it prayed riders carry
        'And many riders prayed to carry it.'

Iliad 4.143

➤ Wackernagel notes that this position is only available to these phonologically deficient items.

➤ And even more peculiar, these elements often split up elements that belong together *and* occur far away from elements they belong to.

(8)   polees=te=min ērēsanto hippēes phoreein
        many=and=it prayed   riders   carry
        'And many riders prayed to carry it.'
                                                    Iliad 4.143

➤ For these reasons, the term *clitics* was extended to cover elements which are phonologically weak *and* show some sort of special morphosyntactic behavior.

➤ The first one to tackle the task of *clitics* against a more modern background was Arnold Zwicky in his Stanford dissertation (1977) and a series of subsequent papers (Zwicky & Pullum 1983; Zwicky 1985) and collections (Nevis, Joseph, Wanner & Zwicky (1994); Zwicky 1996).

➤ The first one to tackle the task of *clitics* against a more modern background was Arnold Zwicky in his Stanford dissertation (1977) and a series of subsequent papers (Zwicky & Pullum 1983; Zwicky 1985) and collections (Nevis, Joseph, Wanner & Zwicky (1994); Zwicky 1996).

➤ Zwicky originally concerned with the question how to differentiate words from affixes and develop a set diagnostics that apply crosslinguistically.

Zwicky (1977) proposes the following diagnostics to distinguish affixes from words:

① Ordering: Affix order is typically fixed, word order can typically vary.

Zwicky (1977) proposes the following diagnostics to distinguish affixes from words:

① Ordering: Affix order is typically fixed, word order can typically vary.

② Internal Sandhi: Some phonological rules apply within words only.

Zwicky (1977) proposes the following diagnostics to distinguish affixes from words:

① Ordering: Affix order is typically fixed, word order can typically vary.

② Internal Sandhi: Some phonological rules apply within words only.

③ Binding: Some morphological forms cannot appear on their own; these are bound elements

Zwicky (1977) proposes the following diagnostics to distinguish affixes from words:

① Ordering: Affix order is typically fixed, word order can typically vary.

② Internal Sandhi: Some phonological rules apply within words only.

③ Binding: Some morphological forms cannot appear on their own; these are bound elements

④ Rule Immunity: Syntactic rules affect only words, never parts of words.

Zwicky (1977) proposes the following diagnostics to distinguish affixes from words:

① Ordering: Affix order is typically fixed, word order can typically vary.

② Internal Sandhi: Some phonological rules apply within words only.

③ Binding: Some morphological forms cannot appear on their own; these are bound elements

④ Rule Immunity: Syntactic rules affect only words, never parts of words.

⑤ Accent: Elements that cannot bear independent accent are affixes.

➤ Each of these diagnostics has definitional or empirical
problems:
  ↪ What counts as a syntactic rule?

➤ Each of these diagnostics has definitional or empirical problems:
  ↪ What counts as a syntactic rule?
  ↪ Word order is often fixed as well?!

➤ Each of these diagnostics has definitional or empirical problems:

  ↪ What counts as a syntactic rule?
  ↪ Word order is often fixed as well?!
  ↪ What counts as a word-bound phonological process?

➤ But even apart from these definitional problems, the diagnostics face tons of empirical problems.

➤ For this reason, Zwicky argues that there must be something in between words and affixes: *Clitics*.

➤ But even apart from these definitional problems, the diagnostics face tons of empirical problems.

➤ For this reason, Zwicky argues that there must be something in between words and affixes: *Clitics*.

➤ Zwicky further introduces a classification of *clitics*, which has, in a slightly modified version, been adapted by many people.

Zwicky's original classification of clitics, i.e. unaccented elements which are phonologically subordinated to an adjacent word, which may or may not be phonologically reduced:

Zwicky's original classification of clitics, i.e. unaccented elements which are phonologically subordinated to an adjacent word, which may or may not be phonologically reduced:

❶ Simple Clitics: These are unaccented elements which do not differ morphosyntactically from their accented counterparts.

Zwicky's original classification of clitics, i.e. unaccented elements which are phonologically subordinated to an adjacent word, which may or may not be phonologically reduced:

❶ Simple Clitics: These are unaccented elements which do not differ morphosyntactically from their accented counterparts.

❷ Special Clitics: These are unaccented elements which do differ morphosyntactically from their accented counterparts.

Zwicky's original classification of clitics, i.e. unaccented elements which are phonologically subordinated to an adjacent word, which may or may not be phonologically reduced:

❶ Simple Clitics: These are unaccented elements which do not differ morphosyntactically from their accented counterparts.

❷ Special Clitics: These are unaccented elements which do differ morphosyntactically from their accented counterparts.

❸ Bound Words: These are unaccented elements which do not have accented counterparts.

➤ Elements like the English cliticized auxiliaries or the cliticized pronouns in (9) would thus count as simple clitics since they exhibit the same behavior as their fully accented counterparts:

(9)   It=ll hit=əm like a triple espresso.

➤ Elements like the French object pronouns would however count as special clitics since their placement wrt the verb depends on them being a clitic.

➤ A number of people have observed though that this classification is somewhat unusual and far from ideal since

  ↪ it conflates two dimensions (namely whether an element has an accented counterpart and whether that element shows syntactically unusual behavior)

➤ A number of people have observed though that this classification is somewhat unusual and far from ideal since

↪ it conflates two dimensions (namely whether an element has an accented counterpart and whether that element shows syntactically unusual behavior)

↪ the grammatical status of an element A should not be determined on the basis of whether an element B exists or not.

➤ For this reason, the classification that is widely adopted still uses the terms *simple clitic* and *special clitic* but got rid of these confounds:

➤ For this reason, the classification that is widely adopted still uses the terms *simple clitic* and *special clitic* but got rid of these confounds:

➤ Thus, the term *simple clitics* refer to elements that are unaccented and potentially phonologically reduced and show no idiosyncratic morphosyntactic behavior.

➤ For this reason, the classification that is widely adopted still uses the terms *simple clitic* and *special clitic* but got rid of these confounds:

➤ Thus, the term *simple clitics* refer to elements that are unaccented and potentially phonologically reduced and show no idiosyncratic morphosyntactic behavior.

➤ Simple clitics simply appear in the position we would syntactically expect them and lean to the left or the right.

   ↪ In the former case, they are called enclitics, in the latter case, they are called proclitics.

   ↪ Note that the direction in which they lean is independent from their morphosyntactic constituency.

➤ A striking example comes from Kʷakʷala, a Wakashan language from Vancouver Island

➤ Here the determiners precede the NP they modify but the consistently lean to the left - away from the constituent they belong to:

(10) yəlkw̃əmas=ida   bəgw̃anəma=x̣-a 'watsi=s-a   gw̃ax̣x̣ƛux̣w̃
      cause.hurt=DEM man=OBJ-DEM dog=INST-DEM stick
      'The man hurt the dog with a stick.'   Anderson (2005:16f)

➤ A striking example comes from Kʷakʷala, a Wakashan language from Vancouver Island

➤ Here the determiners precede the NP they modify but the consistently lean to the left - away from the constituent they belong to:

(10)   yəlkw̃əmas=ida   bəgw̃anəma=x̣-a   'watsi=s-a   gw̃ax̣ƛux̣w̃
       cause.hurt=DEM man=OBJ-DEM   dog=INST-DEM stick
       'The man hurt the dog with a stick.'   Anderson (2005:16f)

(11)   noƛa-∅-s-is   kʷix̣ayu lax̣-is ts'a'   ya
       threaten-3SG=INST=DEM club   to-his brother
       'He threatened his younger brother with his club.'

↪ The determiners simply do not care about their host, they'll just lean to the left.

➤ The Kʷakʷala determiners count as simple clitics because - linearly speaking - they simply occur in the position we expect them to occur:

(12)   V Det NP Det NP

➤ The Kʷakʷala determiners count as simple clitics because - linearly speaking - they simply occur in the position we expect them to occur:

(12)   V Det NP Det NP

➤ They somehow lean into the wrong direction; i.e. the direction of leaning does not match with the syntactic constituency.

➤ The Kʷakʷala determiners count as simple clitics because - linearly speaking - they simply occur in the position we expect them to occur:

(12)   V Det NP Det NP

➤ They somehow lean into the wrong direction; i.e. the direction of leaning does not match with the syntactic constituency.

➤ We will see that the phonology of clitics often mismatches with their syntactic behavior and thus has been claimed to be (largely) independent.

➤ The Kʷakʷala determiners count as simple clitics because - linearly speaking - they simply occur in the position we expect them to occur:

(12)   V Det NP Det NP

➤ They somehow lean into the wrong direction; i.e. the direction of leaning does not match with the syntactic constituency.

➤ We will see that the phonology of clitics often mismatches with their syntactic behavior and thus has been claimed to be (largely) independent.

➤ The process by which phonologically deficient clitics such as the Kʷakʷala ones attach to their host has received various names such as *leaning*, *cliticization* and *Stray Adjunction* (Anderson 2005)

➤ In contrast to the ones above, *special clitics* then refer to the same kind of elements which do show some idiosyncratic behavior.

↪ Note crucially, that under this definition, the *specialness* of these elements is not defined in relation to an accented counterpart but rather in relation to the general rules of a given language.

- The determiner in Bulgarian is claimed to attach to the hierarchically highest morphosyntactic word of its complement (Embick & Noyer 2001):

(13)   a.   dosta glupava-**ta** zabeležka
                 quite stupid-DEF remark
                 'the quite stupid remark'   Franks (2001)
        b.   prohladna-**ta** i   sveža večer
                 cool-DEF   and fresh evening
                 'the cool and fresh evening'   (Gribanova &
                 Harizanov 2012)

  ↪ This clitic counts as special since the regular rules of Bulgarian suggest that it actual syntacto-semantic position should be at the beginning of the noun phrase.

➤ Subject agreement, tense and mood clitics in Lummi simply occur after the first word, which is often, but not always the verb.

(14) a. kʷəniŋ-t-óŋəl=ə=sə'=sxʷ
           help-TRANS-1PL.ACC=Q=FUT=2.SG.NOM
           'Will you help us?'
      b. 'əy=sxʷ   swəy'qə'
           good=2SG.NOM man
           'You are a good man.'   Lummi, Jelinek (1996)

➤ This position is only accessible to these clitics; other elements cannot occur there.

➤ The ϕ-agreement markers in Sanzhi Dargwa (Nakh-Dagestan) occur in clause-final position attached to the verb (where we would expect them) unless the clause contains a focussed constituent:

(15)   a.   du-l   hana t'alaʔħ-ne ic-an=**da**
                1SG-ERG now dishes-PL wash.IPFV-PTCP=1
                'Now I will/have to wash the dishes.'
        b.   du-l   hana t'alaʔħ-ne=**da** ic-an
                1SG-ERG now dishes-PL=1   wash.IPFV-PTCP
                'Now I will/have to wash the **dishes**.'   Forker 2016:2

➤ Claims about the positioning of special head-clitics include:

- Second-Position clitics:
  - ↪ Attaching to the first morphosyntactic word in a given domain
  - ↪ Attaching to the first prosodic word in a given domain
- Focus-sensitive clitics
  - ↪ Attaching to the focussed constituent
  - ↪ Attaching to the head of the focussed constituent
- Second-to-last position clitics
- Clitics that are sensitive to a certain category (e.g. the verb)

➤ In a similar fashion, argument clitics (i.e. weak pronouns) exhibit a wide range of theoretically challenging properties:

- Their placement properties

➤ In a similar fashion, argument clitics (i.e. weak pronouns) exhibit a wide range of theoretically challenging properties:

- Their placement properties
- Their ability to occur together with other arguments referring to the same entity in certain configurations (clitic doubling):

(16)　　**La**=oian　　　　　　　a　la　niña
　　　　　CL.ACC=listened.3PL to the girl.ACC
　　　　　'They listened to the girl.'　　　　Rioplatense Spanish

➤ In a similar fashion, argument clitics (i.e. weak pronouns) exhibit a wide range of theoretically challenging properties:

- Their placement properties
- Their ability to occur together with other arguments referring to the same entity in certain configurations (clitic doubling)
- Their (apparent) ability to cross clause boundaries in certain configurations (clitic climbing):

(17)   Gianni **lo**=vuole comprare.
             Gianni it=wants buy.INF
             'Gianni wants to buy it.'   Italian

➤ In a similar fashion, argument clitics (i.e. weak pronouns) exhibit a wide range of theoretically challenging properties:

- Their placement properties
- Their ability to occur together with other arguments referring to the same entity in certain configurations (clitic doubling)
- Their (apparent) ability to cross clause boundaries in certain configurations (clitic climbing)
- Their weird restrictions about the cooccurence with other clitics (PCC-effects).

(18) a. *le=lo=diste.
          it.ACC=him.DAT=give.2SG
          'You gave it to him.'
      b. se=lo=diste.
          REFL?=him.DAT=give.2SG
          'You gave it to him.'

In this course, I/we want to learn something about:

➤ The range of different types of both head-clitics and argument-clitics

➤ Their properties and how they interact with the phonology.

➤ The diagnostics to distinguish the different types.

➤ Possible theoretical implementations modelling the distribution and their morphophonological properties.

What do you want to learn about?