

## ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROSODIC AND SYNTACTIC PROPERTIES OF PRONOUNS IN THE SLAVIC LANGUAGES

Gilbert C. Rappaport

### 0. Introduction

The present paper is intended as a contribution toward understanding clitics in the Slavic languages.<sup>1</sup> The central empirical issue to be addressed here is the relationship between the prosodic and syntactic properties of Slavic pronouns; the focus is on the contrast between the personal pronouns in Contemporary Russian, which normally are not considered clitics, and those in Contemporary Polish, which normally are considered clitics. Underlying the empirical discussion is a cluster of theoretical questions concerning the nature of clitics in general: What are the defining properties of clitics? Do clitics constitute a separate class of units in a grammatical description (parallel to, but distinct from, words and affixes)? If not, how should they be described?

Polish is chosen as the exemplar of a language with pronominal clitics because the variation in the behavior exhibited by its clitics appears to be the greatest among the Slavic languages. After some remarks in Section 1 on defining the term “clitic”, the empirical discussion begins in section 2 with an analysis of three types of clitics (both pronominal and non-pronominal) in Contemporary Polish. It will be shown that clitics in a given language can exhibit distinctive clitic-like behavior to varying degrees, and that the concept of a clitic must be able to encompass this diversity. A broader perspective on the range of prosodic properties exhibited by clitics sheds light on certain distinctive word order properties of personal pronouns in Russian; this question is explored in section 3. Typological and diachronic perspectives on the material presented in sections 2 and 3 are offered in section 4. The Slavic languages can be ranked with regard to the extent to which clitics function in the language. Polish occupies an intermediate position in this ranking; furthermore, the language is moving toward eliminating clitics. In particular, pronominal clitics are developing greater autonomy, becoming less like clitics. A synchronic comparative perspective makes the diachronic change taking place in Polish clear in its outline; Serbo-Croatian and Slovene, along with Russian, are briefly considered here. The results of the paper are summarized in section 5.

### 1. What Are Clitics?

It is surprisingly difficult to provide a satisfactory definition of clitics. There is a certain convergence in the literature on the intuition that a clitic resembles a word in some ways and an affix in others. Making this intuition precise is far from simple. The problem lies in the familiar tension which follows from proposing a general (ideally, universal) definition which includes all but only the linguistic elements which the investigator intuitively feels should be included in the category.

To illustrate the problems involved, consider the definition of enclitics offered by Decaux in his monograph on Polish clitics (1955:15): “L'enclitique . . . est un mot dépourvu de ton qui a la propriété de prendre appui sur un mot précédent porteur de ton, en constituant avec lui une unité accentuelle.” This definition is an example of the intuition referred to above: an adequate definition of a word is assumed, and a clitic is defined as a word with the affix-like properties of not bearing stress and constituting part of a unit assigned word stress. Unfortunately, this

definition begs essential questions in assuming an adequate definition of a word: is it justified to treat as words such elements in Polish as subject markers (e.g., the *em* in *czytał-em* ‘(I) was reading’), the modal marker *by* of *czytał-by* ‘(he) would read’, or the particle  *bądź*  of *kto bądź* ‘anybody’? Decaux's practice indicates that his answer is “yes”, although this does considerable violence to traditional notions of what a word is; these elements, after all, cannot stand in isolation and retain their referential sense.

Furthermore, is it always clear what word “leans” (“prend appui”) on what? Decaux discusses prepositional phrases with stress on the preposition only, such as *za mną* ‘behind me’, *po co* ‘why’. He notes first that such phrases contain pronouns which are “new enclitics” and then that the preposition is a proclitic (p. 16). Curiously, Decaux's definition of enclitics leads to different results depending upon whether it is applied to “superficial” or “underlying” structure. The superficial facts lead to the conclusion that the pronoun is an enclitic: it is, after all, unstressed and forms an accentual unit with a preceding word which bears stress. Decaux prefers to apply his definition to the component parts of such a prepositional phrase: “les deux éléments de tels groupes sont ici d'une part les proclitiques déplaçant l'accent (*za . . .*) et de l'autre les mots principaux *mną . . .* qui en eux-mêmes n'ont rien d'enclitiques” (p. 16). But if the absolute regularity that monosyllabic personal pronouns do not bear stress after monosyllabic prepositions (e.g., *za mną*) does not indicate that the pronoun *mną* is an enclitic, how do we account for the fact that when a monosyllabic lexical noun stands after the same preposition, the stress is borne by the noun and not by the preposition (*za wsią* ‘behind the village’)? It would not seem appropriate to exclude the apparent shift of stress from a pronoun to the preceding word from the domain of clitic phenomena, since a similar shift characterizes the Greek indefinite pronoun *tis* ‘any, some’, traditionally considered an enclitic. This pronoun bears pitch accent if disyllabic and uttered in isolation, but regularly loses its accent to a preceding “host”. Consider, for example, the result of combining the lexical noun *’ánthropos* ‘man’ and the indefinite pronoun *tis/tinés* ‘any, some<sub>Nom. Masc. Sg./Nom. Masc. Pl.</sub>’: *’ánthropós tis* ‘any man, some man’, *’ánthropóitines* ‘any men, some men’.<sup>2</sup>

Decaux makes no claim that his definition applies to languages other than Polish. One might hope for a more general approach, and yet existing attempts have not been successful.<sup>3</sup> Based on descriptive studies of a large number of languages, Nida (1949:97) sees the essential property of clitics in their being phonologically bound with a word in the absence of a corresponding morphological relation; that is, the clitic does not serve to derive a new word from its host or express a grammatical category implicit in the host. Nida's definition differs considerably from Decaux's, which makes no reference to morphological relation, and thus permits, for example, *kto bądź* to be viewed as a clitic structure, even though the clitic bears a morphological relation to its host (in this case, derivational). One approach might be to avoid the problem by declaring that clitics are primes of the grammar, as are words and sentences, and therefore they need not be defined as a special case of some other element. Klavans (1982) is close to this position, as she argues against deriving clitics by rule and for assuming that “clitics are lexically marked [+clitic] and are positioned and attached by rules which are sensitive to five parameters” (p. 3).<sup>4</sup>

It is the thesis of this paper that there is no separate linguistic category of clitics in either universal or language-particular grammar. In fact, the very opposition of word and affix is not a discrete one. We propose that words and affixes have different properties at different levels of linguistic structure (at the levels of prosodic phonology, segmental phonology, and syntax). A clitic may represent any of various possible clusters of these properties. For example, a word

might have properties [+A], [+B], and [+C]; an affix would then have properties [-A], [-B], [-C]; it is proposed that these properties are in fact independent of one another. Thus, for example, an element could have properties [+A], but [-B] and [-C]; or [+A] and [+B], but [-C]. And in fact, there are various elements in the Slavic languages which share the meta-property of being neither words nor affixes and which are candidates for the status of “clitic”, while differing among themselves in the precise cluster of word properties and affix properties. Thus, the difficulty in defining clitics follows from the fact that their shared property is a negative one (neither a typical word nor a typical affix), rather than a positive one which is amenable to formulation in the classic terms of a definition (an X is a Y which has the property Z). To call a linguistic element a clitic may be useful, but it is imprecise: it is a statement about what the element is not, rather than about what it is.

## 2. Three Classes of Clitics in Polish

As background for the discussion of Polish pronouns (sections 2.3 and 2.4), we begin with a fairly detailed look at the properties of two classes of non-pronominal elements in Polish (sections 2.1 and 2.2). For convenience, we will refer to the units of these three classes as clitics, even though we have not yet offered a definition of the term. This discussion is not intended to exhaust the range of clitic phenomena in Polish.

**2.1 Imperative Clitics.** Although the imperative desinences in the Slavic languages are normally considered part of the inflectional paradigm of the verb, word boundary sandhi is observed between the imperative desinences and the verb stem. This fact was first noted by Jakobson (1971 [1935]), who termed imperative desinences “*particules enclitiques*”. Jakobson further observed that there is a fundamental difference in meaning between imperative desinences and other verbal desinences: “Tandis que les autres désinences verbales caractérisent l'action et l'agent, celles de l'impératif ne servent qu'à déterminer l'attitude de sujet parlant et à désigner ceux à qui il s'adresse. Ce sont des fonctions qui précisément se rapprochent de celles des particules” (p. 17).

The imperative desinences of Polish and some examples are given in (1) (here and below, I adhere to a convention of indicating the boundary between a clitic and its host with an equal sign):

(1) *Imperative clitics:*

plural addressee: *-cie*

inclusivity: *-my*

EXAMPLES:

*robić* ‘to do or make’: *rób, rób=my, rób=cie*

*pisać* ‘to write’: *pisz, pisz=my, pisz=cie*

*czytać* ‘to read’: *czytaj, czytaj=my, czytaj=cie*

In Polish, this boundary is indicated primarily by voicing sandhi, although the precise facts depend upon the dialect. Before the *-cie* desinence (which begins with a voiceless obstruent), devoicing is observed in all dialects; voicing assimilation in obstruent clusters occurs both word-internally and in continuous speech across word boundaries, so this fact indicates nothing. Before the initial sonorant of the *-my* desinence,<sup>5</sup> however, the voicing facts are those observed across word boundaries in the given dialect, not those observed word-internally. Word-internally, an obstruent retains its inherent voicing (or lack thereof) before a sonorant; thus, voicing contrasts are observed before sonorants: (*[ž]mija* ‘viper’, *[š]mata* ‘rag’).<sup>6</sup> Across word boundaries in connected speech, voicing becomes neutralized before sonorants. The phonetic

result depends upon the dialect, as there is a split between the northeast areas (centered in Mazowsze, and including Warsaw) and the west and south (centered in Greater Poland and Lesser Poland, and including Cracow) (see, e.g., Nitsch 1912, Dejna 1973:95-7). The northeast dialects exhibit devoicing in this environment, including before the *-my* desinence: *brat* ‘brother’, *bra[t] matki* ‘mother’s brother’; *wóz* ‘cart’, *wó[s] matki* ‘mother’s cart’; *pi[š]=my*, *ró[p]=my*. In these same environments, the dialects in the south and west exhibit voicing (*bra[d] matki*, *wó[z] matki*; *pi[ž]=my*, *ró[b]=my*).

It is important to contrast the sandhi behavior exhibited by the imperative clitics with the facts related to another rule sensitive to word boundaries. Aside from well-known exceptions, Polish has fixed stress on the penultimate syllable; we will assume that this word stress is assigned by a *Main Stress Rule* (MSR)<sup>7</sup> For the purposes of the MSR, imperative endings are word-internal: *czytaj*, *czytaj=my*, *czytaj=cie* (stressed vowels are written with upper-case letters). It appears, then, that the word is defined for the purposes of segmental phonology (voicing sandhi) differently than the word defined for the purposes of prosodic phonology (the MSR): an imperative clitic lies in a different (segmental) phonological word than does the verb stem, but in the same prosodic word as that stem. If we define a syntactic word as a segment of speech which is subject to the rules of syntax (which govern movement and permit elements to be freely separated by other elements), the imperative clitics lie within the syntactic word of the verbal stem, since these endings cannot be moved or separated from the stem by other elements. Thus, in the case of the imperative forms, the syntactic word is co-extensive with the prosodic word, but not with the phonological word. These facts are formalized in (2), in which phonological word boundaries are indicated by parentheses, prosodic word boundaries by angle brackets, and syntactic word boundaries by square brackets; each unit is further identified by an appropriate mnemonic:

- (2) phonological word:     (*czytaj*)<sub>ph</sub>=(*cie*)<sub>ph</sub>  
 prosodic word:           <*czytaj=cie*><sub>pr</sub>  
 syntactic word:          [*czytaj=cie*]<sub>sy</sub>

**2.2 Verbal Clitics.** Clitics of the second category, which will be called simply verbal clitics, also resemble affixes, but they exhibit more word-like properties than do the imperative clitics. The verbal clitics of Polish are given in (3):<sup>8</sup>

(3) *(Other) verbal clitics*

- a. The following set of subject markers, expressing the person (first and second person only) and number of the clause subject:<sup>9</sup>

first person singular:   -(*e*)*m*  
 second person singular: -(*e*)*ś*  
 first person plural:     -(*e*)*śmy*  
 second person plural:  -(*e*)*ście*

These markers combine with the *l* form of any verb in the past tenses and irrealis (subjunctive/conditional) mood, with the stem *jest* of the verb ‘to be’, and with certain adjectival predicate (e.g., *powinien* ‘should’)

- b. the irrealis mood marker *by*  
 c. the particles *no*, *to*, *-że*, *-li* (archaic)

EXAMPLES:

*czytali=ście* ‘you (pl.) were reading’  
*Powinien=eś pójść do lekarza* ‘You should go to the doctor’  
*zapomniał=by* ‘He would forget’

*Siadaj=że!* ‘Do sit down!’

*Znasz=li ten kraj?* ‘Do you know this country?’

Clitics of the three subcategories of verbal clitics may co-occur, and when they do, they must stand in a particular order, given in (4a); furthermore, verbal clitics must follow the imperative clitics, as indicated in (4b):

- (4) *Order template for verbal clitics*  
 a. particles > *by* > subject markers  
 b. imperative clitics > verbal clitics

Examples of these ordering constraints are given in (5):

- (5) *Examples of clitic order*  
 a. *Zapomniał=by=m.* ‘I would forget’  
 b. *Zrobił=no=by=ś to.* (Ozga 1976) ‘You could do this.’  
 c. *Patrz=cie=no!* ‘Well, look!’

Among the verbal clitics, the particles share the voicing sandhi properties of imperative clitics, as seen before *no* and *-li*; for example, the pronunciation *pa[tš]=no*, *zna[š]=li* would be found in the northeast dialects, but *pa[dž]=no*, *zna[ž]=li* in the southern and western dialects. Evidence of voicing sandhi in the past tense or irrealis verb forms is limited in the standard language, because rarely does the relevant context arise in these forms: the verbal stem ends in a sonorant (*l*) or vowel, not an obstruent, (e.g., *czytał=em*, *czytał=by=m*, *czytala=m*). However, obstruent verbal stems permit evidence of a different type, with respect to the mood marker *by*. The sonorant *l* is not pronounced in normal speech between obstruents. This fact permits us to contrast, for example, *niósłby* ‘(he) would carry’, pronounced [ńusby], with *jabłko* ‘apple’, pronounced [japko]. In the latter case, where the cluster *blk* is word-internal, voicing assimilation passes regressively from one obstruent to another over an unpronounced *l*; such assimilation is blocked when the cluster *slb* is spread over the mood marker *by* and the verb stem. The absence of assimilation is also observed across any typical word boundary, as in *niósł brata* ‘(he) carried the brother’ ([sb]). Thus, the mood marker *by* is separated from its host by a phonological word boundary.

The Polish dialects provide further evidence that in the past tense the subject markers are separated from their verbal host by a phonological word boundary. Certain verbs (consonant stems) may appear in the past tense without the sonorant *l* ending in the masculine singular verb forms of the first and second person, obviously under the levelling influence of the masculine singular third person, where this *l* is regularly dropped as in the literary language. The result is a paradigm such as that in (6a), instead of that of the literary language in (6b) (Dejna 1973: 96; Urbańczyk 1984: 38, 51; Nitsch 1912: 407-416); *ó* represents a raised variant of *o*, corresponding to *ó* in the literary language):

- (6) a. (ja) [ńós=em]; (ty) [ńós=eś]; (on) [ńós]  
 b. (ja) [ńosł=em]; (ty) [ńosl=eś]; (on) [ńus]

This generalization appears to be sporadic in the dialects of all regions, rather than being localized in a particular area. It is important for our purpose because it results in the sequence of interest to us: an obstruent before a sonorant over a boundary. When this levelling occurs in a southern or western dialect, the voicing which occurs over word boundaries is observed:

- (6) c. (ja) [nóz=em]; (ty) [nóz=eś]; (on) [nós]

Consistent with the voicing sandhi facts is the appearance in these forms of the raised *ó*, resulting historically from compensatory lengthening in a newly closed (e.g., final) syllable. Thus, all available evidence indicates that verbal clitics lie outside the phonological word of their verbal host.<sup>10</sup>

Unlike imperative clitics, verbal clitics are usually recognized as being different from other affixes on the basis of two synchronic properties in Contemporary Polish; one property is prosodic, and the other is syntactic.<sup>11</sup>

The first property of verbal clitics which distinguishes them from affixes (and from the imperative clitics) is that in the standard literary language they are not counted when penultimate word stress is assigned by the MSR; that is, verbal clitics are *opaque* to the MSR. Contrast the following sentences, in which a stressed vowel is indicated by an upper case letter:

- (7) a. CzytA-cie.  
 ‘You (pl.) are reading.’  
 [-cie is the second person plural present tense desinence]
- b. CzytAj=cie! ‘Read!’  
 [-cie is the plural addressee marker in the imperative]
- c. CzytAli=ście.  
 ‘You (pl.) were reading.’  
 [-ście is the second person plural subject marker in the past tense]

If we assume that the MSR applies over the domain of a prosodic word, then a verbal clitic, unlike an imperative clitic, stands outside the prosodic word containing its host.

The second property distinguishing verbal clitics from affixes (and imperative clitics) will be termed *clitic float*: a verbal clitic can be attached either to the stem of the verb whose subject the clitic designates or to another word which stands earlier in the sentence.<sup>12</sup> When verbal clitics float, the order template in (4a) remains in effect. Some examples of clitic float and the order template are given in (8):

- (8) a. Gdzie byli=ście tyle czasu?  
 Gdzie=ście byli tyle czasu?  
 ‘Where were you for so long?’
- b. Chciał=by=m poprosić o to.  
 Ja=by=m chciał poprosić o to.  
 ‘I would like to ask for this.’

The possibility of clitic float indicates that the clitic involved constitutes a syntactic word separate from that of its host; only in that way does it have the status of a unit visible to the rules of syntax.

To summarize, a verbal clitic stands outside the phonological, prosodic, and syntactic words of its host. These observations are summarized in (9), in terms of the formalism utilized above in (2).

- (9) phonological word: (czytali)<sub>ph</sub>=(ście)<sub>ph</sub>  
 prosodic word: <czytali><sub>pr</sub>=ście  
 syntactic word: [czytali]<sub>sy</sub>=[ście]<sub>sy</sub>

Verbal clitics contrast with both imperative clitics and typical lexical items with respect to prosodic word analysis. An imperative clitic stands within the same prosodic word as its verb stem; a typical lexical item constitutes a separate prosodic word by itself. A verbal clitic differs from both in that it does not stand in a prosodic word at all; it does not affect the stress of its neighboring words, nor is it assigned word stress itself as even a monosyllabic lexical item would be. Rather, as indicated in (9), a verbal clitic is adjoined to another prosodic word, which is defined as its host. It follows automatically from this formalism that an imperative clitic must precede a verbal clitic (cf. *patrz=cie=no*), because the former is within the prosodic word of its host, while the latter is outside it. If the facts were the opposite, it would be impossible under current assumptions to describe them.

**2.3 Pronominal Clitics.** The third category of clitics will be called pronominal clitics. These are monosyllabic forms of the personal pronouns which cannot bear stress; the pronominal clitics co-exist with full, orthotonic (stressed) forms. Identified separately here among the pronominal clitics is the intransitive particle *się*, whose presence is probably conditioned lexically rather than syntactically (Saloni 1976:104-18). Not all case, number, and person forms of the personal pronouns have both clitic and orthotonic forms. The pronominals of Contemporary Polish which distinguish clitic and orthotonic forms are given in (10) (corresponding orthotonic forms are given in parentheses):<sup>13</sup>

(10) *Pronominal clitics*

a. Certain case forms of the personal pronouns:

(NOM.)	GEN.	ACC.	DAT.
(ja) 'I'		mię (mnie)	mi (mnie)
(ty) 'you <sub>SG</sub> '	cię (ciebie)	cię (ciebie)	ci (tobie)
(on) 'he'	go (jego)	go (jego)	mu (jemu)
(ono) 'it'	go (jego)		mu (jemu)
reflexive	się (siebie)	się (siebie)	

b. The intransitive particle *się*.

Clitics of this category can co-occur; when they do, they must stand in a particular order, given in (11a); corresponding examples illustrating this order are given in (12a). If clitics of this category co-occur with those of the other two categories, the order must be that given in (11b), with the corresponding examples in (12b):

(11) *Order template for pronominal clitics*

a. dat. > *się* > acc. > gen.<sup>14</sup>

b. imperative clitics > verbal clitics > pronominal clitics

(12) *Examples of clitic order*

a. On dał=mi=go. 'He gave it to me.'

Przyglądam=mu=się. 'I am looking at it.'

Miało się go w rękę po raz pierwszy.

'It was being held in the hand for the first time.'

b. Bali=by=śmy=się=go.

'We would be afraid of him.'

Zrobił=no=by=ś=mi=się grzeczniejszy. (Ozga 1976)

'After all you could become a little more polite to me.'

Pronominal clitics share the properties of verbal clitics discussed above: inter-word voicing sandhi, opacity to the MSR, and clitic float. These properties are illustrated by the following examples:

(13) a. Brat=mi=się podoba.

Brat podoba=mi=się.

\*Brat=mi podoba=się.

'I like (the) brother.'

b. Bardzo lUbię=go. 'I like him very much.'

(13a) illustrates clitic float; if there is more than one pronominal clitic, all must float, or none. In the southern and western dialects, we would find the pronunciation *bra[d]=mi=się podoba* for the first example in (13a), indicating a phonological word boundary between *mi* and its host *brat*. The enclisis of the pronoun *go* to the verb in (13b) does not affect the penultimate stress on the verb, pointing to adjunction of the clitic to the prosodic word of its host. These

characteristics indicate that the status of pronominal clitics at the levels of segmental phonology, prosody, and syntax is the same as that of the verbal clitics. Thus, the word structure of pronominal clitics at the three levels discussed so far takes the following form:

- (14) phonological word:  $(\text{podo}b\text{a})_{\text{ph}}=(\text{mi})_{\text{ph}}=(\text{si}\text{e})_{\text{ph}}$   
 prosodic word:  $\langle \text{podo}b\text{a} \rangle_{\text{pr}}=\text{mi}=\text{si}\text{e}$   
 syntactic word:  $[\text{podo}b\text{a}]_{\text{sy}}=[\text{mi}=\text{si}\text{e}]_{\text{sy}}$

Despite these similarities between verbal and pronominal clitics, there are differences. We will return to these differences and their consequences in section 4.

**2.4 Relating the Prosodic and Syntactic Properties of Clitics.** If we compare the word structure of the three types of clitics discussed so far, represented in (2), (9), and (14), two generalizations are clear. First, in each case, each clitic constitutes a phonological word separate from that of its host. Second, there is a correlation between the prosodic word structure and syntactic word structure: either the clitic is contained in the same prosodic and syntactic word as its host (the imperative clitics), or it stands outside of both (the verbal and pronominal clitics). The consequence of this correlation is that all and only clitics which are opaque to the MSR can float. We propose that this is a significant generalization; more specifically, the syntactic word cannot be smaller than the prosodic word. The basis for this conclusion is found in a change which Polish is currently undergoing, to which we now turn.

While verbal clitics in the literary language are adjoined to the prosodic word comprising the verb stem host, this is not necessarily the case in substandard speech and in the dialects. In fact, stresses such as *przyszlłsmy* ‘we arrived’, *czytalłsmy* ‘we were reading’ (cf. standard *przYszliłsmy*, *czytAlisłsmy*) are becoming increasingly common even in the speech of educated urban Poles. However, there is no such variation when the verbal clitic floats to another host. A stress such as *Kiedyłsćie przyszlł?* ‘When did you(pl.) come?’ is not reported.<sup>15</sup> Thus, it is a clitic's opacity to the MSR which permits it to float. The converse also appears to be true, making the correlation even stronger: a speaker who avoids clitic float probably includes the clitic in the prosodic word of its (verbal) host.<sup>16</sup>

The singular verbal clitics *-(e)m*, *-(e)ł* are problematic for this analysis, because they are not opaque to the MSR even in the literary language when attached to the verbal host: *pisAlem*. Thus, such clitics appear to stand within the prosodic word of their (verbal) host, and yet permit float. The fact is particularly striking because the vowel is an epenthetic one: if anything, one would expect an epenthetic vowel not to count for the purposes of stress assignment.

These facts should be considered in the context of several other facts which indicate that the inconsistency between the singular and plural endings is caused by a change in the language which is in progress. First, the stress *plsałem* is observed in some dialects (Decaux 1955:24). Second, when the first person clitics float to another host, they are opaque to the MSR, just as the plural clitics are; e.g., *ChOciałzem nie mólł (SPP - see bibliography)* ‘Although I could not’. Thirdly, as noted by several investigators, movement is becoming less common, and is currently more restricted, in the singular than in the plural (Buttler et al. 1971:287, Kowalska 1976:46, Selberg 1970:225, Szpiczakowska 1987). Fourthly, while the alternations of nasal vowels in the past tense verb stem treat the singular verbal clitics as outside phonological word of the verb (*wziłł* ‘he took’, *wziłła* ‘she took’, *wziłł=em* ‘I<sub>MASC</sub> took’), the *o:ó* alternation treats these same clitics as part of the same phonological word as the verb stem (*niólł* ‘he was carrying’, *niólła* ‘she was carrying’, *niólł=em* ‘I<sub>MASC</sub> was carrying’). All of these facts suggest that verbal clitics are ceasing to be clitics, becoming instead affixes. In terms of the formalism proposed above, verbal clitics are ceasing to be adjoined to the prosodic word of their verbal host and becoming included in it:

(15) *Reanalysis change in progress in Polish*

$$\langle X \rangle_{pr} = Y \rightarrow \langle X=Y \rangle_{pr}$$

As the prosodic word expands to include the verbal clitic, the syntactic word necessarily must as well, since, by the principle we are proposing here, it cannot be smaller than the prosodic word. When the syntactic word expands to include the verbal clitic, the latter loses its ability to float.

We return to the reasons for the reanalysis in (15) in section 4. At this point, it is important to note that the change is at different stages in different dialects, and is proceeding faster in the singular than in the plural. Once the reanalysis has taken place, the *niósł:niosłem* alternation becomes regular, and the stability in *wziął:wziąłem* is interpreted as a morphologized and exceptional fact destined to be lost; and indeed it is being lost, to judge by the warning against the pronunciation *wziął=em* in the entry under *brać* ‘to take<sub>IMPF</sub>’ in SPP. The fact remains that clitic float is possible only when the clitic stands outside the prosodic word: as the prosodic word is extended to include the verbal clitic, the syntactic word is extended in this way as well, eliminating the possibility of float. It follows automatically from this correlation that the imperative clitic cannot float: as indicated by the stress facts, it is included in the prosodic word of its host, and therefore must be contained in the host's syntactic word as well.

### 3. The Personal Pronouns of Russian as Clitics

Although it has been recognized that the principles governing the linear position of pronouns in the sentence differ somewhat from those governing lexical noun phrases, the question has not attracted the attention that it deserves.<sup>17</sup> The relevance of some form of “functional sentence perspective” for the relatively free word order of the Slavic languages is well-known and well-studied; pronouns differ from lexical nouns in that (a) the reference of pronouns is necessarily assumed to be fixed in the discourse situation, and (b) pronouns often do not bear phrase stress in a context in which a lexical noun does. It is the goal of this section to show that some distinctive aspects of pronoun word order should be attributed not to their reference properties, but rather to their prosodic properties. Furthermore, the relevant prosodic properties and their syntactic consequences are analogous, although at a different level of grammar, to those of the pronominal clitics of Polish.

**3.1 A Theory of Word Order and Phrase Stress.** In a pair of complementary articles, Isačenko (1966, 1967) developed an approach to Russian word order which could be summarized (with slight changes in terminology) as follows:

(a) There is an essential distinction between *grammatical word order* and *neutral word order*. Grammatical word order is the optimal word order defined exclusively in terms of syntactic units and structure, without reference to the pragmatic context of the sentence. The unmarked grammatical word order in Russian is subject-verb-object. Neutral word order, intimately related to functional sentence perspective, is the optimal word order for a given sentence in a given pragmatic context. The unmarked neutral word order may differ from the unmarked grammatical word order; the latter may even be impossible in a given context.

(b) A *nuclear stress rule* (NSR) in Russian applies to syntactically derived phrases in Russian, assigning phrase stress to the latter of two adjacent phrases:  $xy \rightarrow xY$ .

(c) If the NSR assigns stress to a phrase with the unmarked neutral word order, resulting in  $xY$ ,  $Yx$  is also possible in the same pragmatic context and represents a marked neutral word order.

Consider, for example, a simple sentence with a nominal subject and verbal predicate, as in (16) below (from Isačenko 1966:971). If the reference of the subject is presupposed, the unmarked neutral word order is  $sv$ ; that is, the subject precedes the verb (16a). If the reference of the subject is not presupposed, the unmarked neutral word order is the opposite:  $vs$  (16b). The

NSR assigns stress contours  $sV$  and  $vS$  to these word orders.  $Vs$  and  $Sv$  are alternative marked neutral word orders, respectively. In this and following examples, words with phrase stress are capitalized:

- (16) a. Mašiny RABOTAJUT.  
RABOTAJUT mašiny.  
'The machines are working.'  
b. Rabotajut MAŠINY.  
MAŠINY rabotajut.  
'There are machines working.'

The difference between the (a) and (b) sentences can be made clear by providing a discourse context in the form of a question to which these sentences can or cannot be appropriate answers.<sup>18</sup> For example, the sentences in (16a) are possible answers to the question 'What are the machines doing', while those in (16b) 'What is going on?' or 'What is that noise?'; the latter member of each pair of sentences represents the marked neutral word order.

Now consider the somewhat more complicated example in (17a), with two verb complements:

- (17) a. Petja podaril cvetok Svete.  
'Petja gave a flower to Sveta.'

If this sentence is pronounced as a single *intonational phrase* (IP), without pause, then each of the first three words would have word stresses of comparable intensity, while the last word would be associated with a more intense stress and a distinctive falling pitch accent associated with a declarative sentence. It is also possible to segment this sentence exhaustively into smaller IPs, each associated with its own phrase stress and pitch accent, as in (17b) (here and below, we use double slashes to demarcate IPs):

- (17) b. // Petja // podaril cvetok // Svete. //

The final IP, consisting of the word *Svete*, bears a phrase stress of even greater intensity than those of the preceding IPs. Furthermore, while the pitch accent on either or both of the first two IPs can be rising or rising-falling, only this last IP bears the falling pitch accent of declarative sentences found in (17a). The segmentation of a sentence into IPs may apply to a sentence in its neutral word order even if this is not a grammatical word order (in Isačenko's sense of the term). Thus the possible intonation contours of (17c) parallel those of (17b):

- (17) c. Svete //podaril cvetok // Petja.

Before proceeding, it would be useful to introduce a more explicit formalism for the facts just discussed. We will utilize *metrical grids*, an iconic representation developed in detail by Selkirk (1984) to describe the rhythmic structure of a sentence, that is, the pattern of alternating word and phrase stresses. The metrical grid for (17b) takes the form of (18):

					Level
				x	4 (clause stress)
	x		x	x	3 (phrase stress)
	x	x	x	x	2 (word stress)
	x x	x x x	x x	x x	1 (demi-beat)
	// Pétja //      podaríl cvetók //      Svéte. //				

The level of *demi-beats* (here numbered "1") simply designates all syllables, that is, all positions of potential stress. Level 2 designates primary word stress; although stress in Russian is free, not fixed as in Polish, we assume that word stress is assigned over the domain of prosodic words in both languages. Levels 3 and 4, those of phrase stress and clause stress, involve

sentence-level phonology, since stress at these levels is assigned to syntactic constructs. Stress at these levels is assigned by the NSR to certain syllables bearing word accent; furthermore, pitch accent in Russian is assigned to syllables bearing sentence-level (i.e., phrase or clause) stress.<sup>19</sup>

With these assumptions, then, we turn to the personal pronouns of Russian. The discussion is intended to be illustrative only, since space does not permit a more detailed treatment here.

**3.2 The Personal Pronouns of Russian.** The properties of personal pronouns in Russian differ in several ways from those of lexical nouns described above.

First consider a situation in which the reference of three entities, Petja, Sveta, and a particular flower, are known to both speaker and hearer. We wish to construct a *presentational* sentence describing an event involving these three entities, without any parcellation with respect to new and old information. A presentational sentence is an appropriate answer to a very general question, such as ‘What happened?’. The sentences in (19a) utilize a noun for ‘the flower’, while those in (19b) substitute a pronoun for it:

- (19) a. // Petja podaril cvetok Svete. // (=17a)  
 // Petja cvetok podaril Svete. //  
 ‘Petja gave the flower to Sveta.’  
 b. // Petja podaril ego Svete. //  
 // Petja ego podaril Svete. //  
 ‘Petja gave it to Sveta.’

All of these sentences can be interpreted as presentational sentences; however, if they are read with neutral intonation and as a single IP, there is a difference in their rhythmic structure: while the first three words in (19a) are pronounced with word stress of comparable intensity, the pronoun in (19b) is pronounced with a stress of less intensity than that of the lexical nouns. This is an example of the observation that personal pronouns in Russian are “potencial’no bezudarnye” or “slaboudarjaemye” (Isačenko 1976:967).

Despite the fact that in relation to its external context the pronoun *ego* in (19b) bears a weak word stress, the phonological facts internal to this pronoun point to stress on the second syllable: that syllable is in fact pronounced with greater intensity than the first syllable, and the second syllable does not undergo the qualitative reduction of unstressed vowels, while the first syllable does. These facts recall those of compound nouns in Russian such as *samolëostroenie* ‘airplane construction’, in which there are two stresses of different intensity, a primary stress (*stroEnie*) and a secondary stress (*samolËt*); a secondary stress functions as a stressed syllable within that portion of the compound for the purposes of vowel reduction, despite the fact that its intensity is less than that of a primary stress. We incorporate this fact into the metric grid, following Selkirk (1984), by introducing a level of *basic beats* for secondary stresses, which we will number “1” (renumbering the level of demi-beats “0”). Thus, the metric grid corresponding to the first sentence of (19b) is given in (20):

					Level
				x	4 (clause stress)
				x	3 (phrase stress)
	x	x		x	2 (word stress)
	x	x	x	x	1 (basic beat)
	x x	x x x	x x	x x	0 (demi-beat)
	// Pétja	podaril	egó	Svéte //	

For the time being, we will use the term *destrressing* to refer to the property of a pronoun bearing secondary stress instead of primary word stress.

Destressing is not obligatory for pronouns. Focus stress is always possible, for example. But focus stress represents a very different phenomenon, and it is not being considered here. There are two constraints on destressing which bear on the point at hand.

First, the destressing of pronouns at the end of an IP, although favored, is not obligatory, regardless of whether the pronoun stands in sentence-final position (21a) or not (21b); it is obligatory, however, internal to an IP (21c):

- (21) a // Petja Svete podaril ego. //  
 b. // Petja // podaril ego // Svete. //  
 c. // Petja podaril ego Svete. //

The facts illustrated by (21a-c) indicate that the pronoun can bear a sentence-level stress (and concomitant pitch accent) when it is in a position to be assigned one (as at the end of an intonational phrase); however, if the pronoun is not assigned sentence level stress, it undergoes destressing. That is, unlike a lexical noun, a pronoun cannot bear primary word stress without bearing sentence-level stress as well.

The second constraint on destressing is this: destressing is observed only when the pronoun is adjacent to the verb whose argument it is. For example, contrast the (a) and (b) utterances in each of the following pairs:

- (22) a. Petja podaril cvetok Svete. (=19a)  
 b. Petja podaril cvetok ej.  
 (23) a. Petja podaril Svete cvetok.  
 b. Petja podaril Svete ego.

The (a) sentences are perfectly acceptable as presentational sentences answering the question ‘What happened?’. The (b) sentences are highly unnatural in such a pragmatic function, or, indeed, in the absence of focus stress on the pronoun, in any function. In contrast, placing the pronoun adjacent to the verb (either before or after) results in utterances perfectly natural as presentational sentences; in this context, the pronouns undergo destressing:

- (22) c. Petja podaril=ej cvetok.  
 Petja ej=podaril cvetok.  
 (23) c. Petja podaril=ego Svete.(=19b)  
 Petja ego=podaril Svete.

This fact represents perhaps the strongest parallel between the personal pronouns of Russian and the familiar clitics: in (22c) and (23c), the pronoun takes the verb as its host and becomes part of the same prosodic word, defined as the domain assigned a single primary word stress. This incorporation into the prosodic word of the host is indicated here (and below) by the equal sign.

**3.3 Analysis.** We will now propose an analysis of these facts, which will make it possible to view the properties of the personal pronouns in Russian as similar (at some level of abstraction) to those of the Polish clitics. The analysis will be based on the following observation.

The fact that a personal pronoun can bear focus stress is of no consequence, because any syllable, even a normally unstressed one, can bear focus stress. But since personal pronouns in Russian can bear sentence-level stress (cf. 21a,b), we assume that personal pronouns bear word stress at some level, since sentence-level stress, as noted above, is constrained to fall only on syllables with primary word stress. The occurrence of pronouns with secondary stress will then be taken to be the result of the application of a rule, whence the term “destressing” assumed thus far. This rule is conditioned to occur only when the pronoun is adjacent to the verb whose



sentence. Jakobson noted further that as the distinctive prosodic features of vowels evolved separately in the various languages, so did the syntactic behavior of the inflected clitics. By tracing the loss of clitics in certain languages, it is possible to discover certain generalizations about the degree to which clitics exhibit grammatical behavior distinct from that of their fully stressed counterparts. In particular, the languages in which clitics have the most distinctive behavior are Serbo-Croatian, Slovene, Czech, and Slovak. Clitics are least distinctive as a category throughout the East Slavic languages (excluding certain southwestern Ukrainian dialects).

The syntactic aspect of clitic behavior is essentially the question of what is an eligible host. Common Slavic inherited a rule placing clitics after the first stressed word or phrase in the sentence; we will say in this case that the clitic takes a *W-host* (“Wackernagel host”), because Wackernagel (1892) is widely associated with the discovery of second position clitic placement. Alternatively, a clitic may take an *H-host* (“head host”), that is, take as its host the word with which the clitic is syntactically related, either as a modifier or argument.

Considering the Polish and Russian facts discussed above on the background of the development of clitics in Slavic in general makes it possible to justify defining the term “clitic” in a broad sense. Before doing so, it is necessary to understand the dynamic aspect of the status of clitics in Polish.

There is considerable evidence that in Polish a loss of inflected clitics is underway. It was noted above that all investigators of the verbal clitics note that the prevailing tendency in the contemporary language is to (a) attach such clitics to their H-host, and (b) include them in the prosodic word of that host (as evidenced by the assignment of penultimate stress). That is, verbal clitics are coming to be treated as affixes. On the other hand, while the pronominal clitics share the essential features of verbal clitics, the trend appears to be for such pronominal forms to exhibit fewer clitic properties: they are becoming less like other clitics and more like orthotonic pronouns. We will demonstrate this by considering six differences between the two types of clitic and by noting that in each case pronominal clitics exhibit the distinctive properties of clitics to a lesser degree than do verbal clitics. We will do so by contrasting both types of clitics to the Serbo-Croatian clitics (and, to some extent, to Slovene clitics), as described in detail by Browne (1975, 1986) and Bennet (1986).<sup>20</sup>

First, while clitics within each of these clitic types must group together, the two types need not group with each other:

- (26) a. *Kiedy=śmy zobaczyli=go?* (SPP)  
           ‘When did we see him?’  
       b. *Czy=się nie przeliczył=eś?* (SPP)  
           ‘Haven't you miscounted?’

This is not the case in either Serbo-Croatian or Slovene.

Second, when the two clitic types do group with each other, they do not intermingle: verbal clitics precede pronominal clitics (cf. 1 Ib). Not only is the fact of separation significant, but the order is as well: the verbal clitics are more intimately bound with the host. In contrast, the order templates for clitics in Serbo-Croatian and Slovene intermingle the two classes:

(27) *Order templates for clitics in Serbo-Croatian and Slovene*

- a. Serbo-Croatian (Browne 1975)  
*li* > auxiliary\* > dat. > acc./gen. > reflexive > je
- b. Slovene (Bennet 1986)  
particles > past auxiliary\* > reflexive > dat. > ace. > gen. > future aux./je  
(\*except *je*)

Third, the order templates in Serbo-Croatian and Slovene are rigid; the order template for verbal clitics in Polish is rigid as well, but that for pronominal clitics more readily admits violations.<sup>21</sup> It was observed in footnote 14 that the order template in (1 la) is not particularly strict in relation to the last three elements listed there. Even the precedence of dative clitics over *się* can be violated; contrast the second and third examples in (12a) with the following:

- (28) a. *Zdawało=się=im, że wszystkie nieszczęścia wydostały się z puszki Pandory i spadły na nich.* (Polityka)  
'It seemed to them that all misfortunes had escaped from Pandora's box and befallen them.'
- b. *Goni=go=się po całym świecie.* (Gladney 1983)  
'He is pursued the entire world over.'

In this respect, the pronominal clitics of Polish more closely resemble the pronouns of Russian, in which there is no fixed word order among the various case forms (Isačenko 1966:34).

Fourth, pronominal clitics can take a wider range of W-hosts than can verbal clitics, such as the stressless coordinating conjunctions *i* and *a*:

- (29) a. *Janek poszedł do tego pana, i=mu wszystko powiedział.*  
'Johnny went to that gentleman and told him everything.'
- b. *\*Poszedłem do tego pana, i=m wszystko powiedział.*  
'(I went to that gentleman and said everything.)'

In this respect, the verbal clitics resemble the clitics of Serbo-Croatian, while the pronominal clitics differ (Browne 1975:112). Being more restrictive about possible hosts is a characteristic of the distinctive syntax of clitics.

Fifth, while both verbal and pronominal clitics can be enclitics to either a W-host or an H-host, pronominal clitics have an additional option: a pronominal clitic can be a proclitic to the H-host as well. For example:

- (30) a. *Mój brat mieszka w Paryżu. Mój kolega, który tam był, go=odwiedził.*  
'My brother lives in Paris. My colleague who was there visited him.'
- b. *W instytucie // [pause] się=nie=zgodzą.* (from a conversation)  
'At the institute (they) won't agree (to it).'

Serbo-Croatian does not admit proclisis, although Slovene does (*Ko sem se vzdramila, sem=ležala na postelji* 'When I awoke, I was lying in bed' (Bennet 1986). According to Jakobson (1971[1935]), proclisis becomes possible as a transitional stage toward the loss of inflected clitics.

Finally, pronominal clitics move inside an initial phrase with more difficulty than do verbal clitics. The variable seems to be the prosodic weight of the host. In any event, there are contrasts such as the following:

- (31) a. *\*Ten=się piosenkarz zgodził.*  
'(This singer agreed.)'
- b. *Tego=m piosenkarza znał.* 'I knew this singer.'

Serbo-Croatian (more than Slovene) also can break up a phrase with a clitic, as in *Moja će*

*sestra doći u utorak* ‘My sister will come on Tuesday’ (Browne 1975). Again, it is the verbal clitic in Polish which exhibits more distinctive clitic-like behavior than the pronominal clitic, as an orthotonic verb argument could not stand in this position.

These differences are significant because together they point to the fact that the pronominal clitics have greater autonomy (have fewer of the distinctive characteristics of clitics) than do verbal clitics.

When we consider, in addition to these facts, that the number of morphological distinctions between clitic and orthotonic pronominal forms is restricted (absent in the plural pronouns, being lost in the first person singular - see footnote 13), we see that clitics are far from a uniform category in Polish, and their presence is diminishing: the verbal clitics are becoming affixes, and the pronominal clitics are not exhibiting much of the distinctive behavior of clitics. Thus, Polish is proceeding in the direction in which East Slavic has already proceeded.

## 5. Conclusion.

Word and affix properties have been discussed at four levels of linguistic structure: segmental phonology, word-level (pre-syntactic) prosody, syntax, and sentence-level prosody. Accordingly, three notions of “word” have been defined, corresponding to the first three of these levels; properties at sentence-level prosody are derivative of word-level prosody, since sentence-level stress is assigned to prosodic words. A paradigmatic word is one at which all of these boundaries coincide; this is represented in (32a), where X is such a word; a paradigmatic affix is a linguistic element which cannot stand in isolation and which stands together with another linguistic element to form a paradigmatic word; this is represented in (32b), where Y is the affix and Z is its stem:

- (32) a. *Structure of a paradigmatic word*  
 $[<(X)_{ph} >_{pr}]_{sy}$   
 b. *Structure of a paradigmatic affix*  
 $[<(Z-Y)_{ph} >_{pr}]_{sy}$

There are many possible intermediate stages between these two extremes. An element Y could be separated from its host Z by some but not all of the word boundaries defined at different levels of structure. We have discussed a concrete case in which an element was part of the prosodic and syntactic words of its host but separated from it by a phonological word boundary (the imperative clitics of Polish); we have also discussed cases in which an element constituted phonological and syntactic words separate from its host, while being adjoined to this host at the level of the prosodic word (the verbal and pronominal clitics of Polish, and the pronouns of Russian). The Polish clitics are lexically specified to lack the status of a prosodic word, requiring that they be adjoined to one; in contrast, when Russian pronouns have this status, it is derived. It has been noted that while these notions of “word” can be defined independently of one another, there are interdependencies. This question has not been investigated in detail, but the verbal clitics of Polish provide evidence that a syntactic word cannot be smaller than a prosodic word it overlaps with: if a prosodic word includes an element X and an element Y, the syntactic word including X must include Y as well. This principle also explains why the Polish imperative clitic cannot float.

Furthermore, it has been shown that this formalism is not adequate to capture the full range of variation. Polish is currently in a state of transition, which can be observed both in the history of the language itself and, due to variable rates of change, in the synchronic comparison of Polish with other Slavic languages. The outline of this change is clear, because the direction of change

is clearly toward simplification, toward an isomorphism of word boundaries at the various levels of grammatical structure. However, the details of this change are rather complicated precisely because the language is at a transitional stage.

Finally, it has been an underlying theme of this study that there is a wide range of prosodic and syntactic behavior which can be associated with clitics, a range which cannot be captured by stipulating that a given linguistic element is a clitic with certain features and therefore it must behave in a particular way. Rather, the term “clitic” applies to any of the levels, and to the adjunction of a clitic to a word at the given level. The precise properties of a given clitic in a language are a function of a) the status of the clitic as a word or adjoined element at each level of linguistic structure, and b) the properties of words at the corresponding levels in the given language.

Slavic and Eurasian Studies  
University of Texas at Austin  
grapp@mail.utexas.edu

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The author gratefully acknowledges the support for this research provided by the University Research Institute of the University of Texas at Austin, the International Research and Exchanges Board (Princeton, NJ), and the East European program of the Wilson International Center for Scholars (Washington, DC). During my stay in Poland in the Spring of 1987, I benefitted greatly from discussions with Andrzej Bogusławski, Zygmunt Saloni, and Marek Świdziński of the University of Warsaw. At the Jagiellonian University in Cracow, the research groups of Professors Bogusław Dunaj and Zofia Kurzowa were very helpful in making materials available to me; I am especially grateful to Kazimierz Sikora and Bronisława Ligara. My most indefatigable informants in Texas have been Leszek and Bożena Kasproicz and Konstantin Gurevich. I am indebted to an anonymous reader (or readers) for the American Committee of Slavists Selection Committee for many helpful suggestions which improved both the form and content of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> There is a difference between the two cases: the Polish pronoun loses its stress to a word which normally does not bear word accent (a preposition), while the Greek pronoun loses stress to a word which does (a lexical noun). The significance of this difference depends upon how one analyzes the apparent stress shift in Polish. If one assumes that there is no actual shift in Polish, but rather that stress falls on the preposition because the two lexical words (*za + mną*) are interpreted as representing a single phonological word and penultimate word stress is assigned to this unit, then the pronoun appears to be as much an (en)clitic as the preposition is a proclitic.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Zwicky (1977, 1985), Klavans (1982, 1985), and Zwicky and Pullum (1983) for discussion of the literature on the subject.

<sup>4</sup> Klavans adopts a different position in a later paper (1985), in which she writes (p. 96) that “[t]here is no a-priori requirement that all clitics across languages must be universally generated in the same way ... In fact, the source of clitics is probably a language-particular fact . . . However, what is strictly constrained is the position where a clitic can occur in a tree structure.”

<sup>5</sup> For the purposes of these dialect facts (here and below), we understand a sonorant to be a nasal, liquid, glide, or vowel.

<sup>6</sup> For phonetic transcriptions (given between square brackets), I retain traditional Polish orthography, with a few exceptions: *sz* is replaced by *š*, and *ż* and *rz* are replaced by *ž*. Palatalization will be indicated by a grave accent over the corresponding consonant.

<sup>7</sup> For a recent descriptively rich formal approach to stress assignment in Polish, see Rubach and Booij 1985.

<sup>8</sup> On verbal clitics, see, for example, Booij and Rubach 1987:34-42, Kowalska 1976, Mikoś and Moravcsik, to appear, Selberg 1970, 1973, Sussex 1980, and Zawiślakowa 1974.

<sup>9</sup> The parenthesized vowel is epenthetic, appearing when the clitic is placed after a consonant; cf.: *pisal=em*, *pisala=m*. We will return to some interesting properties of this epenthetic vowel below.

<sup>10</sup> There is a problem with the vowel alternation *niósł*, *niosła*, *niosł=em* (\**niósł=em*), to which we return below.

<sup>11</sup> A third reason is historical: these clitics are derived from cliticized forms of the auxiliary verb *być* ‘to be’.

<sup>12</sup> On the syntactic constraints of verbal clitic placement, see the references cited in note 8.

<sup>13</sup> The information in (10) is based on SPP. The first person singular accusative form (*mię*) is almost archaic in the modern language; a trend I have not seen recorded in the literature is for the dative case form of this same pronoun *mi* to cease being a clitic, resulting in a loss of distinction between clitic:orthotonic forms and the establishment of a case distinction (genitive/accusative *mnie*:dative *mi*), analogous to the first person plural forms (genitive/accusative *nas*: dative *nam*), among others). There are non-syllabic clitic forms of the genitive and accusative third person singular masculine and neuter, as in *doń* ‘to him’, *przezeń* ‘through it’; for more details on the morphology of pronominal clitics, see Decaux (1955). Forms without the morphological contrast can function either as clitic or orthotonic forms.

<sup>14</sup> Few sources provide a relative ordering among *się* and the genitive and accusative pronominal clitic pronouns. Gladney (1983:108) observes that with respect to these forms, “the order varies”. While this is true, it appears to me, based on textual examples and informant work, that the order given in (11a) is the most neutral. Not every speaker accepts the following examples, with the accusative before the genitive, but some do and none accept the opposite:

(i) On uczył cię go. (*uczyć kogo*[acc.] *czego* [gen.])  
‘He taught it to you.’

(ii) Pozbawiłeś go jej. (*pozbawić dom*[acc.] *radości* [gen.])  
‘You deprived it of it.’

<sup>15</sup> It is difficult to find explicit statements of such negative facts in the literature on dialects; the closest I have come to is a statement by Nitsch (1947:63) that “typ *dawnOśmy niepisali* chyba nie istnieje” ‘The type *dawnOśmy niepisali* probably does not exist’. This observation has been confirmed for me in personal communications from investigators of Polish dialectology (Kazimierz Sikora of Jagiellonian University and Stanislaw Dubisz of Warsaw University). It has been mentioned to me by others that while such a stress is occasionally observed, it is often an artifact of reading a printed text or a hypercorrection.

<sup>16</sup> “Kto już nie powie *dawnośmy nie pisali*, ten prawdopodobnie tylko po nowemu *dawno nie pisaliśmy*” (Nitsch 1947:63) ‘He who no longer says *dawnośmy nie pisali* probably will only use the newer form *dawno nie pisaliśmy*’.

<sup>17</sup> See Svedstedt 1976 for more discussion and further references, which are not numerous; Svedstedt recognizes the essential importance of intonation without investigating the question in any depth.

<sup>18</sup> On this use of questions to create contexts with a particular partition between new and old information and the concomitant consequences for word order and sentence intonation, see Rappaport (1984) for discussion and references, in the context of a different grammatical question.

<sup>19</sup> Throughout this discussion, we do not consider focus stress, which is accompanied by a distinctive pitch accent. Focus stress has many characteristics which distinguish it from the sentence-level stress assigned by the NSR. For example, focus stress need not even fall on a stressed syllable (*On PRIšel, a ne Ušel* ‘He arrived, not left’).

<sup>20</sup> Czech and Slovak contrast with Polish as well, although in the interests of brevity we restrict our attention to the South Slavic languages mentioned.

<sup>21</sup> It is possible to encounter in the speech of children errors of the type *dawat=em=by* ‘I would give’, instead of the correct *dawat=by=m*. Such forms are clearly perceived as errors: the order template, an artifact of the language like a morphological exception, has not been mastered.

## REFERENCES

- Bennet, David C. 1986. Towards an explanation of word-order differences between Slovene and Serbo-Croat. *The Slavonic and East European Review* 64:1.1-24.
- Booij, Geert and Jerzy Rubach. 1987. Postcyclic versus postlexical rules in lexical phonology. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:1.1-44.
- Browne, Wayles. 1975. Serbo-Croatian enclitics for English-speaking learners. *Kontrastivna analiza engleskog i hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika*, vol. I, 105-34. Zagreb: Institut za lingvistiku, Filozofskog fakulteta.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986. Parameters in clitic placement: Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian. Cornell University ms. [Presented at the Fifth Balkan and South Slavic Conference, Indiana University, March 1986.].

- Buttler, Danuta; Halina Kurkowska; and Halina Satkiewicz. 1971. *Kultura języka polskiego. Zagadnienia poprawności gramatycznej*. Warszawa: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
- Decaux, Étienne. 1955. *Morphologie des enclitiques polonais*. (Travaux de l'Institut d'Études Slaves, 23) Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves.
- Dejna, Karol. 1973. *Dialekty polskie*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Gladney, Frank V. 1983. *Handbook of Polish*. Urbana: G and G Press.
- Isačenko, Aleksandr V. 1966. O grammatičeskom porjadke slov. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 15.27-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1967. Frazovoe udarenie i porjadok slov. *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, vol. 2 (Janua Linguarum, Series Maior, 32), 967-76. The Hague: Mouton.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1971. Les enclitiques slaves. *Selected Writings*, vol. II: *Word and Language*, 16-22. The Hague: Mouton & Co. [First published in *Atti del Congresso di Linguistica tenuto in Roma il 19-26 settembre 1933*, Firenze, 1935.]
- Klavans, Judith L. 1982. Some problems in a theory of clitics. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. *Language* 61:1.95-120.
- Kowalska, Alina. 1976. *Ewolucja analitycznych form czasownikowych z imiesłowem na ł w języku polskim*. (Prace naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach, 123.) Katowice: University of Silesia.
- Mikoś, Michael J. and Edith Moravcsik. To appear. Moving clitics in Polish and some cross-linguistic generalizations. *Studia Slavica*.
- Nida, Eugene. 1949. *Morphology: The descriptive analysis of words*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Nitsch, Kazimierz. 1912. Fonetyka międzywyrazowa. *Materiały i prace Komisji Językowej Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności* 5.393-422.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1947. Baczość. *Język polski* 27.62-3.
- Ozga, Janina. 1976. Clitics in English and Polish. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, vol. 4, ed. by Jacek Fisiak. 127-40, Poznań. Adam Mickiewicz University.
- Rappaport, Gilbert C. 1984. *Grammatical function and syntactic structure: The adverbial participle of Russian*. (UCLA Slavic studies, 8) Columbus: Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- Rubach, Jerzy and Geert E. Booij. 1985. A grid theory of stress in Polish. *Lingua* 66.281-319.
- Saloni, Zygmunt. 1976. *Cechy składniowe polskiego czasownika*. (Polska Akademia Nauk, Prace językoznawcze, 76). Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Selberg, Ole Michael. 1970. Szyk enklityk preterytalnych w polszczyźnie. *Slavica* 16.225-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. Zur Syntax der Präteritalenklitika in der polnischen Schriftsprache der ersten Hälfte des 19 Jahrhunderts. *Scando-Slavica* 19.177-85.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1984. *Phonology and syntax: The relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- SPP = Doroszewski, Witold. 1973 (ed.) *Słownik poprawnej polszczyzny*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Sussex, Roland. 1980. On agreement, affixation and enclisis in Polish. *Morphosyntax in Slavic*, ed. by Catherine V. Chvany and Richard D. Brecht, 187-203. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, Inc.

- Svedstedt, Dag. 1976. *Position of objective personal pronouns: A study of word order in modern Russian*. Stockholm Slavonic Studies, 9. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International.
- Szpiczakowska, Monika. 1987. Ruchomość końcówek czasu przeszłego we współczesnym języku polskim. Jagiellonian University, ms.
- Urbańczyk, Stanisław. 1984. *Zarys dialektologii polskiej*. 7th ed. Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
- Vinogradov, Vladimir V. et al., ed. 1960. *Grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moscow: Akademija Nauk, SSSR, Institut russkogo jazyka.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892. Über ein Gesetz der Indo-Germanischen Wordstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1.333-436.
- Zawiślakowa, Ewa. 1974. Końcówki ruchome czasu przeszłego. *Język polski* 54:3.195-202.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1977. On clitics. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. Clitics and particles. *Language* 61:2.283-305.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't*. *Language* 59:3.502-13.