



1998

Review of *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, by Aaron L. Halpern and Arnold M. Zwicky

Gregory Stump

University of Kentucky, gstump@uky.edu

Right click to open a feedback form in a new tab to let us know how this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://uknowledge.uky.edu/lin_facpub



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Stump, Gregory, "Review of *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, by Aaron L. Halpern and Arnold M. Zwicky" (1998). *Linguistics Faculty Publications*. 26.

https://uknowledge.uky.edu/lin_facpub/26

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Linguistics at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Linguistics Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@sv.uky.edu.

Review of *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, by Aaron L. Halpern and Arnold M. Zwicky

REVIEWS

Rohlf, G. (1968). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. Vol. 2: *Morfologia*. Turin: Einaudi.

*Author's address: Department of Linguistics,
University of Bergamo,
Piazza Vecchia 8,
24100 Bergamo,
Italy.
E-mail: giorgi@ibguniv.unibg.it*

(Received 16 September 1997)

Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching second: second position clitics and related phenomena*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 1996. Pp. xxiii + 629.

Reviewed by GREGORY T. STUMP, University of Kentucky

The eighteen papers of which this excellent volume is composed (the outgrowth of a workshop held at the Ohio State University in 1993) are united by their authors' shared interest in explaining the special properties of second-position (2P) clitics; readers will be struck, however, by the heterogeneousness of the explanations proposed here. This diversity stems both from the disparate nature of the authors' theoretical interpretations of the evidence and from the strong likelihood that 2P clitics do not, in any event, constitute a unified phenomenon – that their properties aren't susceptible to a single, cross-linguistically valid explanation.

There is, to begin with, a fundamental disagreement about the theoretical status of 'second position'. Some contributors portray it as a purely syntactic notion, while others characterize it in prosodic terms. Thus, Ljiljana Progovac ('Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the second position') argues that in Serbo-Croatian, 2P clitics are fronted syntactically and end up right-adjoined to Comp; second position is here associated with a particular node in syntactic structure. Vesna Radanović-Kocić ('The placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics: a prosodic approach'), by contrast, argues that the Serbo-Croatian clitics are positioned by a rule of prosodic structure, which places them after the first phonological phrase in the intonational phrase to which they belong; on this view, second position needn't (and in fact doesn't) correspond to any uniquely identifiable syntactic node. The papers by Mark Hale ('Deriving Wackernagel's Law: prosodic and syntactic factors determining clitic placement in the language of the Rigveda') and Hans Henrich Hock ('Who's on first? Toward a prosodic account of 2P clitics') develop similarly contrasting accounts of 2P clitics in Vedic. Though it is at odds with much recent work on clitic syntax, the radically prosodic conception of second position advocated by Radanović-Kocić and Hock accounts for a range of facts (e.g. the interaction of 2P clitics with heavy

initial constituents, appositives, parentheticals and nonrestrictive relative clauses; parallelisms between clisis and sandhi; the incidence of 2P clitics after line-initial, post-caesura, and cadence-initial hosts in poetry) for which fundamentally syntactic theories of clitic placement afford no obviously credible explanation.

Whether second position is regarded as a syntactic or a prosodic notion, the central problem posed by 2P clitics remains the same: why must they occupy this position? This is, in fact, two problems: first, why are 2P clitics positioned near the left periphery of their domain, and second, why mustn't they appear AT this periphery?

A good many explanations are proffered for the proximity of 2P clitics to domain-initial position. Patrick McConvell ('The functions of split-Wackernagel clitic systems: pronominal clitics in the Ngumpin languages (Pama-Nyungan Family, Northern Australia)') argues that in one class of languages, the placement of clitics in second position serves the discourse-pragmatic function of marking the presence of a focussed or new topic constituent in sentence-initial position; Eloise Jelinek ('Definiteness and second position clitics in Straits Salish') suggests that the raising of pronominal clitics by head movement is motivated by semantic considerations – specifically, by an LF constraint requiring definite arguments to be external to VP; Liliane Haegeman ('Object clitics in West Flemish') argues that clitic raising takes place in steps motivated by the need for feature checking, and that these steps include both A-movement of the DP headed by the clitic and head movement of the clitic itself; Chiyo Nishida ('Second position clitic pronouns in Old Spanish and Categorical Grammar') proposes a movement-free analysis in which the devices of categorial grammar – specifically, those of functional composition and type raising – allow 2P clitics simply to be generated in situ; Hock attributes the leftward movement of clitics to their accentlessness, in virtue of which they gravitate to the most prominent member of their prosodic domain and anchor themselves to it; and so on.

Just as most contributors regard the proximity of 2P clitics to the left periphery of their domain as a syntactic effect, some likewise assume that syntactic principles are what prevent such clitics from appearing domain-initially: for instance, Olga Mišeska Tomić ('The Balkan Slavic nominal clitics') argues that the Macedonian definite article clitics head their domain DP, and that movement of the following word to [Spec DP] guarantees that they will be non-initial within that domain; similarly, Josep M. Fontana ('Phonology and syntax in the interpretation of the Tobler-Mussafia Law') argues that in Old Spanish, I⁰-to-C⁰ movement places a verb into preclitic position, satisfying the clitic's prosodic need for a preceding host (though without, he maintains, being in any sense triggered by that need). But even if one appeals to syntactic principles to explain a 2P clitic's proximity to the left periphery of its domain, one might perfectly well regard its failure to

appear domain-initially as a wholly prosodic effect. Thus, several contributors appeal to Halpern's (1992) principle of prosodic inversion, by which a domain-initial clitic acquires a preceding host by being flipped past the word which follows it: Ann Taylor ('A prosodic account of clitic position in Ancient Greek'), for example, shows that in Ancient Greek NPs containing a possessive-pronoun or indefinite-determiner clitic, the clitic ordinarily occupies second position, even if the NP itself isn't immediately post-pausal; she attributes this fact to the incidence of prosodic inversion after the phonological phrase boundary which ordinarily coincides with a NP's left edge. Nevertheless, the principle of prosodic inversion is a kind of compromise between the purely syntactic and the radically prosodic conceptions of 2P clitic placement, and the need for this principle is called into question by proponents of both of these more extreme perspectives (e.g. by Progovac and Hock).

Indeed, the notion of prosodic inversion is potentially problematic. A clitic following a domain-initial constituent and a clitic following the first prosodic word of a domain-initial constituent are alike in that each follows something initial in its domain; yet, a proponent of prosodic inversion is seemingly committed to the view that such clitics are positioned by different means – by syntactic movement (or by generation *in situ*) in the former case, but by (syntactic movement plus) prosodic inversion in the latter case. Moreover, a clitic whose distribution is regulated by prosodic inversion must be assumed to be inherently enclitic. It is not clear, however, that enclisis can be seen as a general property of 2P clitics; for instance, Jindřich Toman ('A note on clitics and prosody') demonstrates that in Czech, the same clitic may be enclitic or proclitic according to the requirements of its prosodic context. Such facts suggest that the properties determining a clitic's linear positioning are in principle independent of those regulating its phonological attachment, as Klavans (1980, 1985) has argued; Susan Pintzuk ('Cliticization in Old English') shows that this perspective affords a natural account of the differences between pronominal and adverbial clitics in Old English.

Another point of disagreement relates to the problem of accounting for the sequence in which multiple clitics appear. For example, Hale argues that in Vedic, the sequence of 2P clitics reflects the nesting of functional categories in syntax; Hock, by contrast, attributes this sequence to a prosodic template. *A priori*, the postulation of a language-specific template might seem to be the least explanatory account of clitic ordering, but Steven Schäufele ('Now that we're all here, where do we sit? Phonological ordering in the Vedic clause-initial string'), pursuing Hock's assumption, argues that the form of the Vedic template reflects the grammaticization of various independent properties which clitics tend to exhibit cross-linguistically; and an explanation based on functional categories nested in a particular way is only as strong as the independent motivation for postulating those categories in the required nesting.

Although the disparateness of the analyses proposed in this volume can be partly ascribed to differences of theoretical interpretation, the vast array of evidence catalogued here leaves no doubt that, however one might choose to explain their properties, 2P clitics are, as a class, remarkably miscellaneous. For instance, besides differing with respect to their relative ordering, a language's clitics frequently differ with respect to the kinds of hosts they allow: Taylor observes that in Ancient Greek, some 2P clitics require an accented host, while others do not; pursuing a distinction proposed by Halpern & Fontana (1994), Pintzuk suggests that among Old English adverbial clitics, some require a head as their host, while others require a phrase; Schäufele raises the possibility that in Vedic, discourse-particle clitics differ from pronominal clitics in requiring their host to have a certain degree of semantic weight; and so on. (On the other hand, instances in which clitics seem to impose different requirements on their hosts can sometimes be attributed to independent syntactic factors. Dutch object clitics, for example, are superficially very different from their French counterparts – unlike the latter, they fail to invert with the verb in questions, and they license parasitic gaps; but C. Jan-Wouter Zwart ('Clitics, scrambling, and head movement in Dutch') argues that object clitics are actually alike in the two languages – that their apparent differences follow from independent facts about the syntax of Dutch and French.)

A final, important highlight of this volume is the group of papers concerning diachronic developments by which once-robust systems of 2P clisis have become restricted in usage. Andrew Garrett ('Wackernagel's Law and unaccusativity in Hittite') demonstrates that the innovative system of 2P subject clitics in Hittite has a restricted distribution, co-occurring with unaccusative verbs but not with unergative or transitive verbs; he argues that this state of affairs – unusual in Indo-European – is the outcome of a historical reinterpretation of the subject clitics as phrasal affixes. McConvell argues that the restricted discourse-pragmatic function of 2P clisis in the Ngumpin languages is the outcome of a historical competition with a different pattern of cliticization (namely cliticization to an auxiliary). Dieter Wanner ('Second position clitics in Medieval Romance') documents a gradual historical shift in the Romance languages whereby an inherited system of 2P clisis was, after a period of co-existence, virtually replaced by an innovative pattern of verb cliticization; Pilar Barbosa ('Clitic placement in European Portuguese and the position of subjects') proposes a formal explanation for the exceptional conservatism of European Portuguese with respect to this shift.

Halpern's introduction to the volume helpfully lays out the web of theoretical issues posed by the phenomenon of 2P clisis and anticipates the controversies which follow. Cumulatively, the articles in this book open up these controversies in a detailed and exhaustive way (particularly with respect to the incidence of 2P clisis in Germanic, Old Indic, Romance and

REVIEWS

Slavic); they cannot be said to resolve any of these controversies, but together, they set an explicit agenda for future research on clitics and make it abundantly clear why this area of inquiry is so central to the goal of understanding how morphological, syntactic and prosodic principles are articulated in natural language.

REFERENCES

- Halpern, A. L. (1992). *Topics in the placement and morphology of clitics*. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.
- Halpern, A. L. & Fontana, J. M. (1994). X^0 and X^{max} clitics. In Duncan, E., Farkas, D. & Spaelti, P. (eds.), *The proceedings of the Twelfth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. 251–266.
- Klavans, J. L. (1980). *Some problems in a theory of clitics*. Ph.D. dissertation, University College London.
- Klavans, J. L. (1985). The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. *Language* 61. 95–120.
- Author's address: Department of English,
University of Kentucky,
Lexington, KY 40506-0027,
U.S.A.
E-mail: gstump@pop.uky.edu*

(Received 20 January 1998)

Alice C. Harris & Lyle Campbell, *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 74). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Pp. xvii + 488.

Reviewed by WILLEM KOOPMAN, HIL/Universiteit van Amsterdam

In this book Harris & Campbell (henceforth H&C) chart a framework for a theory of syntactic change. They set out their aims in the introduction (chapter 1), which contains an initial discussion of a range of important topics that are to be dealt with in more detail later, such as predictability and explanation. Chapter 2 reviews the major themes that over time have played a role in explanations of syntactic change. H&C show that the issues that are much to the forefront today (e.g. reanalysis, the role of language acquisition) in many cases have been the concern of scholars in the past. A special section is devoted to the more recent history of the subject. Lightfoot as an exponent of an approach using more formal syntactic theories comes in for substantial criticism. According to H&C he relies too much on Universal Grammar and fails to address functionalist matters. On the other hand, an exclusive functionalist approach often suffers from lack of rigour and excessive speculation (47).

In chapter 3 H&C sketch their theory of syntactic change, in which only three mechanisms are recognized. A separate chapter is devoted to each of