

On the direction of cliticization in Macedonian

Macedonian allows both pro- and enclisis, but the direction of cliticization depends on the host: clitics precede finite verbs and *l*-participles (cf. 4 & 5), but follow nouns, adjectives, and passive participles (cf. 1, 2, and 3). There have been a few attempts to capture the variation: Joseph (1983) claims that the proclisis occurs on finite verbs, but this forces him to stipulate that *l*-participles are finite. Tomić (1997) argues for a decomposition of the hosts into [$\pm V$, $\pm N$] feature pairs and claims that the type of cliticization depends on the saliency of verbal properties of the clause predicate. This, however, results in a very complex system.

My analysis: I propose that proclisis is obligatory with the hosts that assign case: finite verbs and *l*-participles. The clitics must move to case checking Agr projections above the *l*-participle or a finite verb (cf. 6). Whether they move as X^0 or XP's is irrelevant for the proposal, given the ambiguous X^0 /XP status of clitics (cf. Chomsky 1995). Recall that in Serbo-Croatian (Bošković 1997, Stjepanović 1999) and Bulgarian (cf. Arnaudova 2003) the object must A-move from the VP, possibly for case checking. I suggest that the object case must be checked in Macedonian as well, but this is done by clitic doubling (cf. 4 & 5). Otherwise, the outputs are ungrammatical (cf. 7).

Following Cardinaletti and Starke's (1999) distinction, I claim that the Macedonian clitics instantiate two types of deficient elements: (i) clitic pronouns and auxiliaries, which occur with case assigners and are proclitic, and (ii) weak pronouns and auxiliaries, which occur with non-case assigning categories, such as passive participles, adjectives, and nouns. I also assume C& S's (1999: 198) "Minimise Structure" principle, which states that weak forms are selected only if the realization of a clitic element is independently ruled out. Thus, in the constructions with passive participles, adjectives, and nouns there are no agreement projections available, because these categories are not case assigners. Therefore, clitics may not be selected, because they are unable to check case. As a result, weak pronouns must be realized. Notice that weak pronouns always carry inherent case, such as dative in (1-3) and that there is no clitic doubling required. This is expected, given that inherent case is purely semantic, related to thematic structure, so it is not checked, as it can be interpreted at LF.

Having more structure than clitics, weak pronouns are more independent with respect to their position in the clause. They need not occur in the second position, nor do they have to be verb adjacent (cf. 3). They only have to appear in the second position when they are preceded by predicative hosts, such as nouns, adjectives, and passive participles, which agree in ϕ features with the subject, as in (1) and (2). Following Migdalski's (2004) analysis of Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian and Willis' (2000) account of Old Church Slavonic, I submit these are instances of predicate inversion. The predicative elements XP-move to Spec,TP to check ϕ features (cf. the derivation of 2 in 8).

Note that the 3rd person auxiliary in *both* singular and plural can never be overt in the constructions with the *l*-participle in Mac (cf. 9). This is expected, as the auxiliary 'to be' cannot assign case, because it is unaccusative. Case can only be assigned by the *l*-participle, and the presence of an auxiliary clitic would block the adjacency between the case assigner (=the *l*-participle) and the case receiver (=pronominal clitics). The 3rd person is the only auxiliary form that might intervene between the *l*-participle and the pronominal clitics in the cluster, so it has to be deleted. The other auxiliary forms precede pronominal clitics, therefore they do not cause any problems for the adjacency requirement (cf. 10; Franks & King 2000).

- (1) a. **Si mu tatko*
be_{2SG} him_{CL.DAT} father
b. *Tatko si mu*
father be_{2SG} him_{CL.DAT}
“You are his father”
c. *Ti si mu tatko*
you be_{2SG} him_{CL.DAT} father
- (2) a. ??*Si mu mil*
be_{2SG} him_{CL.DAT} dear_{ADJ.M.SG}
b. (Mnogo) *mil si mu*
very dear_{ADJ.M.SG} be_{2SG} him_{CL.DAT}
“He likes you (very much)”
c. *Ti si mu mil*
you be_{2SG} him_{CL.DAT} dear (Tomić 2000)
- (3) a. *Na Petreta (mu e) poveke pati (mu e) rečeno da bide točen*
to Peter_{DAT} him_{DAT} is more times him_{CL.DAT} is tell_{PASS.N} to be_{3SG.SUBJ} punctual
“Peter was told more than once to be punctual” (Tomić 2000)
- (4) b. *(Vie) (včera) ste im go (*včera) dale proektot (včera)*
you_{PL} yesterday be_{AUX.2PL} CL.DAT.PL CL.ACC.SG yesterday give_{PART.PL} project-the yesterday
“As reported, you gave them the project yesterday” (Tomić 1999)
- (5) *(Jana) mu go dade pismoto na deteto*
Jana CL.3SG.M/N.DAT CL.3SG.M/N.ACC give_{PAST3SG} letter+the to child+the
“Jana gave the letter to the child” (Tomić *to appear*)
- (6) [TP (Vie) [T *ste* [AgrIO *im* [AgrO *go* [vp [PartP *dale*_{PART} *proektot*]]]]]]]
- (7) **Dal/dade im go včera proektot*
give_{PART.M.SG}/gave CL.DAT.PL CL.ACC.SG yesterday project-the
- (8) [TP *Mnogo mil*_t [T *si* [AgrIO *mu* [vp [PredP *t*_(Mnogo) *mil*]]]]]]]
- (9) a. *Mu *(e) skinato paltoto*
3SG.M/N.DAT.CL be_{3SG.CL} torn_{PASS.PART.N.SG} coat+the
“His coat is torn”
b. *Mu se (*e) skinalo paltoto*
3SG.M/N.DAT.CL REFL.CL be_{AUX.3SG.CL} torn_{PART.N.SG} coat+the
“Reportedly, his coat got torn” (Tomić, *to appear* ex. 18-19)
- (10) *li* > Mod > Neg > AUX (except 3rd SG&PL) > DAT > ACC > 3rd SG&PL AUX *e/se*

References:

- Arnaudova, O. 2003. *Focus and Bulgarian Clause Structure*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Bošković, Ž. 1997. *The Syntax of Non-finite Complementation. An Economy Approach*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Cardinaletti, A, and M. Starke. 1999. “The typology of structural deficiency”. In H. van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 145-233.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Franks, S. & T. King. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Joseph, B.D. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Migdalski, K. 2004. “To Be or To Have: On the Syntax of Perfect Tenses in South Slavic” *FASL-13* talk.
- Stjepanović, S. 1999. *What Do Second Position Cliticization, Scrambling, and Multiple Wh-Fronting Have in Common?* Ph.D. dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Tomić, O. 1997. “Non-first as a Default Clitic Position”. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 5(2): 301-23.
- Tomić, O. 1999. “Cliticization and Clitic-hood”. In: I. Kenesei, (ed.). *Crossing Boundaries. Advances in the Theory of Central and Eastern European Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 9-32.
- Tomić, O. 2000. “On Clitic Sites”. In: F. Beukema, and M. den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 293-316.
- Tomić, O. *to appear*. “The South Slavic Pronominal Clitics”. To be published in *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* (special issue on pronominal clitics in Slavic, ed. P. Law and U. Junghans).
- Willis, D. 2000. “Verb Movement in Slavonic Conditionals”. In S. Pintzuk *et al* (eds.), *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.