1. Three kinds of deficiency

The term “clitic” has been applied to such a variety of elements that it strikes me as highly unlikely that all the things linguists refer to as clitics can (or should) be analyzed in the same way. This much bandied-about term instead subsumes a variety of canonical properties, there being no general agreement among scholars as to which to take as definitive. Yet however elusive any comprehensive definition of clitic may be, one thing is clear: clitics are defective. That is, clitics are different from other words in that they cannot do something other, “normal” words can do.¹ Traditionally, of course, this deficiency has been regarded as a...
prosodic one, i.e., clitics are not fully fledged phonological words in that they lack stress and thus require a host. The naïve view is that this prosodic hallmark is all there is to it, and while there is some sense to this characterization, it does not make for a flawless correspondence with everything (and only those things) which we as linguists might intuit to be clitics. What they lack is more than just independent prosodic viability – clitics are in fact defective across-the-board. If we aspire to be, it will be argued, perfect "minimal" words in all senses in which this term might be construed.

That clitics have special properties at multiple levels of representation has long been recognized. Klavans (1985), building on Zwicky’s classic 1977 paper, put forward a parameterization that pulled apart syntactic and phonological dependency, allowing them to look in different directions for a host. Sadock (1991: 52) later described clitics as potentially having special properties in virtually every domain of linguistic organization, i.e., not just phonology, but also morphology, syntax, semantics, and the lexicon (this last presumably the repository of all special information from the other domains). While even a cursory inspection of the enormous literature on clitics – a literature so extensive I do not even try to list significant publications here – proves this description an apt one, it is important to observe that the idiosyncrasies of clitics all seem to go in the same direction, i.e., a negative one. Zec (2009), in her review of Anderson (2005), puts it thus:

“What emerges from this vast body of work is that clitics are more easily characterized by what they are not, than by what they are. Elements referred to as clitics systematically defy the general distributional and other principles that otherwise hold in the grammar. But while the phonology and syntax of clitics appears to be unlike the phonology and syntax of other linguistic elements, there are no obvious phonological or syntactic properties that uniquely characterize the class of clitics.”

movement of phrases as heads (cf., e.g., Bošković 2001, 2002, this volume) and a morphology which countenances fusion of heads, as well as other manipulations of their features, the question of when a clitic becomes an affix remains a vexed one. See Franks (2009) for the claim that pronominal clitics have evolved into object agreement markers in Macedonian.

2. To paraphrase Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart’s famous test for identifying pornography, we know a clitic when we see it.

3. Bošković (this volume: Section 4.1) regards this possibility as a type of rare “mismatch,” since it goes against the “preference for a prosodic word to correspond to a syntactic constituent.”
While perfectly true, I think there is a way of understanding what clitics are that (loosely) unifies them as a class of vocabulary items. What follows is an attempt to articulate this, at each point by characterizing clitics in terms of what they cannot do. I start in Section 2 with the prosodic deficiency, also devoting the most space to its exegesis.

2. The prosodic deficiency

As noted, the most canonical property of clitics is that they lack stress. Anderson (2005:23) states this as in (1):

(1) Phonological Clitic: A linguistic element whose phonological form is deficient in that it lacks prosodic structure at the level of the (Prosodic) Word.

This is however clearly not a surface property, as clitics can be stressed if they find themselves in the right surface configuration. Anderson (2005:24) mentions (Modern) Greek δοσε-μυτο ‘Give it to me!’ , with stress on the clitic μυ ‘me’. As Anderson notes, although the clitic status of μυ ‘me’ “seems to be compromised by the fact that it has an accent,” stress “is assigned not to the clitic per se, but rather to the larger word” containing the clitic, and by the regular rules of Greek prosodification. Thus one probably does not want to say that clitics lack prosodic structure, but rather that they are unfooted on their own. A segment must be [+syllabic] to project a syllabic nucleus, but not all nuclei can support a stress-bearing syllable. Like the initial reduced syllable of American English affect or effect, we can say clitics, as a lexical property, are unfooted. Ultimately, they attach to a prosodically normal element, i.e., to one over which metrical structure is built. To push the foot metaphor, without their own feet they cannot stand on their own. Another way to think of this is that canonical clitics are words which cannot project prosodic feet:

(2) The Prosodic Deficiency: Clitics cannot project prosodic feet.

Clitics are thus vocabulary items which lack what it takes actually to pronounce them. In a phonological sense, clitics can be understood as “minimal.”

---

4. The stress in this Greek example, perhaps more accurately translated ‘Gimmeit!’ , has been adjusted to reflect comments in Anderson (2011) that the rule which places stress on the clitic also causes the lexical stress on δοσε ‘give!’ to reduce to secondary. An anonymous reviewer comments that the more common Greek parsing is δοσε μυτο, the two options evoking similar alternants described for Bulgarian (Bg) in Footnote 8.
2.1 Some stressed clitics in South Slavic

Slightly closer to home, the surface vacuity of (1) is similarly demonstrated in Balkan Slavic. Standard Macedonian (Mac) exhibits fixed antepenultimate stress,\(^5\) so if the sequence of clitics is long enough one of them can fall within the stress window. This is difficult but not impossible to construct:\(^6\)

\[
(3) \quad \text{Kamo} = \text{me}_{\text{OBL}} \text{ti}_{\text{OBL}} \text{go} = \text{?}
\]

where me\(\text{OBL}\) you\(\text{OBL}\) it\(\text{OBJ}\)

'Where did that thing of yours get to on me?'

An alternative and far more productive method of accomplishing this is to over-ride the extrametricality of the final syllable, leading to Greek-style penultimate stress. As discussed in Franks (1987, 1989), final extrametricality is blocked when the host word is monosyllabic:

\[
(4) \quad \text{Ne} = \text{mu}_{\text{OBL}} \text{go} = \text{dal}.
\]

neg him\(\text{OBL}\) it\(\text{OBJ}\) gave

'He has not given it to him.'

It will be noted that the direction of cliticization indicated in (3) and (4) differs. This is because, in Mac, pronominal and auxiliary clitics are not specified for directionality – they can be supported by a host on either side. Indeed, the local decisions to opt for \(\text{mu}=\) and \(\text{go}=\) in (4) were driven by the fact that \(\text{ne}=\) is proclitic and \(\text{dal}\) is not a clitic at all. A fairer representation would be not to take a stand, and just use a ligature such as \(\text{ne}^{\sim} \text{mu}^{\sim} \text{go}^{\sim} \text{dal}\), rather than speculate about internal prosodic structure. Consider also (5), in which the interrogative \(\text{sto}\) 'what' is not normally a clitic:

\[
(5) \quad \text{\v{S}to} = \text{bi}_{\text{MOD}} \text{mu} = \text{zel} = ?
\]

what \(\text{MOD}\) it\(\text{OBJ}\) took

'What should he take from him?'

Here one could alternatively have used \(\text{bi}=\) instead of \(\text{sto}=\). Once again, for Mac at least, the neutral representation \(\text{sto}^{\sim} \text{bi}^{\sim} \text{mu}^{\sim} \text{zel}\) might be more appropriate.

---

5. This could be a variant of the Greek system, in that in Mac the trochaic foot is built at the right edge only after the final syllable has been marked as extrametrical; cf., e.g., Franks (1987, 1989).

6. Clitics are italicized in examples, with cliticization represented by “=” on the appropriate side. Stress is only indicated where relevant. Given the impoverished case systems of Mac and Bg, I gloss historical dative as “oblique” and historical accusative as “objective.” This and other Mac examples here are due to Koneski (1976).

7. Along with future proclitic \(k\), the hypothetical marker \(bi\) has become invariant in Mac, distinguishing these from their conjugating counterparts in Bg and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (BCS).
In Bulgarian too, clitics can end up bearing stress. The clitic version of (6a) is (6b), with the nominal arguments replaced by clitics:

(6) a. Az dadox tortata na učenikât.
    I gave cake to student
    ‘I gave the cake to the student.’

b. Az $mu= ja= dádox$.
    I him it gave
    ‘I gave him it.’

The clitics are incorporated into the P(rosodic)-word headed by dadox ‘gave’, but this does not affect the stress of the resulting $mu= ja= dádox$. An interesting thing happens however when (6b) is negated:

(7) Áz ne= mú= ja= dádox.
    I neg him it gave
    ‘I did not give him it.’

Since Bg ne in (7) is post-stressing, the clitic mu ends up stressed. This once again shows that what is prosodically special about a clitic such as mu is not that it cannot in principle bear stress, but rather that as a vocabulary item it lacks the structural basis for any independent stress. What these examples all demonstrate is that, once a clitic becomes part of a larger P-word, the fact that it was a clitic becomes irrelevant.

Slovenian (Slvn) displays an even more dramatic possibility: not only can clitics end up bearing stress, but they can also be pronounced without a prosodic host at all. First, although the syntax of pronominal and auxiliary clitics in Slvn is comparable to that of BCS, as in Mac they are not restricted in terms direction of prosodic support.

Marušič and Žaucer (2015) also note this, stating that in neutral contexts clitics are proclitic. That is, they much prefer to attach to their right as in their (8a). According to Lanko Marušič (pers. comm.), the prosodic parsing in (8b) is however also possible, although it “sounds slightly unnatural”.

---

8. According to Iliyana Krapova (pers. comm.), there is a secondary stress on dadox ‘gave’ here. This is similar to what happens to Greek; cf. Footnote 4. If primary stress is retained on dadox, then the parsing becomes ne= mú ja= dádox, with two P-words. We shall see in the next section that this is relevant to the placement of li.

9. In Section 2.3 below I will argue that directionality per se never need be specified.

10. Rok Žaucer (pers. comm.) is dubious about a preference for prosodic grouping here, and if anything has the opposite intuition about which parsing might be preferred. On the other hand, such variation might reflect syntactic structure. If, for example, the adverb is a topic, an anonymous reviewer points out that “we actually expect proclisis to be much more natural, as typically there is a prosodic gap between the topic and the rest of the sentence.” Whatever
The following Slvn examples illustrate the possibility, unknown in BCS (cf., e.g., Bošković 2001), of starting with a clitic after various types of heavy constituent which necessarily induce a **prosodic break**:

(9) a. ‘Počival =bom!‘ je= rekel!
\[\text{rest fut}_{1SG} \text{ aux}_{3SG} \text{ said} \]
“I am going to have a rest!” he said.’

b. Ko= \[\text{aux}_{1SG} \text{ refl} \text{ awoke} \text{ aux}_{1SG} \text{ lay on bed} \]
‘When I awoke, I was lying in bed.’

c. Moj prijatelj Peter Košenina je= velik junak.
\[\text{my friend Peter Koshenina aux}_{3SG} \text{ big hero} \]
‘My friend Peter Koshenina is a big hero.’

In the BCS versions of these sentences the **auxiliary clitic** would appear one word to the right of where it does in Slvn, i.e., \[\text{rekao je in (9a), ležala sam in (9b), and velik je in (9c)}.\]

The flexible nature of the Slvn clitic can be seen particularly in (9a), where \[\text{bom is enclitic and je is proclitic}.\] This means that, unlike BCS, Slvn allows clitics in absolute initial position. This situation is often created by **ellipsis**. Thus, in (10a) and (10b) the Yes/No question particle \[\text{ali is deleted, and in (10c) the expletive to is presumably missing in the front of the sentence}.\]

(10) a. \[\text{Si= ga= videl? aux}_{2SG} \text{ him}_{ACC} \text{ saw} \]
‘Have you seen him?’

---

11. Examples are drawn from Franks (2010) and the references acknowledged therein. Those in (9) were originally cited by Bennett (1986:7)

12. As discussed in Section 2.2, this is because in BCS clitics cannot be initial in their Intonational Phrase, thus the next lower copy (or occurrence) must be pronounced. Slvn lacks this restriction. For discussion see Golden & Milojević-Sheppard (2000), as well as Bošković (2001) and Franks (2000, 2011).

13. The (unmarked) order is **smejal se mi je**, as in BCS. My point is that ellipsis of material to the left of the clitics does not cause a problem in Slvn, hence (10c) can survive in that language, but not in BCS (given the restriction in the previous footnote).
b. \( \text{Se} = \text{je} = \text{Rajko res poročil?} \)  
\( \text{REFL} \text{aux}_{3SG} \text{Rajko really married} \)  
‘Did Rajko really get married?’

c. \( \text{Se} = \text{mi} = \text{je} = \text{smejal.} \)  
\( \text{REFL} \text{me}_{DAT} \text{aux}_{3SG} \text{laughed} \)  
‘He was laughing at me.’

Comparable sentences with initial clitics are not permissible in BCS.

The most interesting aspect of Slvn clitics is however surely this: not only can they tolerate silence to their left and, as expected, to their right, but they can even tolerate silence on both sides at the same time. That is, in addition to the kinds of ellipsis in (10), VP ellipsis can independently remove the material following the clitics. This should of course strand them prosodically, resulting in PF ineffability. But that is not what happens, as demonstrated by the examples in (11), cited by Priestly (1993:429):  

(11) a. \( \text{Si že končal delo? Predvčerajšnjim še nè,} \)  
\( \text{AUX}_{2SG} \text{already finished work day-before-yesterday still NEG} \)  
\( \text{včeraj pa sem gà.} \)  
\( \text{yesterday but AUX}_{1SG} \text{him}_{ACC} \)  
‘Have you finished the work?’ ‘The day before yesterday I didn’t, but yesterday I did (finish it).’

b. (Ali) \( \text{se} \) dobro počutiš? Jà, \( \text{sè}. \)  
\( \text{Q REF} \text{good feel yes REF} \)  
‘Do you feel well?’ ‘Yes, I do (feel well).’

In (11a) the clitic ga is stressed, as is otherwise proclitic ne, and in (11b) se is. Crucially, however, although tonic these do not become the corresponding full forms njega and sebe.

An additional and particularly instructive paradigm is given in (12):

(12) a. \( \text{Ali si si to izmisil?} \)  
\( \text{Q AUX}_{2SG} \text{REFL}_{DAT} \text{this thought-up} \)  
‘Did you think this up for yourself?’

b. \( \text{Si si izmisil?} \)

c. \( \text{Si sì?} \)

Example (12b) is simply derived through deletion of ali, so that the clitics become proclitic, but (12c) involves VP ellipsis, hence the second (dative) si must bear the

14. In (11)–(14) the unexpectedly stressed clitic is in boldface font. Also, given its flexibility, in these examples I do not attempt to indicate direction of cliticization.
stress, although once again it is not the full form sebi. Moreover, this stressed si seems to provide a host for the unstressed auxiliary clitic si that precedes it.

One might suspect, since stress is the only thing that distinguishes full from clitic auxiliary forms in Slvn,\textsuperscript{15} that auxiliary si in (12c) is really underlingly the tonic form (despite the surface fact that it lacks stress here), which could then provide a host for the dative clitic. This conjecture is however easily shown to be false. One can construct comparable examples based solely on pronominal clitics, as shown in (13).

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(13)] a. Ali\textit{ mu ga} daješ?
\hspace{2em}Q\,\textit{ him}\textsubscript{DAT} it\textsubscript{ACC} give
\hspace{2em} ‘Are you giving him it?’
\item[(13)] b.\textit{ Mu gà}.
\hspace{2em} ‘(Yes, I am giving) him it.’
\end{enumerate}

Since the full forms of the pronominal forms are segmentally distinct in Slvn, it would make no sense to contend that \textit{mu} in (13) supports \textit{ga}. In addition, as we have seen, a pronominal clitic can even stand on its own, so that in (11b) the affirmation could simply be the (accusative) reflexive clitic sè. Some final illustrations of this sort of contextually dependent VP-ellipsis, also from \textcite{Priestly} (1993: 437–38), are given in (14):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(14)] a. …\textit{Zdi se mi da gà}.
\hspace{2em} …seems \textit{ refl me}\textsubscript{DAT} c \textit{ him}\textsubscript{ACC}
\hspace{2em} ‘[Do you understand your neighbor now?] I think that I (understand) him.’
\item[(14)] b. …\textit{Da, zakáj jo jè}? …\textit{yes why her}\textsubscript{ACC} \textit{aux3SG}
\hspace{2em} ‘[And why did he stab Clementina more than once?] Yes, why did he (stab) her?’
\item[(14)] c. …\textit{Sàj sem gà}.
\hspace{2em} …\textit{but aux1SG it}\textsubscript{ACC}
\hspace{2em} ‘[You’re beaming as if you had won the jackpot.] But I have (won) it.’
\end{enumerate}

All these examples clearly demonstrate that clitics can end up bearing stress. What is crucial about them is a lexical fact, the prosodic deficiency stated in (2) that

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. also Slvn and BCS clitic \textit{nas}, \textit{vas} ‘us,’ ‘you’ versus segmentally identical but tonic \textit{nàs}, \textit{vàs} (BCS nàs, vàs). The view I will espouse in Section 4 is that the latter, although featurally identical, are phrasal in structure, and it is their phrasal status that precludes prosodic clitic status. Segmentally identical tonic and clitic forms are fairly common in West Slavic pronominal systems as well; consider the confusion between clitic and full forms in Polish discussed in Franks & King (2000: sec. 3.3).
they do not project their own prosodic feet thus cannot have any lexically represented stress, nor can they be the target of the regular stress rules of the language. Typically, they surface by attaching to an adjacent P-word, in which case they may then accidentally come to be stressed. What about the Slvn construction just discussed, in which ellipsis on both sides leaves the clitics completely stranded, with no potential host? Here it looks like a “lexical” clitic (i.e., an element that lacks word-level prosodic structure as a lexical property) can acquire such structure if forced. I suggest that there is a last resort PF rule in Slvn that, on encountering an I(ntonational)-Phrase which contains no footed syllables, imposes a special prosodic structure, placing default stress on the final element.16 This rule is possibly also at work in imposing stress on Slvn clitics when they fall outside the cluster, for those speakers who employ such a strategy.

2.2 Non-initiality: A further prosodic deficiency

As articulated above, clitics are words which are incapable of doing something normal words can. They are in some way defective, and this deficiency can manifest itself in various ways. In addition to the core prosodic deficiency of not projecting a word tree of their own, there is another aspect alluded to in the last section. This is the restriction against being initial (in some prosodic domain).

Clearly, no such restriction holds in Slvn: the clitics in (9) immediately follow the I-phrase boundary with abandon. In BCS, on the other hand, there is a prohibition against being initial in the I-phrase, stated as follows:17

(15) Prosodic Restriction_{I-phrase}: Clitics cannot initiate an I-phrase.

[BCS, but not Slvn]

Thus, as discussed in Bošković (2001 and elsewhere), Franks (2010, 2011, and elsewhere), in BCS lower copies of clitics are pronounced instead. That is, in BCS, but not in Slvn, the inability to start an I-phrase causes “clitic third” or what I have called “delayed clitic placement”: whenever offending clitics are left by the syntax at the beginning of their I-phrase, we encounter them in lower than second position. Consider for example appositives which, because they constitute independent I-phrases, must be followed by an intonational break. An oft-cited paradigm

16. As observed by an anonymous reviewer, this analysis supports the view that prosodic requirements are on prosodic domains, rather than on clitics per se.

17. While this generally holds of pronominal and auxiliary clitics throughout BCS, changes are taking place, regionally and probably lexically too. Some Croatian speakers report allowing clitics at the beginning of their I-phrase, and use of initial third singular auxiliary je seems to be spreading throughout the BCS area.
is given in (16). In (16a) the clitics sam ti are prosodically adjoined to the P-word to their left, ja 'I', which projects: [ω [ω ja] sam ti]. In (16b), however, tvoja mama 'your mother' is an appositive, hence induces delayed pronunciation of sam ti:

(16) a. [ι [ω [ω Ja] sam ti] [ω obećala] sams ti [ω igračku]].
   I AUX1SG youDAT promised toyACC
   'I promised you a toy.'

b. [ι [ω Ja]], [ι [ω tvoja] [ω mama]], [sams ti [[ω obećala] sam ti] [ω igračku]].
   'I, your mother, promised you a toy.'

The higher copy of the clitics cannot be pronounced, because this would make them initial in their I-phrase; instead, a lower copy is realized. Heavy fronted constituents, to the extent that they are parsed as independent I-phrases, have the same effect. Consider (17) and (18), from Bošković (2001:67–68):

(17) a. [ι Tvome prijatelju [ι su [ω prodali] su] knjigu].
   yourDAT friendDAT sold AUX3PL bookACC
   'To your friend, they sold the book.'

b. [ι [ω Tvome] [ω prijatelju] su] prodali su knjigu

(18) a. [ι Njegovom najboljem prijatelju [ι su [ω prodali] hisDAT bestDAT friendDAT sold
   su] knjigu].
   AUX3PL bookACC
   'To his best friend, they sold the book.'

b. *Njegovom najboljem prijatelju su prodali knjigu.

In (17) the clitics are pronounced lower when the topicalized phrase tvome prijatelju 'your friend' constitutes a separate I-phrase, but not when it does not. In (18), according to Bošković, the fronted constituent njegovom najboljem prijatelju 'his best friend' is too heavy not to be parsed as its own I-phrase, hence (18b) is impossible.

Examples such as those in (9) confirm that nothing like (15) is operative in Slvn. In that language, the right order would be as in (18b). A minimal pair with (16b) can be found in its Slovenian translation, cited by Golden and Milojević Sheppard (2000):

---

18. Unpronounced copies are represented in outline font. Here and below, “i” is used to label the I-phrase and “ω” is used to label a P-word. Prosodic adjunction can then target prosodic units, as in the examples below.

19. Henceforth I do not employ the “=” notation, since prosodic structure obviates the traditional need to stipulate direction of cliticization.
Clitics are/become Minimal(ist)

There being no prohibition against these clitics initiating an I-phrase in Slvn, it is possible – hence necessary – to pronounce the highest copy of \( \text{sem } ti \) rather than any lower one. These clitics thus adjoin to \( \text{obljubila} \) 'promised' to produce \( \omega \text{ sem ti obljubila} \).

The Slavic Yes/No particle \( li \) is constrained by non-initiality in a smaller domain, that of the P-word. This is stated in (20), which holds of all Slavic languages that make use of this element, including BCS, Mac, Bg, and Russian.

(20) **Prosodic Restriction**\(_{\text{P-word}}\): Clitics cannot initiate a P-word. \([li]\)

In other words, the vocabulary item \( li \) has, as an idiosyncratic property, the additional deficiency that it cannot begin the P-word to which it belongs.\(^{20}\) To see how this works, let us consider the effects of (20) in Bg.

Assume that \( li \), which I will gloss as “Q,” merges in \( \text{C}^0 \), so that it should, by virtue of asymmetrically c-commanding them, precede all the terminals dominated by its sister TP.\(^{21}\) If \( li \) is preceded by a P-word – as in (21), where \( v \text{ tozi grad} 'to this city' \) has moved to SpecCP – then it adjoins prosodically to that P-word and nothing more need be said:\(^{22}\)

---

20. An anonymous reviewer wonders why the Utterance (discussed immediately below) could not be the relevant domain for \( li \). Indeed, whatever set of prosodic units one adopts, these are necessarily nested in that each prosodic unit is exhaustively composed of a sequence of constituents at the next level down. This is the “Strict Layer Hypothesis” of Selkirk (1984) and Nespor and Vogel (1986). Hence, any vocabulary item which cannot be initial in its P-word also cannot be initial in its I-phrase or Utterance, and any that cannot be initial in its I-phrase also cannot be initial in its Utterance. Consideration in this article of evidence bearing on what the correct domain is for specific vocabulary items in specific languages would however take us too far afield.

21. Here I adopt without further comment Kayne’s (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA) to implement linearization, which crucially applies before any prosodically motivated adjustments. Also, I put aside the possibility that \( li \), which is also a focus marker, might be in Foc\(^0\) instead, since either way it will c-command everything in TP. See Franks (2006) for specific proposals about the placement and behavior of \( li \) in Bg.

22. Note that for me the relevant requirement is simply that \( li \) not be initial in its P-word, whether or not – contra Bošković (2001) – that P-word is right-adjacent to an I-phrase boundary. See Franks (2006) for much additional support for this conclusion.
If, however, SpecCP is empty, then li comes up against (20) and is forced to find prosodic support to its right. Just how li does this is a contentious matter, but, as demonstrated below, its ultimate position clearly takes into account PF information. 23

Recall from example (7) that Bg ne is post-stressing. Thus, ne mü constitutes an autonomous P-word, but li, linearized by the syntax to precede ne mu, must be pronounced after it in (22) in order to respect its lexical requirement in (20):

(22) [ω [ω Ne mü li] dade knigata. 
   NEG himOBL Q gave bookDEF 
   ‘Didn’t she/he/you give him the book?’

Even more striking, given the discussion around (7), is the observation that if another clitic is added (e.g., by replacing knigata ‘the book’ in (22) with ja ‘it’), then li ends up between them:

(23) [ω [ω Ne mü li] [ω ja [ω dade]]. 
   NEG himOBL Q itOBJ gave 
   ‘Didn’t she/he/you give him it?’

The fact that nothing else can ever split the pronominal clitic group in Bg – i.e., there is no syntactic space between them – confirms the purely prosodic nature of the positioning of li; cf., e.g., Bošković (2001, this volume) or Franks (2006, 2010, 2011).

The same effect is well known for Russian li, with the added proviso that, following Stepanov’s (1998) observations about wh-movement in Russian, nothing in that language ever moves to SpecCP. Fronted phrases are thus to the right of li, stranding it in initial position, hence splitting is obligatory. Here is a telling example, from Rudnitskaya (2000: 350):

(24) Kartinu li van Goga MoMA priobrel?
   paintingACC Q van GoghGEN MoMA NOM acquired 
   ‘Was it a painting by van Gogh that MoMA acquired (or one by Matisse)?’

23. While as explained below (cf. also Footnote 27) I opt for prosodically conditioned (re)linearization, the literature is replete with alternative technical solutions to the positioning of li that do not (re)adjust linear order on the PF side of Spell-out. These include scattered deletion (of material in copies of the verbal complex both preceding and following li, since li itself does not move hence has no copies to exploit), as in Bošković 2001, and last resort movement, either raising of some substructure of the verbal complex, as proposed by Mišeska-Tomić (1996 and elsewhere) or li-lowering, as discussed by Rivero (1993).
Even with *van Goga* contrastively focused, *li* cannot occur after it. Instead, the LCA linearizes *li* to precede everything else, since it is in C₀. Later, when prosodic structure is imposed, *li* is adjoined to the prosodic word *kartinu* and, in accordance with (20), it is pronounced to its right: [ω [ω *kartinu*] *li*].

Finally, pronominal and verbal auxiliary clitics in Bg are constrained by non-initiality in a larger domain in the Prosodic Hierarchy, that of Nespor and Vogel’s (1986) Utterance. This is stated in (25):

(25) **Prosodic Restriction**

In Franks (2010, 2011) I argue that Bg pronominal and auxiliary clitics (except for future marker *šte*, which is not constrained by (25)), are prosodically proclitic, unless that would cause them to violate the restriction in (25). This gives rise to the famous “Tobler–Mussafia” (TM) effect, according to which, if the clitics would end up in absolute initial position, they must then follow the verb instead. Compare (26b) with (26a):

(26) a. Včera v gradinata Mila sigurno mu gi dade. yesterday in garden*DEF* Mila surely him*OBL* them*OBJ* gave ‘Yesterday, in the garden, Mila surely gave him them.’

   b. Dade *mu gi* včera. gave him*OBL* them*OBJ* yesterday ‘(She/he/you) gave them to him yesterday.’

These Bg clitics are clearly subject to a prohibition against being initial. However, the domain of that restriction, although still prosodic, is not the I–phrase (as it is in BCS), but rather the Utterance. This is demonstrated by the fact that these clitics can appear at the beginning of an I-phrase with abandon:

---

24. Here I disagree with the claim in Bošković (this volume) that these are “prosodically parsed as enclitics, i.e., hosted by the element that precedes them.” Recall (6b), prosodically parsed as *az mu* *ja dadox* rather than *az* *mu* *ja dadox*. Similarly, the parsing in (26a) is *sigurno mu gi* *dade* and not *sigurno* *mu gi* *dade*.

25. I put aside situations in which there is no finite verb. Hauge (1999: 196) comments that the clitics “occur as enclitics only … with hosts that are nominal and adverbial verb forms (participles and gerunds), and with the presentatives … *eto, ej, and ná*.” I believe this to be a matter of syntax, not prosody, since similar facts hold even in Mac, which lacks the prosodic non-initiality restriction. That is, the host c-commands the clitics and, by the LCA, is linearized to precede them. Once again, there is no need to invoke directionality *per se*.

26. The symbol “υ” is used to label the Utterance.
Crucially, the clitics *mi go* are initial in their I-phrase but not in the Utterance, showing that the operative principle is (25) rather than (15). Additional examples that confirm this follow, with (28c) due to Rudin (2007):

(28)  

a. Ivan, spored Marija, go viždam vseki den.  
   Ivan according-to Maria himObj see1sg every day  
   ‘Ivan, according to Maria, I see (him) every day.’

b. Sled kato si živjal dosta s edna žena, ja  
   after aux2sg lived enough with one woman herobj  
   poznavaš mnogo dobre.  
   know2sg very well  
   ‘After you have lived with a woman long enough, you know her very well.’

c. Koj(to) kakvoto e polučil, si go  
   who(ever) whatever aux3sg received reflobl himobj  
   e zaslužil.  
   aux3sg earned.  
   ‘Whoever has received whatever, he has earned it.’

None of these orders would be acceptable in BCS, since the clitics appear at the beginning of their I-phrase, although as we have seen they are fine in Slvn, where clitics are subject to neither (15) nor (25). Mac is comparable to Slvn in this regard, hence it shows no TM effects, thus instead of Bg (26b) we find (29) in Mac:

(29)  

*Mu gi dade včera.*  
himobl themobj gave yesterday  
‘(She/he/you) gave them to him yesterday.’

Indeed, (26b) is unacceptable in Mac, just as (29) is in Bg; cf. Franks (2009) for detailed comparison of pronominal clitics in these two languages.

2.3 Against **directionality**

We have seen in this section that pronominal and auxiliary clitics in Slvn and Mac can adjoin to a P-word in either direction. Moreover, the additional lexical deficiencies which certain clitics display, summarized in (30), conspire to force them to appear to the right of their host under certain prosodic conditions.
What this means is that ostensible specification of directionality for prosodic support is never a property of vocabulary items; instead apparent enforced enclisis follows from a ban on their initiating some prosodic domain.

Of course, which items obey which restrictions, if any, remains stipulative; ultimately it would be desireable to derive their deficiencies from independent aspects of their behavior. Here, however, I put aside this research question of how the prosodic restrictions displayed by particular (classes of) clitics might correlate with their syntax and/or morphological properties, and turn to a brief summary of the mechanics I have in mind. Clitics are in whatever position the syntax places them, possibly along lines briefly outlined in Section 4 below. As described in Franks (2011), Spell-out then initially linearizes them to proceed all the terminals they c-command, in keeping with Kayne's LCA. Later, when prosodification is imposed, the clitics prosodically adjoin to an adjacent P-word. This adjunction must however respect the restrictions in (30), which sometimes means that the LCA-based linear precedence is erased (or more likely is no longer even accessible as such) and the sequence relinearized on the basis of prosody. To take a specific example, consider Bg (26b). The LCA orders the clitics to precede the verb, which is how things remain in Bg (26a), as well as in Mac (29), neither of which come up against (30c). The result is then prosodified as in (27), with the clitics attached at the beginning of the prosodic word ([ω mi go [ω da.de]]), which is itself prosodified as the initial P-word in its I-phrase, which is itself prosodified within a larger Utterance; cf. Footnote 19 and the Strict Layer Hypothesis. In Bg (26b), on the other hand, since the pronominal clitics cannot initiate the Utterance, the local precedence relationship between them and the verb is erased and a new order compatible with (30c) is imposed. This scenario is sketched in (31).27

27. The reanalysis represented in (32b) is reminiscent of Halpern's (1995) “Prosodic Inversion,” although I conceive of it as imposing a new linear order rather than literal PF movement. As an alternative one might imagine that Spell-out linearization involves competition between various desiderata, including both the general LCA and specific lexical exigencies as in (30), the implementation of which follows the Paninian principle that the specific overrules the general. Still, I would want linearization to be an iterated process, in order to get the clitics to follow li in Bg (i):

(i) Dala li si mu gi?
gave Q AUX2SG himOBL themOBJ
‘Did you give him them?’
There is thus, I contend, no need to specify whether these elements are proclitic or enclitic, as in what Werle (2009) calls the traditional subcategorization approach of Klavans (1985) and many others. It would be conceptually desirable for such stipulations to be universally eschewed, although of course (30) – the inability to demarcate the beginning of a new prosodic unit – is still in need of explanation. And potential problems remain, especially so far as canonical proclitics are concerned, because these cannot be handled by a prohibition against being initial. Why can’t they ever be enclitic, as se je can in Slvn (8b)? Since, in my view, the inability to initiate a prosodic domain is the only kind of restriction that can be imposed, the fact that elements such as negative ne, the future markers šte and ke, in Bg and Mac respectively, or atonic prepositions such as the po of po rokah ‘over hands’ in Slvn (8), are invariably proclitic must derive from their syntactic position (together with their lexical property of not projecting any prosodic feet).

Here in a nutshell is the idea. The element ne heads a NegP, while šte and ke head a TP, and po a PP. All are clitics in the sense of (2), but they are not subject to any of (30). Like li, they are “simple” clitics in the sense of Zwicky (1977), in that they display no idiosyncrasies beyond their prosodic deficiencies; these can be opposed to his “special” clitics, which have special syntactic properties. Unlike such (declining) pronouns and (conjugating) verbal auxiliaries, simple clitics are not paradigmatic so have no reason to move for feature checking/valuation, hence are pronounced wherever they are generated. Why then do they form a P-word with the material that follows rather than precedes them? The reason, following insights of Selkirk (1995, 2011) among others, has I contend to do with their syntactic constituency, which in turn reflects their semantic scope: ne, the future clitics, and prepositions both merge with and scope over what follows them. They are however in no relation whatsoever with what precedes them. They thus prosodify
to reflect this, adjoining to the P-word to their right, i.e., the initial P-word of their syntactic complement. That is, in the spirit of Selkirk’s (2011) Match Theory, in mapping syntactic phrasing into prosodic phrasing canonical correspondences should be exploited, everything else being equal. With the sequence včeraj se je Janez in Slvn (8b), on the other hand, the clitics se je have moved to a position between včeraj ‘yesterday’ and Janez, hence are not in construction with adjacent material in either direction. They are in principle free to adjoin to either adjacent P-word, in the spirit of interface constraint approaches such as that of Werle (2009), “whereby prosodic structures are built according to general constraints on their well-formedness, and on their interface to syntactic structures.”

3. The semantic deficiency

The kinds of things that can be prosodic clitics are those which supply grammatical rather than substantive information. This is a traditional observation, echoed in Sadock’s (1991: 112) comment that:

“… clitics always seem to represent closed lexical classes. They are frequently encountered among determiners, auxiliary verbs, prepositions, complementizers, conjunctions, and pronouns, but I have no good examples of clitic main verbs, clitic nouns, or clitic adjectives.”

While Sadock simply states this idea as a “Law of Clitics,” the fact takes on special significance in light of generative grammar’s division between functional and lexical categories: only the former can be clitics. The idea that pronominal clitics are functional heads and that their syntax should therefore be assimilated to that of other functional heads was to my knowledge first laid out in Sportiche (1996). I further contend that anything which expresses purely grammatical information can in principle (i.e., in some language) be a clitic, but nothing which expresses lexical information can (in any language).

Hence, the second deficiency is one that differentiates mu ‘him< obl >’ and ja ‘it< obj >’ in Bg (6b) from na učenikât ‘to student< def >’ and tortata ‘cake< def >’ in (6a): the former are closed class grammatical elements, while the latter are open class and contentful. This means that whereas ja can be exhaustively defined as “3rd singular feminine objective,” i.e., as an amalgam of person-number-gender and case features, tortata cannot. While tortata has these grammatical (or formal) features (and indeed, for ja to be able to refer to tortata it must share them), it also has lexical meaning. Hence, this distinction has both a semantic and a morphological aspect: the meaning of a clitic is such that it can be represented exclusively in terms of grammatical features. A clitic is hence a kind of grammatical morpheme, akin
to inflection (although of course syntactically independent, as discussed in the next section). This second deficiency, that only functional categories can be clitics, is expressed in (32):

(32) The **Semantic Deficiency**: Clitics **cannot** instantiate **lexico-conceptual features**.

Once again, clitics are words which are unable to do something that other words can. They are minimal linguistic elements in terms of what meanings they can express.

An anonymous reviewer points out that (32) follows if clitics do not have roots. In keeping with standard **Distributed Morphology** claims, roots are category-neutral and only receive their part-of-speech in the course of the computation, by virtue of combining with a categorizing head. Thus, if clitics lack roots, then they cannot have part-of-speech either. Of course, however, not everything that has the property in (32) is a clitic in the prosodic sense. On the one hand, many elements that are purely functional are affixal morphemes, and on the other hand there are full counterparts to clitics that do not seem to differ in their grammatical features. That is, Slvn *sem* must be distinguished from the 1st singular -*m* ending of a conjugated verb (such as *srečam* ‘I meet’ in (33c)), and *ga* must be distinguished not just from a noun with lexico-conceptual features, such as *prijatelja* in (33b), but also from the (apparently) featurally comparable long form *njega* in (33c):

(33) a. Na ulici *sem ga* srečal.  
   on street aux 1SG himACC met  
   ‘I met him on the street.’

b. Na ulici *sem* srečal prijatelja.  
   on street aux 1SG met friendACC  
   ‘I met a friend on the street.’

c. Na ulici srečam njega.  
   on street meet1SG HIMACC  
   ‘I will meet HIM on the street.’

Being purely grammatical thus makes an element a candidate for prosodic clitic status, but does not ensure it.

3.1 Some extensions

As with the prosodic deficiency, it is possible for clitics to have additional featural defects. One popular idea, due to Béjar and Řezáč (2003), is that **PCC effects** arise from a locality restriction on **Agree** which constrains the licensing of **person features** on clitic pronouns. Building on their insights, Stegovec (this volume, 2015)
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proposes that clitics can have unvalued person features and that the values come from an associated functional head.\(^{31}\) This deficiency induces so-called “Person Case Constraint” (PCC) effects – which, Stegovec shows, really have nothing to do with case. Let us, following Runić (2013), adopt Halles’s (1997) \([\pm \text{Participant}]\) and \([\pm \text{Author}]\) system:\(^{32}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(34) a.} & \quad \text{3rd person is not specified for PERSON} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{2nd person is PERSON – [PARTICIPANT]} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{1st person is PERSON – [PARTICIPANT, AUTHOR]}
\end{align*}
\]

In the standard Slvn described by Stegovec (this volume), 1st or 2nd person must precede 3rd person and, in addition, 1st and 2nd person clitics cannot cooccur; the reader is referred to his examples (15a–c). This is the “strong” PCC. It is also shown by Stegovec (and the literature he cites) that 1st/2nd person are valued, but 3rd person arises by default – it is the absence of PERS features.\(^{33}\) Assuming, as he does, that minimality forces the highest (=first) clitic to be the one which gets its PERS features set, we can posit the deficiency in (35) for Slvn:\(^{34}\)

\[
\text{(35) Semantic Restriction}_{\text{Person}}: \text{The clitic may not have features for PERS.} \\
\text{[“strong” Slvn]}
\]

A probe with \([\pm \text{Participant}]\) (whether or not also specified as \([\pm \text{Author}]\)) will then value the highest PERS it encounters; any additional clitics can thus only end up as default 3rd person.

31. Stegovec, following Béjar and Řezáč (2003), employs \(v\) (rather than, say, Agr or Asp) for this purpose.

32. I prefer to think of these as privative features which elaborate PERSON. Also, since only a participant can be an author, there is an obvious markedness relationship here; a deeper explanation for the hierarchy in (34) will surely lie in discourse models which embody notions such as “point of view.” For an early interesting discussion of the ontology of person prominence, see Wierbicka (1981). More recently, Charnavel and Mateu (2015) also hypothesize that PCC effects are due to perspective conflicts, which “arise in the presence of IO clitics because dative clitics are inherently logophoric, i.e. they always encode a point of view.” (Thanks to Adrian Stegovec for drawing their work to my attention.)

33. The idea that 1st/2nd forms bear a morphological specification for person, while 3rd do not, is a traditional one; cf., e.g., Rivero (2005), who uses this contrast to derive a variety of special 3rd person auxiliary properties in Bg.

34. Weak pronouns (in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke 1999) may also respect (35): compare English show me ’em with ?*show ’em me (vs. show me to them). Note that lack of person specification can hold even though weak pronouns arguably do not display the syntactic deficiency of Section 4.
This accommodates traditional PCC effects, but, like the facultative prosodic restrictions in (30), one encounters interesting cross-linguistic variation. Runić (2013) points out, for example, that in BCS 1st person is opposed to both 2nd and 3rd. Her example (36) shows that 3rd person can precede 2nd but not 1st and (37) shows that 1st person can precede 2nd but not vice versa:

(36) a. Toplo mu te preporučujem.  
warml y him you recommend
3.DAT » 2.ACC
‘I warmly recommend you to him.’

b. ??(*)Toplo mu me preporučuje.  
warml y him me recommend
*3.DAT » 1.ACC
‘You warmly recommend me to him.’

(37) a. Toplo mi te preporučuje.  
warml y me you recommend
1.DAT » 2.ACC
‘He warmly recommends you to me.’

b. ??(*)Toplo ti me preporučuje.  
warml y you me recommend
*2.DAT » 1.ACC
‘He warmly recommends me to you.’

Under the strong PCC in (35) these should all be disallowed. How can (36b) and (37b) be blocked but the (a) examples still be admitted? One possibility is that clitics in BCS come with PART features but do not have valued AUTH features, as follows:

(38) **Semantic Restriction** Author: The clitic may not have AUTH features.  [BCS]

This has the effect of forcing 1st person to be higher than the others; the first clitic encountered is valued as AUTH, but nothing is said about 2nd person since it needs no additional specification from a higher functional head. This allows (36a) and (37a), where the 1st person clitic is highest, but not (36b) or (37b), where it is not.

Finally, there is the so-called “weak” PCC pattern displayed by some speakers of Slovenian. According to Stegovec (this volume), unlike standard speakers whose grammars instantiate (35), such speakers judge combinations of 1st and 2nd person clitics to be grammatical. An example is his (15b), repeated here as (39):

(39) (*)Sestra mi/ti te/me bo predstavila.  
sister me/you you/me introduce
(*)1/2.DAT » 2/1.ACC
‘The sister will introduce me/to you/me.’

My proposal to accommodate this system is for PART to be missing but for it to be simultaneously provided to both 1st and 2nd person clitics, under multiple probe by v.
Semantic Restriction_{Participant}: The clitic may not have \text{PART} features. 

["weak" Slvn]

What is crucial here is that both clitics be specified as \text{PART} since, if it were possible for a probe to skip an unvalued \text{PERS} feature, then 3rd person would be allowed to precede 1st or 2nd, contrary to fact. Also crucial is that, for such speakers at least, \text{AUTH} not be a value of \text{PART} (in a \text{feature geometric} dependency), but rather an independent value of \text{PERS}, just as \text{PART} is. Note that, if this kind of multiple probe approach is on the right track, then we might expect standard Slvn to allow combinations of clitics that do not differ in terms of \text{PART} and \text{AUTH}, i.e., 1st and 1st (\textit{mi me}) or 2nd and 2nd (\textit{ti te}). According to Adrian Stegovec (pers. comm.), even in his “strong” standard, there is a contrast between these, given in (41a, b),\textsuperscript{35} and the infelicitous combinations in (41c):

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(41a)] Janez \textit{mi me} bo pokazal.  
  \textit{Janez me} \text{DAT} \text{ACC} \textit{fut}_{3SG} \text{show}_{M}
  \text{Janez will show me to me.} (e.g., in a mirror or picture)
  
  \item[(41b)] Janez \textit{ti te} bo pokazal.  
  \textit{Janez you} \text{DAT} \text{ACC} \text{fut}_{3SG} \text{show}_{M}
  \text{Janez will show you to you.} (e.g., in a mirror or picture)

  \item[(41c)] *Janez \textit{mi/ti te/me} bo pokazal.  
  \textit{Janez me/you} \text{DAT} \text{ACC} \textit{fut}_{3SG} \text{show}_{M}
  \text{Janez will show you to me/me to you.}
\end{itemize}

There are surely other potential semantic restrictions. For example, whereas the clitic \textit{ga} in (33a) could refer to an inanimate masculine or neuter entity, full form \textit{njega} in (33b) is required to be animate. So we might posit (42) as another credible deficiency:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(42)] Semantic Restriction_{Animacy}: The clitic may not have \textit{Animacy} features.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{35} Lanko Marušič (pers. comm.) confirms the viability of such identical person clusters, commenting that these improve with clitic doubling (which his Nova Gorica dialect has; see Marušič and Žaucer 2009):

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] Tebe \textit{sem ti te} pokazal že včeri.  
  \textit{you aux}_{1SG} \text{you} \textit{fut}_{3SG} \text{show}_{M}
  \textquote{I showed you yourself already yesterday'.}
\end{itemize}

Stegovc adds that there could be extraneous complications here and, in particular, that degraded combinations involve a \textit{de se} reading, but (41a, b) do not (otherwise there might be a Condition B violation). See Charnavel and Mateu (2015) for discussion of this and related phenomena in French and Spanish clitic clusters.
Since animacy on *ga* is never specified it is free to refer to inanimates, whereas *njega* is presumably specified as animate.\textsuperscript{36} My expectation is that all such facultative restrictions on clitics will derive from some lapse in their representation of grammatical features.

4. The syntactic deficiency

We now turn to what makes clitics special syntactically. A traditional minimalist characterization of clitics, at least since the advent of Chomsky’s (1995) \textit{Bare Phrase Structure} (BPS) approach, is to regard clitics as elements which are ambiguous between XP and X\textsuperscript{0}. This means that they do not branch, hence can exhibit properties indicative of both head and maximal projection status. This syntactic deficiency is stated in (43):

\begin{equation}
\text{(43) The Syntactic Deficiency: Clitics cannot express syntactic complexity.}
\end{equation}

This definition requires some elaboration and clarification. An anonymous reviewer questions the viability of reducing all clitics to heads, drawing my attention to the far from trivial matter of how best to implement the avoidance of syntactic complexity. Taking Bošković (2002) as a particularly cogent instantiation of the BPS account, let us explore some of the issues raised.

Bošković’s assumption, also expressed in his contribution to the present volume, is clearly that clitics are non-branching and lack the internal structure of a phrase \textit{because} they do not project. He suggests that taking this structural criterion to be a “necessary but not sufficient property” for clitic status captures Cardinaletti and Starke’s (1999) insight that “clitics have less structure than their non-clitic counterparts.” It is hardly coincidental that in their lengthy discussion they reiterate the present theme of clitic deficiency although, as noted briefly at the end of this paper, there are significant differences between their approach and mine in terms of how the deficiencies are manifested and how pervasive they might be.

Another reviewer rightly points out that, while credible for pronominal clitics if these are ambiguously K\textsuperscript{0}/K\textsuperscript{max} elements which undergo initial merge in argument positions, the characterization of clitics as non-branching raises questions about the analysis of other clitics. Prepositions (and negation), for example, project

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{36} Alternatively, following Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), because full (or “strong”) pronouns are “associated with a dummy noun which does not provide any range specification … a default range is inserted: [+human].” This is consistent with my treatment of full pronouns in (46).}
a phrase but can themselves be proclitic, and auxiliaries also project. Indeed, as Bošković (2002) describes it, because clitics are by definition non-branching, even pronominal clitics are in the specifiers of Agr phrases (although they could have moved there in the course of the derivation). His solution (p. 334) is thus to introduce all potentially branching clitics in the specifier positions of phrases with null heads, so as not to offend what I have called the syntactic deficiency even upon initial merge. Consequently, “auxiliary clitics … can no longer be analyzed as a head of XP taking a phrase as complement …. Instead, we need to analyze the XP as headed by a null element, the auxiliary clitic being located in its specifier …. Since X rather than the auxiliary clitic is taking a complement, the clitic remains non-branching and, therefore, an ambiguous XP/X⁰ element.” I sketch this approach in (44), with Ø the head of XP and VP as its complement:

\[ \left[ FP \left[ F^0 \left[ \text{XP} \left[ \text{AuxP} \left[ \text{aux}^0 \left[ \text{VP} \ldots V^0 \ldots \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \]

\text{aux}^0 can thus adjoin to \( F^0 \) once \( V^0 \) raises there to provide it with a target for head movement. This in a nutshell is the system advocated by Bošković, although whether or not his solution to imposing (43) on all initial clitic representations will turn out to be advantageous – or even workable – remains to be seen.

A more measured system might be to temper (43) by allowing non-branching status to arise in the course of the derivation. Indeed, as pointed out in Section 5 below, while canonical pronominal argument clitics are I maintain introduced as non-branching hence ambiguously \( K^0/K^{\text{max}} \), it is also possible that they could be rendered non-branching by virtue of all other lexical material vacating the projection. Applying this sort of approach to the problem of auxiliary clitics, however, would require wholesale movement: instead of treating auxiliaries as non-branching specifiers, as in (44), they would be heads whose complements become null, presumably by moving above them. This is sketched in (45):

\[ \left[ FP \left[ \text{VP} \ldots V^0 \ldots \right] \left[ F^0 \left[ \text{XP} \left[ \text{AuxP} \left[ \text{aux}^0 \left[ \text{VP} \ldots V^0 \ldots \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \]

Once again, \( V^0 \) serves to provide a target for head movement of \( \text{aux}^0 \).

While neither alternative is simple enough to be compelling without additional theoretical and empirical support, and both proliferate functional categories, the point is that clitics can be understood as embodying the BPS idea that the

37. Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) also grapple with the problem posed by Slavic auxiliaries, reaching the unsatisfying conclusion that “since verbal clitics do not provoke deficiency of their whole CP, they cannot be clitics in the present sense of the term.”

38. The diagrams in (44) and (45) are meant to be merely schematic; more structure is needed than has been represented here.
syntax should embrace the possibility of elements which are ambiguous between phrasal and head status. This is by now the standard minimalist view (cf., e.g., Bošković this volume), although whether or not clitics can be maintained as the poster child for BPS will depend on their analysis in particular constructions. To my mind, the general approach reflected in (43) is very appealing, given that clitics lack internal structure themselves and that they seem to attach only to heads. Questions proliferate, however, when we further attempt to include simple clitics such as *li*, discussed above. This element merges in C⁰ and, arguably, remains there in the syntax. It is cannot plausibly be assimilated to (43) either as in (44), heading its own phrase in SpecCP, nor as in (45), with the rest of the clause moving above it. Perhaps, then, the deficiency expressed in (43) only constrains how clitics analyze movement operations. Such consequences as these thus reveal that exploitation of the BPS model in characterizing what clitics are is far from uncontroversial.

4.1 Clitics and movement

On the one hand, clitics differ from comparable inflectional elements in that, although also purely grammatical, they constitute independent syntactic heads. This is where their mobility comes into play. The morphosyntactic status of the 1st singular auxiliary in Slvn (33a) is clearly different from the 1st singular inflectional ending -m, which is part of the internal structure of the word (so that all word-internal phonological processes apply). The same is true for object agreement markers in languages that have them, such as Swahili (and possibly Mac, if I am right in Franks 2009). Clitics on the other hand enter the structure as distinct syntactic entities, although they too consist exhaustively of formal features. They are, in essence, morphology above the level of the word.³⁹ Clitics also differ from other words in that they lack lexico-conceptual features. This is, I contend, what enables them to appear in positions where other words and phrases do not.

As noted, even though all clitics are purely grammatical entities, there is a fundamental division between them: simple clitics have no syntactic needs, whereas special clitics do. Simple clitics, being fully specified, stay put. But, because special clitics have paradigms and inflect,⁴⁰ they have unvalued features

---

³⁹. Anderson (2005) is the most fleshed out attempt to capitalize on the insight that clitics are a sort of “phrasal morphology.” However, he does this by adapting morphological principles to position clitics in phrases, rather than by using the syntax to manipulate them (letting their unique behavior fall out from their special defects).

⁴⁰. Inflecting clitics were, as a class, lost in Russian. To my knowledge, Jakobson (1935/1971) was the first to express this generalization. Simple clitics such as discourse particles, modal by, and the interrogative particle *li* remained intact, but pronominal and verbal auxiliary clitics
which leads them to move, so that they appear higher than they might otherwise be expected to. Properly understood, the fact that clitics are pronounced higher than items with substantive lexico-conceptual content becomes a direct consequence of their being pure formal feature bundles. Here I briefly recapitulate the reasoning, referring the reader to Franks (2011) *inter alia* for a more detailed exposition. The basic idea is that, unlike lexico-conceptual features, formal features always “move” or “copy,” because that is what feature valuation by a higher probe really is – the identification of an unvalued feature of some goal with the value for that feature of some probe is tantamount to copying the information of the goal’s formal features to the probe. For me, however, this is neither movement nor copying, but rather multiattachment of the same information, i.e., multiple calls to the address of a single data set. Technically, movement involves a bundle of features – which is after all the nature of every syntactic entity – being attached both high and low, with the higher attachment realized in PF if possible. Now, once we pull formal features apart from lexico-conceptual ones, we can understand formal features as always “moving” to the functional heads that value them, and we can understand the facultative movement of substantive words and phrases as the pied-piping of their associated lexico-conceptual features (however formally triggered, be it feature strength, an EPP feature, or an Edge feature). “Overt” movement thus reduces to the pied-piping of a vocabulary item’s lexico-conceptual features in addition to the necessary movement of its formal features. The consequence for clitics is clear. Assuming, in the spirit of Lasnik (1999), that words cannot be realized if their features are scattered, this means that, in the absence of pied-piping (i.e., under formal feature movement alone), entities that just contain formal features will be pronounced higher than entities which also have lexico-conceptual features. This scenario, of pronouncing elements that are exhaustively formal feature bundles higher than their fully lexical counterparts, is widespread. Not only is it a hallmark of clitics that they typically appear higher than full NPs, the same reasoning applies to traditional V-to-T movement, as in Roberts’s (1998) account of why English auxiliaries raise to T₀ whereas main verbs do not. Indeed, he comments that “another obvious place to look … is disappeared. The fact that special clitics were lost had all sorts of repercussions throughout Russian: while the loss of pronominal clitics forced the voice/reflexive morpheme -sja to become frozen and inflectional, the loss of auxiliary clitics forced the modal auxiliaries to become the uniform noninflecting form by for all persons and caused the past tense person/number auxiliary to disappear, turning Russian into a non pro-drop language.

41. See Franks (2014) for elaboration of this multidominance approach to movement.
Steven Franks

the area of clitics. My point about clitics is therefore that they can always be realized with the higher attachment: the failure to pied-pipe lexical material is irrelevant (since they have none).

Let us compare in this light the positions of the various objects in Slvn (33). The clitic ga in (33a) is pronounced high because its accusative features are valued by some functional head outside VP (e.g., by v, Asp, or AgrO), whereas the noun prijatelj ‘friend’ in (33b), although it has its accusative features valued in the same way, is pronounced low because it is also comprised of lexico-conceptual features (which do not move to v/Asp/AgrO). Whether or not prijatelj projects is immaterial: even if it is a non-branching, bare N, the semantic deficiency in (32) means that prijatelj still cannot possibly move like a clitic. That is, failure to project alone does not make something a clitic. Tonic njega in (33c) presents more of a challenge, since it is like the clitic in lacking lexico-conceptual features but does not move as a head. Presumably, njega has internal structure which exempts it from (43). In Franks (2013) I argue for a structure where the nje- piece is categorially an N, which moves to adjoin to the K(ase) head ga:

(46)

The additional structure posited for tonic pronouns is evocative of Cardinaletti and Starke’s (1994) approach to strong pronouns. Regardless of the details, some derivation along these lines is surely what deprives njega of the ability to display the deficiency in (43); it also means that njega differs from ga in bearing categorial features (presumably, [+N, −V]).

---

42. That is, formal features always move overtly, or in the system of Franks (2014), they become multiattached (hence valued) in the overt syntax. For Roberts, strong features in addition cause the entire category to be pied-piped. Taking verb features in English to be weak, lexical verbs are as expected pronounced in situ. Auxiliaries, in his system, only have formal features, so that when these move “… checking the weak feature of the V node causes the entire auxiliary to move” (Roberts 1998:119).

43. This is presumably true of non-clitic pronouns in general. An anonymous reviewer makes the interesting suggestion that if tonic pronouns are represented as in (46), which implies “lexical content” by virtue of the nominalizing root, then this might be the reason why they cannot be clitics. (The reviewer sees this as pointing towards a PF account.)
4.2 More on Slvn pronominal clitics

It has frequently been observed that Slvn clitics tolerate far greater freedom of
distribution than their BCS counterparts. This is manifested in several ways. For
one thing, as Stegovec (this volume, 2015) discusses, accusative clitics can precede
dative ones. He provides the example in (47).

(47) Sestra me/te mu bo predstavila.
     sister me/you ACC him DAT fut 3SG introduce FEM
     'The sister will introduce me/you to him.'

This strategy can serve to circumvent the problem that the canonical Slavic dative »
accusative order would otherwise create for (35) – the semantic restriction against
lexical representation of PERSON features. This sort of solution to potential PCC
violations is not unique to Slvn and is, for example, well documented for French.
Thus, as Wierzbicka (1981: 65) points out, both order (accusative » dative) and
form indicate that la ‘her’ is the direct object and leur ‘to them’ is the indirect
object in (48), but in (49) it is always the 1st person clitic that come first, regardless
of the grammatical relation it bears:

(48) Il la leur donne.
     he her ACC them DAT gives
     'He gives her to them.'

(49) a. Il me les donne.
     he me DAT them ACC gives
     'He gives them to me.'

b. Il me leur donne.
     he me ACC them DAT gives
     'He gives me to them.'

The order leur la, with the dative clitic preceding the accusative, would not be possible
in French (48). Curiously, Stegovec’s examples in (50) show that in Slvn the
inverse order can apply much more generally (so long as the PCC is respected):

(50) a. Gospa mu ga je opisala.
     lady him DAT him ACC aux 3SG describe FEM
     'The lady described him to him.'

b. Gospa ga mu je opisala.
     lady him ACC him DAT aux 3SG describe FEM
     'The lady described him to him.'

Of course, viability of the marked order in (50b) depends on an appropriate dis-
course context. Adrian Stegovec (pers. comm.) suggests it as a natural response to
the question in (51), with lopova ‘(the) thief’ fronted.
(51) Kdo je lopova opisal Petru?
who aux3SG thiefACC describeM PeterDAT
‘Who described the thief to Peter?’

I take this freedom to mean that these clitics can move as phrases before their eventual movement as heads.\textsuperscript{44} I concur with Stegovec (2015), that in Slvn these clitics are arguably on their way to becoming “weak” pronouns,\textsuperscript{45} as in neighboring German, where pronominal elements have intermediate status between full phrases and clitics. Also significant is the fact that, unlike in BCS, the clitics in Slvn need not be contiguous. Stegovec (this volume) cites (52), from Bošković (2001: 162).\textsuperscript{46}

(52) ?So včeraj ga pretepli?
AUX3PL yesterday himACC beatM,PL
‘Did they beat him up yesterday.’

This shows failure to cluster, which I, contra Bošković, treat as a syntactic rather than PF fact about Slvn vis-à-vis BCS. Of more significance is the possibility of separating the two pronominal clitics. Adrian Stegovec (pers. comm.) finds the possibilities in (53) similarly marginal but possible:

(53) a. ?Ivan mu pogosto ga kupi.
Ivan himDAT often himACC buys
‘Ivan often buys it for him.’

\textsuperscript{44} The difference between Slvn and French is unclear, since as noted for French the noncanonical order has a decidedly "last resort" flavor. Possibly relevant factors distinguishing Slvn from French are its relative distinctness of case morphology and its relative freedom of word order ("scrambling").

\textsuperscript{45} I show in Franks (2010) that this process is far more advanced in Polish, as is the shift from clitic to inflectional status for the erstwhile auxiliaries.

\textsuperscript{46} Lanko Marušič (pers. comm.) finds (52) considerably more degraded, commenting that it may be appropriate as part of a poem but outside of such specialized context could only be made acceptable by stressing ga. Possibly, since stress is irrelevant for Stegovec and since Marušič feels similarly about (ii) in the next footnote, the only way he can accept these orders is presumably by coercing ga into tonic/full status. This conclusion is supported by the impossibility for Marušič of (i) in the next footnote, because the order *videl ga* ‘saw him’ would be inconsistent with focusing ga, although stress plus \textbf{contrastive focus} greatly improves this word order (with spelling reflecting his dialect):

(i) ?A si vidu ga al ja?
so AUX2SG saw HIMACC or HERACC
‘So did you see HIM or HER?’

Clearly, these matters exhibit considerable variation across speakers and require careful investigation.
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b. ?Ivan ga pogosto mu kupi.
   Ivan it_{ACC} often him_{DAT} buys
   ‘Ivan often buys it for him."

Crucially, Stegovec adds that (53b) requires “the right context,” just as the noncanonical order in (50b) does. These data again suggest that pronominal clitics in Slvn can move as phrases, to the specifier of (or adjoining to) the relevant case-licensing functional projection. In this way, the accusative can scramble to a position above the dative in order to encode aspects of information structure in word order terms.47

In Franks (2013) I put forward a nominal structure for Slvn that has a Definiteness projection between the KP and NP of (46). I did this in part on the basis of the well-known fact, first discussed in the generative literature by Perlmutter and Orešnik (1973), that Slvn clitic pronouns admit an “identity of sense” reading (akin to English one), in addition to their canonical referential function. Their (54) is thus ambiguous:

(54) Stane je videl plav avto in tudi Tone ga je videl.
    Stane aux_{3SG} saw blue car and also Tone it/one_{ACC} aux_{3SG} saw.
    ‘Stane saw a blue car and Tone also saw it/one.’

47. Bošković (2001: 163) also cites the examples in (i) and (ii) as ungrammatical:

   (i) *Si videl ga.
       AUX_{2SG} saw him_{ACC}
       ‘You saw him.’

   (ii) *Ga včeraj so pretepli?

(Presumably Bošković’s (i) should also have been an interrogative, since initial auxiliary clitics are typical when ali has been elided, as discussed in Section 2.1 above.) His unacceptable (ii) should be compared (52). I take this contrast to mean that, as weak pronouns, clitics can scramble by adjoining to a phrase below the auxiliary, which they cannot cross (although why tonic pronouns and full noun phrases are not so restricted remains to be explained). Adrian Stegovec (pers. comm.) points out however that (i) becomes “significantly better” if some material follows ga, after an intonational break:

   (iii) ?Si videl ga, lopova?
        AUX_{2SG} saw him_{ACC} thief_{ACC}
        ‘Did you see him, the thief?’

Here too information structure is likely at work, rather than intonation (which for Stegovec is not relevant, since he does not feel any need to stress these noncanonically positioned clitics, contra Marušič).
Suppose that $ga$ can either originate in $K$ or, as an identity of sense pronoun, move there from $\text{Def}$ (also used to host $en$ ‘a’):

\[(55)\]

This factor adds credibility to the phrasal status of pronominal clitics in Slvn.

Finally, I argued that clitic doubling in Slvn dialects, as described by Marušič and Žaucer (2009), can exploit (55) by combining it with (46). A Gorica Slvn example of doubling is given in (56):

\[(56) \text{Jaz se } ga \text{ njega spomnim še iz srednje šole.}\]

\[I \text{ refl him}_{\text{ACC}} \text{ him}_{\text{ACC}} \text{ remember already from middle school}\]

\[\text{‘I remember him already from high school.’}\]

As in Bulgarian – where, as discussed by Bošković (this volume), doubling correlates with the rise of DP – the development of doubling in Slvn also suggests a more finely articulated extended nominal projection (in order to allow for both the clitic and its associate). Let us assume then that the Def projection (in these dialects at least) can contain both [–definite] and [+definite] features. Even referential pronominal clitics would thus originate there and move to $K^0$. If $nje$- moves to (and fuses with) $ga$ in $\text{Def}^0$, rather than with $K^0$ as in (46), both $ga$ and $njega$ will end up being pronounced:\[48\]

\[(57)\]

\[48.\] This presumably derives from the effect of morphological fusion, which, following Nunes (2004: Section 1.5.3.3) should disrupt the chain relationship between the two occurrences of $ga$.\]
Marušič and Žaucer (2009) point out that this doubling phenomenon (although possibly not in all dialects that have it) is restricted to pronominal associates, a limitation which is captured by the derivation in (57).

5. Conclusion: Clitics Come and Go

In this paper it has been argued that clitics are defective vis-à-vis other lexical items, and that their varying deficiencies can be localized in diminished aspects of their phonological form, their interpretation, or their syntactic structure. The perfect clitic is thus the most minimal word. In this concluding section, I speculate on a few associated complications and extensions, making two basic points.

First of all, the elements linguists call clitics can be better or worse instantiations of what it means to be a clitic, depending on how minimal they are. I identified three overarching criteria, repeated below:

\[(58)\]

a. **The Prosodic Deficiency**: Clitics cannot project prosodic feet.

b. **The Semantic Deficiency**: Clitics cannot instantiate lexico-conceptual features.

c. **The Syntactic Deficiency**: Clitics cannot express syntactic complexity.

The semantic deficiency is the fundamental one: no vocabulary item can be a clitic if it has lexical (substantive or contentful) meaning. This limits clitics to functional categories, and we saw that even here clitics can vary in how defective they are in terms of their grammatical features. Beyond this inability to instantiate lexico-conceptual features, however, there are departures from perfection. Weak pronouns may be prosodically clitics, reflecting (58a), and also have purely grammatical meaning, reflecting (58b), but without instantiating (58c) so that they do not necessarily move as heads. The opposite is also possible, namely, a clitic that is not prosodically deficient, contra (58a). A famous example of this is Italian *loro* ‘them\text{DAT}’, which for Zwicky (1977) was anomalous as a special clitic, being tonic but nonetheless consistent with (58b) and presumably also (58c), like the other clitic pronouns in Italian.  

\[49\]

Anderson (2005:32) notes that “classification of this element as a clitic is a chronic problem,” pointing out that it “displays some of the properties of other pronominal clitics in Italian, while differing in others.” His intuition is that “ultimately, these differences should be resolved by providing an account of the element’s atypical distribution in terms of its atypical prosody.” Cardinaletti and Starke (1991), on the other hand, treat *loro* as a weak pronoun in their tripartite system.
Second, vocabulary items can either become clitics or lose their inherent clitic status. The Slvn stressed clitics described in Section 2.1 instantiate the latter, and in fast speech loss (or at least amalgamation) of prosodic structure is common even for lexically contentful words. Also as noted in Section 2.1, certain clitics are segmentally identical to their tonic counterparts, e.g., Slvn nas ‘us’ versus nàs. Assuming these to be variants of the same vocabulary item, there are several ways this difference might be represented: one could tinker with (58a), such that the syllabic nucleus optionally projects a foot, or one could tinker with (58c), such that K optionally projects a KP. I opt for the latter, positing an NP complement to K (as well as DefP, for Slvn at least, if (55) turns out to be correct), where N bears, in addition to its categorial features, a [+focus] feature (reflecting the emphatic status and contrastive nature of the tonic variant). Stressed nàs is thus comparable to njega, as depicted in (46), and it is this internal structure, with N-to-K movement, which prevents it from being a clitic. Next, if we analyze Slavic weak pronouns as KPs with an empty NP complement, then to the extent that – and from the point when – NP is deleted, we might expect the resulting non-projecting K to move as a clitic. The implication is thus that clitic status with respect to (58c) can be established in the course of the derivation.

It is not clear whether these vocabulary items start with prosodic structure, which is later pruned (along with the irrelevant syntactic structure), but, to the extent that the particular prosody is unpredictable, erasure of prosodic structure is preferable to adding it. This is in contrast to the stressed clitics of Section 2.1, where stress arises by some rule. For Slvn stressed clitics, as in (11)–(14), this still raises the question of how the stress becomes associated with the clitic if, in keeping with (58a), syllables in clitics do not project. My suggestion here is that the stress is exceptionally grounded to the syllable (rather than to the foot). This approach may also be applicable for the representation of Bg ne, which it will be recalled is post-stressing. This suggests that ne comes with an accent, which could become floating when ne attaches to an adjacent prosodic word (and which does not happen when ne stands on its own in the meaning ‘no’). The floating accent would be erased as stray except when what follows is itself unaccented.

50. A related example might be the contrast between auxiliary and copula uses of ‘to be’ in Czech and Slovak, where only the former is a true clitic; see Franks & King (2000:92–97, 121–123) for details. This discrepancy is not amenable to a phrasal account, but may derive from head movement (e.g., of T to Agrs), with the copula comparable to tonic auxiliaries in having a T element in addition to the Agr element of the auxiliary.

51. Alternatively, ne has a floating accent in its lexical representation, i.e., even without a foot to support it. Stuart Davis (pers. comm.) explains: “It is not uncommon in the autosegmental literature that when a morpheme sponsors a floating element for the floating element not to
Finally, in other work including Franks and Rudin (2005) and Franks (2009, 2013), I show that clitic doubling is also created “on-line,” through extraction of the associate out of its containing KP. This phenomenon requires a potentially autonomous associate, which is possible in Bg because that language, I argue, has developed a KP-over-DP structure (i.e., replacing the DefP of (55) with DP). Clitic doubling in Bg then results from A-movement of the associate out of KP. This strands K and renders it non-branching, giving it clitic status in keeping with (58c).

In sum, clitics are words that cannot do something: they are in some way defective. Typically that deficiency is displayed in their prosodic lapses, as stated in (58a), augmented by the additional possibilities summarized in (30). But there are other sorts of deficiencies, namely the inability to express meaningful (as opposed to purely grammatical) content, stated in (58b), and the inability to project syntactic structure, stated in (58c). Of course, the idea that their deficiencies is what makes clitics clitics is not unique to the approach laid out in this paper, but is rather a fairly obvious insight. The most comprehensive discussion of clitics as defective elements can be found in Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), hence it is worth contrasting my perspective with theirs. Given the sweeping nature of their claims and the somewhat disjointed presentation in that paper, I cannot do justice to a proper comparison of proposals here. They too contend that “the unique primitive is structural deficiency.” Nonetheless, some differences stand out. They argue to have “discovered” a hierarchy of three specific types of pronouns: strong » weak » clitic. Each embodies a phrasal structure nested inside that of the type above it on the hierarchy. Specifically, they posit three possible layers above the lexical layer, LP: $I_LP$, $\Sigma_LP$, and $C_LP$. The first, which clitics have, consists of unspecified functional projections, the second, which defines weak pronouns, adds to that unspecified discourse and polarity projections, and the third, which expresses “functional case-features” (also CP by analogy with the familiar clausal CP), defines strong pronouns and thereby completes the system of potential functional categories dominating any lexical

be realized on its sponsor. The floating accent then attaches to whatever is next to it as long as it is not accented; otherwise the floating accent deletes.” See Wolf (2007) for a theory of floating autosegments; he proposes a constraint, relevant to the behavior of ne, which states that “floating autosegments cannot dock onto bearing units that are exponents of the same morpheme.”

Although we differ on the details, the additional layers of nominal structure I attribute to Bg (and other languages with doubling) is in the spirit of typological proposals made by Bošković (this volume).
While I concur with the general spirit of this system – which is that clitic pronouns are not just different from full pronouns, but rather deficient relative to them, and that this deficiency can be represented as lack of features (and/or the projections that house these features) – I do not accept their tripartite partitioning of the pronominal world. I have shown in this paper that the facts are complex enough to warrant far greater variation both in degrees and types of deficiency than strong, weak, and clitic, and that clitics themselves are of various types. Furthermore, their discussion is almost exclusively concerned with pronouns, not with what it means to be a clitic in general. Also, although the structures they posit for all the pronouns in their typology are phrasal, Cardinaletti and Starke nonetheless adhere to the view that clitics are heads (in that they must ultimately move as such to adjoin to some functional category).

The fact that clitics cannot do something is an interesting and surely not accidental confluence of properties, reflecting as it does a minimal or bare-bones structure at all levels. I have suggested that there are more or less canonical clitics, with the best being the ones with the most deficiencies. The ideal clitic thus seems to be one which lacks structure entirely, being a pure pairing between a phonological string and a set of grammatical features. In a sense, clitics are perfect vocabulary items – they are as defective as a word can possibly be and still survive in the phonetic output.

One might even imagine that there are clitics with no form at all, that is, a clitic lacking not just prosodic structure, but segmental properties as well. Such an element would be silent, but would still have to adjoin to a host. Indeed, the idea of null C, an element with categorial features but nothing else, has been invoked in the syntactic literature. Bošković and Lasnik (2003), for example, argue that null C in English is a clitic, and Landau (2008) makes this claim for Russian (hinting that null C may be a clitic universally). However, whether or not it really makes sense to treat such elements are clitics in the traditional sense explored in this paper is a question best left for future work.

Thus, in their own words, “weak elements are ‘peeled’ strong elements, and clitics are ‘peeled’ weak elements.” We can clearly see in this metaphor the roots of Starke’s more recent “nanosyntactic” thinking.

They do admittedly seem to countenance the idea that deficiency is a matter of degree: “the more a pronoun is deficient, the less structure it has.”

Note that Bošković and Lasnik’s null C introduces finite complement clauses, whereas Landau’s introduces infinitival complements. The reason for positing clitic status is to make these complement clauses transparent for various processes and to force them to be adjacent to V. I am not convinced that either need be full CPs, nor I am convinced of the merit of invoking silent clitics to impose adjacency, especially in languages without overt ones.
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