

The cross-linguistic tendency for normal words to evolve through various stages of cliticness into affixes is well documented and uncontroversial (Andersen 1987, McConvell 1996, Nichols 1986). Whereas generative accounts (e.g., Franks & King 2000) have tried to account for the clitics' placement using syntactic mechanisms (as opposed to, say, templatic models), the fact remains that at some point in this evolution, the syntax must relinquish control over the ordering. This is especially apparent in Ibero-Romance dialects (as discussed, e.g., in Minkoff 1993), which exhibit clear evidence of morphological ordering. The proposed talk clarifies the morphology's role in taking over such constituent-ordering responsibilities from the syntax. The relatively well known facts from Balkan Slavic are compared to those of Romance and Tagalog.

Background: Responding to proposals that clitic placement relative to other sentence constituents needs to be adjusted by non-syntactic mechanisms (i.e., Marantz's 1988 *Morphological Merger* or Halpern's 1995 *Prosodic Inversion*), scattered-copy-and-delete models (notably Bošković 2001) have emerged to ensure that the syntax be the only component responsible for constituent-ordering. Such models also ensure that syntax need not look ahead (criticizing, e.g., Rivero 1997) to see if phonology requires V to move past the clitics. We examine a stage in the diachronic migration from being clitics (first in second position and later adjacent to the verb) to eventual affixhood. There exists, we contend, a stage at which the syntax continues to move the clitics within the arboreal structure (delivering them, as it were, to the cluster's head position), but the *internal* ordering of the clitic cluster is no longer syntactic.

To demonstrate our claim, we look at two modern languages, whose clitics are syntactically and prosodically ordered, giving a more complete picture of clitics' morphological evolution. These are Bulgarian and Tagalog, respectively. Lacking a comprehensive historical/comparative account of Tagalog, we rely on the much more thorough documentation from Ibero-Romance. (Contra Kroeger 1993 and others, we show that Tagalog's pronominal clitics are already verb-adjacent.) We explain clitic placement in these languages, leading to a new conception of the role of the morphological component (MC) in ordering clitics.

We further propose that Bulgarian's and Tagalog's syntactic movement of non-clitic elements to near the left periphery is not motivated by the clitics' prosodic deficiency. Rather, each language has an independently motivated EPP feature that attracts either a phrase to SpecTP, as in (1), or—following Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998)—a verb to T, as in (2). At this point, these languages diverge; while Bulgarian's order mirrors the syntax (e.g., IO before DO), Tagalog's pronominal-clitic ordering is primarily prosodic (monosyllabic before disyllabic). Thus, we claim that Bulgarian clitics occupy separate functional projections at Spell-out, while in Tagalog V moves through the clitics' heads, resulting in their being in the same complex head.

Drawing on the intuition that the morphology is responsible for clitic-verb contiguity, we argue that in the MC the clitics and the verb—in both languages—become a morphological word (MWd), although not necessarily a single prosodic word. This MWd, in Bulgarian, ranges across several adjacent syntactic head positions, whereas in Tagalog the MWd is co-extensive with a single complex syntactic head. The clitics' and verb's features then combine through *Alternative Realization* of features (Emonds 1994). In neither language does the MC determine any ordering; it merely ensures the clitic cluster's internal contiguity (and adjacency of the cluster to the verb).

How is the linear order then imposed? In the case of Bulgarian clitics, which are in separate projections with respect to the verb and each other, PF uses the *Linear Correspondence Axiom* (Kayne 1994) to read the linear order off of the syntax. Tagalog clitics, however, are spelled out in a single (albeit complex) head. Thus, the clitics and V constitute one MWd. As such, ordering the clitics within this MWd does not constitute moving syntactic atoms. In fact, Tagalog clitics cannot be assigned linear order by the syntax because their configuration violates the LCA (due to their being adjoined to a single head), forcing PF to assign order based on phonological principles, along the lines of templatic approaches (going back at least to Perlmutter 1971) or more recent Optimality-theoretic restatements (e.g., Legendre 1999).

In conclusion we have shown more clearly how clitics become affixes. In a sense, the competition between syntactic and morphological models in the linguistic literature mirrors the competing mechanisms acquired by speakers during the crucial stages of diachronic change. As the clitics are reanalyzed, their formal syntactic features also change, causing the verb to move differently and result in fundamentally distinct structures both syntactically and morphologically.

EXAMPLES (clitics shown in *italics*; verbs, underlined):

- | Bulgarian | Tagalog |
|--|--|
| (1) a. Az <i>ti</i> <i>ja</i> <u>dadox.</u>
I.NOM 2SG.IO FEM3SG.DO gave.1SG
'It's me that gave it to you.' | b. Bukas <i>ba siya</i> <u>aalis?</u>
tomorrow Q 3SG.NOM FUT.leave
'Is it tomorrow that he'll be leaving?' |
| (2) a. <u>Dadox</u> <i>ti</i> <i>ja.</i>
gave.1SG 2SG.IO FEM3SG.DO
'I gave it to you.' | b. <u>Aalis</u> <i>ba siya</i> (bukas)?
FUT.leave Q 3SG.NOM (tomorrow)
'Will he be leaving (tomorrow)?' |

WORKS CITED:

- Alexiadou, A. and E. Anagnostopoulou (1998) "Parameterizing Agr: Word Order, V-movement, and EPP-checking." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 16: 491-539.
- Andersen, H. (1987) "From Auxiliary to Desinence." M. Harris & P. Ramat (eds.) *The historical development of auxiliaries*. Mouton de Gruyter, 21-51.
- Bošković, Ž. (2001) *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface: Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Elsevier.
- Emonds, J.E. (1994) "Two Principles of Economy." G. Cinque et al. (eds.) *Paths Towards Universal Grammar: Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*. Georgetown University Press, 155-172.
- Franks, S. & T.H. King (2000) *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. Oxford University Press.
- Halpern, A.L. (1995) *On the Placement and Morphology of Clitics*. CSLI Publications.
- Kayne, R.S. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. MIT Press.
- Kroeger, P. (1993) *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. CSLI Publications.
- Legendre, G. (1999) "Morphological and Prosodic Alignment at Work: The Case of South-Slavic Clitics." K. Shahin et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Seventeenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. CSLI Publications, 436-450.
- Marantz, A. (1988) "Clitics, Morphological Merger, and the Mapping to Phonological Structure." M. Hammond and M. Noonan (eds.) *Theoretical Morphology: Approaches in Modern Linguistics*. Academic Press, 253-270.
- McConvell, P. (1996) "The Functions of Split-Wackernagel Clitic Systems: Pronominal Clitics in the Ngumpin Languages (Pama-Nyungan family, Northern Australia)." A.L. Halpern and A.M. Zwicky (eds.) *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*. CSLI Publications, 299-331.
- Minkoff, S.A. (1993) "Plurality, Clitics, and Morphological Merger in Caribbean Spanish." *MIT working papers in linguistics* 20: 177-192.
- Nichols, J. (1986) "Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar." *Language* 62: 56-119.
- Perlmutter, D.M. (1971) *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rivero, M.-L. (1997) "On Two Locations for Complement Clitic Pronouns: Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian, and Old Spanish." A. van Kemende and N. Vincent (eds.) *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge University Press, 253-270.