Goal:

- Wakhi second-position (2P) clitics appear to “float” – that is, they sometimes appear to the right of second position. The goal is to show that second position and non-second position “floating” clitics are two different kinds of clitics → semantic restrictions on the host of the clitic will be crucial.
- Illustrate data from own fieldwork
- Provide a preliminary analysis, discuss challenges

Overview

1. Background
2. “Floating” clitics
3. Two different clitics
4. Analyses of two different clitics
5. Further considerations

1 Background

- Wakhi:
  - Endangered East Iranian language spoken by about 60,000 speakers
  - Dialects in Pakistan, Pamirs of Tajikistan, China, and Afghanistan
    * Data in this talk come from the Pamirs of Tajikistan, specifically from Murghab, the most isolated of the Wakhi towns
  - SOV, split ergative
  - Several clitics, including question-marking, aspectual, and pronominal clitics
- This talk will focus on pronominal clitics that agree with the subject (1) of the sentence and appear only in the past tense
Wakhi clitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>=öm</td>
<td>=ön</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>=ôt</td>
<td>=îf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>=î</td>
<td>=îf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Wackernagel’s Law clitics** (henceforth 2P clitics) (Wackernagel 1892) occur in second position in the clause, after the first word or phrase.

2. In Wakhi, 2P clitics occur after the first phrasal constituent (rather than just the first word), which may be arbitrarily complex:

   - **after pronoun**
     
     (3) *wuz=öm*  
     1SG=1SG.CL run-PERF  
     ‘I ran.’

   - **after noun phrase**
     
     (4) *[ja šelżin]=i  
     det woman=3SG.CL run-PERF  
     ‘That woman ran.’

   - **after coordinate structure**
     
     (5) *[wuz-ôt Laura]=ön  
     droz  
     1SG=AND Laura=1PL.CL tall  
     ‘Me and Laura are tall.’

   - **after complex noun** (with relative clause)
     
     (6) *[ja badʒ  daj kumd ki ja  sapik ptun jitk]=i  
     rucpetk  
     [DET fat man who COMP DET food all eat.PST]=3SG.CL sleep.PST  
     ‘The man who ate all the food slept.’

3. **What happens if first constituent is not the subject of the clause?** A couple options:

   - **First constituent receives focus interpretation; second constituent is subject**
     
     (7) *bilʃ=öm  
     wuz  
     tøj  
     çi  
     zmax dajt-ôj  
     shovel=1SG 1SG in SELF.GEN jaw  put-PST  
     ‘I put the shovel in my jaw.’ ...in response to *What did you put in your jaw?*

   - **First constituent receives topic interpretation; second constituent is subject**
Wakhi clitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8) bil$_T$=öm wuz tə çi zmax$_F$ dajt-aj shovel=1SG 1SG in SELF.GEN jaw put-PST</td>
<td>'I put the shovel$_T$ in my jaw.$_F$' in response to Where did you put the shovel?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There is no overt subject. The next constituent (linearly) hosts the clitic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9) ja put-i=m litʃ dicti DET ball-ACC=1SG.CL kick lv.PST</td>
<td>'I kicked the ball.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 “Floating” Clitics

• Almost Wackernagel Clitics (Erschler 2010) (aka “floating” clitics) most frequently occur in second position but may also occur further to the right.

• Consider a transitive sentence with a prepositional phrase complement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10) a. wuz=öm bil pa çi zmax dijt-i 1SG=1SG shovel in SELF.GEN jaw put-PST</td>
<td>'I put the shovel in my jaw.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ??wuz bil=öm tə çi zmax dajt-aj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. wuz bil [tə çi zmax]=öm dajt-aj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ??wuz bil tə çi zmax dajt=öm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• We can summarize (10) in the following schema, where =X represents a possible site for the clitic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schema</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[*=X] DP$<em>{subj}$=X ??DP$</em>{obj}$=X PP$_{comp}$=X ??VP=X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• (10-a), in which the clitic is in 2P is judged to be information neutral.

• (10-c), in which the clitic is on my jaw is judged to have “some emphasis on the subject of the clause, in contrast to other people who may have performed similar actions”

• Note the awkwardness of (10-b) and (10-d). The speaker says in principal these are ok, but she’s not sure what they would mean.

• Sidenote: Clitic placement and focus (marked by pitch accent) seem to be independent, but not mutually exclusive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12) a. Q: What did you break? b. wuz=öm jezi ci şow-i şkendovdi 1SG=1SG.CL yesterday SELF horns-ACC break.PST</td>
<td>'I broke my horns.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) a. Q: What did you break? b. wuz jezi ci şow-i=m şkendovdi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) a. Q: When did you break your horns? b. wuz jezi ci şow-i=m şkendovdi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• So far we know non-2P clitic can be hosted by the external argument of the verb and a prepositional phrase. It can also be hosted by the internal argument:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(15) wuz [ci şew-i]=äm şkandevdi 1SG SELF.GEN horns-ACC=1SG.CL break.PST</td>
<td>'I broke my horns.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Seem to have no syntactic restrictions on the host of the pronominal clitic. The verb is the only grammatical category that seems to really resist the clitic.

Interim Summary

• pronominal clitics usually occur in 2P
  – If host is subject, information-neutral
  – If host is non-subject, focus or topic interpretation (depending on pitch accent)
• can occur further to the right of 2P, regardless of argument structure, with a certain interpretation
• Puzzle: Are these the same clitics? How do we account for the different interpretations that can be associated with them in different positions?
  – Option 1: These are the same clitic. What are the relationships between the different loci in which the clitic can appear and the associated interpretations? Is this movement?
  – Option 2: These are different clitics, the fact that they have the same form creates the illusion of “floating”. What are these two different types, and how do they come to have the same form?

3 Two different clitics

Argument: Different semantic selectional restrictions on host of 2P and non-2P clitics suggest that these are different types of clitics.

• Starting point: In the previous section we saw that in one case, the non-2P clitic could be hosted by the internal argument of the verb, whereas in another case it could not. Why?
• The non-2P clitic seems to require a certain semantic relationship between the subject of the clause and the host of the clitic:

  (16) a. wuz [ci ʂow-]=m ʂkendǝvdı
      1SG SELF horns-ACC=1SG.CL break.PST
      ‘I broke my horns.’
  b. *wuz [ci qlam-]=am ʂkǝndǝvdı
      1SG SELF.GEN pencil-ACC=1SG.CL break.PST
      ‘I broke my pencil.’
  c. *wuz [ti ʂow-v]=m ʂkendǝvdı
      1SG 2SG.POSS horns-ACC=1SG.CL break.PST
      ‘I broke your horns.’

• Generalization: non-2P clitic host must be in a part-whole relationship to the subject of the clause
• But all of the hosts in (16) can be hosts of a 2P clitic:

  (17) a. [ci ʂow-]=m wuz ʂkendǝvdı
      SELF horns-ACC=1SG.CL 1SG break.PST
      ‘It was my horns that I broke.’
  b. [ci qlam-]=am wuz ʂkǝndǝvdı
     pencil-ACC=1SG.CL 1SG SELF.GEN break.PST
     ‘It was my pencil that I broke.’
c. \[ \text{[ti } \text{šow-vi]}=m\] \text{wuz škendavdi}  
\[2\text{SG.POSS horns-ACC}=1\text{SG.CL 1SG break.PST}\]  
‘It was your horns that I broke.’

- Generalization: 2P clitics place no semantic restrictions on their host
- This suggests that 2P and non-2P clitics are different kinds of clitics. If this is the case, we predict it will be possible to have both in the same clause. This prediction is borne out:

\[(18) \text{wuz=}ám \text{ ci } \text{šow-i}=m \text{ škendavdi}  
\text{1SG=1SG SELF horns-ACC}=1\text{SG.CL break.PST}\]  
‘I broke my horns.’

- Interim Conclusion 2:
  - Two different kinds of clitics ... what are they?
  - 2P clitics such that they can be associated with information-neutral, topic, and focus interpretations of their host
  - Non-2P clitics that place a semantic restriction on their host and are associated with an emphasis on the subject of the clause

4 Analysis: 2P clitics

Claim: 2P clitics are in a syntactically fixed position, in [Spec,TP]. This accounts for why they can be hosted by a fronted focused expression, by a topic, or by the first constituent in an information-neutral clause.

- Approaches to 2P clitics:
  - syntactic approaches: clitic is located in structurally fixed position high in the tree, usually in C or a maximal projection right under C
    
    * Strong syntactic accounts offered by Franks and Progovac (1994), Progovac (1996), Roberts (1994), Cavar and Wilder (1994a,b). In these approaches, syntax is fully responsible for 2P clitics.
    
    * Weak syntax approach: Movement of clitics takes place in syntax, but some word reordering is still allowed in PF. Clitics are not in the second position in syntax, under certain well-defined conditions they can undergo movement to that position (Halpern (1992, 1995), Embick and Izvorski (1997), Percus (1993), Schutze (1994), and King (1996)).
  
  - phonological approaches
    
    * Strong phonological approach: phonology is fully responsible; analysis relies on heavy word reordering at PF (Radanovic-Kocić 1988, 1996)
    
    * Weak phonological approach: phonology plays dominant role; 2P is a morphophonological requirement of clitics. Relevant movement occurs in syntax, and phonology plays a passive filtering role by ruling out syntactically well-formed sentences that violate this morphophonological requirement (Boskovic 1995a,b, 1997a,b)

- I assume a weak syntax approach, and assume the following structure:
• This structure predicts the host of the 2P clitic in each of the possible scenarios:

  – Information-neutral $\rightarrow$ subject of clause is host because clitic has no eligible host to its left, must look to its right, and lower and encliticize onto nearest constituent

    \[
    \text{(20) } \text{wuz=am } \text{bil po ci zna}x \text{ dijt-i} \\
    \text{1SG=1SG shovel in SELF.GEN jaw put-PST} \\
    \text{‘I put the shovel in my jaw.’}
    \]

  – Information-neutral with no overt subject $\rightarrow$ next constituent is host, because null subject is not eligible as host

    \[
    \text{(21) ja put-i=am litf dicti} \\
    \text{DET ball-ACC=1SG.CL kick LV.PST} \\
    \text{‘I kicked the ball.’}
    \]

  – Focused expression is fronted $\rightarrow$ this expression hosts the clitic

    \[
    \text{(22) } \text{bil=am wuz to ci zna}x \text{ dijt-aj} \\
    \text{shovel=1SG 1SG in SELF.GEN jaw put-PST} \\
    \text{‘I put the shovel$_F$ in my jaw.’}
    \]

  – Topic is fronted $\rightarrow$ topic hosts the clitic

    \[
    \text{(23) } \text{bil=am wuz to ci zna}x_F \text{ dojt-aj} \\
    \text{shovel=1SG 1SG in SELF.GEN jaw put-PST} \\
    \text{‘I put the shovel$_F$ in my jaw.’}
    \]

• Sidenote: binding evidence for fronting
Coindexation of bound possessive pronoun with John is not allowed with John does not c-command the pronoun

\(\text{John}_i \text{ } \text{Ci}_{i/j} \text{ } \text{nan-i } \text{lit}\text{ dicti} \)

\(\text{John}=3\text{SG} \text{SELF.GEN mother-ACC kick LV.PST} \)

‘John\(_i\) kicked his\(_i/j\) mother.’

\(\text{b. } *\text{Ci}_{i/j} \text{ nan } \text{John-i}_{i} \text{ lit}\text{ dicti} \)

\(\text{SELF.GEN mother John-ACC kick LV.PST} \)

‘His\(_i/j\) mother kicked John\(_i\).’

But \(A'\)-movement preserves binding relationships from before movement, so if sentence-initial foci and topics really are fronted, we expect possessive pronoun to be bound by John. This is borne out:

\(\text{Ci}_{i/j} \text{ nan-i } \text{John-i } \text{lit}\text{ dicti} \)

\(\text{SELF.GEN mother John-ACC kick LV.PST} \)

‘John\(_i\) kicked his\(_i/j\) mother.’

Additional prediction made by this structure: If a topic and a focused expression are both fronted, clitic will appear in “third” position

\(\text{Q: What did you break in the forest?} \)

\(\text{[ar box]} \text{ [}\text{Ci } \text{pijd]}=\text{am } \text{wuz } \text{skendovdi} \)

\(\text{in forest SELF.GEN foot=1SG 1SG break.PST} \)

‘It was my foot that I broke in the forest’

An alternative from a different dialect of Wakhi (that I cannot use for my data):

Clitic heads its own focus projection

\(\text{CP} \)

\(\text{TP} \)

\(\text{subj } \text{FocP} \)

\(\text{Foc} \)

\(\text{=CL } \text{vP} \)

\(\text{...} \)

We have seen that in Murghab Wakhi, clitic can be hosted by topic and can appear in information-neutral clause, so it is not always associated with focus

Under my analysis, the clitic has no semantics; rather, it is sometimes associated with focus as a result of movement around it, rather than being a focus marker
5 Analysis: non-2P clitics

Claim: Non-2P clitics are an instance of possessor raising. This accounts for their independence from 2P clitics as well as for their identical form.

- External possessors and possessor raising are familiar from other languages such as French.
  - In (29), we have a regular possessive (no grammatical relation to the verb), but in (30) we have an external possessor: the dative lui is semantically the possessor the ‘the hand’ but grammatically an argument of the verb
    
    (29) J’ai pris sa main
    1SG-HAVE taken 3SG.POSS hand
    ‘I took his hand.’

    (30) lui ai pris la main
    1SG 3SG.DAT have taken the hand
    ‘I took his hand.’

  - Come with the requirement that the possessor be affected (often physically) by the action being performed on the possessee
    
    (31) Je lui ai lave le bras / *le fils / *la voiture
    1SG 3SG.DAT have washed the arm / *the son / *the car
    ‘I washed his arm/*son/*car.’

- This is what we have in Wakhi. Recall:

    (32) a. wuz [ci śow-i]=m škendəvdi
    1SG SELF horns-ACC=1SG.CL break.PST
    ‘I broke my horns.’

    b. *wuz [ci qlam-i]=m škəndəvdi
    1SG SELF.GEN pencil-ACC=1SG.CL break.PST
    ‘I broke my pencil.’

- Additional requirement that the possessor be the subject of the clause

    (33) a. *wuz [ti śow-vi]=m škendəvdi
    1SG 2SG.POSS horns-ACC=1SG.CL break.PST
    ‘I broke your horns.’

    b. *wuz ti śew-i=t škəndəvdi
    1SG 2SG.GEN horns-ACC=2SG.CL break.PST
    ‘I broke your horns.’

- Possessor starts out in [Spec,DP] and moves into [Spec,vP] to get case/theta-role; bottom of chain is spelled out as clitic.
We have the syncretism between the 2P and non-2P clitics for free. The possessor clitic gets its $\phi$-features from the argument that is also the associate of the second position clitic, so it is expected that they have the same form.

6 Conclusions and Further Questions

- So far the data and the analysis point to 2P clitics and non-2P clitics being two different kinds of clitics, seemingly independent from each other...
- But maybe they’re not entirely independent. Past tense clauses require a subject-oriented clitic, and it appears that this can be satisfied by either a 2P clitic or a non-2P clitic

(35)  

a. wuz=$^{am}$ $^{ci}$ $^{\#ew-i}$ $^{\#k\&ndevdi}$  
1SG=1SG.CL SELF.GEN horns-ACC break.PST  
‘I broke my horns.’  
b. wuz=$^{am}$ $^{ci}$ $^{\#ew-i=m}$ $^{\#k\&ndevdi}$  
c. *wuz $^{ci}$ $^{\#ew-i}$ $^{\#k\&ndevdi}$  
d. wuz $^{ci}$ $^{\#ew-i=m}$ $^{\#k\&ndevdi}$

- Under an analysis in which they’re independent of each other, this is unexpected.
- Conclusion:
  - 2P clitics are syntactically fixed in [Spec,TP] and have no semantics, accounting for their position in various kinds of clauses
  - non-2P clitics are possessor raising clitics, which captures semantic restrictions on the hosts of non-2P clitics
  - Put together this illustrates why they have the same form, which is the source of the illusion of “floating”
  - Outstanding question: How are they related to each other, if they’re separate but not entirely independent.
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