

# CLITICIZATION IN POLISH, THE CASE OF POLISH PRETERITE ENDINGS

## 1 The data

The examples presented here are considered by the majority of linguists to be clitics (see Booij & Rubach (1987), Dogil (1984), Aguado & Dogil (1989), Spencer (1991), Zwicky (1977)). This paper will concentrate on the following clitics:

- (1) - *m* [m]: 1sg. preterite ending, e.g.. *zab+i+l+e+m* 'I killed'; - *ś* [c]: 2sg. preterite ending, e.g.. *zab+i+l+e+s* 'you killed';  
- *śmy* [cmɨ]: 1pl. preterite ending, e.g.. *zab+i+l+i+śmy* 'we killed'; - *ście* [ctce]: 2pl. preterite ending, e.g.. *zab+i+l+i+ście* 'you killed'

The preterite endings derive historically from the forms of the auxiliary 'to be': 1(sg.). *jeśm*⇒*m*; *jeś*⇒*ś*. 2(pl.). *jeśmy*⇒*śmy*; *jeście*⇒*ście*.

## 2 Problems analysing Polish clitics

Booij & Rubach (1987) propose an analysis where the generation of Polish preterite endings takes place in the Lexicon, since they trigger the application of rules which within the framework of lexical phonology are considered to be lexical.

Polish Raising,<sup>1</sup> a rule which turns /o/ into /u/, for instance in: the verb *mogł+em* [[[mog]w]e]m] /mogwem/ 'I could', compared with *mógł* [[mog]w] /mugw/ 'he could'. The context for raising is a non-syllabic voiced consonant following the vowel. When the floating 1st. person sg. preterite clitic -*m* is attached to the verb, then raising does not occur. The same situation arises with the 2nd. person sg., 1st. person pl., 2nd. person pl. preterite clitics: [c], [cmɨ], [ctce].

Another lexical rule is Polish Lower. Polish /e/ alternating with zero and/or /i/ derive from underlying high lax vowels /i i i/, one of which is palatalising and the other not. These vowels, called *yers*, either lower to /e/ when followed by a yer in the next syllable, or delete context-free. Lower is a lexical rule applying cyclically, yer deletion also applies in the lexicon, but it is not cyclic.

I have already shown that preterite clitics can block the application of Raising.. Booij & Rubach (1987:37) explain the alternation between *szedł+em* 'I went' and *szedł* 'he went' by proposing the derivation below (š-postalveolar fricative):

|         |            |                 |              |                    |
|---------|------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|
| (2)     |            | <i>szedł+em</i> | <i>szedł</i> |                    |
| Cycle 1 | šid        | šid             |              |                    |
| Cycle 2 | šid+l      |                 | šid+l        | WFR: Preterite     |
| Cycle 3 | šid+l+i    |                 | šid+l+i      | WFR: Gender        |
|         |            | šed+l+i         | šed+l+i      | Lower              |
| Cycle 4 | šed+l+i+mi |                 | -----        | WFR: Cliticization |
|         |            | šed+l+e+mi      | -----        | Lower              |
|         |            |                 |              |                    |
|         |            | šedwem          | šedw         |                    |

From the above data we can see that clitics create a context for the application of lexical phonological rules. The above examples indicate that clitics phonologically behave no differently than affixes (see Booij & Rubach (1987), Szczegielniak (1991), Zwicky (1977,1985)).<sup>2</sup> Of course, Booij & Rubach's analysis assumes that the preterite clitics are attached in the lexicon. I will argue against such an analysis of cliticization in Polish.

As pointed out by Aguado & Dogil (1989), the assumption that preterite endings are generated in the lexicon encounters two problems. First, preterite endings attach to almost anything:

- (3) (a) PRONOUNS: *ja to rob+i+l+e+m = ja+m to rob+i+l* 'I did this'  
(c) COMPLIMENTIZERS: *myślał, że tam by+l+e+m = myślał, że+m tam by+l* 'he thought I was there'  
(d) ADVERBS: *szybko to rob+i+l+e+s = szybko+o+s to rob+i+l* 'you did it fast'  
(e) NOUNS: *dla Stefan+a to rob+i+l+e+s = dla Stefan+a+s to rob+i+l* 'you did (it) for Stefan'  
(e) INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS: *co ja rob+i+l+e+m = co+m ja robił* 'what did I do'

A model where preterite endings are generated in the lexicon will cause over-generation in the lexicon, since every entry would have to be listed with the clitic and without it.

Another problem is the syntactic behaviour of clitics, they cannot be sentence initial or attached to elements following a verb, this plus the fact that we have to eliminate instances like: \*(3) X+CL<sub>i</sub>.....Y.....Z+CL<sub>i</sub>..... make the assumption that preterite endings are attached in the Lexicon very doubtful, since we would have to establish syntactic filters making use of phonological data.

## 3. The solution

I propose that, following Aguado & Dogil (1989) and adopting the structure of the clause proposed by Chomsky 1993, the clitics are generated under AGRs. The distribution of the clitics within the clause is a result of the different feature checking movements taking place in overt syntax. In such an analysis, clitics cannot attach to anything following the verb. Cliticization to the verb results from the verb moving up to the head position of AGRs. The subject becomes the host of the preterite clitics through the SPEC- AGRs relationship. Further investigation is needed how the other elements become hosts of the preterite endings. One plausible solution is that when there is no host in the head of AGRs, and the SPEC- AGRs position is, then the preterite endings move upwards in order to find a host. It is important to note that the syntactic host of the clitics is the verb, other elements can only serve as phonological hosts.

<sup>1</sup>I suggest a statement of the rule along the lines proposed by Booij & Rubach (1987:10):

RAISING

$O \Rightarrow u / \_ C_{\sigma} \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} -syll \\ +voice \end{smallmatrix} \right] ] ]$

The double square brackets indicate the end of a constituent (a phonological or morphological word).

<sup>2</sup>For a detailed characteristic of the syntactic and phonological behaviour of preterite Polish endings see Szczegielniak (1991).

In order not to abandon the assumptions of Lexical Phonology, I also propose that clitics when attached to their hosts, form a new phonological word. Adopting the framework of K. Rice (1990), Selkirk (1980) and Vogel (1984), let us assume that Lower is a domain span rule. It applies in the domain of phonological word, and is cyclic (constrained by the STRICT CYCLE CONDITION "SSC"). There is no contradiction in a rule being cyclic and domain sensitive. Affixation in the lexicon means that the affix is incorporated into the prosodic structure of the phonological word. Therefore, we might say that there is overlap between the statement that Lower applies in every cycle and that it applies after the mot structure of a given element has altered. It seems that Booij & Rubach (1987) assume that only processes in the lexicon can cause a change in the prosodic structure of a word. However, if we assume that affix-like cliticization can also change the structure of mot, then Lower should also be allowed to apply. This means that Lower is 'turned off' after the last rule influencing the structure of mot has applied, this does not necessarily mean it has to be in the lexicon.

Yer deletion also has the status of a domain sensitive rule. It differs from Lower in that it is not bound by the SSC, since it is context-free. Finally let us consider the status of Raising. As Booij & Rubach (1987) point out, one of the contexts for Raising is that it must apply at the end of a word. I propose that Raising is a domain limit rule and that its application is restricted to the edge of mot. This is a stronger prediction than that of Booij & Rubach's, since they do not specify what exactly they understand to be a word. In the case of Polish cliticization and its interaction with phonological rules, the relevant domain is a phonological word.

At first glance we seem to lose the generalisation concerning the ordering of the rules above. The fact that Lower precedes Yer deletion and Raising is predictable from the nature of the rules. Lower, according to Booij and Rubach, is a cyclic lexical rule, Yer deletion is Postcyclic and lexical, and so is Raising. However, we can impose certain ordering restrictions. Lower is constrained by the SCC and is structure preserving. Yer deletion is in fact a reflex of a more general principle **Stray erasure** which deletes at the end of a derivation material which is not prosodically adjoined to mot (see Steriade (1982), Booij & Rubach (1990)). Yers which are not vocalised cannot be assigned a syllable structure, and hence cannot be incorporated to mot.<sup>3</sup> Stray erasure applies at the end of a given derivation, for example after the application of domain sensitive rules. Raising, being a domain limit rule, will apply after all the domain sensitive rules have applied. I am not postulating that domain sensitive rules have to precede domain limit ones, however, a domain sensitive rule constrained by the SCC and structure preserving, has to precede a neutralising domain limit rule not constrained by the SCC.

Rules like Raising will be defined as applying not in the Lexicon, but when the structure of the phonological word is altered. This usually occurs in the Lexicon as a result of Word Formation Rules. Cliticization of preterite endings in this sense will be no different, with the exception that it takes place in overt syntax. This would imply that syntactic processes like cliticization can trigger the application of lexical rules if they are sensitive to the alterations in the structure in the mot domain.

#### Conclusions:

The above analysis implies that certain forms of cliticization in Polish, although syntactic in nature can trigger the application of rules which are considered to apply in the lexicon. This sheds new light on the interaction between different levels of grammatical description, especially between the lexical component of phonology and overt syntax.

#### References:

- Aguado, M., and G. Dogil. 1989. Clitics in lexical phonology: alleged counter evidence? *Linguistische Berichte* 120.
- Booij, G., and J. Rubach. 1987. Postcyclic versus postlexical rules in lexical phonology. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18 :11-44.
1990. Edge of constituent effects in Polish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8, 427-463.
- Chomsky, N. 1993. A minimalist programme for linguistic theory. In *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvian Bromberger*, ed. Kenneth Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser, Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1-52.
- Dogil, G. 1984. Lexical phonology and floating inflection in Polish. In W.U. Dressler (ed.), *Phonologica* 1987, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selkirk, E. O. 1980. Prosodic domains in phonology: Sanskrit revisited. In M. Aronoff and M.-L. Kean (eds.), *Juncture (Studia linguistica et philologica 7)*, 107-129. Saratoga, Calif. Anma Libri.
- Spencer, A. 1991. *Morphological Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Steriade, D. 1982. Greek prosodies and the nature of syllabification. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Szczegielniak, A. 1991. The Problems Caused by Polish Clitics in the Model of Lexical Phonology. *Bulletin de La Societe Polonaise de Linguistique*, fasc. XLVI, 1991, 30-39.
- Vogel, I. 1984. On constraining prosodic rules. In H. van der Hulst and N. Smith (eds.), *Advances in Nonlinear Phonology*, 27-233. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Zwicky, A. M. 1977. *On Clitics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club. 1985. Clitics

<sup>3</sup>Following Rubach PC, I assume that yers are floating matrices, and cannot play any role in syllable structure