



WestminsterResearch

<http://www.wmin.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

Book review: Zeljko Boškovic, On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: cliticization and related phenomena (North-Holland Linguistic Series: Linguistic Variations Volume 60). Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2001. Pp. ix+328.

Andrew Caink

School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Languages

This paper has been published in Journal of Linguistics, 39 (3), (November 2003), pp. 661-665)

© Cambridge University Press [2003].

The Journal of Linguistics is available online at:

<http://uk.cambridge.org/journals/lin>

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners. Users are permitted to download and/or print one copy for non-commercial private study or research. Further distribution and any use of material from within this archive for profit-making enterprises or for commercial gain is strictly forbidden.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch. (<http://www.wmin.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail wattsn@wmin.ac.uk.

J. Linguistics 39 (2003). DOI: 10.1017/S0022226703242298
 © 2003 Cambridge University Press

Zeljko Bošković, *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: cliticization and related phenomena* (North-Holland Linguistic Series: Linguistic Variations Volume 60). Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2001. Pp. ix + 328.

Reviewed by ANDREW CAINK, University of Westminster

Generative research on South Slavic clitics during the 1990s has been a prolific and rapidly developing field, resulting in many substantive developments both in our knowledge of the data and our theoretical approaches to them. This work, by one of the major contributors to this debate, makes the case for variable spell-out in the phonology, focusing principally but not solely on South Slavic languages. It includes some meticulous critical discussion of competing analyses, an often highly impressive account of data, and a magnanimous acknowledgement of the many other authors and unpublished researchers who have contributed to a number of the ideas.

Bošković's principal agenda is to carefully dismantle arguments from South Slavic that have been gathered by various authors in favour of Prosodic Inversion (Halpern 1995), whereby an unsupported enclitic generated by the syntax in sentence-initial position switches places with the next phonological word in the string. He argues that the phonology is able to modify the syntactic output not by movement, but via the selective pronunciation of copies in a movement chain.

With an eye on the wider field, the author asserts that South Slavic clitics represent 'a perfect "laboratory" for investigating cliticization' (2) on account of the variety and idiosyncrasies that they display. The empirical domain includes brief discussions of Germanic verb-second, object shift in Scandinavian, cliticisation and *wh*-movement in Romanian, Romance negation, and cliticisation in Polish and Czech in support of the main theory.

In addition to a succinct introductory first chapter and a brief summary conclusion in chapter 5, there are three chapters. Chapter 2 critically reviews much of the literature on 'second position' clitics in Serbian/Croatian (henceforth SC). The literature is divided for this purpose into 'weak' and 'strong' syntactic and phonological approaches (with an acknowledgement that there exist alternative accounts not covered by this typology). 'Weak' syntactic approaches are those analyses mentioned above that modify the syntactic output via Prosodic Inversion. Bošković is thorough in his deconstruction of the arguments for Prosodic Inversion, demonstrating that it is too powerful in many instances. This is a fine case of superficial observation of the data being proved untrue by careful scientific debate and analysis. The equally numerous 'strong' syntactic accounts are typified by movement of syntactic material in front of the SC clitics which are situated high in the clause, often in C. Bošković draws together an extensive list of arguments

to show that the SC clitics in fact can appear in a variety of positions in the syntax, but not as high as C. Next, Bošković rejects the idea of phonological movement utilized in Radanović-Kocić (1988), a ‘strong’ phonological approach, but concludes this chapter by adopting her descriptive generalisation that clitics must appear second in their intonation phrase. Following Klavans (1985), he makes this a lexical specification on SC clitics, along with the fact that they are marked ‘suffix’ (83). It is these lexical specifications that rule out the appearance of SC clitics in anything other than a second position. Previously published in Beukema & den Dikken (2000: 71–119), this chapter appears here with a number of additional arguments against the strong and weak syntactic accounts.

In chapter 3, Bošković adopts the claim that the phonology may pronounce a lower copy rather than the head of a movement chain. Informally, the pronominal clitic moves up in the syntax leaving multiple copies along the way, and PF spells out the highest copy that satisfies the prosodic requirements of the clitic. Hence, in cases where the syntax generates clitics in an unsupported position (i.e. first in the intonation phrase), we do not need recourse to phonological movement; the output of the syntax can be appropriately modified via deletion of the head and pronunciation of a lower copy.

- (1) (a) *Ga voli.
 him.ACC loves
 (b) Voli ga.
 loves him.ACC
 (c) Ona ga voli.
 ‘She loves him.’

In (1), the SC clitic and verb have independently raised for checking purposes to AgrO, leaving the clitic exposed in (1a) in sentence-initial position. This violates the clitic’s lexical requirements at PF. However, if the head is deleted at PF and the copy following the verb is pronounced instead, we have (1b). Example (1c) demonstrates that the head is pronounced if prosodic support is available (135). Equally effective analyses of Slovene and Polish clitic placement follow the SC analysis, along with a brief but elegant reanalysis of Northern Norwegian verb-second data.

The account provides impressive coverage of the SC data, including a re-analysis of what have previously been analysed (problematically) as optional movements (132–141). The marginality of some crucial data, particularly data involving ‘split’ clitic clusters (51–61), remains curious, as it would appear to be predicted to be fully grammatical in Bošković’s ‘Pronounce a copy’ (henceforth PAC) account, but this is a problem for all competing accounts too.

Chapter 4 focuses on Bulgarian and Macedonian clitic placement. The pronominal and auxiliary clitics lack the lexical specification of ‘second

position' found in SC, and the cluster results from adjunction in the syntax. Bošković details several alternative ways in which the movement chains may be generated (depending on what theoretical limitations one adopts concerning left/right adjunction). He is not unduly concerned about the syntactic position to which the verb and clitics raise in order to provide the necessary copies for the analysis to work, however (185). There is a particularly effective account of the question (and focus) particle *li* that includes a vigorous dismissal of the Prosodic Inversion accounts (197–249). In an appendix, there is some discussion of Macedonian clitics, with, as is the case in competing accounts, variable success. A final appendix presents three arguments in favour of multiple spell-out combined with the PAC theory from Bulgarian, Scandinavian object shift and Romance negation.

Regarding the PAC mechanism, Bošković follows Franks (1998) in assuming that if the head of a chain cannot be pronounced owing to a PF requirement, then the next highest head that satisfies the constraint is pronounced (100, 124). He suggests that this is an attempt by the phonology to be 'faithful' to the syntax as far as possible (125). Intuitively, this makes sense to us on account of the generative history of syntactic movement and traces, but it remains a stipulation within the system. Bošković's 'weak' phonology approach has simplified the syntax (in comparison to the 'strong' syntax proposals), and elegantly ruled out the need for phonological movement, but this is made possible only by placing a great deal of sophistication in this mechanism (see the derivation of (2) below). It is unfortunate that discussion of how the PAC mechanism works in terms of scanning and deleting copies is largely restricted to footnotes 12 and 30 (193 and 210, respectively) in chapter 4.

The analysis of the SC 'clitic cluster' is persuasive and manages to avoid several of the theoretical pitfalls found in purely syntactic or phonological approaches ('look ahead', stipulation of the clitic position in C, phonological movement). A particularly interesting result of the analysis of SC is that the 'clitic cluster' itself is merely an epiphenomenon of the lexical requirements of individual clitics combined with Bošković's rule of 'PF merging' (84). This is an adaptation of Marantz's (1988) Morphological Merger, in which Bošković proposes that when X and Y merge at PF, the derived element takes on the requirements of both X and Y and is unable to affect linear order (i.e. Prosodic Inversion is ruled out). Hence, only copies in second position in the intonation phrase may be pronounced, and material intervening between the clitics (e.g. adverbs) is excluded. In contrast, Polish clitics lack the second position requirement and may appear in various positions in the clause (171). With the qualification that the PAC mechanism may have the power to spell out any copy in the chain optionally, the PAC theory predicts the Polish data fairly straightforwardly. Implying that the SC and Polish clitic systems are a minimal pair, Bošković

writes: ‘apparently, removing the second position requirement results in the relaxation of the clitic clustering requirement, as expected under the current analysis’ (171).

However, in languages that might be seen as better candidates for ‘minimal pair’ status with SC, such as Bulgarian and Macedonian, the lack of the second position requirement does not result in a relaxation of clitic clustering. The similarities between the clitic clusters in these languages is merely superficial for Bošković; the Bulgarian/Macedonian clitic cluster is derived in the syntax via multiple adjunctions as verb and clitics move up the hierarchy of functional projections (see (2) below for one example).

One of the similarities between the clitic clusters is the internal ordering, particularly the appearance of the 3rd person singular auxiliary clitic that follows the dative and accusative pronominal clitics. Bošković demonstrates that despite this ordering at PF, the SC clitic auxiliary *je* ‘is’ appears higher in the syntax than the pronominal clitics (125–127). The PAC theory copes with such an apparent paradox with attractive ease; syntactically, *je* appears above the pronominal clitics but a ‘lower’ copy is pronounced at PF. The all-important question is what the motivation for this alternative spell-out might be. Bošković cites the fact that *je* is losing its clitic status, and suggests that this leads to either (i) a ‘low level constraint’ which forces the auxiliary to be either first or last in the cluster, and the final position is chosen ‘arbitrarily’, or (ii) loss of clitic status means ‘*je* does not allow cliticization across it but is not strong enough to serve as a clitic host itself’, hence it is pronounced at the end of the clitic cluster (130). The discussion here becomes somewhat opaque in comparison to the laudably lucid style that characterises this book, and consequently it remains unclear what effect ‘losing its clitic status’ has in this synchronic analysis. Either (i) this adds a hybrid category to the typology of ‘bound’ and ‘unbound’ morphemes, or (ii) sometimes *je* behaves like a clitic, and sometimes like an unbound morpheme. In any case, a PF requirement forcing the clitic to appear at the right edge of the cluster, ignoring all other copies, does not obviously follow. This is disappointing, given that a template approach to the clitic cluster has been partly rejected in SC on the grounds that it is evidently stipulative (62).

Bošković assumes that the Bulgarian clitic auxiliary *e* ‘is’ is also subject to a requirement that it appear at the right edge of the clitic cluster (192), though it is not stated whether this also derives from a partial loss of clitic status or is a further coincidence. Either way, its membership of a ‘clitic cluster’ is essential in determining which copy of the verb is spelled out in (2a).

- (2) (a) Toj go e vidjal.
 he him.ACC is seen-participle
 ‘He has seen him.’
 (b) Toj e go vidjal e go vidjal go vidjal go. (193)

For Bošković, the syntax generates (2b), and the items crossed out are those subsequently deleted in the phonology. The pronominal clitic *go* 'it/him' cliticises in front of the verb, they both then move up to the auxiliary, and *e + go + vidjal* moves up as a whole to AgrO. The auxiliary cannot be pronounced in the first position because of the stipulation that it appear at the right edge of the cluster, so it is deleted and the pronominal clitic *go* is spelled out. The existence of the clitic cluster as an entity that can be referred to in the PAC mechanism then becomes of significance because pronunciation of the main verb in the highest position 'leads to a PF violation, namely it prevents the accusative and the auxiliary clitic from being parsed into the same clitic group' (193). As a result, the head of the verb chain is deleted and the next element to be pronounced is the copy of *e*, followed by the next copy of the verb, as indicated in (2b). Therefore, not only is the position of the auxiliary in the clitic cluster stipulated, but the Bulgarian clitic cluster is, in some way, a primitive of the system, and not simply derived via syntactic adjunction.

Notwithstanding these points, this work is for the most part written in a clear, well-organised way. It presents a startlingly elegant analysis of much previously recalcitrant data in South Slavic and brings to light a great deal of fresh data. It is an important contribution to the field as a whole, and within Slavic linguistics it has already set a new benchmark for any discussion of cliticisation.

REFERENCES

- Beukema, F. & den Dikken, M. (eds.) (2000). *Clitic phenomena in European languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Franks, S. (1998). Clitics in Slavic. Paper presented at the Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax Workshop, Indiana University, Bloomington, June 1998. (<http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/index.html>)
- Halpern, A. (1995). *On the morphology and placement of clitics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Klavans, J. (1985). The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. *Language* 61. 95–120.
- Marantz, A. (1988). Clitics, morphological merger, and the mapping to phonological structure. In Hammond, M. & Noonan, M. (eds.), *Theoretical morphology: approaches in modern linguistics*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press. 253–270.
- Radanović-Kocić, V. (1988). *The grammar of Serbo-Croatian clitics: a synchronic and diachronic perspective*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois.
- Author's address: Department of English and Linguistics, University of Westminster,
32-8 Wells Street, London W1T 3UW, U.K.
E-mail: A.Caink@wmin.ac.uk

(Received 16 January 2003)