

Case contingency of Macedonian cliticization*

Krzysztof Migdalski

Abstract: This paper analyzes patterns of cliticization in Macedonian. Macedonian is one of the two Slavic languages with verb-adjacent cliticization, the other one being Bulgarian. Like Bulgarian, Macedonian requires clitics to adjoin to verbal hosts. However, there are contexts in which the adjunction is not possible. This paper demonstrates that these environments involve hosts that do not have case-assigning properties. Moreover, this paper examines some other properties of Macedonian clitics, showing that in certain contexts they display characteristics of weak pronouns and verbal affixes, unexpectedly resembling certain properties of Polish cliticization.

Keywords: Macedonian, weak pronouns, clitics, case, Polish, affixation, Force

1. Introduction

Two Slavic languages, Bulgarian and Macedonian, display rather different grammatical properties than the rest of the Slavic group. They have developed the definite article and have a radically impoverished case system. Moreover, they display verb-adjacent cliticization, a property that is typical of Romance languages, which sets them apart from the remaining Slavic languages with clitics, which by default have second position cliticization. With respect to cliticization properties, Macedonian is a little different than Bulgarian, in the sense that it does not require clitic adjacency to passive participles and that in certain contexts pronominal clitics seem to be interpreted as affixes, as they participate in the calculation of stress assignment. These areas of particular divergence are the focus of this paper. They are used to show that the factor that conditions cliticization in Macedonian is case assignment of the host and that in the environments in which case assignment is not possible, weak pronouns are realized instead. This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 overviews general properties of cliticization in Macedonian and analyzes the way they have been accounted for in the literature. Section 3 examines the relation between the distribution of clitics and the categorial status of their hosts. Sections 4 and 5 argue that in the contexts in which case assigning hosts are not available, weak pronouns are realized instead of pronominal clitics, in line with Cardinaletti and Starke's (1999) Minimize Structure principle. Section 6 addresses instances of pronominal affixation accompanied by stress shift and relates them to special force marking in the clause.

2. General properties of cliticization in Macedonian

The distribution of clitics in Macedonian is presented in (1), with data taken from Bošković (2001: 182–83).

* I would like to thank Hans Broekhuis, Vladimir Cvetkoski, Alberto Frasson, Ljupka Grujoska, and Olga Tomić for their help with language data and fruitful discussions. I also express my gratitude to the two anonymous reviewers, whose detailed comments have led to considerable improvements of the paper. All errors remain my own responsibility. A very preliminary variant of this study, which related the direction of cliticization in Macedonian to types of hosts, was presented in Migdalski (2006a; b).

- (1) a. Petko *mi go* dade včera.
 Petko me.DAT it.ACC gave yesterday
 ‘Petko gave me it yesterday.’
 b. Včera Petko *mi go* dade
 c. Včera *mi go* dade Petko.
 d. *Petko *mi go* včera dade.
 e. *Mi go* dade Petko včera.
 f. *Dade *mi go* Petko včera.
 g. deka Petko *mi go* dade včera.
 that Petko me.DAT it.ACC gave yesterday
 (Mac; Bošković 2001: 182–83)

In examples (1a–c), the pronominal clitics precede the finite verb, satisfying the verb-adjacency requirement. Example (1b and 1g) show that the clitics do not need to appear in second position. In the Slavic languages with second position clitics, the counterparts of these examples are ungrammatical. The sentence in (1d) is ungrammatical due to the lack of clitic verb-adjacency, which is interrupted by the adverb *včera*. Example (1e) indicates that the pronominal forms in Macedonian are proclitic, that is, they may occur clause-initially. This is not a universal property of Macedonian pronominal clitics, as will be shown later, but in this way they are different from Bulgarian clitics, which require some overt material to their left. Example (1f) is instructive in the sense that its Bulgarian counterpart is grammatical, and it has been taken as evidence for the assumption that clitic placement is dictated by prosodic requirements, analyzed as a case of Prosodic Inversion (for example, Rudin 1997 and Rudin et al. 1999) or scattered deletion (as in Bošković 2001 and Franks and King 2000, with different variants of the analyses). Since the pronominal clitics need support to their left, the verb must move across the clitics to precede them. In Macedonian, the prosodic requirements of the proclitics are satisfied in configurations such as (1e), so verb movement across the clitics in (1f) is unnecessary and thus precluded. Bošković (2001: 184) captures the ungrammaticality of (1f) by proposing that copies of the pronominal clitics could be present above and below the verb as parts of the chain, as illustrated in (2). In Macedonian, the head of the chain created by clitic movement is pronounced (see 2a).

- (2) a. (X) clitic V ~~clitic~~
 b. ~~clitic~~ V clitic

In Bulgarian, which has pronominal enclitics that cannot occur clause-initially, the lower copy of the clitic, located just below the verb, will be pronounced if there is no other lexical material preceding the clitic (see 2b). Otherwise, if there is lexical material in front of the clitic, the head of the chain created by clitic movement will be pronounced.

Bošković’s (2001) analysis correctly accounts for the Bulgarian data given in (3), which show that the sequence of pronominal clitics may follow the verb in (3b), but they cannot precede the verb, as in (3a), if it means that they surface in the clause-initial position, in contrast to Macedonian.

- (3) a. **Mi go* dade Petko včera.
 b. Dade *mi go* Petko včera. (Bg)

Bošković's analysis also correctly captures the ungrammaticality of (1f) in Macedonian in terms of the economy of the derivation, as was observed earlier. However, it does not straightforwardly explain the contexts in which clitic placement is contingent on the type of a verbal host in Macedonian, rather than the phonological requirements, as will be shown in section 3.

An important issue discussed in the literature on verb-adjacent cliticization, especially on Romance languages, concerns the motivation for the clitic movement as well as for its placement immediately next to the verb. An influential traditional assumption made by Kayne (1975) and Sportiche (1989), and then also later adopted by Chomsky (1995: 249) in the Bare Phrase Structure approach, is that clitics are ambiguous elements that display phrasal and head-like properties. Their ambiguous status is relevant for the mechanism of their derivation, in which they move out from phrasal, theta-marked positions in the VP and raise as XP elements without triggering locality violations. Subsequently, they adjoin to a functional head, usually associated with Inflection and/or Tense features (most commonly T^0) as heads, thus avoiding violating the Chain Uniformity Condition. An issue that seems left open in the analysis is the relation between verb movement and the adjunction of the clitic to the functional head, that is, whether the clitics adjoin to T^0 or to the verb when it is located in a lower position and then raise and adjoin together with the verb to T^0 (see Matushansky 2006).

Another question relates to the motivation for clitic movement to T^0 . The operation certainly does not happen due to prosodic reasons, such as the need to satisfy the prosodic requirements of clitics, as they can be satisfied in the base position. Nash and Rouveret (2002: 177) argue that the cliticization onto T^0 is driven by the need to check the ϕ -features of T^0 . Some other analyses postulate a prosodic motivation, such as Belletti (1999: 550), who, in the spirit of early Minimalist assumptions, assumes that pronominal clitics are hosted in agreement projections before moving to T^0 . Since the agreement projections are not strong heads, they cannot contain any lexical elements with semantic import at PF. Consequently, these projections must be emptied before Spell-Out, which results in clitic movement to T^0 . In a recent analysis, Bošković (2016) also attributes clitic adjunction to T^0 to PF-related requirements. He assumes, as is standard, that clitics are functional elements, and in the case of verb-adjacent clitics, they are D-heads. Since functional elements cannot be stranded, clitics must assume a head-adjunction configuration by incorporating into the V/T complex. In this way they can also check case by incorporation.

The previous analyses of verb-adjacent cliticization attribute clitic adjunction to the need to check either ϕ -features or case. I observe that Macedonian gives us strong evidence in favor of case-driven movement, which comes from properties of clitic doubling. Both direct and indirect objects are doubled by clitics in Macedonian, but in different conditions. The doubling is obligatory for pronominal objects (Tomić 2012: 249), as shown for the doubling of strong pronouns by the accusative clitic *me* and the dative clitic *mi* in (4b) and (5b), respectively.

- (4) a. *Me* vide.
me.ACC saw.3SG
'(S)he saw me.'
- b. **(Me)* vide mene.
me.ACC saw.3SG me.ACC
'(S)he saw ME.' (Mac)
- (5) a. *Mi* go dade.
me.DAT it.ACC gave.3SG
'(S)he gave it to me.'
- b. **(Mi)* go dade mene.
me.DAT it.ACC gave.3SG me.DAT
'(S)he gave it to ME.' (Mac; Tomić 2012: 168–69)

For nominal objects, the conditions for clitic doubling are different for direct and indirect objects. Direct objects are obligatorily doubled when they are definite, as in the case of the direct object *šefot* 'the chief' in (6), which is obligatorily doubled by the pronominal clitic *go*.

- (6) **(Go)* vidov šefot
him.ACC saw.3SG chief.the
'I saw the chief.' (Mac; Tomić 2004: 220)

Indirect objects are doubled only if they are specific. Therefore, the definite indirect object *šefot* is doubled only when it has a specific interpretation, as in (7a), but not when it is non-specific, as in (7b); see also Tomić (2012: 249–61).

- (7) a. *Mu* dadov cveka na šefot.
him.DAT gave.1SG flowers to chief.the
'I gave flowers to (the specific person who is) the chief.'
- b. Dadov cveka na šefot.
gave.1SG flowers to chief.the
'I gave flowers to (whoever is) the chief.' (Mac; Tomić 2004: 220)

Clitic doubling seems to be a strategy of case checking. Suitable evidence for this assumption comes from the impossibility of clitic doubling with passive participles, as shown for the passive participle *naredni* in (8a), which cannot be doubled by the accusative clitic *gi*. Conversely, clitic doubling is required in structures with the *l*-participle, as shown in (8b) for the related structure with the *l*-participle *naredile*. Both types of participles are marked for the same set of the ϕ -features (gender and number), but they differ with respect to their case assigning properties. The passive participle is not able to assign accusative case, and it disallows clitic doubling. Clitic doubling is required with the *l*-participle, which is the only candidate for case assignment in the structure, as the other verb is the auxiliary 'be', which is unaccusative (see Broekhuis and Migdalski 2003 for discussion).

- (8) a. (**Gi*) bea naredni na tezgata čašite za vino
 them.ACC was.3PL place.PASS.PL on counter.the glasses.the for wine
 i rakija.
 and rakija
 ‘The glasses for wine and rakija were placed on the counter.’
 b. *(*Gi*) bevte naredile čašite za vino i rakija
 them.ACC were.2PL place.PTCP.PL glasses.the for wine and rakija
 na tezgata.
 on counter.the
 ‘You placed the glasses for wine and rakija on the counter.’
 (Mac; Migdalski 2006a: 182)

There have been many syntactic analyses of verb-adjacent cliticization in South Slavic. Following the insights of these proposals (for example, Rudin 1997; Tomić 2000, 2004; Bošković 2001; Franks and Rudin 2005; and Franks 2020), I suggest that pronominal clitics must cliticize by raising to Agreement projections, which are traditionally assumed to be case-licensing heads, as in (9). Potentially, the pronominal clitics could be analyzed as Kase heads (as in Franks and Rudin 2005 for Bulgarian), which like all case-bearing elements must move to be associated with Agr⁰ in the derivation; see Franks (2020: 302) for an extensive recent discussion and argumentation, and also sections 3 and 4 below. As is standardly assumed, these Agr heads are located in the extended verbal projections above the finite verb or the *l*-participle. After the cliticization, the verb+clitic complex may further raise to T.

- (9) [TP [T *ste* [AgrIO *mu* [AgrO *go* [VPdale proektot na Petko]]]]]
 are.3PL him.DAT it.ACC give.PTCP.PL project.the to Petko
 ‘You have reportedly given the project to Petko.’ (Mac)

3. Direction of cliticization

As was pointed out in the previous section, the distribution of clitics in Bulgarian and Macedonian differs with respect to the direction of cliticization: Macedonian has proclitics, whereas Bulgarian has enclitics, which are syntactically proclitic.¹ One way to derive this contrast is to assume that a copy of pronominal clitics occurs both above and below the verb (Bošković 2001: 184) and that although it is normally the head of the chain created by clitic movement that is pronounced, the lower copy will be pronounced if the pronunciation of the highest copy leads to a violation of phonological requirements. In this scenario, the position of the clitic is dictated by a type of PF-filter, which precludes phonologically infelicitous structures. As will be shown in this section, this type of analysis is problematic given that the direction of cliticization in

¹ Importantly, an anonymous reviewer points out that the traditional observation that Bulgarian has enclitics is an oversimplification. If the clitics were phonologically enclitics, it should be possible to introduce a pause between the clitics and the following verb, but this is not the case. The reviewer observes, referring to the examples given in (1), that although a pause can be added or a new intonation contour started between the clitics and the element preceding them, as in *Včera \ mi go dade*, a pause is absolutely not possible between the clitics and the verb: **Včera mi go \ dade*. These observations indicate to me that the clitics are adjoined to the verb, with which they form a phonological word, and that the syntactic requirements of cliticization prevail over the prosodic ones.

Macedonian is contingent on the categorial status of the verbal host of the pronominal clitics. Since the PF component does not have access to information about the morphosyntactic category and properties of the verbal host, clitic placement cannot be attributed only to the phonological requirements.

As shown in the data below, pronominal clitics in Macedonian assume proclisis and may appear in the clause-initial position when their host is a finite verb, such as *raduvame* in (10a) or the *l*-participle, such as *dale* in (11a). Examples (10b) and (11b) indicate that the pronominal clitics may occur low in the structure and they certainly do not need to target second position. However, they must be located immediately to the left of their verbal hosts, and placement of any intervening material between the verb and the clitics results in ungrammaticality, as in (10c) and (11c). Moreover, due to their proclitic status, they can only precede the tensed verb and the *l*-participle, and clitic placement after the verb is precluded, as indicated in (10d) and (11d). Non-verbal forms, such as the subject *nie* (see 10a–b), may precede clitics, as it is only verbal hosts that are disallowed in that position.

- (10) a. (Nie) *si se raduvame na vnučevo*
 we REFL.DAT REFL.ACC rejoice.1PL to grandson.the.PROX
 mnogu.
 very.much
 ‘This grandson of ours is giving us a lot of pleasure.’
 b. (Nie) *mnogu si se raduvame na vnučevo*.
 c. **Nie si se mnogu raduvame na vnučevo*.
 d. **Raduvame si se mnogu na vnučevo*. (Mac; Tomić 1999: 10)
- (11) a. (Vie) *ste im go dale proektot včera*.
 you.PL are him.DAT it.ACC give.PTCP.PL project.the yesterday
 ‘As reported, you gave them the project only/already yesterday.’
 b. (Vie) *včera ste im go dale proektot*.
 c. **Vie ste im go včera dale proektot*.
 d. **Dale ste im go včera proektot*. (Mac; Tomić 1999: 10)

When the verbal host is instantiated by an imperative (see 12) or a gerund (GER) (see 13), pronominal clitics follow the verb rather than precede it and thus they assume the enclitic position with respect to the verb. Proclisis is not possible in these contexts, even when the clitics are preceded by lexical material to their left.

- (12) a. *Penkaloto kupuvaj mi go!*
 pen.the buy.IMP.2SG me.DAT it.ACC
 ‘Buy me the pen!’
 b. **Penkaloto mi go kupuvaj!* (Mac; Franks and King 2000: 83)
- (13) a. *Nemarno pišuvajki go pismoto, ...*
 carelessly writing.GER it.ACC letter.the
 ‘Carelessly writing the letter, ...’
 b. **Nemarno go pišuvajki pismoto* (Mac; Franks and King 2000: 84)

The distribution of clitics with imperatives is different for some speakers in the presence of negation. As reported by Franks and King (2000: 84), in colloquial speech some speakers allow proclisis on imperatives in the presence of negation, whereas the enclisis is more typical of the literary standard (see 14a; the percentage sign indicates speaker variation with respect to acceptance of the clitic placement). In section 6, I attribute the possibility of the proclisis to the operator-like properties of negation and the special force value of imperative forms. As shown in (14b), negation does not influence the distribution of clitics with gerunds, which then are enclitic as in the case of declarative forms.

- (14) a. Ne (%*mi go*) nosi *mi go*!
 NEG me.DAT it.ACC bring.IMP.2SG me.DAT it.ACC
 ‘Don’t bring it to me!’
 b. Ne (**mi go*) donesuvajki *mi go* toa na vreme,...
 NEG me.DAT it.ACC bring.GER me.DAT it.ACC that on time...
 ‘Not bringing it to me on time...’ (Mac; Franks and King 2000: 83–84)

Franks and King (2000: 83) observe that since pronominal clitics in Macedonian can be proclitic or enclitic in designated syntactic contexts, they can be phonologically supported in either direction. This property indicates that their placement is conditioned by syntactic requirements, which is a challenge for the analyses that attribute their placement to phonological constraints discussed earlier in this paper. Of course, it is necessary to establish the reason why the clitics are only right-adjacent to gerunds and imperatives. Franks (2020: 318) argues that on the assumption that pronominal clitics in Macedonian are inflectional (as also argued by Rudin 1997), it is possible to make a generalization that they behave as prefixes with finite verbs and otherwise they assume enclisis. This is a descriptive generalization that naturally needs a deeper insight, though note that a similar distribution of clitics is observed in some Romance languages, thus an analysis of these cliticization patterns postulated for Romance languages (for example, Rivero 1994 and Rivero and Terzi 1995) should be applicable to Macedonian as well.

4. Weak pronouns

This section addresses the distribution of pronominal clitics accompanied by non-verbal predicates and passive participles. The distribution of clitics in these contexts is quite different than with finite verbs, gerunds, and *l*-participles and has not been conclusively explained in the literature so far. I propose that in the presence of non-verbal predicates and passive participles Macedonian pronominal clitics are undergoing a process of language change that involves their reanalysis as weak pronouns, and that similar developments have been observed in some other Slavic languages, especially in Polish.

As shown in (15), with predicative nominals, pronominal clitics in Macedonian are excluded clause-initially and occur in second position.

- (15) a. **Mu e tatko (na deteto).*
 him.DAT is father to child.the
 b. *Tatko mu e na deteto.*
 father him.DAT is to child.the
 ‘He is the father of this child (so he has to take care of him)!’
 c. *Toj mu e tatko*
 he him.DAT is father
 ‘He is his father (and not anyone else)!’ (Mac; Tomić 2000: 295–96)
 d. *Petko mi e tatko.*
 Petko me.DAT is father
 ‘Petko is my father.’ (Mac; Franks and King 2000: 83)

Bošković (2001: 255) states that the second position requirement could be a phonological restriction given that the clitics may surface in the third position of the clause as long as they occur second within their intonational phrase. This property is illustrated with the data in (16), in which *tatko* is preceded by a pause.

- (16) *Čovekot što ga sretnav minatata godina vo Paris # tatko*
 man.the that him.ACC met last.the year in Paris father
mi e.
 me.DAT is
 ‘The man you met last year in Paris is my father.’
 (Mac; Bošković 2001: 255)

Another property, which according to Bošković (2001: 255) shows that the clitics in (15) and (16) follow the second position requirement, is the fact that the clitics do not impose any requirements on the categorial status of their preceding phonological host, as they do not need to be preceded by predicative nouns, as indicated in (17b).

- (17) a. *Petko mi e mil.*
 Petko me.DAT is dear
 ‘Petko is dear to me.’
 b. *Mnogu si mi mil.*
 much are me.DAT dear
 ‘You are very dear to me’ (Mac; Bošković 2001: 255)

The structures in (15) and (16) resemble possessive structures with DP-internal oblique clitics that target second position. These structures are pervasive in Bulgarian, where they are used not only to indicate possession, but are also possible with arguments of deverbal nouns (Franks 2020: 315). In Macedonian, the usage of these forms is more limited, and they are largely restricted to kinship terms (Tomić 2012: 181–82). While it is true that clitics that occur in these structures are precluded clause-initially, Franks and King (2000: 86) report data which exemplify clitics that occur below second position, as shown in (18).

- (18) Petko sekogaš *mi e* mil.
 Petko always me.DAT is dear
 ‘Petko is always dear to me.’ (Mac; Franks and King 2000: 86)

A similar distribution of clitics is observed with predicative adjectives, to which the clitics need not be adjacent either, as indicated in (20c). Moreover, the clitics may appear lower than in the second position, as in the case of predicative complex NPs (see 19b). They can even occur clause-initially, especially in the presence of more than one clitic, as in (20a). As will be shown below, this is increasingly also a typical property of weak pronouns in Polish.

- (19) a. **Si* ubava žena.
 are.2.SG pretty woman
 b. Ubava žena *si*.
 c. Ubava *si* žena.
 d. Ti *si* ubava žena.
 you are pretty woman
 ‘You are a pretty woman.’ (Mac; Franks and King 2000: 86–87)

- (20) a. ??*Si mu* mil.
 are.2.SG him.DAT dear
 ‘He likes you.’
 b. Mil *si mu*.
 ‘You are dear to him.’
 c. Ti *si mu* na našion sin mnogu mil.
 you are him.DAT to our.the.PROX son very dear
 ‘You are very dear to our son!’ (Mac; Tomić 2001: 664)

Clitics display an even greater freedom of placement in structures with predicative passive participles. Namely, when the passive participle is the clause-initial element, the clitics occur in second position (see 21a).² The clitics occur lower than in second position in (21c), but as Bošković (2001: 257) observes, this example is acceptable because the passive participle *rečeno* preceding the clitics occurs after a pause, so in this way it is the first element within its intonational phrase, as in example (16) discussed above. Correspondingly, example (21b) in fact also becomes grammatical when a pause is introduced before *rečeno*, as has been reported to me by Vladimir Cvetkoski (p.c.).

² Migdalski (2006a: 193) attributes this restriction to the movement of the passive participle to Spec, TP, where it checks the ϕ -features of T, similarly to *l*-participle fronting in Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian. The passive participle is the only candidate for the movement, as it is the only element showing agreement. As an illustration, (i) presents a derivation of (21a).

(i) [TP Rečeno_i [T mu+e [PredP t_i [XP da bide točen]

- (21) a. Rečeno *mu* *e* da bide točen poveke pati.
 tell.PASS.N him.DAT is to be.SBJV.3SG punctual more times
 ‘He was told to be punctual more than once.’ (Mac; Tomić 2000: 296)
- b. *Na Petreta rečeno *mu* *e* da bide točen poveke
 to Peter.DAT tell.PASS.N him.DAT is to be.SBJV.3SG punctual more
 pati.
 times
- c. Na čovekot što *ga* sretnav minatata godina vo Paris #
 to man.the that him.ACC met last.the year in Paris
 rečeno *mu* *e* da bide točen poveke pati.
 tell.PASS.N him.DAT is to be.SBJV.3SG punctual more times
 ‘The man you met last year in Paris was told to be punctual more than once.’
 (Mac; Bošković 2001: 257)

As in the case of predicative adjectives, but unlike with nouns, clitics may occur clause-initially in the context of passive participles.

- (22) ?*Mu* *e* rečeno da bide točen poveke pati.
 him.DAT is tell.PASS.N to be.SBJV.3SG punctual more times
 ‘He was told to be punctual more than once.’ (Mac; Tomić 2000: 296)

Olga Tomić (p.c.) informs me that clause-initial placement of clitics in the presence of nouns, as in (15a), is uniformly excluded by all native speakers. Clitic placement with adjectives and passive participles is subject to speaker and dialectal variation. In the Western dialects, clitics may both precede and follow adjectives and passive participles, with the latter distribution being more common in the Eastern dialects. This type of variation may indicate that we are observing a process of language change, in which the pronominal forms become strengthened, as is also the case in some other Slavic languages, such as Polish (see section 5 for the relevant data). See also Korubin (1974); Tomić (1997, 2000), and Baerman and Billings (1998) for more discussion of the diachronic change in Macedonian.

With passive participles, the position of clitics in the clause is even more flexible than with predicative nouns and adjectives. As shown in (23a), the clitics do not have to be left-adjacent to the passive participle, such as *rečeno*. Moreover, when they are preceded by elements other than the passive participle, they need not target second position, and they in fact may occur rather low in the structure, as long as they do not follow the participle in the structure (see 23b and c). Native speakers inform me that the elements preceding the two clitics *mu e* in (23b and c) are not separated from these clitics by pauses, which indicates that the clitics may move quite freely in the clause and are not subject to the second position requirement.

- (23) a. Na Petreta *mu e* poveće pati rečeno da bide
to Peter.DAT him.DAT is more times tell.PASS.N to be.SBJV.3SG
točen.
punctual
‘Peter was told to be punctual more than once.’ (Mac; Tomić 2000: 296)
- b. Na Petreta (*mu e*) od strana na komisijata (*mu e*)
to Peter.DAT him.DAT is from side of commission.the him.DAT is
poveće pati (*mu e*) rečeno da bide točen.
more times him.DAT is tell.PASS.N to be.SBJV.3SG punctual
‘Peter was more than once told by the commission to be punctual.’
(Mac; Tomić 2000: 299)
- c. Na Petreta (*mu e*) poveće pati (*mu e*) jasno i
to Peter.DAT him.DAT is more times him.DAT is clear and
glasno (*mu e*) rečeno da dojde.
loudly him.DAT is tell.PASS.N to come.SBJV.3SG
‘Peter was loudly and clearly told to come more than once.’
(Mac; Franks and King 2000: 86)

Franks and King (2000: 86) observe that the acceptability of structures of the types presented in (23b–c) degrades if there are many adverbials that separate the clitics from the passive participle, as in (24).

- (24) ??Na Petko *mu e* poveće pati vo tekot na
to Peter.DAT him.DAT is more times in course.the of
minatata godina jasno i glasno rečeno da dojde.
last.the year clear and loudly tell.PASS.N to come.SBJV.3SG
‘Last year, more than once, loudly and clearly, Peter was told to come.’
(Mac; Franks and King 2000: 86)

Franks and King (2000: 86) point out, however, that the marginal status of (24) could be due to the awkwardness of focusing too many constituents at the same time, so it is most likely unrelated to the position of the clitics with respect to the passive participle.

The data involving clitic placement with predicative nominals, adjectives, and passive participles have been analyzed in the literature as instantiating a switch from a complete second position clitic system to a system with verb-adjacent clitic (see Bošković 2001; Legendre 1998; Tomić 1996, 1997, 1999), and the non-uniform distribution of the clitics has been attributed to the fact that the change has not been completed. However, the data discussed above indicate that neither of the systems is consistently at work here, as the clitics do not need to be in second position (except for the examples with predicative nominals), and they also do not need to be adjacent to the passive participle. Crucially, the distribution of the clitics is also entirely different in the presence of the passive participle than in structures with the *l*-participle. As shown by Franks and King (2000: 87), the clitics may not be separated by any lexical material from the *l*-participle (see 25a), but rather they must precede it, as in the grammatical structures presented in (25b–d).

- (25) a. *Na Petko *sum mu* poveќе pati kažal da
to Peter.DAT is him.DAT more times tell.PTCP.M.SG to
dojde.
come.SBJV.3SG
b. Na Petko poveќе pati *sum mu* kažal da dojde.
c. Poveќе pati *sum mu* kažal na Petko da dojde.
d. *Sum mu* kažal poveќе pati na Petko da dojde.
‘Several times, I told Peter to come.’ (Mac; Franks and King 2000: 87)

Moreover, in the contexts with passive participles corresponding to the ones in (23) in Bulgarian, the clitics must be adjacent to the passive participle, and this is the only clitic placement that is possible in Bulgarian, as shown in (26).

- (26) Na Petūr *mu e* kazvano mnogo pūti ot strana na
to Peter him.DAT is tell.PASS many times from side of
komisijata da būde točen.
commission.the that be.SBJV.3SG punctual
‘Peter was more than once told by the commission to be punctual.’ (Bg)

If the cliticization contrast between Macedonian and Bulgarian was related only to the proclitic versus enclitic status of the clitics or their verb-adjacent versus second-position placement, we would not expect the possibility of having so many positions available for Macedonian clitics across the clause.

The position of clitics in relation to the host in Macedonian has been accounted for in a number of ways in the literature. In a classic account, Joseph (1983: 110–17) argues that although Macedonian does not have a morphological infinitive, it displays a finiteness distinction. One of the consequences of finiteness on verbs is that finite verbs require proclisis. There is a problem with this claim, however, as it presupposes that *l*-participles, which trigger proclisis, are finite verbs, which is not correct, given that they show adjectival morphology (they are marked for gender and number) and occur with a finite form of the auxiliary (specified for person and number). Moreover, Tomić (1997) points out that another issue with Joseph’s account is the fact that it does not address the distribution of clitics with passive participles, adjectives, and nouns. In all fairness, these elements do not trigger pro- or encliticization per se and are not clitic hosts, so Joseph’s account does not necessarily need to take these categories into account.

For her own part, Tomić (1997) relates the distribution of clitics in Macedonian to the verbal and nominal properties of their hosts, which she decomposes into feature pairs [$\pm V$] and [$\pm N$], as given in (27).

- | | | | |
|------|-----------------------|---|---|
| (27) | | V | N |
| | tensed verbs | + | – |
| | <i>l</i> -participles | + | – |
| | passive participles | + | + |
| | adjectives | + | + |
| | nouns | – | + |

Tomić proposes a generalization which states that the direction of cliticization in Macedonian is related to the verbal properties of the host and that only verbal hosts may trigger proclisis. Therefore, nouns, which are [−V] categories, are not suitable hosts for proclitics. Passive participles and adjectives are nominal and verbal at the same time, thus carrying [+V, +N] features, and they display indeterminate distribution, as only a subset of speakers allow proclisis with these hosts. Finally, *l*-participles and tensed verbs form a natural class in the sense of both having positive values for V and negative values for N, and they both trigger proclisis.

Tomić's observations, which attribute the type of cliticization to the degree of verbiness of the clitic host, are insightful and correct. However, her assumption that nouns, adjectives, and passive participles serve as hosts for clitics cannot be substantiated, given that clitics do not need to be adjacent to these categories. Moreover, the feature decomposition of the hosts that she proposes may give rise to a prediction that speakers who allow proclisis on passive participles and adjectives treat these elements as verbal categories, which in turn may indicate that these elements should have more verbal properties among those speakers than among speakers of the other dialects, which is highly speculative. Finally, Tomić does not elaborate on a feature decomposition of gerunds and imperatives, which trigger enclisis, so it is not certain how these elements may fit into the workings of this system.

In his analysis of the distribution of clitic hosts in Macedonian, Bošković (2001: 256–57) follows Joseph's (1983: 110–17) assumption referred to above and argues that clitics are hosted by finite verbal elements, which include *l*-participles. However, due to a process of language change, the clitics become reanalyzed as simple verbal clitics that do not impose a more specific requirement on the nature of their verbal hosts, but then they target second position, as exemplified in (28a) for a structure discussed earlier in (21a), which contains a passive participle, thus a non-finite verbal form. To account for the grammaticality of (28b), where clitics unexpectedly procliticize on the passive participle, Bošković (2001: 257) argues that the passive participle in this structure could be “marginally analyzable as a finite form.”

- (28) a. Rečeno *mu* *e* da bide točen poveke pati.
 tell.PASS.N him.DAT is to be.SBJV.3SG punctual more times
 ‘He was told to be punctual more than once.’
 b. ?*Mu e* rečeno da bide točen poveke pati (Mac; Bošković 2001: 257)

This explanation seems highly speculative, as it presupposes that the same category of the passive participle could be treated by speakers as non-finite or “marginally finite” depending on the position of clitics. Moreover, Bošković's analysis cannot capture cases in which the clitics are neither in second position nor adjacent to the passive participle, as in a modified variant of (23b) given as (29) below.

- (29) Na Petreta od strana na komisijata *mu e*
 to Peter.DAT from side of commission.the him.DAT is
 poveќе pati rečeno da bide točen.
 more times tell.PASS.N to be.SBJV.3SG punctual
 ‘Peter was more than once told by the commission to be punctual.’
 (Mac; Tomić 2000: 299)

In a recent analysis, Franks (2020: 318–19) proposes that when occurring with conjugated verbs, pronominal clitics in Macedonian are basically object agreement markers, which procliticize on the verb. In the other contexts, they remain pronouns, and it is possible to make a generalization that “the further the context is from the host being a finite verb” (Franks 2020: 318), the less likely the clause-initial proclisis is.

5. A solution

It seems that in general the analyses summarized in the previous section correctly relate cliticization in Macedonian to the degree of finiteness of the verb that serves as a host to the clitics, though with the incorrect assumption that the *l*-participle is finite. What they lack is a discrete property or a unique morphosyntactic feature that could condition cliticization. I propose that the relevant condition is case assignment, that is, cliticization is obligatory and possible only with those hosts that are able to assign case. Since both finite verbs and *l*-participles are case assigners, they trigger proclisis and the clitics may not be separated from these hosts by any overt lexical material. Correspondingly, imperatives and gerunds are case-assigners as well; however, for independent reasons, which in fact largely match properties of cliticization in similar contexts in Romance languages, they trigger enclisis. Regardless, on a par with finite verbs and *l*-participles, they cannot be separated from clitics by any other lexical material. Furthermore, I also argue that pronominal clitics in Macedonian do not form a uniform class. The elements that cliticize and occur with case-assigning verbs are true pronominal clitics, whereas the pronominal forms that are attested with the categories that are unable to assign case, such as passive participles, adjectives, and nouns are in fact weak pronouns, in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999).

In Cardinaletti and Starke’s (1999) system, weak pronouns are assumed to occupy XP positions, while clitics target heads and cliticize on case-assigning hosts. Both of them are prosodically weak elements, therefore clitics are adjacent to their host, while weak pronouns are avoided clause-initially, though in Macedonian they gradually become strengthened and are accepted by speakers of some dialects at the beginning of a clause, as in (20a) and (22).³ However, in spite of their prosodic impoverishment, weak pronouns are phrasal elements in syntactic terms, and for this reason they can be scrambled in different positions across the clause, as indicated by the data with the passive participle *rečeno* in (23). In this way, their distribution resembles the behavior

³ Jung and Migdalski (2021) attribute the pronominal strengthening to the gradual erosion of the tense system and demonstrate that a similar process has taken place in some other Slavic languages. In the case of Macedonian, the erosion consists in the exclusive use of aorist and imperfect forms of verbs in perfective and imperfective aspect, respectively. This restriction is a recent development (see Friedman 1993/2003: 267) that does not hold in Bulgarian, where verbs marked for the aorist and the imperfect are compatible with both perfective and imperfective aspect.

of pronominal elements in Polish, which are also often analyzed as weak pronouns (see Cetnarowska 2003; Witkoś 1998; Witkoś and Łęska-Bayraktar 2024). As shown in (30), weak pronouns in Polish do not target a designated position in the clause, though they are avoided clause-initially, clause-finally or in front of a prosodic boundary. For this reason, they occur at the end of a clause only in structures that consist of just one other lexical item, as in (30b).

- (30) a. Często (go) spotykam (go) na ulicy.
 often him.ACC meet.PRS.1SG him.ACC on street
 ‘I often meet him on the street.’
 b. Spotykam go.
 ‘I meet him.’ (Pol; Spencer 1991: 367–68)

As in the context of passive participles in Macedonian, a recent corpus study performed by Włodarczyk (2018) indicates that the dative weak pronoun in Polish is increasingly attested clause-initially, including combinations with the reflexive pronoun *się*, as in (31), and in topicalization contexts, such as the dialogue between two speakers presented in (32), with the topicalized dative pronoun *mi* in (32B).

- (31) a. *Mi się* wydaje, że...
 me.DAT REFL seems that
 ‘It seems to me that...’ (Pol; Włodarczyk 2018: 66)
- (32) A: Ja zawsze piłam mocną herbatę z cukrem, ale
 I always drink.PTCP.F.SG strong.ACC tea.ACC with sugar but
 nie zawsze *mi* pomagało.
 NEG always me.DAT help.PTCP.N
 ‘I always used to drink strong tea with sugar, but it wasn’t always helpful.’
 B: A *mi* przeważnie pomaga herbata z miodem
 but me.DAT usually helps tea with honey
 ‘For me, tea with honey is usually helpful.’ (Pol; Włodarczyk 2018: 65)

An important ingredient of Cardinaletti and Starke’s (1999) proposal that is relevant for the current analysis is the assumption that due to economy reasons, an element with the least structure possible should be realized. This tendency is captured through the Minimize Structure Principle (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999: 198), which says that the realization of weak pronouns or strong pronouns is a last resort procedure that is applied only if the realization of a clitic is ruled out for independent reasons that cannot be avoided. Given that clitics are licensed by movement to case assigning positions to recover case, the last resort procedure could apply if there are no case assigning projections available in the structure. I suggest that this is what happens in the derivations that involve predicative nouns, adjectives, and passive participles. Since these elements are not case assigners, they do not project agreement categories in the structure, where case could be checked (or valued). In consequence, weak pronouns are realized, in line with the Minimize Structure principle. Incidentally, the weak pronouns realized with these elements are marked for dative, which is an inherent case. Since an

inherent case is related to thematic structure and is purely semantic, it does not need checking or valuation, as it can be interpreted by the LF component.

The analysis presented here may explain a contrast in the distribution of clitics with non-case assigning hosts in Macedonian and Bulgarian, especially if we take into account the difference in the syntactic structure of clitics in these two languages recently postulated by Franks (2020, ch. 6). Franks argues that Bulgarian and Macedonian differ with respect to the richness of their extended nominal projections: while pronominal clitics in Bulgarian consist of a DP layer dominated by a KP (Kase Phrase), in Macedonian they are just DPs, with the KP layer missing. This means that pronominal clitics in Macedonian are morphosyntactically poorer than their Bulgarian counterparts, and as a result, they behave more like exponents of verbal inflection or object agreement markers. The idea of pronominal clitics acting as agreement markers has been put forward originally by Rudin (1997) for Bulgarian, but Franks (2020) elaborates on it and is able to deduce a number of contrasts between the patterns of cliticization in these two languages. For instance, Franks observes that whereas Bulgarian in specific contexts tolerates some degree of laxing the strict adjacency between the verb and the pronominal clitics (see Krapova 1999), this is never a possibility in Macedonian, where strict clitic-verb adjacency is uniformly required. Furthermore, Franks points to the loss of feature distinctions for number and gender in dative clitics in some southwestern Macedonian dialects (see Tomić 2012: 172) and interprets it as $\varnothing$ -feature erosion and a hallmark of a transition of pronominal clitics to agreement markers (Franks 2020: 319).

The details of the implementation of the syntactic contrast between Bulgarian and Macedonian clitics by Franks (2020) are rather complex, but it seems that the gist of the idea may explain the variation in the distribution of pronominal clitics in these two languages discussed in this paper. Namely, pronominal clitics in Macedonian cannot be licensed in the presence of non-case assigning hosts because they lack KP and are morphosyntactically too impoverished to recover case, and as a result, in line with the Minimize Structure Principle, weak pronouns must be realized instead. This licensing restriction does not affect pronominal clitics in Bulgarian, which project KP and are morphosyntactically stronger, and as a result are able to adjoin to passive participles even though these elements are not case assigners.

6. Clitic affixation in operator contexts

This section overviews cases in which the regular antepenultimate stress pattern in Macedonian is altered, as a result of which pronominal clitics take part in the calculation of stress and may even become stressed themselves. These cases are argued here to be instances of a reanalysis of clitics as affixes, which is observed in other Slavic languages such as Polish for auxiliary clitics. These cases have been discussed in the literature, but it seems that the environments in which they occur have not been fully identified or related to similar phenomena in other Slavic languages. Below I argue that the stress shift affects elements that form a natural class in the sense that they all occur when a clause expresses a non-indicative (non-declarative) value of the illocutionary force. The empirical part of the analysis is largely based on the observations made by Rudin et al. (1999), Tomić (2000, 2001), as well as on the discussion of prosodic properties of operator clitics presented in Migdalski (2016, ch. 3).

In the standard variant of Macedonian, word stress is placed on the antepenultimate syllable, that is the third one from the end of a word. This is shown through capitalization in (33a) for an imperative and in (33b) for an indicative clause that contains a finite verb. If a word has fewer than three syllables, the first syllable receives stress, as shown in (33c) for a sentence with the *l*-participle *prodal*.

- (33) a. DOnesi!
bring.IMP.2SG
'Bring!'
- b. doNEsuvaš
bring.PRS.2SG
'You are bringing.' (Mac; Rudin et al. 1999: 551–52)
- c. (TOJ) PROdal MNOgu JAbolka
he sell.PTCP.M.SG many apples
'He has reportedly sold a lot of apples.' (Mac; Tomić 2001: 648)

The distribution of stress is not affected by the presence of pronominal or auxiliary clitics in clauses with the *l*-participle or a tensed verb. For instance, neither the auxiliary clitic *sum* nor the pronominal clitics *ti* and *go* alter stress placement in (34). Hence, stress is placed on the first syllable of the *l*-participle *kažal*, rather than on the pronominal clitic *go*, even though this clitic constitutes the antepenultimate syllable in the sequence of the clitics and the *l*-participle. This fact indicates that pronominal or auxiliary clitics do not form a prosodic word with the finite verb or the *l*-participle (the examples in 34b–c do not contain an auxiliary, as it is null in the 3rd person singular form in Macedonian).

- (34) a. (JAS) *sum ti go KAžal*.
I am.AUX you.DAT it.ACC say.PTCP.M.SG
'I have told it to you.'
- b. *Mi go DAle*. (cf. **mi GO* dale)
me.DAT it.ACC give.PTCP.M.PL
'They gave it to me.'
- c. *Mi go DAL*. (cf. **MI go dal*)
me.DAT it.ACC give.PTCP.M.SG
'He gave it to me.' (Mac; Rudin et al. 1999: 553)

However, this pattern changes in the presence of negation. If a clause contains a finite verb or an *l*-participle, the negation particle *ne* forms a prosodic word with the verb. Therefore, if a verb has two or less than two syllables (such as *uči* in 35), it carries no stress, which is then shifted onto negation.

- (35) a. Ne ZBORuva angliski.
 NEG speaks English
 ‘S/he doesn’t speak English.’
 b. NE uči angliski.
 NEG learns English
 ‘She isn’t learning English.’ (Mac; Tomić 2000: 388)

Likewise, if there are auxiliary or pronominal clitics located between *ne* and the finite verb, they are also included in the phonological word formed by the whole complex. Hence, the stress is assigned on the antepenultimate syllable even if this syllable is a pronominal clitic, such as *te* in (36b and c) and *gi* in (36d).

- (36) a. Ne *ti* ZBORuvam po angliski.
 NEG you.DAT speak.PRS.1SG in English
 ‘I am not speaking to you in English.’
 b. Ne *TE* učam angliski.
 NEG you.ACC teach.PRS.1SG English
 ‘I am not teaching you English.’
 c. Ne *sum* *TE* učel angliski.
 NEG am.AUX you.ACC teach.PTCP.M.SG English
 ‘Reportedly, I have not been teaching you English.’ (Mac; Tomić 2000: 388)
 d. (TI) ne *si* *mu* *GI* dala jaBOLkata
 you NEG are.AUX him.DAT them.ACC give.PTCP.F.SG apples.the
 ‘Reportedly, you haven’t given him the apples.’ (Mac; Tomić 2001: 649)

Tomić (2000: 388) concludes that this means that the negation particle (which she refers to as the “negation operator”) is a clitic with particular phonological requirements. Observe that negation is also generally assumed to be a Force marker, as it licenses negative assertion acting as an operator.

Likewise, the distribution of stress may be altered in the context of imperatives, which exemplify another case of non-indicative illocutionary force marking. The structure in (33a) above exemplifies stress pattern in an imperative that does not contain any pronominal clitics. The imperative forms in (37) indicate that placement of each pronominal enclitic in imperatives moves the stress to the right by one syllable, the way it also happens in clauses with negation, but unlike in declarative clauses.

- (37) a. doNEsi go!
 bring.IMP it.ACC
 ‘Bring it!’
 b. doneSI *mi* go!
 bring.IMP me.DAT it.ACC
 ‘Bring it to me!’ (Mac; Rudin et al. 1999: 551)

Finally, Tomić (2000) observes that *wh*-words in Macedonian (which she refers to as *wh*-operators) match the behavior of the negation operator. As shown in (38), the *wh*-operators form single prosodic words with finite verbs that occur to the right of them.

- (38) a. Koj POmina?
 who passed.3SG
 ‘Who passed (on the road)?’
 b. KoGO vide?
 whom.ACC saw.2SG
 ‘Whom did you see?’
 c. ŠTO baraš?
 what seek/want.2SG
 ‘What do you want?’ (Mac; Tomić 2000: 398)

Correspondingly to the examples with the negation operator, if there are pronominal or auxiliary clitics occurring between the *wh*-operator and the verb, they all form a single phonological word, with stress falling on the antepenultimate syllable even if this syllable is a clitic, as in (39b).

- (39) a. Komu mu go PREdade proektot?
 who.DAT him.DAT it.ACC handed.2SG project.the
 ‘To whom did you hand the project?’
 b. Što IM storil na studentite?
 what them.DAT do.PTCP.M.SG to students.the
 ‘What is he reported to have done to the students?’ (Mac; Tomić 2000: 399)

Admittedly, stress patterns in Macedonian are complex and the relation between the distribution of stress and the presence of operators is not entirely uniform. For example, the clitic *li*, which is regarded as an operator as it alters the interpretation of a clause into non-declarative, does not shift the stress rightward. When *li* is placed after a verb, as in (40b), it is excluded from the antepenultimate stress calculation of the verb.

- (40) a. doNEsuvaš
 bring.PRS.2SG
 ‘You are bringing’
 b. doNEsuvaš li?
 bring.PRS.2SG Q
 ‘Are you bringing?’ (Mac; Rudin et al. 1999: 551)

Furthermore, in some dialects of Macedonian stress is shifted when pronominal clitics encliticize on gerunds, which do not need to express any special, non-indicative Force value. Moreover, the stress shift applies to enclitics, so it could be potentially argued that the distribution of the stress pattern in Macedonian may be related to the division between proclisis and enclisis, with only the latter group of clitics triggering the stress shift, rather than the presence of operators. However, a problem with such a potential explanation is the fact that negation, which acts as a proclitic on the verb, also shifts the stress. Thus, it seems that operators may indeed affect stress placement. The issue certainly deserves further research; for the time being I tentatively propose (see also Migdalski 2016 ch. 3) that stress shift in Macedonian may be linked to the non-indicative Force value expressed in a clause. I also observe that the fact that stress shift occurs in operator contexts is in line with the behavior of operator clitics in Macedonian

and other Slavic languages. For example, as was mentioned in section 3 and is indicated in the examples in (41), the pronominal and auxiliary clitics procliticize on the verb in Macedonian. However, *li* is an enclitic, and needs to be supported by some overt material in front of it, such as the main verb located to its left in (42b).

- (41) a. *Si mu gi dal parite?*
 are.AUX him.DAT them.ACC give.PTCP.M.SG money.the
 ‘Did you give him the money?’
 b. **Dal si mu gi parite?* (Mac; Rudin et al. 1999: 544)

- (42) a. **Li si mu gi dal parite?*
 Q are.AUX him.DAT them.ACC give.PTCP.M.SG money.the
 b. *Si mu gi dal li parite?*
 are.AUX him.DAT them.ACC give.PTCP.M.SG Q money.the
 ‘Did you give him the money?’ (Mac)

The operator clitic *li* imposes special prosodic requirements also in Czech. Toman (1996: 507) observes that depending on a syntactic environment, pronominal clitics in Czech may either encliticize (as shown in 43 for the first clitic *ji* in the infinitival clause) or procliticize (as illustrated for the second clitic *ji* in the matrix clause in 43).

- (43) Poslouchat (*#) *ji* (#) *by ji* (*#) *asi nudilo.*
 listen.INF her.ACC COND her.ACC probably bore.PTCP.N.SG
 ‘It would perhaps bore her (e.g. Ann) to listen to her (e.g. Sue).’
 (Cz; Toman 1996: 507)

In contrast to the pronominal clitics, *li* in Czech may only encliticize, and in addition it requires a verbal host.

- (44) a. *Máte-li pochyby, zatelefonujte na informace.*
 have.2PL-Q doubts call.2PL at information
 ‘If you have doubts, call the information.’
 b. **Pochyby / *dnes li máte...*
 doubts / today Q have.2PL
 (Cz; Toman 1996: 508)

Operator clitics display special prosodic and syntactic behavior also in other contexts and in other Slavic languages. For example, in Serbo-Croatian they are located higher than the other second position clitics (see Bošković 2001: 60 for the distribution of ethical datives), while in Polish and Czech they impose special restrictions on the categorial status of their host (see Migdalski 2016, ch. 3 for a detailed discussion).

Recall from section 5 that Franks (2020, ch 6) argues on the basis of different syntactic contexts that Macedonian pronominal clitics have been reanalyzed as object agreement clitics on the verb. Here I show on different grounds that the reanalysis has advanced further in the operator contexts, in which pronominal clitics participate in the calculation of stress. A similar situation is observed in periphrastic tenses in Polish, where some speakers have reinterpreted the auxiliary clitic as an affix of the *l*-participle. As in the case of Macedonian, the hallmark of the reanalysis is the stress shift, which

causes the former auxiliary clitic to participate in the calculation of stress on the *l*-participle.

As the examples in (45) show, in Polish plural forms on the *l*-participle accompanied by the auxiliary verb, the *l*-participle may receive antepenultimate (as in 45a) or penultimate stress (as in 45b), which is also the default stress pattern in Polish. The former option is adopted by speakers who interpret the auxiliary verb as a clitic (that is, a form that does not participate in the calculation of stress and is thus considered a separate word), whereas the latter is used by speakers who have reanalyzed the auxiliary as an affix.

- (45) a. CzytAli-*śmy* listy.
 read.PTCP.VIR.PL-AUX.1PL letters
 ‘We read letters.’
 b. CzytaLI-*śmy* listy (Pol)

Mikoś and Moravcsik (1986) and Franks and Bański (1999) observe that the auxiliary can be deleted in coordinate structures under identity, but only when the antepenultimate stress pattern is applied (see 46a), but not when the auxiliary is interpreted as an affix, as this would involve deletion of a part of a word. These facts provide syntactic evidence for the affixal nature⁴ of the clitic in (46b), which as in Macedonian, is hallmarked by a stress shift.

- (46) a. CzytAli-*śmy* i piSAli.
 read.PTCP.VIR.PL-AUX.1PL and write.PTCP.VIR.PL
 ‘We read and wrote.’
 b. *CzytaLI-*śmy* i pisaLI. (Pol)

7. Conclusion

This paper has discussed the licensing of Macedonian cliticization in relation to the properties of clitic hosts. It has identified case assignment of clitic hosts as the factor which makes cliticization possible and which licenses pronominal clitics. In the absence of such a host, weak pronouns are realized, in line with the Minimize Structure Principle. The weak pronouns are becoming gradually stronger, adopting a distribution that resembles weak pronoun placement in Polish. Furthermore, this paper has overviewed cases of stress shift in Macedonian, as a result of which pronominal clitics may bear stress. It has been demonstrated that these are ultimate cases of pronominal affixation, which are currently restricted to operator contexts, in which a clause expresses a non-indicative (non-declarative) value of the illocutionary force.

⁴ An anonymous reviewer asks what is meant by the “affixal nature” of clitics and what it implies in formal syntactic terms. For the purpose of this paper, I assume that since affixal clitics participate in the calculation of lexical stress, they are interpreted as morphemes on their lexical hosts. Apart from the auxiliary verbs in Polish discussed in this section, similar cases involve prefixation of negation on verbs in Polish, Serbian, and possibly other Slavic languages.

References

- Baerman, Matthew, and Loren Billings. (1998) "Macedonian clitics and the trisyllabic stress window". Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Lars Hellan, Ivan Kasabov, and Iliyana Krapova, eds. *Papers from second conference on Formal Approaches to South Slavic Languages, Sofia, September 1997*. Dragvoll: Linguistics Department, NTNU, 13–32. [University of Trondheim Working Papers in Linguistics, 31.]
- Belletti, Adriana. (1999) "Italian/Romance clitics: Structure and derivation". Henk van Riemsdijk, ed. *Clitics in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 543–80. [Empirical approaches to language typology, 20; EUROTYP, 5.] <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110804010.543>
- Bošković, Željko. (2001) *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface. Cliticization and related phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier. [North Holland Linguistic Series: Linguistic Variations, 60.] <https://doi.org/10.1163/9780585474250>
- Bošković, Željko. (2016) "On second position clitics crosslinguistically". Franc Lanko Marušič and Rok Žaucer, eds. *Formal studies in Slovenian syntax: In honor of Janez Orešnik*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 23–53. [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 236.] <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.236.02bos>
- Broekhuis, Hans, and Krzysztof Migdalski. (2003) "Participle fronting in Bulgarian as XP-movement." *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2003*: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1075/avt.20.04bro>
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michal Starke. (1999) "The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns". Henk van Riemsdijk, ed. *Clitics in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 185–234. [Empirical approaches to language typology, 20; EUROTYP, 5.] <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110804010.145>
- Cetnarowska, Bożena. (2003) "On pronominal clusters in Polish". Peter Kosta, Joanna Błaszczak, Jens Frasek, Ljudmila Geist, and Marzena Żygis, eds. *Investigations into formal Slavic linguistics: Contributions of the fourth European conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages – FDSL IV held at Potsdam University, November 28–30, 2001*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 13–30. [Linguistik International, Volume 10.]
- Chomsky, Noam. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Franks, Steven. (2020) *Microvariation in the South Slavic Noun Phrase*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
- Franks, Steven, and Piotr Bański. (1999) "Approaches to 'schizophrenic' Polish person agreement". Katarzyna Dziwirek, Herbert Coats, and Cynthia M. Vakareliyska, eds. *Annual workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Seattle meeting 1998*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 123–43. [Michigan Slavic Materials, 44.] <https://lsa.umich.edu/content/dam/slavic-assets/slavic-publications/FASL7PDF.pdf>
- Franks, Steven, and Tracy Holloway King. (2000) *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Franks, Steven, and Catherine Rudin. (2005) "Bulgarian clitics as K⁰ heads". Steven Franks, Frank Gladney, and Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva, eds. *Annual workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The South Carolina meeting 2004*.

- Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 104–16. [Michigan Slavic Materials, 50.] <https://lsa.umich.edu/content/dam/slavic-assets/slavic-publications/FASL13.pdf>
- Friedman, Victor, A. (1993/2003) “Macedonian”. Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett, eds. *The Slavonic languages*. London: Routledge, 249–305. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781136861376>
- Joseph, Brian D. (1983) *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive: A study in areal, general and historical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 18.]
- Jung, Hakyung, and Krzysztof Migdalski. (2021) “Degrammaticalization of pronominal clitics in Slavic”. Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson and Thórhallur Eythórsson, eds. *Syntactic features and the limits of syntactic change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 139–60. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198832584.003.0007>
- Kayne, Richard. (1975) *French syntax: The transformational cycle*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Korubin, Blagoja. (1974) “Mesto glagola *sum* kak vspomogatel'nogo i kak svjazki v makedonskom literaturnom jazyke” [The position of the verb *sum* as an auxiliary and as a copula in the Macedonian literary language]. Natalija Ju. Švedova et al., eds. *Grammatičeskoe opisanie slavjanskix jazykov: koncepcii i metody*. Moscow: Nauka, 244–50.
- Krapova, Iliyana. (1999) “The system of auxiliaries in Bulgarian”. Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Lars Hellan, eds. *Topics in South Slavic syntax and semantics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 59–89. [Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 172.] <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.172.05kra>
- Legendre, Géraldine. (1998) “Second position clitics in a verb-second language: Conflict resolution in Macedonian”. Jennifer Austin and Aaron Lawson, eds. *Proceedings of the 14th Eastern States Conference on Linguistics '97*. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications, Cornell University, 139–49.
- Matushansky, Ora. (2006) “Head Movement in linguistic theory”. *Linguistic inquiry* 37 (1): 69–109. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002438906775321184>
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. (2006a) *The syntax of compound tenses in Slavic*. Doctoral dissertation, Tilburg University. Utrecht: LOT Publications. https://www.lotpublications.nl/Documents/130_fulltext.pdf
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. (2006b) “Direction of cliticization in Macedonian”. James E. Lavine, Steven Franks, Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva, and Hana Filip, eds. *Annual workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Princeton meeting 2005*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 221–35. [Michigan Slavic Materials, 51.] <https://lsa.umich.edu/content/dam/slavic-assets/slavic-publications/FASL14PDF.pdf>
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. (2016) *Second position effects in the syntax of Germanic and Slavic languages*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego. [Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 3747.] <https://fbc.pionier.net.pl/id/oai:repozytorium.uni.wroc.pl:133615>
- Mikoś, Michael J., and Edith A. Moravcsik. (1986) “Moving clitics in Polish and some crosslinguistic generalizations”. *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 32(1–4): 327–36. <https://real-j.mtak.hu/id/eprint/5399>

- Nash, Lea, and Alain Rouveret. (2002) "Cliticization as unselective attract". *Catalan journal of linguistics* 1: 157–99. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/catjl.58>
- Rivero, Maria L. (1994) "Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 12: 63–120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992746>
- Rivero, Maria L. and Arhanto Terzi. (1995) "Imperatives, V-movement and logical mood". *Journal of linguistics* 31(2): 301–32. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700015620>
- Rudin, Catherine. (1997) "AgrO and Bulgarian pronominal clitics". Martina Lindseth and Steven Franks, eds. *Annual workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Indiana meeting 1996*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 224–52. [Michigan Slavic Materials, 42.] <https://lsa.umich.edu/content/dam/slavic-assets/slavic-publications/FASL5PDF.pdf>
- Rudin, Catherine, Christina Kramer, Loren Billings, and Matthew Baerman. (1999) "Macedonian and Bulgarian *li* questions: Beyond syntax". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 17: 541–86. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006223423256>
- Spencer, Andrew. (1991) *Morphological theory: An introduction to word structure in generative grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sportiche, Dominique. (1989) "Le mouvement syntaxique: Contraintes et paramètres" [Syntactic movement: Constraints and parameters]. *Langages* 95: 35–80. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41690390>
- Toman, Jindřich. (1996) "A note on clitics and prosody". Aaron Halpern and Arnold M. Zwicky, eds. *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 505–10.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. (1996) "The Balkan Slavic clausal clitics". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 14: 811–72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00133364>
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. (1997) "Non-first as a default clitic position". *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 5(2): 301–23. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24599719>
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. (1999) "Cliticization and clitichood". István Kenesei, ed. *Crossing boundaries: Advances in the theory of Central and Eastern European languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 9–32. [Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 182.] <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.182.03mis>
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. (2000) "On clitic sites". In Frits Beukema and Marcel den Dikken, eds. *Clitic phenomena in European languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 293–316. [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 30.] <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.30.12mis>
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. (2001) "The Macedonian negation operator and cliticization". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 19: 647–82. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010775327330>
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. (2004) "The South Slavic pronominal clitics". *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 12(1–2): 213–48. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24599872>
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. (2012) *A grammar of Macedonian*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
- Witkoś, Jacek. (1998) *The syntax of clitics: Steps towards a minimalist account*. Poznań: Motivex.

- Witkoś, Jacek, and Paulina Łęska-Bayraktar. (2024) "The Person Case Constraint, Person Ordering Constraint and pronominal clusters in Polish". *Glossa: A journal of general linguistics* 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.10122>
- Włodarczyk, Hélène. (2018) "Mnie czy mi? O użyciu zaimka pierwszej osoby w celowniku" [*Mnie* or *mi*: On the use of the first-person pronoun in the dative case]. *Poradnik językowy* 758 (2018/9): 64–80. <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=922348>

Krzysztof Migdalski
Department of English and Comparative Linguistics
University of Wrocław
Wrocław, Poland
krzysztof.migdalski@uwr.edu.pl