Using data from Digor Ossetic, a Northeast Iranian language spoken in the Central Caucasus, I argue for the necessity of post-syntactic lowering operation for the correct analysis of the 2nd position cliticization phenomena. I propose a specific OT-regulated version of the lowering for Digor Ossetic.

1. Introduction
1.1. What are second position clitics?
One of the basic assumptions of the Y-model of syntax is that all overt movement proceeds before the derivation is sent off to the PF. The more interesting is the evidence that sometimes the phonology might have a say in what and where to move. One of such cases is that of “second position clitics”.

Second position clitics are syntactically or prosodically deficient morphemes (not necessarily stressless!) placed roughly at the second position in the clause: either after the first word or first constituent. They may form there long clusters:

(1)  Warlpiri, Pama-Nyungan, Australia (Legate 2008:19)
    kuturu-fu = ka = npa = nyam
    nullanulla-TOP =PREM.IMP=2SG=REFLEX
    nyarrpara-wiyi marda-rni?
    where-first have-NPAST
    “Where do you have this nullanulla of yours?”

Starting from the classical paper (Wackernagel 1892), second position clitics were extensively studied by linguists of different persuasions, the bibliography of works published between 1892 and 1991 (Nevis et al. 1995) is 274 pages thick. From the modern point of view, the main question is whether it is syntax or phonology that places the 2P clitics there where they are. A more specific question is whether clitics sit at the edges of syntactic or prosodic constituents. Given that the phenomenon is very common cross-linguistically, it is desirable to develop some universal treatment of it.

Not unfrequently, languages impose a somewhat freer constraint on the clitic placement: there, enclitics show a strong tendency to land after the 1st constituent, but actually their position in the clause is somewhat more free. I will call the phenomenon ‘generalized 2P clitics’:

(2)  Pashto
    a.  
    sangin = ba  war  māt  kṛ-i
    Sangin=FUT  door  broken.M.SG  do.PST.PF-M.3SG
    ‘Sangin will break the door.’ (Taylor 2000:43, rechecked)
    b.  
    sangin war = ba  māt  kṛ-i
    Idem (fieldwork)

In such languages, the acceptability of a sentence usually decreases as the enclitic is moved rightwards:

(3)  Shughn (Southeast Iranian, Pamiri, Tajikistan)
    a.  
    Mādīna=ta  ar  ruz  garĎā  pīz
    Madina=HAB  every day  bread  cook.PST.F
    ‘Madina bakes bread every day.’ (fieldwork)
While the issue of the rightmost possible position of clitics in such languages might be rather delicate, questions about the leftmost position are quite well defined. It is reasonable to assume that, in such languages, the choice of the leftmost position and the placement of clitics are essentially analogous to similar processes in languages with strict 2P.

One of the arguments for this is that very closely related languages may differ in this respect: for instance, among the East Iranian, Digo or Ossetic has generalized 2P clitics, while in the closely related Iron Ossetic the placement is strictly in the 2nd position; the same holds for Shughni vs Rushani.

1.2. Approaches to 2P phenomena

1.2.1. “Just Syntax”: (see, among others, (Progovać 2005:125-166, Bošković 2001) for Serbocroatian1) The movement and placement of clitics occurs in the narrow syntax cycle, then some of the generated structures are filtered out at the PF. Among the predictions of this approach are the following:

✔ There is nothing special about clitics, where clitics are placed, some other material could occur as well.

✔ Ordering of clitics in a cluster should more or less correspond to the position in the tree.

This approach encounters a number of problematic (or at least challenging) facts. First, there are typologically attested orderings that seem to be difficult to reconcile with the purely syntactic ordering:


First-person clitics first (regardless of the grammatical relation to which this corresponds), followed by second- and third-person markers ordered according to a phonological principle, with “lighter” clitics preceding “heavier” ones.

(5) Tagalog (Anderson 2005:166)

Monosyllabic pronouns < Particles < Disyllabic pronouns; Within each group, there is a particular ordering.

Obviously, one may assume that syntax shuffles clitics on their way to the 2nd position while the phonology chooses to spell out (or filters all but) one of the resulting orderings. However, that would make the theory completely counterevidence-proof.

Another problematic phenomenon is the splitting of constituents by clitics:

(6) Pashto (Tegey 1977)

\begin{verbatim}
 a =me kesto
\end{verbatim}

PREV=1SG wear

‘I was wearing (it).’

No syntactic material other than clitics is allowed to appear in these poitions. Digor data of this type will be discussed later in the paper.

1.2.2. “Just Phonology”. (see, among others, (Radanović-Kocić 1996) for SC) Clitics enter the derivation and stay there until the structure is sent off to PF, all movement of clitics proceeds there. The well known problematic fact is the clitic climbing in Serbo-Croatian sentential complements:

(7) (Bošković 2001, Progovac 2005:146)²

\begin{verbatim}
 a. Milan kaže da =ga vidi.
 M. says that him sees
\end{verbatim}

1 To be referred later in this paper as SC.
2 Progovac reports that for some speakers both (7b) and (7 d) are equally unacceptable.
‘Milan says that he can see him.’

b.*  Milan =ga kaže da vidi.
c. Milan želi da =ga vidi.
M. wishes that him sees
‘Milan wants to see him.’
d.?  Milan =ga želi da vidi.

The difference between the verbs is hardly phonological.

If one is looking for a universal approach to 2P phenomena, these data seem to rule out the purely phonological treatment.

1.2.3. Prosodic Inversion (see, among others, (Halpern 1995) mostly on SC material): 2P clitics are fronted by the syntax into the highest position in the clause, but afterwards they are put after the first phonological word, or, otherwise, they are moved in the syntax into the position after the first constituent.

(8) Serbo-Croatian, (Halpern 1995:18)

a. non-split constituent

\[ \text{Taj čovek=je vole-o Marij-u.} \]
This man=be.3SG love-PST M-ACC
‘That man loved Maria.’

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{NP}_i \quad \text{IP} \\
\text{AP} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{je} \quad \text{IP} \\
\text{taj} \quad \text{čovek} \quad \text{ti} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{vole} \quad \text{Marij} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. split constituent

\[ \text{Taj=je čovek vole-o Marij-u.} \]
this=be.3SG man love-PST M-ACC
‘That man loved Maria.’

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{cl}_i \quad \text{IP} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{I} \\
\text{AP} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{ti} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{taj=je čovek} \quad \text{vole} \quad \text{Marij} \\
\end{array}
\]

The question of how je got adjoined to IP is disregarded.

Like the previously sketched approaches, this one encounters a number of empirical and theoretical problems. Perhaps the most salient empirical problem is how to deal with ‘bizarre’
clitic orderings like exemplified in (4), (5). The theoretical problem is of course with the idea of modularity of grammar.

1.2.4. Non-derivational accounts. The influential work (Anderson 2005) does not quite fit in this classification: it assumes that no movement occurs, pronominal clitics are part of "sentence-level morphology", there is a co-reference between the clitics and (phonologically null) verb arguments.

The placement of clitics is regulated by a series of constraints:

(9)
- **Integrity**
- **NonInitial**
- **LeftMost**

where runs over all appropriate domains, either syntactic or phonological: it can be some XP, intonational phrase etc.

The ordering of clitics within the cluster is achieved through an appropriate ranking of the constraints. For example, the fact that in SC dative pronominal clitics always precede the accusative ones can be rendered by positing the ordering

(10) \textbf{LeftMost} > > \textbf{LeftMost}

Among problems faced by this approach are the following. First, if one subscribes to a derivational theory of syntax, one needs to explain when the clitics enter the derivation and where they are placed in the tree. Significantly, it is sometimes possible to show that clitics occupy structurally different levels, in particular it is so for SC dative and accusatives pronouns (Bošković 2001).

An empirical difficulty for such approach is created by ‘clitic climbing’ effects, (7).

1.2.5. Choice of subject language in previous approaches. To quote Bošković:

The bulk of recent work on second position cliticization has been done with respect to Slavic languages, especially Serbo-Croatian (SC). This is not surprising, given that most second position cliticization languages are either no longer spoken (Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, Hittite, Old Spanish, among others) or, if they are, they are not as readily accessible as SC (Warlpiri, Pashto, Tagalog, Luiseño, Mayo, Ngiyambaa, among others). For this reason, SC is increasingly becoming a testing ground for theories of second position cliticization. As a result, the argumentation and the kind of data examined with respect to second position cliticization in SC have reached a level of subtlety not attested in the discussion of the phenomenon in other languages. (Bošković 2001:7)

Given this situation, it appears desirable to test the proposals formulated on the basis of SC data on a widest possible array of languages with 2P clitics. Ones of such languages is Ossetic.

1.3. Subject language and theoretical premises of the present study

1.3.1. Ossetic: trivia. ‘Ossetic’ is a cover term for two closely related Northeast Iranian idioms, Iron and Digor. Iron speakers form a majority (probably about 90% of ethnic Ossetians), however, no precise figures are available. Ossetic is spoken in the Central Caucasus (North and South Ossetia) by about 300,000-400,000 people. The closest extant related language is Yaghnobi, an endangered minority language of Tajikistan. Ossetians are assumed to be descendants of ancient Sarmatians (closely related to Scythians) and medieval Alans.

Descriptive work (mostly concentrating on Iron, but on Digor too) has been done by native linguists. However, they mostly dealt with morphology and not with syntax (Issaev 1966, Takazov 2003). Studies of syntax in ‘modern’ frameworks have started only very recently, nothing is published as yet.

Probably the best analyzed cognate language is Pashto, a major Southeast Iranian language. Pashto 2P clitics have been addressed in a number of works (Tegey 1977, Roberts 2000, Anderson 2005, Dost 2007).

---

3 I have in mind here the availability of the relevant data, number of linguists working on the language, and a relatively rich descriptive grammar tradition. (Bošković’s note).
1.3.2. *Theoretical assumptions.* I assume a derivational syntax and an OT-regulated phonology. I will argue however that the phonological module must be allowed to perform a certain re-adjustment of the word order. It is usually assumed that “Phonological rules refer to only prosodic constituent structure.” (Truckenbrodt 1999: 221). As I will show, the placement of clitics in Ossetic is sensitive to the constituent structure.

2. Highlights of Digor Ossetic grammar

In this section, I review the points of the Ossetic grammar relevant for further discussion. Most of what is said here is equally applicable to Digor and Iron Ossetic. The by far most frequent word order is SOV (it is so in about 95% of transitive clauses, Erschler & Volk 2009b), however the constituent order is largely influenced by various factors, including information structure.

(11) a. 

```
direktor  wänndeg  prikaz  erba xasta @^4
principal  himself  order  brought
```

‘The principal himself brought the order.’

b. 

```
men- nj  fiulder  intervju = din  eveži
OBL-ABL  more  interview = DAT.2SG  certainly
neke  radta @
nobody  gave
```

Certainly, nobody gave you an interview longer than mine.’

c. 

```
flvaren= ba  levarda  75  axurzawi @
exams = CONTR  gave  75  student.OBL^5
```

‘75 students took (entrance) exams.’

The language is mostly left branching, it possesses a sizeable case system (nominative, Accusative-Genitive^6, Inessive, Ablative, Dative, Allative, Superessive, Equative^7). Another hallmark of the Ossetic grammar is a rich system of preverbs with spatial and aspectual semantics (similar to those in modern Georgian and Slavic).

As typical of Iranian languages, Digor Ossetic possesses only a limited number of ‘synthetic’ verbs, while all new verbs are formed as a combination of the nominal part and a light verb (usually ken-un ‘to do’ or un ‘to be’).

(12) a. 

```
ironx  ken-un
forgettance  do-INF
‘to forget’
```

b. 

```
ba-ironx  ken-un
PREV- forgettance  do-INF
‘to have forgotten’
```

Important for my previous purposes is the fact that nothing except clitics may intervene between the nominal part and the light verb.

Remarkable is the Digor system of negation (Erschler & Volk 2009a). The language shows negative spread (13a), that is, a number of negative indefinites are allowed to co-occur in a clause, but the negative indefinites are incompatible with negative markers. Moreover, negative

---

^4@ marks examples from fiction or oral narratives. The rest of Digor examples are elicited.

^5The oblique here is not an outcome of an unusual subcategorization frame of the verb but is assigned by the numeral.

^6I prefer to gloss (and call) this case oblique. In most instances, it coincides with the inessive as well.

^7In Iron, there is also the comitative.
indefinites are obligatorily moved into the preverbal position (13b-c), they can be split from the verb only by 2P clitics (13d):

\[(13)\]

\[\text{a. } \text{uma won-uj } \text{ma-ked } [\text{ma-ke } \text{tuxxuj}]
\]

and they-ABL N.IMP-when N.IMP-who for

\[(*\text{ma}) \text{arsaw-e}
\]

N.IMP pray-IMP.2SG

‘And never you pray for anyone of them’

\[\text{b. } \text{soslan-i neke } (*\text{ne}) \text{ warz-uj}
\]

Soslan-OBL nobody NEG love-PRS.3SG

‘Nobody loves Soslan.’

\[\text{c.* neke } \text{soslani } \text{warzuj}
\]

Idem (intended)

\[\text{d. } \text{neke=}j \text{ warzuj}
\]

nobody=ACC.3SG loves

‘Nobody loves him/her.’

Wh-words in Ossetic are also obligatorily moved into the preverbal position where they can be separated from the verb only by negative markers, negative indefinites, or/and 2P clitics:

\[(14)\]

\[\text{a. } \text{Mudin-i } \text{ka } \text{warz-uj?}
\]

M-OBL who love-PRS.3SG

‘Who loves Madina?’

\[\text{b.* ka } \text{mudini } \text{warzuj?}
\]

\[\text{c. } \text{ka } =j \text{ ne } \text{zon-uj?}
\]

who =ACC.3SG NEG know-PRS.3SG

‘Who doesn’t know her/him?’

While a number of better described and analyzed languages (Georgian, (Harris 1984; King 1996), Hungarian, (Kiss 2002), Basque (Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina 2003)) possess a similar pattern of wh-movement, another feature of Ossetic left periphery seems to be unique. The language possesses two kinds of complementizers: the 1st type is strictly preverbal (more precisely, pre-NegP) (15a) while the 2nd type roams freely between the left edge of the clause and the verb (15 b).

\[(15)\]

\[\text{a. } \text{aslan=}\text{mene } \text{vžine } \text{ku } \text{ne } \text{rbazurtajde}
\]

\[\text{wad=}\text{mi } \text{erbachun } \text{feronx ada tide}
\]

‘If Aslan had not called me yesterday, I would have forgotten to show up.’

\[\text{b. } \text{xwenx-t-i } \text{kud } \text{vžine } \text{war-gw } \text{kod-ta}
\]

mountain-PL-INESS if yesterday rain-CONV do.PST-TR.PST.3SG

\[\text{wntur } \text{aslan=}\text{ba } \text{xwase karsta}
\]

nevertheless Aslan-CONTR hay cut.PST-TR.PST.3SG

‘Although it was raining in the mountains, Aslan nevertheless was mowing hay.’

Clitics are able to intervene between the 1st type complementizers and the verb.

As a working hypothesis, I assume the following clause structure:

\[(16)\]

\[\text{[TopP(?)} \text{[CP-2 } \text{[CP-1} \text{[NegP} \text{[TP} \text{[vP...]...}
\]

fronted 2nd type 1st type negation;

material compls compls; negative

wh-words indefinites

3. 2P Clitics in Digor Ossetic: Basic Data

3.1. Inventory
Three types of enclitics can be distinguished

- **PRONOMINAL ENCLITICS**: for 6 cases, Acc, Dat, All, Superess, Abl, and Iness (the latter coincide with the forms for Abl\(^8\)), and for all values of number and person.
- **2P ‘PARTICLES’**: *ma* ‘still, else’; *bal* ‘while’; *dan* ‘reported speech’
  Of these, the most important one for the further reasoning is the marker of reported speech *dan*, as it definitely takes scope over the whole clause.
- **‘STRAY PARTICLES’** that can be placed more or less anywhere in the clause (in particular, in 2P cluster(s)): *der* ‘even; also; focus/emphasis marker’; *ba* ‘contrastive topic marker’; *bab\(^8\)* ‘again’; *čit* ‘iterative’; *jew* ‘iterative’

Altogether, that makes 38 items. (To compare, in Pashto, there are only 8 2P enclitics.)

### 3.2. Placement

Enclitics can form a long cluster roughly at the 2\(^{nd}\) position of the clause. Within a cluster, clitics are ordered in a certain way (Dat-All-Superess-Acc-Abl for pronouns; *der/ba-ma-bal-dan* for particles; *bab\(^8\), čit, jew* may occur anywhere).

(17) \[ [\text{me} = \text{new\textit{ng}}] \text{umbal} = \text{der} = \text{bab\textit{ej} = min} \text{3urdta} \]

POSS.1SG=new friend =EMPH=AGAIN=DAT.1SG told

\[ \text{kušt-i} \text{ wavrri} \text{ tuxxtj @} \]

work-OBL condition-OBL about

‘My new friend too has told me about the work conditions.’

Remarkably, ‘particles’ and pronouns behave differently, in particular, under certain conditions they may form two distinct clusters, (18). (The verb here is *ra-*3urdton.)

(18) \[ \text{ra =din=} \text{ ej} \text{ 3urdton = beb\textit{ej = dan} } \]

PREV =DAT.2SG=ACC.3SG I.told =again=REP

PRONOUNS PARTICLES

‘(S)he says: “I have again told you that.”’

As (18) shows, clitics may occupy the position between the preverb and the verb stem. No other material is allowed to occur there. That is not the only instance when a certain position in the clause is only available for clitics: besides that, clitics may intervene between a negative marker and the verb (a), between a negative indefinite and the verb (b) as well as between the nominal part of a complex verb and the light verb (c).

(19) a. \[ \text{ma =jin} \text{ turs @} \]

N.IMP=DAT.3SG be.afraid.IMP.2SG

‘Do not be afraid for his/her sake!’

b. \[ \text{neke=} \text{j} \text{ warzuj} \]

nobody=ACC.3SG loves

‘Nobody loves him/her.’

c. \[ \text{ur-sudi=} \text{ ej} \text{ kodton @} \]

PREV-thought=ACC.3SG do.PST.1SG

‘I have remembered him/her.’

However, the noun phrase is impenetrable for clitics:

(20) a. \[ \text{mink’ij} \text{ k’ebis=} \text{dan = in} \text{ ra-vard-tonc} \]

little puppy=DAT.3SG PREV-give.PST-TR.PST.3PL

‘They say, they gave him/her a little puppy.’

---

\(^8\) I am not aware of examples where Iness and Abl clitics would co-occur.
b.* \( \text{mink'ij} = \text{dan} = \text{in} \ k'ebis \ ra-vard-tonc \)
\( \text{idem (intended)} \)

c.* \( \text{mink'ij} = \text{dan} \ k'ebis = \text{in} \ ra-vard-tonc \)
\( \text{idem (intended)} \)

d.* \( \text{mink'ij} = \text{in} \ k'ebis = \text{dan} \ ra-vard-tonc \)
\( \text{idem (intended)} \)

It is so even if the NP is ‘long’:

\[
[\text{ustur adgin raj\textasciitilde{}ast surx fitk'u}=\text{jin}=\text{jin}=\text{jin}=\text{jin} \text{ra-wardtonc}]
\]

large tasty beautiful red apple=\text{DAT.3SG} they.gave

‘They gave him a beautiful large tasty red apple.’

### 3.3. **Why is a new analysis necessary?**

I suggest that these facts cannot be explained by a PF-filtering account. A number of arguments testify for that.

First, if it is the syntax that places clitic there where they are than some other syntactic material would be able to occur there as well. Unless we posit particular diacritic phonological features on clitics, the prediction would be that other phonologically light material would be able to survive PF-filtering.

Remarkably, some clitics are not intrinsically ‘lighter’ than certain non-clitics:

\[
debel \ (2\text{SG}.\text{SUPERESS clitic}) \ \text{vs} \ \text{non-clitics} \ ber\text{reg} \ ‘\text{sign’}; \ cemen ‘\text{why’ etc}
\]

Moreover, it is still unclear how a sentence-level adverbial would end up sitting within the verb:

\[
\text{fit} = \text{tan} = \text{sv} \ \text{xas-ton} \ \text{@}
\]
\[
\text{PREV=REP=ACC.3SG} \ \text{carry.PST-TR.PST.1SG}
\]

‘They say, I brought them up.’

Second, in order to account for the contrast between the NP and splittable constituents, it is apparently necessary to assume under this approach that the NP is structurally incapable of hosting clitics, while splittable constituents do have appropriate landing sites. \textit{A priori}, there is nothing wrong with this assumption.

However, it is not only the NP that is impenetrable for clitics from the main clause. The same holds for converbal phrases (24a), which can host clitics of their own (i.e. arguments of the converb), (24b):

\[
\text{a.} \quad [\text{bakuj/ej} \ \text{\_\textasciitilde{}ewugisk\textasciitilde{}ume} \ \text{pojezd\textasciitilde{}}}]
\]
\[
\text{baku.ABL} \ \text{Vladikavkaz.ALL} \ \text{train.OBL}
\]
\[
\text{cew-gej} = \text{ba = min}
\]
\[
\text{go-CONV.ABL} = \text{CONTR=DAT.1SG}
\]
\[
\text{ber\textasciitilde{}} \ \text{rawen-t-i} \ \text{xczege} \ \text{ercud-ej @}
\]
\[
\text{many place.PL.OBL} \ \text{wait.CONV} \ \text{come.PST-PST.3SG}
\]

‘But travelling by train from Baku to Vladikavkaz, I had to wait (for another train) at many places.’

\[
\text{b.} \quad \text{end\textasciitilde{}} = \text{ej} \ \text{lasujnag} \ n \ \text{ad\textasciitilde{}}
\]
\[
\text{other\textasciitilde{}}=\text{ACC.3SG} \ \text{carrier} \ \text{NEG} \ \text{I.was}
\]
\[
[\text{\_\textasciitilde{}in\textasciitilde{}} = \text{f\textasciitilde{}} \ \text{mn\textasciitilde{}est\textasciitilde{}j\textasciitilde{}mare} \ \text{ken-gej} @]
\]
\[
\text{without=ACC.3SG} \ \text{PREV-teasing} \ \text{do-CONV}
\]

‘I wouldn’t give him a ride without having teased him before that.’

Therefore, it is not a lack of appropriate landing sites that causes the impenetrability, and, on the other hand, the conjectural phonological filters, whatever they are, tolerate ‘internal’ clitics in converbal clauses.

\textsuperscript{9} \quad \text{Here it means ‘otherwise’}.
The inevitable conclusion appears to be that ‘categorial labels’ of XPs are visible to the mechanism that places clitics.

4. Proposal – Part 1

- Clitics may undergo a post-syntactic lowering.
- This lowering operation, however, is not purely prosodic, but takes into account certain syntactic information.

4.1. Why Lowering?

The crucial observation is that at the PF, clitics sometimes sit not where they are interpreted. The reported speech marker, a sentence-level adverbial, may show up within the verb (the verb here is *fé-xaston*):

(25) *fi* = **tan = sv xas-ton @
PREV=REP=ACC.3SG carry.PST-TR.PST.1SG
‘They say, I brought them up.’

Besides that, *ermest (=durr) ‘only’ normally takes scope over the XP immediately following it. However, it skips clitics (and, apparently, only them):

(26) a. *ermest =dur =mene* jeći kurdiade jes
only=EMPH=ALL.1SG this request exists
ok ‘I have only this request (and no other requests).’
* ‘Only I (and not some others) have this request.’

b. *ermest =dur mun-me jeći kurdiade jes*
only=EMPH L Obl-ALL this request exists
ok ‘Only I (and not anybody else) have this request.’

I suggest that the most natural way to account for these facts is to assume that clitics are placed in their final positions by a post-syntactic lowering.

4.2. What is the lowering sensitive to?

Originally it has been assumed that the lowering is conditioned by prosodic requirements (as the term ‘prosodic lowering’ testifies.) In this section, I show that it is not the case, or, at the very least, that it is impossible to achieve the result invoking only prosodic factors.

The first piece of evidence to support this contention is the behavior of clitics in the spontaneous speech. There, pauses can be made in constituents to which the clitics attach:

(27) a. *[qebé beré {pause}tog]=šl rajvuldej @
very much blood=NESS.3SG was.spilled
‘Very much blood was spilled there.’ (from a recorded narrative)

b.* *qebé beré =sl tog rajvuldej*
very much=NESS.3SG blood was.spilled
Idem (intended)

Moreover, a pause may occur immediately before the clitic:

(28) *mene{pause} din wojberce baftuda @
here DAT.2SG so.much he.added
‘Here, they have added so much (to your pension).’ (from a recorded dialogue)

It is a fairly standard assumption that a prosodic phrase must end before a pause, and thus it is hard to reconcile these facts with a purely prosodic approach.
Additionally, the segment, after which the clitics are placed, may be stressless, for instance, it is so for "er" in (29):

\[
\begin{align*}
& ur = dan = babwj = min = n\bar = \check{\bar}it \\
& PREV = REP = again = DAT.1SG = ACC.3SG = HAB \quad \text{bring-IMP.2PL}
\end{align*}
\]

(S)he said, keep bringing it to me.’

These data show that clitics do not need to attach to an edge of a prosodic constituent (although they may well form one together with their host).

5. Proposal – Part 2

I propose that the lowering is governed by a series of constraints in the spirit of (Andersen 2005). Instead of presenting the general case, I will work out a particular example.

An important underlying assumption is that candidates that collect an equal number of non-fatal violations are ‘equally bad’. I disregard the question how the derivation picks up one of such candidates.

Example: 1 clitic, Verb with a preverb.

Constraints:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{NonInitial(Verb)}, \quad \text{Integrity(Verb)}, \quad \text{Leftmost(Verb)}
\end{align*}
\]

Ranking:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{NonInitial(Verb)} \gg \text{Integrity(Verb)} \\
& \text{NonInitial(Verb)} \gg \text{Leftmost(Verb)} \\
& \text{Integrity(Preverb)} \gg \text{Leftmost(Verb)} \\
& \text{Integrity(Stem)} \gg \text{Leftmost(Verb)}
\end{align*}
\]

(30) $\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a.} & \text{in = ra-3urton} \\
\text{b. ok} & \text{ra = jin 3urton} \\
\text{c. ok} & \text{ra-3urton = in} \\
\text{d.} & \text{r = in-a-3urton}
\end{array}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NonInitial(Verb)</th>
<th>Integrity(Preverb)</th>
<th>Integrity(Stem)</th>
<th>Integrity(Verb)</th>
<th>Leftmost(Verb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{in = ra-3urton}$</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{r = in-a-3urton}$</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{ra = jin 3urton}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{ra-3urton = in}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, the candidates $\text{ra = jin 3urton}$ and $\text{ra-3urton = in}$ accumulate the same number of non-fatal violations and turn out to be ‘equally bad’.
6. Remaining Questions

To make my account consistent with the derivational approach to syntax, I still need to answer a number of questions. In particular, I need to specify where clitics enter the derivation, which projection(s) host them, and how the order of clitics is established.

6.1. Proposal – Part 3

- (Pronominal) clitics enter the derivation where the lexical arguments do, that is, within vP, and then undergo movement.
- Pronominal clitics and ‘2P particles’ are hosted by two separate projections high in the clause, it is reasonable to assume that these are pieces of CP dedicated for that purpose.
- All pronominal clitics are hosted by one projection.
- The order of clitics is established by a number of ranked constraints.

6.1.1. Why are clitics and lexical argument base-generated at the same position? Pronominal clitics are in complementary distribution with lexical arguments:

(31) *Soslan =ej Medin-i warzuj
Soslan=ACC.3SG Madina-OBL loves
'Soslan loves Madina.'

Thus it is reasonable to assume that lexical arguments are generated within the vP.

This assumption has a specific prediction. Recall that Digor clitics do not have to be placed exactly in the 2nd position. If pronouns are generated in vP and moved leftwards, they would be unable to be further to the right than the verb. This prediction is indeed borne out:

(32) a.* ba-lxad-ton ažine =ej
PREV-buy.PST-TR.PST.1SG yesterday=ACC.3SG
‘I bought it yesterday.’

b. ba-lxad-ton =ej ažine
‘I bought it yesterday.’

An additional argument for that Digor clitics are generated within the vP and then moved upwards is that the clitic climbing is bled by overt complementizers:

(33) a. me = mbal [ke koj =din kod-ton] ceruj
1SG= friend COMPL speech =DAT:2SG do-TR:PST.1SG lives
Petersburg-i
Petersburg-OBL
‘My friend, about whom I talked to you, lives in Petersburg.’

1SG= friend=DAT:2SG COMPL speech do-TR:PST.1SG lives P-OBL
Idem (intended)

With no complementizer, the climbing is possible (at least for some speakers).

(34) a.? men fınduj [ba-vdes-un =din =ej]
I.OBL want-PRS.3SG PREV-show-INF= DAT:2SG=ACC.3SG
b. men =din =ej fınd-uj [ba-vdes-un]
I. OBL = DAT:2SG=ACC.3SG want-PRS.3SG PREV-show-INF
‘I want to show it to you.’

6.1.2. Position of pronominal clitics. Standard tests do not provide any evidence for separate structural positions of the pronominal clitics: they climb (or are elided) only together:

(35) a.* men =din fınduj =ej ba-vdes-un
Moreover, the order of pronominal clitics does not reflect the order of the corresponding full NPs: while the former is rigid, the latter is quite free:

(36)  
\[ \text{cawjnon} \quad \text{č'ew} \quad \text{k'ado-bel} \quad \text{ramardta} \]  
\[ \text{Sportsman} \quad \text{Bird} \quad \text{Branch-SUPERESS} \quad \text{killed} \]  
\[ \text{The sportsman killed a bird on a tree branch.} \]  

b.*  
\[ \text{cawjnon} \quad \text{=ej} \quad \text{č'ew} \quad \text{ramardta} \]  
\[ \text{Sportsman=3SG} \quad \text{Bird} \quad \text{killed} \]  
\[ \text{The sportsman killed it on it.} \]  

c.#  
\[ \text{cawjnon} \quad \text{=ibel} \quad \text{=ej} \quad \text{ramardta} \]  
\[ \text{Sportsman=3SG.SUPERESS=3SG.ACC} \quad \text{killed} \]  
\[ \text{Idem (intended)} \]  

Remarkably, other items that undergo movement, like wh- and negative phrases, do not obey a syntactically imposed ordering in Digor.

Therefore we are led to the conclusion that Digor pronominal clitics all occupy a single position, their ordering being regulated by the following constraints (or template):

(37) \[ \text{Leftmost}(\text{Dat},?) \text{>> Leftmost} (\text{All}, ?) \text{>> Leftmost} (\text{Acc}, ?) \text{>> Leftmost} (\text{Abl}, ?) \]

6.2. Position of ‘2P particles’.

The “particles” behave somewhat differently from the “pronouns”. First, while the pronominal clitic cluster is unsplittable in Digor (38a-b), the particles may form a separate cluster (38c-d):

(38)  
\[ \text{ra} \quad \text{=din=ej} \quad \text{zurdton} \]  
\[ \text{PREV} \quad \text{=DAT.2SG=ACC.3SG} \quad \text{I.told} \]  
\[ \text{‘I told you that.’} \]  

b.*  
\[ \text{ra} \quad \text{=din} \quad \text{zurdton=ej} \]  
\[ \text{PREV} \quad \text{=DAT.2SG} \quad \text{I.told=ACC.3SG} \]  
\[ \text{Idem (intended)} \]  

c.  
\[ \text{ra} \quad \text{=babuy=dan =din=ej} \quad \text{zurdton} \]  
\[ \text{PREV} \quad \text{=again=REP=DAT.2SG=ACC.3SG} \quad \text{I.told} \]  
\[ \text{‘(S)he says: “I have again told you that.”’} \]  

d.  
\[ \text{ra} \quad \text{=din=ej} \quad \text{zurdton =babuy=dan} \]  
\[ \text{PREV} \quad \text{=DAT.2SG=ACC.3SG} \quad \text{I.told =again=REP} \]  
\[ \text{PRONOUNS} \quad \text{PARTICLES} \]  
\[ \text{‘(S)he says: “I have again told you that.”’} \]  

The second difference concerns the interaction of clitics with conjoint XPs:

(39)  
\[ \text{Soslan ema} \quad \text{=dan=in} \quad \text{Rustam dedeng-u-t-v} \]  
\[ \text{Soslan and =REP=3SG.DAT} \quad \text{Rustam flower-EP-PL-NOM} \]  
\[ \text{urba-las-tonce} \]  
\[ \text{PREV-carry-TR.PST.3PL} \]  
\[ \text{‘They say, Soslan and Rustam brought her flowers.’} \]  

b.  
\[ \text{Soslan ema} \quad \text{Rustam=dan=in} \quad \text{dedeng-u-t-v urba-las-tonce} \]  
\[ \text{idem} \]  

---

10 This is the default position of enclitics in Digor. In all other East Iranian languages with (generalized) 2P enclitics I have data on (Bartangi, Pashto, Rushani, Shughni) those are placed after the second conjunct.
A natural conclusion is that particles and pronouns occupy separate positions.\textsuperscript{11} Examples like (38a) can be explained either by supposing that pronouns may stay in vP, or that the lowering separately affects the pronoun cluster and the particle cluster. I leave for future research the fine structure of conjoint phrases.

7. Conclusion

I have left a good deal of loose ends (whether the ‘particles’ occupy distinct structural position, how come that the 3rd type clitics are allowed to freely roam within the cluster etc.) However the main points of my analysis do not depend on that. I have argued that the clitic placement occurs after the narrow syntax cycle, but at least some labels (for instance, NP) remain visible for the module that does the job. Thus, the Y-model appears to be challenged.
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Glosses

| ABL       | ABLATIVE                          |
| ACC       | ACCUSATIVE                        |
| ALL       | ALLATIVE                          |
| CONTR     | CONTRASTIVE TOPIC                |
| CONV      | CONVERB                           |
| DAT       | DATIVE                            |
| EMPH      | EMPHASIS                          |
| EP        | EPENTHETIC                        |
| FUT       | FUTURE                            |
| HAB       | HABITUAL                          |
| INESS     | INESSIVE                          |
| INF       | INFINITIVE                        |
| NEG       | NEGATIVE                          |
| N(EG),IMP | NEGATION WITH THE IMPERATIVE      |
| NOM       | NOMINATIVE                        |
| OBL       | OBLIQUE (CASE MARKER OF ACC, GEN AND INESS FOR NOUNS) |
| PF        | PERFECT                           |
| PL        | PLURAL                            |
| POSS      | POSSESSIVE PROCLITIC              |
| PREV      | PREVERB                           |
| REP       | REPORTED SPEECH                    |
| SUBJ      | SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD                  |
| SUPERESS  | SUPERESSIVE                       |
| TR        | TRANSITIVE CONJUGATION            |