

CLITICS IN MACEDONIAN

Francesca FICI, M. Rita MANZINI, Leonardo M. SAVOIA

1. Presentation of the data

1.1. The clitics' inventory

The structure of the Macedonian sentence is characterized by a rich set of inflectional and modal elements, which in a normal declarative sentence appear before the lexical verb. These include the argumental clitics, the auxiliaries (*to be* or *to have*), the modal particles, the negation. In interrogative sentences we can additionally find the question particle *li*. Argumental clitics are articulated according to case and person specifications, as illustrated in the schema in (1). Case specifications distinguish accusative and dative for each person of the paradigm:

(1)	Accusative	Dative
1ps	me	mi
2ps	te	ti
3psm/n	go	mu
3psf	ja	i
1pp	nè	nì
2pp	ve	vi
3pp	gi	im
Reflexive	se	si

Argumental clitics and personal pronouns are the only nominal elements in the language which are inflected for case. As for the form *se/si* note that it is used as the reflexive in all persons of the paradigm; it is also used as the middle-passive morpheme.

Macedonian presents the typical properties of null-subject languages; in particular the subject can be not lexically expressed. As for the position of the clitic string in the sentence, Macedonian is peculiar in relation to the other Slavic languages, and especially Bulgarian (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1994, Mišeska Tomić 1996). Indeed clitic pronouns can occur at the absolute beginning of the sentence, cf. (2); in Bulgarian on the contrary, clitic pronouns appear only in second position, as illustrated in (3):

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------|
| (2) | Go e gledal
him is seen
“He saw him” | <i>Macedonian</i> |
| (3) | Toj go e viždal
he him is seen
“He saw him”
Viždal go
seen him
“He saw him” | <i>Bulgarian</i> |

In Macedonian, the auxiliaries are used in the perfect with different participial forms. The *sum* “I am”¹ auxiliary combines with the *-l* participle which agrees with the subject in Number and Gender as in (4); the *imam* “I have” auxiliary combines with the *-no/-to* participle (from the passive participle *-n/-t*) which does not agree with the subject and is inflected for neuter singular, as in (5).

- | | |
|-----|--|
| (4) | Sum gledal/gledala
I-am seen-m./-f.
“I have seen”
Sme gledale
we-are seen-pl
“We have seen” |
| (5) | Imam gledano
I-have seen
“I have seen”
Imame gledano
we-have seen
“We have seen” |

The modal particles include the irrealis particle *ke* and the *bi* particle for the conditional. The former cooccurs with the present tense of the verb giving rise to a future interpretation, as illustrated in (6a); when *ke* cooccurs with an imperfect, it gives rise to an “unfulfillable expectative” conditional (Friedman 1993: 271). Note that as in other Balkan languages, the irrealis/ future particle corresponds to a stem form of the verb “to want” (cf. Greek, Albanian, Bulgarian, Romanian). The *bi*

¹ Note that the quotation form for Macedonian auxiliaries is the 1st person singular of the present indicative; the language does not have an infinitive.

particle, corresponding to the stem form of the aorist of “to be”, cooccurs with the *-l* participle and precedes both the clitic string and the lexical verb, as illustrated in (6b).

- (6) a. *ќе gledam*
PRT I-see
“I will see”
b. *Jas bi mu go dal*
I PRT to-him it given
“I would give it to him”

The interrogative particle *li* can itself be construed as modal. This does not interact with other clitics, in that it does not position itself internally to the clitic string, but rather, it follows the focused component of the sentence, be it the lexical inflected verb or the participle in auxiliary constructions. This is true even when the other clitics (argumental, etc.) precede the lexical verb, as illustrated in (28).

- (7) *Go gledas< (li)?*
him you-see QPRT
“Do you see him?”
Si go gledal (li) ?
you-are him seen QPRT
“Did you see him?”

The last element to be considered is the negation *ne* which precedes both the modal and the argumental clitics, as in (8)

- (8) *Ne ќе gledam*
not PRT I-see
“I will not see”.

1.2. Argumental clitics

In what follows we shall concentrate on argumental clitics. The paradigm in (9)-(11) presents the data relating to the occurrence of argumental clitics. In (9) we give the basic paradigm for the accusative clitic in isolation, in (10) the basic paradigm for the dative in isolation, in (11) the dative + accusative combination; note that the dative systematically precedes the accusative:

- (9) *Me/ Nè/ Te/ Ve/ Go/ Ja/ Gi gledaat*
me/ us/ you-s/ you-p/ him/ her/them they-see
“They see me/ us/ you/ him/ her/ them”
(10) *Mi/ Ni/ Ti/ Vi/ Mu/ Ì/ Im zboruvaat*
to me/ us/ you-s/ you-p/ him/ her/them they-speak
“They speak to me/ us/ you/ him/ her/ them”

- (11) Mi go /ja /gi davaat
 to me it-m/it-f/them they-give
 “They give it/ them to me”
 Mu go/ ja /gi davaat
 to him it-m/it-f/them they-give
 “They give it/ them to him”
 Ni/ Ti/ Vi / Im go davaat
 to us/you-sg/you-pl/them it they-give
 “They give it to us/you-sg/you-pl/them”

Pronominal clitics in Macedonian appear both in isolation, and in so-called clitic doubling environments, i.e. as the doubling of a definite Noun Phrase (cf. Čašule, 1997). In this case they are obligatory both in the accusative and in the dative. When the verb takes an indefinite (dative or accusative) object, the latter on the other hand is not doubled by the clitic. This set of conditions is illustrated in (12):

- (12) Go gledam deteto
 him I-see child-the
 “I see the child”
 Gledam (edno) dete
 I-see (one) child
 “I see a child”
 * Go gledam (edno) dete
 him I-see (one) child
 “I see a child”
 Mu ja davam knjigata na Jovan
 to-him it I-give book-the to John
 “I give the book to John”

The reflexive form *se* is not differentiated with respect to Person or Number features, as illustrated by the basic accusative paradigm in (13). The same is true of the dative reflexive *si* illustrated in (14), where we also note that the usual dative + accusative order is respected:

- (13) Se miam
 MR I-wash
 Se mies<
 MR you/sg-wash
 Se mie
 MR he/she/it-washes
 Se mieme
 MR we-wash
 Se miete
 MR you/pl-wash
 Se mijat
 MR they-wash
 “I wash myself”, “you wash yourself” etc.

- (14) Si go mie liceto
MR it he-wash face-the
“He is washing his face”
Ne si go mie liceto
not MR it he-wash face-the
“He does not wash his face”

Se also appears with a number of verbs which do not have a reflexive-less counterpart; in this sense one speaks of ‘inherent reflexives’, as in (15).

- (15) Se smam
MR I-laugh
“I laugh”

As we have already noted, the reflexive clitic also occurs in middle/passive and impersonal constructions, as illustrated in (16)-(20); in all of these cases the clitic appears in the accusative form *se*. (16) exemplifies the canonical impersonal construction. (17) exemplifies the case in which the *se* morphology makes a transitive verb into an intransitive one; the latter is what Burzio 1986 call an inaccusative verb. The data in (18) illustrate a peculiar impersonal construction of Slavic languages which is endowed with modal value; in this construction the dative clitic precedes the reflexive one. Note that the same construction is possible also with the inherent reflexive verbs and in this case we see a single reflexive element *se*, as also indicated in (18). Macedonian does not allow for impersonal *se* constructions with transitive verbs and lexical arguments; in this case the verb agrees with the lexical argument, giving rise to a passive construction, as exemplified in (19). Viceversa, we see an impersonal structure with 1/2p arguments, as in (20):

- (16) Se spie
MR sleeps
“One sleeps”
- (17) Se gasi strujata
MR turn off light-the
“The light goes off”
- (18) Mu se puši
to-him MR smokes
“He feels like smoking”
Mi se puši
to-me MR smokes
“I feel like smoking”
Mu se smee
to-him MR laugh
“He feels like laughing”

- (19) Ve ovoj restoran se gotvat spageti
 in that restaurant MR prepares-pl. spaghetti-pl
 “Spaghetti are served in that restaurant”

- (20) Ti se gleda
 you MR sees
 “One sees you”

Impersonal and inherent *se* allow us to check the combination with the dative clitic; in this case the dative precedes the *se* form, as illustrated in (17) and (21):

- (21) Mu se javime
 to-him MR we-call-up
 “We are calling him up”
 Ti se javime
 to-you MR we-call-up
 “We are calling you up”

Let us now consider the position of the argumental clitics with respect to the verb. In the previous examples, the argumental clitic precedes the lexical inflected verb. Analogously the argumental clitic precedes the auxiliary “to have”; nevertheless it follows the auxiliary “to be”, as illustrated in (22a) and (23a) respectively. The same order of the clitics also characterizes the reflexive pronoun, as reported in (22b)-(23b).

- (22) a. Go imam gledano deteto
 him I-have seen child-the
 “I saw the child”
 Go imate izmieno deteto
 him you-have washed child-the
 “You washed the child”
 b. Se imam izmieno
 MR I-have washed
 “I washed myself”
- (23) a. Sum go gledal deteto
 I-am him seen child-the
 “I saw the child”
 Ste go izmile deteto
 you-are him washed child-the
 “You washed the child”
 b. Sum se izmil
 I-am MR washed
 “I washed myself”

In the third person the auxiliary form is not realized; the argumental clitics immediately precede the participial form, as in (24). The 3d person form of the auxiliary nevertheless surfaces in copular sentences, as illustrated in (25):

- (24) Taa mu rekla na sin
she to-him told to son
“She told to her son”

- (25) Toj e dobar
he is good
“He is good”
Tie se dobri
they are good
“They are good”

Another environment where we find enclisis is the imperative of lexical verbs, illustrated in (26). The order of argumental clitics in enclisis is the same as in proclisis, namely dative + accusative. When the imperative is negated, as in (27), then the clitics appear in proclisis. Note that the positive imperative is a perfective aspect form, while the negative imperative is an imperfective aspect form. Thus the presence or absence of the negation does not imply a modal switch, as in the familiar case of Italian and other languages (from imperative to infinitival) but rather an aspectual switch:

- (26) Vikni go!
call-perf. him
“Call him!”
Viknite go!
call-perf.pl. him
“Call him!”
Daj mi go!
give-perf. me it
“Give it to me!”
Dajte mi go!
give-perf.pl. me it
“Give it to me!”
Izmi se!
wash-perf.sg MR
“Wash yourself!”
Izmi si go (liceto)!
wash-perf.pl MR it (face-the)
“Wash yourself/ your face!”
- (27) Ne go vikaj!
not him call-impf.
“Do not call him!”
Ne go vikajte!
not him call-impf.pl.
“Do not call him!”

In other respects, negation does not interact in a significant way with clitics and their verbal hosts; in general the negation precedes, as we have seen, not only the argumental clitics but also the auxiliaries and the modal particles.

2. The analysis

2.1. Theoretical background

Manzini and Savoia 1998, *forthcoming* propose a theory of Italian clitics that we shall be referring to in our analysis of Macedonian. This theory follows a view of sentential structure endorsed by Chomsky 1986, 1995, by which there are two separate positions for the lexical Verb, i.e. V, and for the (Tense and Agreement) Inflection associated with it, i.e. I; in general, it is this second position that is lexicalized by the finite verb. Furthermore, there is a C (Complementizer) position that can be filled either by a sentential introducer, of the type of English *that*, or by the verb again in appropriate contexts. These three positions are hierarchically and linearly ordered; this order is reflected by the simple schema in (28):

(28) [C [I [V

Object clitics appear between I and C; according to the theory adopted here, each clitic realizes a specialized position in the clitic string, characterized by a well-defined set of features and ordered in a fixed way with respect to all other positions. In particular, our idea is that clitic positions are defined in terms of aspectual features, including Meas(ure) and Or(igin) of the event. According to recent proposals by Tenny 1994, Borer 1994, Arad 1998 the specification Meas typically characterizes the internal argument of transitives. Thus in *Mary ate three apples*, “three apples” defines the Measure of the event denoted by *eat*. In turn, the external argument of transitives, such as “Mary” in the previous example, instantiates the aspectual category Or.

Within this model, we identify two object clitic positions corresponding to the categories Meas and Or, where we take the Meas position to be below the Or position, as is generally assumed in the literature. In between, we postulate a third aspectual category which we identify with a Del(imiter), essentially in a locative sense. Thus we enrich the string in (28) as indicated in (29):

(29) [C [Or [Del [Meas [I [V

One further set of clitic positions between C and the Or-Meas string is proposed by Manzini and Savoia 1998, *forthcoming* on the basis of data from Northern Italian dialects that systematically realize a subject clitic series, as well as an object clitic one. Detailed analyses of Northern Italian subject clitics have uncovered not only a fine grained feature system underlying, but also a clear syntactic hierarchy within this system (Poletto 1993). In our own work, we argue

that there are four subject clitic positions, corresponding to four major categories in the structure of DP's, namely P(erson) for 1st and 2nd person clitics, N(oun) for 3rd person singular clitics, Num(ber) for 3rd person plural clitics, and finally D(e finiteness) for otherwise uninflected clitics. These categories appear between the C position and the object clitic positions, in the order indicated in (30):

(30) [C [D [Num [N [P[Or [Del [Meas [I [V

Though the D/Num/N/P positions have been motivated in the works referred to on the basis of subject clitic languages, we believe that they are universally represented in the structure of the sentence. Indeed, while the Or-Meas string corresponds to the set of aspectual properties associated with the nominal arguments of the verb, the D/Num/N/P string corresponds to the set of inflectional properties associated with them. These inflectional properties can be realized by subjects, but as we shall see, this is not necessarily the case. In virtue of their specifications for P, N or other inflectional features, object clitics can also be hosted by these positions.

Consider first the simple sentences in (9)-(11), where object clitics are in proclisis and dative precedes accusative, displaying the same distribution as many Romance dialects, including standard Italian. We can assume that accusative clitics of 3p such as *go*, *ì* 'him/her', *gi* 'them' realize the Meas position. In languages where the dative cooccurs with the accusative and precedes it, several analyses are in principle possible. One of them is that the dative realizes an inflectional position, namely N/Num, as in (31); this option is taken for instance by standard Italian. Another one is that in the absence of distinct forms for the dative in the language, the dative is lexicalized in Del. This option is taken by several Italian dialects that identify the dative and the locative form. Macedonian, which does not have a separate locative form, can in principle take this second option as well, as in (32):

(31)	D	Num/N	P	Or	Del	Meas	I
		mu				go	dava

(32)	D	Num/N	P	Or	Del	Meas	I
					mu	go	dava

The element *se/ si* which appears in different types of middle-reflexive and impersonal sentences, corresponds to Romance middle-reflexive clitics such as Italian *si*, which in turn have been widely discussed in the theoretical literature. Before considering our data in any detail we shall therefore briefly summarize some theoretical conclusions concerning elements such as *si*. Macedonian *se/ si*, is not only a reflexive clitic as in (13)-(14), but also an impersonal, as in (16), an element inducing passive, as in (19), or unaccusativity, as in (17)-(18). Faced with a corresponding array of data in Italian, Burzio 1986 postulates the existence of at

least two omophonous *si*'s in Italian, namely a reflexive and an impersonal, the latter also responsible for passives; as for unaccusatives, they are treated as a lexical variant of passives. This theory however misses the point that the various *si* constructions form a natural class, as can be seen precisely from the fact that they are characterized by the same *si*-like element in different languages.

Following this observation, various attempts have been made in the literature at unifying the two *si*'s. One line of thought (Marantz 1984, Fici Giusti 1994) essentially aims at reducing reflexives to passives. Remember that passive is standardly analyzed along the following lines: the passive morphology, in this case *se*, becomes associated with the external theta-role of the predicate; this forces the internal argument to externalize, yielding the typical promotion of object to subject in (19). Because a reflexive predicate is by definition symmetric, we have no way of knowing whether *se/si* in fact corresponds to the internal or to the external argument of the verb. Suppose that exactly as in the passive, in the reflexive *si/se* as in (13) is associated with the external argument of the predicate; the derivation that ensues is identical to that of passive, with promotion of the object to subject position providing for a unification of the two *se*'s. The relevant derivations are provided in (33):

- (33) a. [~~spageti~~ [se [gotvat spageti]]]
 b. [Jovan [se [mie Jovan]]]

Following Manzini and Savoia 1999, *forthcoming* on Albanian and Italian, we propose that Macedonian *se* realizes the Or position within a clitic string of the type in (31) above. On the other hand, it is not associated with a single aspectual feature, but rather acts as an attractor both for Or and for Meas. Both of these features therefore pass through the Or position. We assume that as in all null subject languages the lexical subject is in turn generated in Top(ic) position. If the Meas feature is passed on to the subject, we obtain passive sentences of the type in (19), whose derivation is outlined in (34):

- (34)
- | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|-------|---|--------------------|------|---------------|
| Top | D | Num/N | P | Or | Meas | I |
| | | | | | | |
| Meas- <i>spageti</i> | | | | Or-Meas- <i>se</i> | | <i>gotvat</i> |

Reflexive *se* sentences of the type in (13) can be derived on the basis of the same assumption, namely that *se* in Or attracts not one but two aspectual features, namely Or itself and Meas. Indeed, a reflexive structure is by definition one in which the Meas and Or arguments are associated with the same argument. Our idea is that this identification is carried out through the attraction of both aspectual features by *se*, and then eventually by the lexical subject in Top, as illustrated in the schema of derivation in (35):

- (35)
- | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---------|------------|------|-----|
| Top | D | Num/N P | Or | Meas | I |
| | | | | | |
| Or-Meas-Jovan | | | Or-Meas-se | | mie |

Inaccusative *se* sentences of the type in (17) are formally indistinguishable from reflexive *se* structures of the type in (13), from which they differ only with respect to their interpretation. Thus it is natural to associate both sentences with essentially the same derivation, schematized for unaccusative *se* in (36). The only difference between (35) and (36) is interpretive. In (35) the two aspectual roles still identify two separate points in the event structure of the predicate; in (36), the two aspectual roles actually identify a single point in the event structure of the predicate:

- (36)
- | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---------|------------|------|------|
| Top | D | Num/N P | Or | Meas | I |
| | | | | | |
| Or-Meas-strujata | | | Or-Meas-se | | gasi |

The existence of impersonal *se* structures with predicates traditionally classified as unergative, are unproblematic if we consider that unergatives are in fact concealed transitives, with an unrealized Meas argument in the active form. Thus we can assume that *se* identifies again the Or and Meas feature, as in (37):

- (37)
- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---------|------------|------|------|
| Top | D | Num/N P | Or | Meas | I |
| | | | | | |
| | | | Or-Meas-se | | spie |

In short, in what precedes we have tentatively identified the position of the accusative clitic with the aspectual category Meas, and the position of *se* with the aspectual category Or. We left open on the other hand the position of the dative clitic, whose order with respect to the accusative is compatible both with the aspectual Del position and with a higher N position. The relative order of the dative and *se* suggests now that the second option is the correct one, in other words that the dative clitic is in the higher of the two positions in (31) i.e. the nominal inflection position N, as illustrated in (38); we tentatively construe the relevant aspectual feature attracted by the N position, and realized by the dative clitic, with Terminus. We shall return to the nature of the feature below; in the meantime we note that in (38), this role is associated with what can be characterized as an Experiencer. Crucially we do not associate Experiencers with the Or role; this is arguably also the case when they surface as nominative subjects, as with subject experiencer verbs (*John fears the truth* etc.), as can be seen from the many differences between experiencers and other subjects (Belletti and Rizzi 1988, Arad 1998):

- (38)
- | | | | | | |
|--------|---------|------------|-----|------|------|
| D | Num/N P | Or | Del | Meas | I |
| | | | | | |
| Ter-mu | | Or-Meas-se | | | puši |

2.2. Interactions between clitics

A significant prediction of our analysis concerns the interaction of the middle-reflexive and accusative clitics. Macedonian excludes the combination of non-reflexive *se* with an accusative clitic, for instance in the modal construction in (18), as illustrated in (39b) by contrast with (39a). In terms of the present analysis indeed the *se* argument attracts both Or and Meas in all of the structures in (34)-(38), effectively making transitive predicates into intransitive ones; evidently therefore it is incompatible with the lexicalization of an independent Meas argument, which would be associated with the accusative morphology.

- (39) a. Mu se čita
to-him MR reads
“He feels like reading”
b. * Mu se ja čita knjigata
to-him MR it reads book-the

Nevertheless it is interesting to note that in grammatical sentences of the type in (39a), or indeed (34)-(38) above, accusative morphology is represented on the *se* clitic itself. Remember once again that wellformed sentences of the type in (39a) are associated with the structure in (38) in which crucially *se* attracts both Meas and Or. Analogously, *se* is associated with accusative case in the impersonal construction in (37). This obviously suggests that accusative morphology is simply a lexicalization for the Meas feature, which automatically applies to *se*.

This leads us to reconsider constructions in which dative reflexive *si* cooccurs with the accusative clitic and in fact precedes it, as exemplified in (14) and repeated below in (40):

- (40) Si go mie liceto
MR it he-wash face-the
“He is washing his face”

In terms of the structures proposed here, we can analyze examples of the type in (40) as involving a *si* clitic in Or and an accusative clitic in Meas, as illustrated in (41). Precisely because the Meas role is independently realized by the accusative clitic, on the other hand, we are led to refine the analysis provided so far in terms of which the middle-reflexive acts as an identifier of the Or and Meas roles. We propose that the Meas category is in fact articulated into two subspecifications Extension and Terminus (cf. Tenny’s 1994 Path and Terminus). In the most typical case, Extension corresponds to the direct object of three-argumental verbs, while Path corresponds to the indirect object. As can be seen in the structure in (41), we assume that in reflexive *si* structures of the type in (40), *si* acts as an identifier for the Or and Terminus features, while the Extension feature is independently realized in the Meas position:

- (41)
- | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|--------------------|-----|--------|------------|---|---------------|
| D | Num/N | P | Or | Del | Meas | I | V | D |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Or-Term- <i>si</i> | | Ext-go | <i>mie</i> | | <i>liceto</i> |

We can therefore assume that accusative is the morphological realization of the Extension feature, a characterization which is compatible with all of the preceding examples, where we can take Meas as a shorthand for Extension (associated or not with Terminus). On the other hand the dative case associated with *si* in (41) can be construed as the morphological realization of Terminus. Note that this analysis of dative case is of course compatible with the characterization of the dative clitic given in particular in (38).

From our data, it can also be seen that inherent *se* cannot be combined with impersonal *se*. Thus an inherent reflexive verb of the type in (18) excludes the repetition of *se* in the formation of the impersonal. On the contrary, the impersonal presents a single *se* clitic, as indicated below in (42). Our analysis of this phenomenon has recourse simply to the idea that *se* can only lexicalize the Or position; since the same position cannot be lexicalized twice, a sequence of two *se*'s is not allowed. The structure corresponding to the example in (42) is therefore the same already provided in (38) for ordinary impersonal *se* constructions.

- (42)
- | |
|--------------------------|
| Mu (* se) se smee |
| to-him (* MR) MR laugh |
| “He feels like laughing” |

We have so far not considered sequences which include a 1p or 2p clitic. We have already suggested that these clitics realize a specialized inflectional position P. In fact, the distribution of 1/2p clitics revealed by our data confirms this hypothesis, since Person clitics precede both the accusative clitic, as illustrated in (11) and the middle-reflexive clitic, as illustrated in (18). In particular, then, we can analyze the sequence *Person clitic* + *middle-reflexive* as in (43), where the Person clitic is associated to the P position, while the middle-reflexive is associated with the Or position. Note the parallelism between (38) and (43), which differ only in that *mu* occupies the inflectional N slot while *mi* occupies the inflectional P slot; this difference is not determined in any way by the aspectual properties of the relevant clitics but solely by their intrinsic inflectional specifications (1/2p vs. 3p):

- (43)
- | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-----------------|--------------------|-----|------|-------------|
| D | Num/N | P | Or | Del | Meas | I |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Term- <i>mi</i> | Or-Meas- <i>se</i> | | | <i>puši</i> |

The analysis of Person clitics leads us once again to consider more closely the question of case, since in Macedonian Person clitics, exactly like 3p clitics (i.e. N clitics in present terms) morphologically distinguish between dative and accusative. This property of course differentiates Macedonian clitics from those of Romance languages in general, where Person clitics do not morphologically

realize case distinctions. As might be expected, accusative P clitics are in complementary distribution with accusative 3p person clitics, i.e. N forms in present terms; this reflects the fact that two different forms cannot both be associated with a Meas role, or to be precise with an Extension one, of which the accusative is simply the morphological realization. The combination of an accusative P clitic with an impersonal *se*, associated in turn with accusative morphology, is also excluded, as in (44), for very much the same reason, namely the fact that they compete for the same Meas role, or to be precise for the Extension one.

- (44) * Te *se* gleda
you-acc. MR sees

In fact, Macedonian does not exclude the combination of impersonal *se* with person clitics, but in these case our data show that the P clitic is realized as a dative, as illustrated in (45):

- (45) Ti *se* gleda
to-you MR sees
“One sees you”

We assume that, as already proposed, the aspectual feature Extension is associated with the impersonal *se* clitic; the only role that remains available for the Person clitic is therefore the Terminus one, which corresponds to the dative morphology. In fact, in Romance languages, where as we have just seen Person clitics do not distinguish between accusative and dative case, they can be construed as specialized attractors for the Terminus role, and therefore as systematically associated with the Terminus role. Therefore the model adopted here leads us to treat in a uniform manner sentences of the type in (45) and sentences of the type in (21) in which an inherent *se* verb takes an indirect object argument. In this latter case the P clitic which precedes *se* is again associated with the Terminus role, as illustrated in (46):

- | | | | | | | | |
|------|---|-------|----------------|--------------------|-----|------|---------------|
| (46) | D | Num/N | P | Or | Del | Meas | I |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | Ter- <i>ti</i> | Or-Meas- <i>se</i> | | | <i>javime</i> |

Thus we find the dative form of the Person clitic in all and only the cases where it corresponds to the Terminus argument. By contrast we can construe the accusative form of the P clitic as corresponding to the case in which it is associated with the Meas role as a whole, hence crucially with Extension. The analysis of (45)-(46) therefore allows us to further articulate our analysis of the case properties of clitics, initiated with the discussion of (39)-(41). In general we have reason to believe that case is to be treated simply as a morphological realization of aspectual classes. It is also worth noticing in this connection that Macedonian restricts case distinctions to the sole pronominal system, including

both clitic and non-clitic pronouns, contrary to other Slavic languages, which are endowed with case morphology for other nominals as well. The syntax of Macedonian clitics on the other hand turns out to be very close to that of Romance ones, as suggested precisely by case phenomena.

2.3. The position of argumental clitics

It remains for us to consider the position of clitics with respect to auxiliaries and the imperative. We have already noted that clitics occupy different positions with respect to the two different auxiliaries, since they precede *imam* “to have” and follow *sum* “to be”. Enclisis with respect to the verb is a characteristic that constructions with “to be” auxiliary share with imperatives. In the case of imperatives, we can assume with much generative literature (cf. Rivero 1994) that their modal properties determine their realization in the C position rather than in the I position, as illustrated in (47). Enclisis stems simply from the fact that clitics remain in their usual position:

- (47)
- | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|-------|-----------|----|-----|-----------|-----------------------|
| C | D | Num/N | P | Or | Del | Meas | I |
| | | | | | | | |
| <i>daj</i> | | | <i>mi</i> | | | <i>go</i> | <i>daj</i> |

By analogy, we propose that enclisis on the *sum* auxiliary results from the fact that it realizes the C position, as in (48a); on the contrary the *imam* auxiliary realizes the I position like lexical verbs, and is therefore associated with proclisis, as in (48b). The fact that *sum* realizes the C position in (48a) leads us to predict that it is associated with modal properties of some sort, contrary to the *imam* auxiliary in (48b). This prediction is compatible with the data at our disposal. Indeed the *imam* form is purely aspectual, corresponding to a resultative perfect, while the *sum* form has not only a perfective connotation, but also an evidential one, which can be construed as modal in nature (cf. the use of the conditional in Italian in evidential contexts *Scalfaro non si ripresenterebbe alle elezioni presidenziali*). Remember of course that contrary to a language like Italian, auxiliary choice does not depend on the verbal class (transitive/unergative vs. unaccusative):

- (48)
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------------|---|-------|---|----|-----|-----------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| a. | C | D | Num/N | P | Or | Del | Meas | I | V | D |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>sum</i> | | | | | | <i>go</i> | <i>gledal</i> | | <i>deteto</i> |
| b. | C | D | Num/N | P | Or | Del | Meas | I | V | D |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | <i>go</i> | <i>imam</i> | <i>gledano</i> | <i>deteto</i> |

Non-pronominal clitics include in Macedonian modal particles such as *ke*, *bi*. Modal particles generally occur at the beginning of the sentence preceding pronominal clitics and the inflected verb. We have already suggested that C is the fundamental modal position of the sentence; it is therefore natural within our model to identify it with the position of *ke* and *bi*, as illustrated in (49). If so, we

predict that these particles cannot cooccur with the *sum* auxiliary, since they compete for the same C position; this prediction is confirmed by the data, since *sum* and the *ke*, *bi* particles are in complementary distribution.

- (49)
- | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|-------|---|----|-----|-----------|--------------|---|---------------|
| C | D | Num/N | P | Or | Del | Meas | I | V | D |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>ke</i> | | | | | | <i>go</i> | <i>gleda</i> | | <i>deteto</i> |
- Ke go gleda deteto*
 PRT him he-sees child-the
 ‘‘He will see the child’’

We have noticed above that the presence of a negation blocks enclisis on the imperative; in negative imperatives therefore, argument clitics appear in proclisis. The same type of alternation between enclisis and proclisis according to the presence or absence of the negation is observed in many languages with the imperative as well as with other forms of the verb. The most familiar account of this alternation within generative grammar frameworks is originally due to Rivero 1994, according to whom in the imperative the verb actually moves from the I to the C position; if the negation, i.e. an element endowed of the same operator properties as C, intervenes on the movement path, this is blocked by a locality effect (cf. Rizzi’s 1990 Relativized Minimality). Therefore the imperative is forced to remain in I. Whatever its merits and demerits may be with respect to other languages, in Macedonian this analysis seems to be excluded by the fact that the negation, appearing in front of modal clitics as illustrated in the example in (8), will in fact position itself above C. Therefore it is outside the supposed movement path from I to C and cannot block it.

Nevertheless the descriptive fact remains that negation does trigger proclisis on the imperative, which means in present terms that the imperative remains in I. We can reconcile this fact and the high position of the negation, illustrated in (50), if we adopt the line of explanation proposed by Manzini and Savoia 1998b for a comparable problem in Italian dialects, namely that the Neg element, appearing within the C domain can and must realize the modal properties of C, so that the verb can and must simply realize inflectional properties in I, as illustrated in (50):

- (50)
- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|-------|---|----|-----------|------|--------------|
| Neg | C | D | Num/N | P | Or | Del | Meas | I |
| | | | | | | | | |
| <i>ne</i> | | | | | | <i>go</i> | | <i>vikaj</i> |

3. Conclusions

As we have already stressed in the course of the discussion, the Macedonian clitic system bears obvious similarities to the Romance clitic system. This is true both descriptively, and more significantly from a theoretical point of view. In this respect, we can summarize our most important results as follows. First, the order

of argumental clitics closely matches the distribution of Romance ones, in particular with respect to the split between P and N clitics. At the same time, our investigation into the case properties of both N and P clitics allowed us to propose a conception of case as a morphologization of aspectual features. Thus accusative realizes the Extension/Measure specification, while dative specializes for Terminus. Second, the modal particles of Macedonian have been identified with the C position, which is in general associated with modal properties within our theory. The position of argumental clitics, which follow the modal particles, strongly supports this analysis. In virtue of their modal features, furthermore, the imperative and the *sum* auxiliary are also to be found in C, where they again precede argumental clitics.

Acknowledgements

The research reported in this article has been financed partially through the following sources, which are hereby gratefully acknowledged: Fondi CNR granted to L. M. Savoia; Fondi del Ministero per la Ricerca (ex-40%) 1997-99 and Fondi d'Ateneo per la Ricerca (ex-60%) granted to L. M. Savoia and M. R. Manzini for the project *Per una cartografia strutturale delle configurazioni sintattiche: microvariazione nei dialetti italiani*; Fondi CNR granted to F. Fici. We are grateful to Dušica Sinadovska for sharing her native competence on Macedonian with the authors. The article is a result of the collaboration of the three authors in all respects. Nevertheless, Francesca Fici takes responsibility for sections 1.2 and 2.3, Rita Manzini for sections 1.1 and 2.2, Leonardo Savoia for sections 2.1.

References

- Arad, M. 1998 *VP-structure and the syntax-lexicon interface*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University College London.
- Belletti A., Rizzi L. 1988 "Psych verbs and theta theory", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 291-352.
- Borer, H. 1994 "The projection of arguments", *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers* 17, University of Massachusetts at Amherst
- Burzio, L. 1986 *Italian syntax*, Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- Čašule, I. 1997. The functional load of the short pronominal forms and the doubling of the object in Macedonian, *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 5: 3-19
- Chomsky, N. 1986 *Knowledge of Language*, New York, Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. 1995 *The minimalist program*. Cambridge Mass., The MIT Press.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, M. 1994 "Clitics in Slavic", *Eurotyp Working Papers* 8 (4): 1-50.
- Fici Giusti, F. 1994 "La referenza del pronome clítico riflessivo: passivo e antipassivo", in Fici Giusti F. (ed.) *Problemi di morfosintassi delle lingue slave* 4, Padova, Unipress: 113-123.

- Friedman, V. 1993 "Macedonian", in Comrie B., Corbett G. G. (eds.), *The Slavonic languages*, London and New York, Routledge: 249-305.
- Manzini M. R., Savoia L. M. 1998 "Clitics and auxiliary choice in Italian dialects: Their relevance for the Person ergativity split", *Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes* 27: 115-128.
- Manzini M. R., Savoia L. M., 1998b, "Negation parameters and their interaction in Italian dialects, *Quaderni dell'ASIS* 2, Università di Padova: 39-60.
- Manzini M. R., Savoia L. M. 1999 "The syntax of middle-reflexive and object clitics: a case of parametrization in arbëresh dialects", in Mandalà M. (ed.), *Studi in onore di Luigi Marlekaj*, Bari, Adriatica: 283-328.
- Manzini M. R., Savoia L. M. Forthcoming "The syntax of object clitics: *si* in Italian dialects", in Cinque G. *et alii* (eds.), *Festschrift Renzi*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Marantz, A. 1984 *On the nature of grammatical relations*. Cambridge, Mass, The MIT Press.
- Mišeska Tomić, O. 1996 "The Balkan Slavic clausal clitics", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14: 811-872.
- Poletto, C. 1993 *La sintassi del soggetto nei dialetti italiani settentrionali*, Padova, Unipress.
- Rivero, M.-L. 1994 "Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 63-120.
- Rizzi, L. 1990 *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.
- Tenny, C. 1994 *Aspectual roles and the syntax-semantics interface*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Abstract

Macedonian presents a rich set of inflectional and modal elements, including argumental clitics, modal particles and the negation. In normal declarative sentences these elements precede the lexical verb, differentiating Macedonian from the other Slavic languages, and especially Bulgarian; in fact in Macedonian, clitic pronouns can occur at the absolute beginning of the sentence, while in Bulgarian, clitic pronouns appear only in second position. From a theoretical point of view, we draw the following conclusions concerning the clitic string, and in particular pronominal clitics. The order of argumental clitics closely matches the distribution of Romance ones, in particular with respect to the split between P (1/2p) and N (3p) clitics. Our investigation into the case properties of both N and P clitics allows us to propose a conception of case as a morphologization of aspectual features; thus accusative realizes the Extension/Measure specification, while dative specializes for Terminus. The position of modal particles has been identified with C, which is in general associated with modal properties within our theory. The position of argumental clitics, which follow the modal particles, supports this analysis. In virtue of their modal features, furthermore, the imperative and the *sum* ("I am") auxiliary are also to be found in C, where they again precede argumental clitics.