

**Andrew Spencer (University of Essex) & Ana Luís (University of Coimbra)**  
**On clitics and canons**

We suggest a set of putative canonical properties ('canons') for pre-theoretical characterizations of 'word', 'clitic' and 'affix'.

*Word:*

A word is canonically a monomorphemic noun or verb lexeme. Compare phrases, which canonically consist of more than one word and show recursion. Take wide scope (where relevant).

*Affix:*

Form: a single (coronal?) consonantal suffix realizing the value of exactly one morphosyntactic property (inflection)/semantic predicate (derivation).

Distribution: placed with respect to a bound stem. Take narrow scope over coordinated phrases.

*Clitic:*

Form: Monosyllabic functional elements realizing the value of exactly one (inflectional/discourse) morphosyntactic property.

Distribution: promiscuous attachment (canonically based on prosodic phrasing/Wackernagel position). Take wide scope over coordinated phrases.

There are interesting problems for a canonical specification of affixhood. On the weak interpretation, a canonical affix would be agglutinating and very much like a clitic or compounding form. On the strong interpretation affixes would cohere tightly with their stems, triggering idiosyncratic allomorphy. An affixed word would canonically be indistinguishable in terms of phonological shape from a canonical monomorphemic word.

For typology the question arises as to whether there are implicational hierarchies for clitics/affixes and clitics/words. For instance, if a formative exhibits some particularly canonical affixal property (e.g. narrow scope) does that preclude the possibility of it exhibiting a particularly canonical clitic property (e.g. promiscuous attachment)? Similarly, are there implicational hierarchies governing clitic/word properties?

There is evidence that words vs. affixes fail to give rise to straightforward implicational hierarchies: for instance, in a biclausal morphological causative, an affix behaves in certain respects as though it were a semantic and syntactic phrasal head. Conversely, in certain types of verb-particle construction a particle has the distribution of a syntactic word but the semantic properties of a piece of a lexeme.

In this talk, we mainly consider the clitic-affix distinction. On the weak interpretation of affixhood, clitics and affixes don't give rise to implication hierarchies, so we adopt the strong interpretation. We consider 'clitic' systems in European Portuguese, Udi, various Indo-Iranian languages, Polish. We show that there is no universal implicational scale. For example, Polish auxiliary 'clitics' ('floating inflections') are both highly canonical affixes and highly canonical clitics.

Hence, the canonical approach to the word-clitic-affix distinction fails to generate a

typology. The canonical approach is useful here: its failure to distinguish words/clitics/affixes highlights the fact that the notion ‘clitic’ (and indeed ‘affix’) is essentially incoherent: any clitic property is a deviation from a canonical word, while affixes are even more non-canonical. But it doesn’t make sense to think of an affix as being a non-canonical clitic (or vice versa). Rather, exponents of conceptual content and morphosyntactic function (i.e. content/function words) may exhibit all manner of deviations from canonicity, but more or less independently.

We speculate that what is really needed is a canons-based typology of word vs. phrase, under which words are canonically simplex but may exhibit form-based patterns which ultimately correspond to inflectional paradigms and derivational ‘word nests’.