

SECOND POSITION CLITICS IN DEGEMA: A REANALYSIS¹

Ethelbert Emmanuel Kari

University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana
ethelbert.kari@mopipi.ub.bw / eekari99@yahoo.com

This paper reanalyzes so-called second position clitics in Degema as verb-adjacent clitics. The reanalysis is based on the observation that these clitics cannot be separated from the verb by intervening elements. Kari (2002a, 2003a and 2003b) analyzes subject clitics in Degema as second position clitics on the basis of the separability of these clitics from the (main) verb by intervening elements, such as auxiliary verbs and preverbal adverbs. With the reanalysis of so-called preverbal adverbs (Kari 2003a, 2003b and 2004) as auxiliary verbs in Kari (2008), the separability test that was used to argue in favour of second position clitics in the language is vitiated. Also, auxiliary verbs and preverbal adverbs that were hitherto considered intervening elements are no more seen as intervening elements but as part and parcel of the verb, which may consist of a main verb alone or a sequence of a main verb and a preceding auxiliary verb. A very important claim in the literature on clitics is that the presence of clitic doubling in a language is closely tied to the existence of verb-adjacent clitics (Franks and King 2000). Thus, the reanalysis of so-called second position clitics in Degema as verb-adjacent clitics provides a plausible explanation as regards the presence of clitic doubling in the language.

Cet article réanalyse la prétendue seconde position des clitiques en degema comme des clitiques adjacents au verbe. La réanalyse se base sur l'observation que ces clitiques ne peuvent se séparer du verbe par des éléments intermédiaires. Kari (2002a, 2003a et 2003b) analyse les clitiques sujet en degema comme de clitiques de seconde position sur la base de la séparabilité de ces clitiques du verbe (principal) par des éléments intermédiaires tels que les verbes auxiliaires et les adverbes pré-verbaux. Avec la réanalyse des prétendus adverbes préverbaux (Kari 2003a, 2003b et 2004) comme des verbes auxiliaires dans Kari (2008), le test de séparabilité qui avait été utilisé pour argumenter en faveur des clitiques de seconde position dans la langue est discrédité. En outre, les verbes auxiliaires et les adverbes préverbaux qui avaient été considérés jusque là comme des éléments intermédiaires ne le sont plus vus de cette manière mais comme une partie intégrante du verbe, qui peut consister d'un verbe principal seulement or d'une séquence du verbe principal et d'un verbe auxiliaire précédent. Une affirmation importante en cours dans la littérature sur les clitiques est que le redoublement de clitique dans une langue est étroitement lié à l'existence des clitiques adjacents aux verbes (Franks et King 2000). Ainsi, la réanalyse de prétendus clitiques de seconde position en degema comme des clitiques adjacents aux verbes fournit une explication plausible par rapport à la présence du redoublement de clitique dans la langue.

¹ Degema is a Delta Edoid language of the Niger-Congo phylum. It has two highly mutually intelligible dialects – Usokun and Atala – spoken in the Usokun-Degema and Degema Town communities respectively in Degema Local Government Area of Rivers State of Nigeria. The population that speaks Degema (based on the 1991 population census figures) is slightly above 20,000. Degema data in this paper are drawn from the Usokun dialect. The discussion is basically descriptive, although the phenomena discussed have theoretical implications. This paper is a revised version of a paper presented at the 3rd Department of African Languages and Literature International Conference held at the University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana, from 30 July – 1 August 2014.

I am grateful to the Editors of JWAL for their very useful comments. All errors that remain are mine.

0. INTRODUCTION

The aim of the paper is to provide a reanalysis of so-called second position clitics in Degema. This reanalysis is necessitated by Kari's (2008) reanalysis of elements that were hitherto called preverbal adverbs as auxiliary verbs, and which were thought of as separating subject clitics from main verbs thus making the clitics appear as second position clitics. A second point that motivates a reanalysis of so-called second position clitics in Degema is the reconsideration of auxiliary verbs and erstwhile preverbal adverbs as part and parcel of the verb sequence, which may consist of a main verb alone or a main verb and a preceding auxiliary verb, thus barring the possibility of having the subject clitic + verb sequence disrupted by intervening elements. The paper provides a brief discussion of clitics in Section 1 and Degema clitics in Section 2. In Section 3, the paper provides a background discussion of second position and verb-adjacent clitics, highlighting their essential differences. Section 4 provides a summary of the analysis of Degema subject clitics as second position clitics. In Section 5, a reanalysis of second position clitics as well as the highlights of the problems with previous analysis is presented. Section 6 examines clitic doubling as a correlation of verb-adjacent clitics. The findings of the paper are presented in the Conclusion.

1. CLITICS

Clitics are linguistic units that have the properties of fully fledged words on the one hand and the properties of (inflectional) affixes on the other. Like fully fledged words, clitics are less restricted in their distribution, as they can co-occur with words that belong to different morpho-syntactic categories, such as nouns, verbs, pronouns, etc. Again like fully fledged words, clitics have some measure of freedom in their mobility within syntactic structures. A comparison of the behaviour of the English adverb *yesterday* in (1) and the possessive clitic **mu** in Bulgarian in (2) illustrates this similarity in behaviour between clitics and fully fledged words:

- (1) a. She bought a beautiful dress *yesterday*.
 b. *Yesterday*, she bought a beautiful dress.
- (2) a. **Vidjax knigata mu.**
 saw.1SG book.DEF him.DAT
 'I saw his book'
- b. **Vidjax mu knigata.**
 saw.1SG him.DAT book.DEF
 'I saw his book'

The adverb *yesterday* occurs in sentence-final position after the noun *dress* in (1a), whereas in (1b) it occurs in sentence-initial position before the pronoun *she*. In (2a), taken

from Franks and King (2000:276), the Bulgarian possessive clitic **mu** occurs after the noun **knigata** ‘book’, whereas in (2b) it occurs after the verb **Vidjax** ‘saw’.

Like affixes, clitics are incapable of independent existence. In other words, clitics are bound and thus require another linguistic unit, usually referred to as host, to attach themselves phonologically. A comparison of (3) and (4) reveals the similarity between clitics and affixes:

- (3) a. We can send documents by courier.
 b. The *sender* of the documents is unknown.
- (4) a. They will buy the eggs.
 b. They *'ll* buy the eggs.

In example (3b), the English agentive suffix *-er* attaches to *send* (cf. 3a) because it is a bound morpheme. Likewise, the clitic *'ll*, which is a reduced form of the auxiliary *will* (cf. 4a), attaches to the pronoun *they* because it is phonologically deformed and therefore cannot exist independently. Examples (3) and (4) show clearly that clitics and affixes are alike in respect of their dependence upon another linguistic unit because they are bound morphemes.

2. CLITICS IN DEGEMA

On the basis of the relative position of clitics to their hosts, Degema clitics separate into proclitics and enclitics, and a surface endoclititic² (see Kari 1997, 2003a, 2003b, 2004, 2008, 2012, among others). Proclitics or subject clitics³ in Degema occur before verbs (auxiliary and/or main verbs), as in (5) while enclitics occur after main verbs or after object pronouns that have a CV(C) phonological structure, as in (6):

² An endoclititic is a clitic that occurs inside a mono-morphemic host thereby splitting the host into two non-contiguous, meanings parts, which are not structurally autonomous. Klavans (1995:123) remarks that “in strictly linear terms, there are three types of clitics: those that occur at the beginning of a word are proclitics, those that occur at the end of the word are enclitics, and those that occur within the word are endoclititics”. Kari (2012:260-261) cites data from Pashto and Udi to illustrate how pronominal clitics that were originally enclitics become endoclititics.

³ For a detailed discussion in support of the fact that Degema proclitics are indeed clitics, not affixes (prefixes), see Kari (2005b).

- (5) a. **óhósò** **mó⁴ = kótú** **wó.**⁵
 Ohoso 3SgSCL=call you
 ‘Ohoso is calling you (sg.)’
- b. **óhósò** **mó = kírí** **kótú** **wó.**
 Ohoso 3SgSCL=again call you
 ‘Ohoso will call you (sg.) again’
- (6) a. **óhósò** **ò = kótú = n** **ójì.**
 Ohoso 3SgSCL=call=FACT him
 ‘Ohoso called him’
- b. **óhósò** **ò = kótú** **wó = ‘ón.**⁶
 Ohoso 3SgSCL=call you=FACT
 ‘Ohoso called you (sg.)’

In example (5a), the subject clitic **mo=** attaches before the main verb **kótú** ‘call’ while in (5b) it (**mó=**) attaches before the auxiliary verb **kírí** ‘again’. Example (6) shows that the factative clitic attaches to the verb in (6a) but to the transitive object pronoun **wó** ‘him’ in (6b). It should be explained that the forms of the factative clitic (cf. 6a and 6b) are determined by the position in which they occur in the clause in positive factative constructions. The form **=n** occurs in positive factative constructions in which the verb + factative clitic sequence is followed by another linguistic unit, say a noun phrase object, as in (6a) whereas the form **=ón** occurs in positive factative constructions in which the verb + factative clitic sequence is not followed by another linguistic unit, as in (6b). The **=ón** form of the factative clitic has a tendency to occur in a position before clause boundary.

The surface endoclititic occurs within the host, thus splitting the host into two non-contiguous, meaningless units or partials (cf. Koprís 2009). Consider example (7):

- (7) a. **sól** ‘jump’.
- b. **óhósò** **ò = só = ‘ól = l.**
 Ohoso 3SGSCL=jump=FACT=jump
 ‘Ohoso jumped’

⁴ Generally, Degema clitics agree with their host (verbs or pronouns) in Advanced Tongue Root (ATR) vowel harmony feature. In other words, the vowels of clitics are +ATR if those of the host are +ATR and -ATR if those of the host are -ATR, as a comparison of (5a) and (5b) shows.

⁵ The different forms of clitics and their conditioning factors are discussed elaborately by Kari (1997), among others.

⁶ The underlying form of the factative clitic is **=Vn** (see Kari 1995, Kari 2003a, Kari 2003b). The underspecified vocalic part of the clitic completely assimilates the vowel of the last syllable of the host.

In example (7b), the factative clitic, which manifests as =ɔ=, occurs inside the monomorphemic lexical verb **sɔl** ‘jump’ thus disrupting the sequence of sounds of which the verb is composed (cf. example 6 where the factative clitic attaches to the hosts as enclitic). It is important to point out that the final **l** of the host is one of the partials, like **sɔ**, and does not constitute a separate morpheme. In other words, each of the partials – **sɔ** and **l** – is not a structurally autonomous unit (see Kari 2002b, 2003a, 2003b and 2012 for a detailed discussion of the Degema endoclititic). My focus in the rest of the paper will be on subject clitics.

3. SECOND POSITION AND VERB-ADJACENT CLITICS

In the literature on clitics, a distinction is made between second-position and verb-adjacent clitics (cf. Tegey 1977, Anderson 1993 and Franks and King 2000, among others). I shall discuss second position and verb-adjacent clitics in this section, highlighting the essential differences between them.

3.1. SECOND POSITION CLITICS

The term ‘second position’, also known as 2P, is credited to Jacob Wackernagel (1852-1938) and is used to refer to clitics that follow the first accented word or constituent of the clause. Wackernagel (1892) was the first to observe that in Greek, enclitics appeared as a group after the first or initial word of the sentence. Second position is not uniformly defined across languages. Different languages appeal to different factors in the definition of this position (cf. Zwicky 1977). Some languages appeal to syntactic and/or phonological factors in the definition of second position. Thus whereas in Greek, enclitics appear in second position after the first word of the sentence, in some other languages clitics appear after the first accented constituent of the sentence or after the first accented word. Franks and Kings (2000:260) note that in Slavic languages with second-position clitics, ‘... the clitic cluster follows the first interrogative phrase and precedes the others’. Consider the Greek sentence in (8), taken from Anderson (1993:70), and the Serbian-Croatian sentence in (9), taken from Franks and King (2000:260):

(8) **polees=te=min ērēsanto hippēes phoreein.**
 many=and=it prayed riders carry
 ‘And many riders prayed to carry it’

(9) a. **Ko mu je šta dao?**
 Who him.DAT aux.3SG what gave
 ‘Who gave him what?’

b. ***Ko šta mu je dao?**

In (8), the enclitics =**te** ‘and’ and =**min** ‘it’ occur as a group after **polees** ‘many’, which is the first or initial word of the sentence. The Serbian-Croatian sentence in (9a) shows that the clitic clusters **mu je** follows the first interrogative phrase **Ko** ‘who’.

Unlike the Greek and Serbian-Croatian examples in (8) and (9) where the clitic cluster occurs in second position after the first word or constituent, second position clitics may occur after what cannot be reasonably called a word or constituent. In Pashto (cf. Tegey 1977), what defines second position could be an affix (perfective prefix) **wǎ-**, as in **wǎ de pezandə** ‘you recognized him’, where **de** is a (pronominal) clitic.

One of the defining features of second position clitics is that the clitic cluster is loosely associated with the verb, as it is possible for the clitic cluster that precedes the verb to be separated from the verb by intervening elements. This is illustrated by the Serbian-Croatian example in (9a) where the clitic cluster **mu je** is separated from the verb **dao** ‘gave’ by the second interrogative phrase **šta** ‘what’. Conversely in (9b) where the clitic cluster is adjacent to the verb **dao** ‘gave’, the sentence is ungrammatical.

3.2. VERB-ADJACENT CLITICS

Verb-adjacent clitics, as the name implies, are clitics that occur next to the verb and thus follow the constituent or constituents before the verb, as in the French sentence **Jean le voit** ‘Jean sees it’ (Halpern 2001:104) where the clitic **le** occurs next to the verb **voit** ‘sees’. Halpern (2001:104) remarks that verb-adjacent clitics, which he refers to as *verbal clitics*, ‘... always appear adjacent to a verb and attach morphologically or phonologically to it’. Similarly, Franks and King (2000:261) note that in Slavic languages with verb-adjacent clitics, ‘... the clitic cluster remains adjacent to the verb and hence follows all of the interrogative phrases’. Consider the Bulgarian sentence in (10), taken from Franks and King (2000:261):

(10) a. **Koj kakvo ti e kazal?**
 Who what you aux.3SG told
 ‘Who told you what?’

b. ***Koj ti e kakvo kazal?**

In example (10a), the clitic cluster consisting of **=ti** ‘you’ and **=e** ‘third person singular auxiliary’ occurs next to the verb **kazal** ‘told’, and follows the interrogative phrases **Koj** ‘who’ and **kakvo** ‘what’.

A notable characteristic of verb-adjacent clitics is that they are never separated from the verb by intervening elements. Any attempt to do so renders the sentence ungrammatical, as seen in (10b). Example (10b) is ungrammatical because the sequence of clitic cluster + verb (**ti e + kazal**) is interrupted by one of the interrogative phrases, **kakvo** ‘who’.

By way of reiteration and summary of the distinction between second position and verb-adjacent clitics, let me state that second position clitics and verb-adjacent clitics are distinguished by whether or not the clitic cluster can be separated from the verb by intervening elements. If the clitic cluster can be separated from the verb by intervening elements then second position clitics are being considered. Where the clitic cluster must always remain next to the verb without a possibility of being separated from the verb by intervening elements then verb-adjacent clitics are under consideration.

4. ANALYSIS OF DEGEMA SUBJECT CLITICS AS SECOND POSITION CLITICS

Degema subject clitics are analyzed as second position clitics by Kari (2002a, 2003a and 2003b). Two lines of arguments pursued in the establishment of what constitutes second position in Degema are the definitions of subject and second position. The subject of the sentence is defined as “the constituent that immediately precedes a subject clitic that attaches to an auxiliary or main verb”, while second position is defined as “the position occupied by a subject clitic that occurs before an auxiliary or main verb in relation to the subject” (Kari 2003b:205). Consider examples (11) – (14), taken from Kari (2003b:202-203):

- (11) **tàtànέ** **mɔ = mészé.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=sleep
 ‘Tatane is sleeping’
- (12) **tàtànέ** **ɔ = mà** **mòn** **ɔji.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL.NEG=IMAUX see him
 ‘Tatane has not seen him’
- (13) **tàtànέ** **ò = dá** **‘mɔ = mészé.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=INIAUX 3SgSCL=sleep
 ‘Tatane is beginning to sleep’
- (14) **ɔmɔ nú** **ò = dí = n** **ísén** **jò**
 child that 3SgSCL=eat=FACT fish the
ò = jí = ‘té.
 3SGSCL=come=PE
 ‘The child that ate the fish has come’

By the definition of subject above, the unit **tàtànέ** in (11) – (13) is the constituent that immediately precedes the subject clitic that attaches to the main verb in (11) and to the auxiliary verb in (12) and (13), while the unit **ɔmɔ nú ò = dí = n ísén jò** ‘the child that ate the fish’ in (14) is the constituent that immediately precedes the subject clitic that attaches to the main verb. Similarly, by the definition of second position above, the subject clitic **mɔ =** in (11) occupies second position in relation to the subject **tàtànέ**. In (12), the sequence of subject clitic and auxiliary **ɔ = mà** occupies second position in relation to the subject. Lastly, in example (13), the two subject clitics as well as the auxiliary (**ò = dá** ‘**mɔ =**) occupy second position in relation to the subject.

A third argument advanced in favour of the existence of so-called second position clitics in Degema hinges on the claim that subject clitics could be separated from the main verb by intervening elements, such as auxiliary verbs and what Kari (2002a, 2003a and 2003b) refers to as preverbal adverbs, as a comparison of (15) with (16) and (17) show:

- (15) **tàtàné mó = kpór í'βí.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=sing song
 'Tatane is singing (a song)'
- (16) **tàtàné ́ = kó kpór íβì.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=EPAUX sing song
 'Tatane did sing (a song)'
- (17) **tàtàné ́ = sì kpór íβì.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=still.NEG sing song
 'Tatane still did not sing (a song)'

Example (15) shows that the subject clitic **mo=** attaches to the verb **kpór** 'sing'. In examples (16) and (17), however, it is claimed that the subject clitic is separated from the verb by the emphatic past auxiliary verb **kó** and by the so-called preverbal adverb **sì** 'still' respectively.

5. REANALYSIS OF DEGEMA SECOND POSITION CLITICS

In Section 3, I discussed second position and verb-adjacent clitics, highlighting the essential differences between the two types of clitics. My discussion in Section 4 focused on previous analysis of Degema subject clitics as second position clitics and the reasons for such analysis. In this section, I reanalyze the so-called second position clitics in Degema as verb-adjacent clitics.

5.1. PROBLEMS WITH PREVIOUS ANALYSIS OF SECOND POSITION CLITICS

In this section, I shall highlight the basic problems with previous analysis of Degema subject clitics as second position clitics. The discussion shall focus on the problems with the definition of subject and second position, and separability of subject clitics from main verbs.

5.1.1. Definitions of subject and second position

The first problem with the previous analysis of Degema subject clitics as second position clitics is with the definitions of subject and second position. As I mentioned in Section 4, the subject of the sentence was defined as "the constituent that immediately precedes a subject clitic that attaches to an auxiliary or main verb", while second position was defined as "the position occupied by a subject clitic that occurs before an auxiliary or main verb in relation to the subject" (Kari 2003b:205). The problem with the definition of subject is that is not limited to clauses with only one subject clitic but also extended to clauses with more than one subject clitic. Consider examples (11) – (13), repeated below as (18) – (20):

- (18) **tàtàné mó = mésé.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=sleep
 'Tatane is sleeping'

- (19) **tàtànέ** **ś = mà** **mòn** **śji.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL.NEG=IMAUX see him
 ‘Tatane has not seen him’
- (20) **tàtànέ** **ò = đá** **‘mś = mésé.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=INIAUX 3SgSCL=sleep
 ‘Tatane is beginning to sleep’

Whereas the definition works well with clauses where there is only one subject clitic as in (18) and (19), it is problematic with clauses that have more than one subject clitic as in (20), as it is not clear which of the subject clitics (the one that attaches to the auxiliary or the one that attaches to the main verb) defines the subject. The problem with the definition of subject with regard to (18) – (20) would have been mitigated if the term ‘subject’ was defined as the constituent that immediately precedes a subject clitic that attaches to an auxiliary and/or main verb.

Like what was pointed out in the definition of subject, the problem with the definition of second position is that second position is not limited to the simple clauses with one subject clitic but also extended to simple clauses with more than one subject clitic. Consider examples (18) – (20), reproduced below as (21) – (23):

- (21) **tàtànέ** **mś = mésé.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=sleep
 ‘Tatane is sleeping’
- (22) **tàtànέ** **ś = mà** **mòn** **śji.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL.NEG=IMAUX see him
 ‘Tatane has not seen him’
- (23) **tàtànέ** **ò = đá** **‘mś = mésé.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=INIAUX 3SgSCL=sleep
 ‘Tatane is beginning to sleep’

Whereas the definition of second position works well with simple clauses with one subject clitic without auxiliary verbs as in (21), the definition is problematic with simple clauses that have one or more subject clitic and an auxiliary verb as in (22) and (23). An obvious problem in the definition of second position in respect of (22) and (23) is that second position refers not only to the subject clitic that occupies second position in relation to the subject but the auxiliary as well. Given that the auxiliary is a non-clitic element, it should not have been included in the definition of second position in the first place. That auxiliaries in Degema are non-clitic elements can be seen in the fact that, unlike clitics, their vowels are not influenced by those of adjacent morphemes, such as main verbs, in respect of \pm ATR (cf. Kari 2003b:26-27). In other words, auxiliaries in Degema are not

phonologically dependent on main verbs or any other linguistic unit, unlike clitics whose vowels harmonize with those of an auxiliary, main verb or pronominal host (cf. 5a and 5b).

5.1.2. Separability of subject clitics from main verbs

Another problem with the previous analysis of Degema subject clitics as second position clitics lies in the claim prior to Kari (2008) that subject clitics could be separated from main verbs by intervening materials, such as auxiliary verbs and preverbal adverbs. Consider examples (15) – (17), reproduced below as (24) and (26):

- (24) **tàtàné** **mó = kpór** **í'βí.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=sing song
 'Tatane is singing (a song)'
- (25) **tàtàné** **ś = kó** **kpór** **íβì.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=EPAUX sing song
 'Tatane did sing (a song)'
- (26) **tàtàné** **ś = sì** **kpór** **íβì.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=still.NEG sing song
 'Tatane still did not sing (a song)'

This analysis of (25) and (26) was based on a view that sees auxiliary verbs as elements that are separate from main verbs and preverbal adverbs as belonging to a different morphosyntactic category from verbs. Thus auxiliary verbs and so-called preverbal adverbs were seen as elements that could interrupt the subject clitic + main verb sequence as in (25) and (26), leading to the erroneous analysis of subject clitics as second position clitics.

5.2. DEGEMA SUBJECT CLITICS AS VERB-ADJACENT CLITICS

Degema subject clitics are verb-adjacent clitics, not second position clitics, as was previously claimed (contra Kari 2002a, 2003a and 2003b). Evidence for the analysis of subject clitic as verb-adjacent clitics comes mainly from the observation that these clitics occur next to the verb (auxiliary and/or main verb) in a simple or minimal clause and cannot be separated from the verb by intervening elements. My reanalysis is informed by Kari's (2008) reanalysis of so-called preverbal adverbs as auxiliary verbs – a reanalysis that vitiates the separability test that was used in previous works to argue in favour of second position clitics in the language, as auxiliary verbs and preverbal adverbs that were hitherto considered intervening elements are no more seen as intervening elements but as part and parcel of the verb, which may consist of a main verb alone or a sequence of a main verb and a preceding auxiliary verb. Furthermore, my analysis sees auxiliary verbs as syntactically and semantically related to the main verb, not as elements that are

completely different from main verbs. Consider examples (24) – (26), repeated below as (27) – (29):

- (27) **tàtànέ** **mó = kpór** **í'βí.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=sing song
 ‘Tatane is singing (a song)’
- (28) **tàtànέ** **ś = kó** **kpór** **íβí.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=EPAUX sing song
 ‘Tatane did sing (a song)’
- (29) **tàtànέ** **ś = sì** **kpór** **íβí.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=still.NEG sing song
 ‘Tatane still did not sing (a song)’

In examples (27), the subject clitic attaches to the main verb **kpór** ‘sing’, whereas in (28) and (29) where there are auxiliary verbs, it attaches to the auxiliary verbs **ku** and **si** respectively. These are simple clauses with only one subject clitic. In example (23), repeated below as (30), I consider a simple clause with two forms of the subject clitic:

- (30) **tàtànέ** **ś = đá** **‘mó = mésé.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=INIAUX 3SgSCL=sleep
 ‘Tatane is beginning to sleep’

In example (30), the *V* form of the subject clitic attaches to the auxiliary verb while the *mV* form of the subject clitic attaches to the main verb. Although the two forms of the subject clitic attach to different elements, they are seen as attaching to verbs, not to words belonging to different morphosyntactic categories. Essentially, the subject clitic cluster in Degema occurs next to the verb in a simple or minimal clause and follows the first word or constituent of the clause.

Contrary to previous analysis, where separability was used as a basis for arguing in favour of second position clitic, Degema subject clitics are observed to always stay next to the verb and cannot be separated from the verb by intervening elements. Consider examples (31) – (35):

- (31) **əjì** **ś = đí** **ídíjòm.**
 He 3SgSCL.NEG=eat food
 ‘He did not eat’
- (32) **ídíjóm** **áwìjè** **káà** **ś = đí.**
 Food morning even 3SgSCL.NEG=eat
 ‘He didn’t even eat his breakfast’

- (33) **ìdfjóm áwìjè káà òjì ɔ = dī.**
 Food morning even he 3SgSCL.NEG=eat
 ‘He didn’t even eat his breakfast’
- (34) ***ìdfjóm áwìjè ɔ = káà dī.**
- (35) ***ìdfjóm áwìjè káà ɔ = òjì dī.**

Sentences (31) – (33) show clearly that the subject clitic **ɔ =** occurs next to the verb **dī** ‘eat’. Examples (31) – (33) demonstrate that no linguistic unit can separate the subject clitic from the verb. This is supported by (34) and (35) where the clitic-verb sequence is interrupted by the adverb **káà** ‘even’ and pronoun **òjì** ‘he’ respectively. For the reason that the subject clitic is separated from the verb by the adverb **káà** ‘even’ and pronoun **òjì** ‘he’ respectively, examples (34) and (35) are ungrammatical.

The Degema sentences in (31) – (33) compare with more with the Bulgarian example in (10a), where the clitic cluster stays next to the verb (cf. 10b), than with the Serbian-Croatian examples in (9a) where the clitic cluster is forbidden from staying next to the verb (cf. 9b).

6. CLITIC DOUBLING AND VERB-ADJACENCY

Clitic doubling is a phenomenon whereby a noun phrase in a sentence is duplicated by a clitic pronoun that agrees with the noun phrase in such grammatical features as person, number, case, gender and human/non-human. It should be clarified that the clitic does not copy an actual constituent but only the grammatical features associated with the noun phrase (cf. Hale 1973). A lot of discussion of clitic doubling exists in the literature. Interested readers are referred to such works as Kayne (1975), Borer (1986), Jaeggli and Safir (1989), Beukema and den Dikken (2000), Franks and King (2000), Kari (2003b), among others.

A number of factors believed as necessitating clitic doubling are discussed in the literature. Some such factors are the presence of a preposition or preposition-like element (cf. Jaeggli 1986), specificity and topicality (Franks and King 2000), anaphoricity, movement and emphasis, and/or familiarity with the subject of discourse (Kari 2003a, 2003b and 2005a). Another factor that is believed to necessitate clitic doubling is the presence of verb-adjacent clitics in a language. It is believed that the existence of verb-adjacent clitics or second position clitics in a language depends on whether clitics originate as heads of Agreement (AGR) or as heads of arguments. Franks and King, working on Slavic languages remark that, “in languages with verb-adjacent clitics, the clitics originate as AGR heads and the verb moves up to them through its extended projection.” Furthermore, they remark that “because the clitics do not originate in argument positions, these positions can be filled by overt argument, resulting in clitic doubling” (Franks and King 2000:371-372). In respect of the behaviour of clitics in second-position languages, they note that in such languages, pronominal clitics originate as heads of arguments which then move to AGR head positions. For this reason, no clitic doubling is possible in such languages because the pronominal clitics originate in argument position (Franks and King

2000:372).⁷ Verb-adjacent clitics are believed, therefore, to exist in languages where clitics originate as heads of AGR, while second position clitics exist in languages where clitics originate as heads of arguments.

Kari (2003a, 2003b) argues that clitic doubling is possible in Degema because subject clitics in the language originate under AGR as purely agreement markers, and not within the verb phrase in argument position. Secondly, it is argued that the verb moves leftwards to form a complex with the subject clitic and not the subject clitic undergoing any kind of head movement (cf. Ndimele and Kari 2003).

6.1. CLITIC DOUBLING IN DEGEMA: A CORRELATION WITH VERB-ADJACENCY

In Degema subject clitics are found to duplicate the subject noun phrase and agree with the noun phrase in number, person, case and human/non-human features of the noun phrase. A fairly elaborate discussion of clitic doubling in Degema is presented by Kari (2003a, 2003b and 2005a). Consider examples (36) – (39):

- (36) **tàtàné** **mó = kpór** **í'βí.**
 Tatane 3SgSCL=sing song
 'Tatane is singing (a song)'
- (37) **tàtàné** **nù** **sìnèsmé** **mé = kpór** **íβì.**
 Tatane and Sinesme 3PISCL.HUM=sing song
 'Tatane and Sinesme are singing (a song)'
- (38) **ènàm** **mó = síré.**
 animal 3SgSCL=run
 'An animal is running'
- (39) **ìnàm** **mí = síré.**
 animals 3PISCL.NON-HUM=run
 'Animals are running'

Examples (36) – (39) show that the subject clitics duplicate the subject noun phrases and agree with them in the grammatical features associated with the noun phrases. A comparison of (36) and (37) demonstrates that the subject clitic **mo**=⁸ in (36) has the features third person and singular because the subject noun phrase is third person and singular, while the subject clitic **me**= in (37) has the features third person, plural and

⁷ For a detailed discussion of the origin of clitics as heads of Agreement or as heads of arguments within a clause and how this determines the presence or absence of verb-adjacent and second position clitics in a language, the curious reader is referred to Franks and King (2000).

⁸ Unlike in (37) and (39) where the human/non-human distinction is clearly reflected in the forms of subject clitics, such distinction is blurred in (36) and (38) where the subject is singular.

human because the subject noun phrase is third person, plural and human. Furthermore, a comparison of example (37) and (39) shows that in (37), the subject clitic **me** = has the features third person, plural and human because the subject noun phrase is third person, plural and human, while in (39) the subject clitic **mi** = has the features third person, plural and non-human because the subject noun phrase is third person, plural and non-human. It should be stressed that the subject clitics in examples (37) and (39) do not only show the phenomena of vowel harmony and number but also the property of human and non-human respectively. While in (37) and (39), the subject clitics are +ATR because the verbal host is +ATR, and plural because the subject noun phrases are plural, the forms of the subject clitics differ essentially because in (37), the subject noun phrase is human whereas in (39) the subject noun phrase is non-human. Thus, the subject clitics are phonologically bound to the host by vowel harmony but are syntactically and semantically related to the subject noun phrase in terms of person, number, and human and non-human features.

The aim of this section is not to go into a discussion of the various factors that necessitate clitic doubling and the theoretical issues surrounding clitic doubling but to highlight the fact that clitic doubling is possible in Degema because of the existence of verb-adjacent clitics (For a theoretical discussion of clitic doubling in Degema, see Kari 2003a, 2003b and 2005a).

7. CONCLUSION

I have thus far provided a reanalysis of so-called second position clitics in Degema as verb-adjacent clitics. The reanalysis is anchored primarily on the observation that Degema subject clitics always stay next to the verb and cannot be separated from the verb by intervening elements; contrary to the analysis in previous works on Degema that subject clitic are second position clitics separable from the main verb by auxiliary verbs and so-preverbal adverbs. The behaviour of Degema subject clitics compares more with the behaviour of Bulgarian verb-adjacent clitics than with Serbian-Croatian second position clitics, for instance. In addition, my reanalysis of so-called second position clitics is motivated by the reconsideration of auxiliary verbs and erstwhile preverbal adverbs as part and parcel of the verb sequence, which may consist of a main verb alone or a main verb and a preceding auxiliary verb, thus barring the possibility of having the subject clitic + verb sequence disrupted by intervening elements. Furthermore, the reanalysis of so-called second position clitics in Degema as verb-adjacent clitics provides a plausible explanation regarding the existence of clitic doubling in the language and supports the claim in the literature that there is a correlation between verb-adjacent clitics and the existence of clitic doubling in a language.

ABBREVIATIONS

1SG	first person singular	DEF	definite
3SG	third person singular	EPAUX	emphatic past auxiliary
3SgSCL	third person singular subject clitic	FACT	factive
3PISCL	third person plural subject	HUM	human

	clitic		
AGR	agreement	IM AUX	imperfective auxiliary
ATR	advanced tongue root	IN IAUX	inceptive non-imperative auxiliary
AUX	auxiliary	NEG	negative
DAT	dative	NON-HUM	non-human

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1993. Wackernagel's revenge: Clitics, morphology and the syntax of second position. *Language*, 69, 1, 68-98.
- Beukema, Frits. and M. den Dikken (eds.). 2000. *Clitic phenomena in European languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Borer, Hagit. (ed.). 1986. *Syntax and semantics 19: The syntax of pronominal clitics*. Academic Press, Inc.
- Franks, Stevens and Tracy H. King. 2000. *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Hale, Kenneth. 1973. Person marking in Walbiri. In S.R. Anderson and P. Kiparsky (eds.), *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, 308-344. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Halpern, Aaron L. 2001. Clitics. In A. Spencer and A.M. Zwicky (eds.), *The handbook of morphology*, 101-122. Blackwell Publishers.
- Jaeggli, O.A. 1986. Three issues in the theory of clitics: Case, doubled NP's, and extraction. In H. Borer (ed.), *Syntax and semantics 19: The syntax of pronominal clitics*, 15-42. Academic Press, Inc.
- Jaeggli, Oswald A. and K. Safir. (eds.). 1989. *The null subject parameter and parametric theory*. In O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), *The null subject parameter*, 1-44. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kari, Ethelbert E. 1995. *The structure of the Degema verb*. M.A. thesis, University of Port Harcourt.
- Kari, Ethelbert E. 1997. *Degema*. *Languages of the World/Materials* 180. München-Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Kari, Ethelbert E. 2002a. Cliticization, movement, and second position. *Languages of the World* 26. München: Lincom Europa.
- Kari, Ethelbert E. 2002b. On endoclitics: Some facts from Degema. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 63, 37-53.
- Kari, Ethelbert E. 2003a. *Clitics in Degema: A meeting point of phonology, morphology, and syntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Kari, Ethelbert E. 2003b. *Clitics in Degema: A meeting point of phonology, morphology, and syntax*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Kari, Ethelbert E. 2004. *A Reference grammar of Degema*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Kari, Ethelbert E. 2005a. Clitic doubling: Insights from Degema. In Ozo-mekuri Ndimele (ed.), *Globalization and the Study of Languages in Africa*, 329-342. Port Harcourt: M and J Grand Orbit Communications Ltd. and Emhai Press.
- Kari, Ethelbert E. 2005b. Degema subject markers: Are they prefixes or proclitics. *Journal of West African Languages*, 32, 1-2, 13-20.
- Kari, Ethelbert E. 2008. *Degema-English dictionary with English index*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Kari, Ethelbert E. 2012. Endoclitization and the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis: Insights from Degema. In M.P. Larranaga and P. Guijarro-Fuentes (eds.), *Pronouns and Clitics in Early Language*, 257-281. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Klavans, Judith L. 1995. On clitics and cliticization: The interaction of morphology, phonology and syntax. New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Kopris, C. 2009. Endoclitics in Pashto: Can they really do that? Third Workshop on Computational Approaches to Arabic Script-based Languages. Machine Translation Summit XII, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, August 26, 2009.
- Ndimele, Ozo-mekuri. and E.E. Kari. 2003. A minimalist account of pro-drop in Degema. In Ozo-mekuri Ndimele (ed.), In the Linguistic Paradise: A Festschrift for E. Nolue Emenanjo, 605-621. Aba: National Institute for Nigerian Languages.
- Tegey, Habibullah. 1977. The grammar of clitics: Evidence from Pashto (Afghani) and other languages. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indo germanische Forschungen*, 1, 333-436.
- Zwicky, Arnold. 1977. On clitics. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.