

Clisis and opportunity
Or: How I learned to stop worrying about clitic definitions
and love the distributional phenomena

Christopher Adam & Aaron Marks
 University of New Mexico

ABSTRACT. The work of grammaticization research is far from done, as not all important stages of the process of grammaticization have been equally addressed. Indeed, despite the fact that painstaking effort has gone into establishing criteria for distinguishing open-class words from closed-class clitics, there is still no consensus as to where to draw the line between clitics and affixes. Moreover, the most prominent grammaticization literature often uncritically follows the lead of descriptive grammars which tend to overlabel all morphology as affixes and which, if they address the non-affix-like behavior of clitics at all, simply describe them as exceptional types of affixation (Kornfilt 1997:122, Mace 1962:219, Mahootian 1997:86, Nevins 2010:56, Schroeder 1999:28, Windfuhr 1979:139-140). Operating on observations of distributional phenomena, we propose here just such an objective, quantifiable criterion with which to evaluate morphemes for clitic status: Since clitics definitively mark phrases, if a marker is separable from the open-class word it applies to, then it is a clitic. Likewise, if it is not separable from it, then it is an affix. We, moreover, note that within these two categories – clitic and affix – there are gradations of borderline and core, which display characteristics more or less typical of their development along the cline of grammaticization.

Keywords: clitic, affix, grammaticization, Turkish, Persian, Wappo, Danish, Spanish, Hungarian, Biblical Greek, Kayardild

1. FIRM GROUND ON WHICH TO MEASURE PROGRESS ALONG A CONTINUUM. Many linguists interested in diachrony agree on the existence of a continuum in which functional words may grammaticize into clitics and thence into affixes. However, there is not a clear-cut consensus on the boundary between clitics and affixes, based on purely distributional phenomena, which can be tested cross-linguistically. The long history of this lack of touchstone criteria goes back to the 19th Century, when Eurocentric attempts to fit Near-Eastern languages like Turkish and Persian into European-friendly molds resulted in foundational literature of which later linguistics did not revise the terminology.

2. A NOTABLE GAP IN CURRENT GRAMMATICIZATION THEORIES. To date, typological research does not systematically distinguish affixes and clitics. As we will see below, what some call clitics, others call affixes. While this lack of consensus in typological literature makes for less than optimal consistency when bringing together data from multiple works, what is worse is that even larger typological enterprises do not systematically make this crucial distinction within single works or a single series of works.

Heine and Kuteva, in their *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* (2002), give an impressive cross-linguistic catalogue of grammaticization shifts from free words to bound morphemes, but they do not systematically distinguish clitics from affixes.

Hopper and Traugott's *Grammaticalization* (2003) similarly does not systematically distinguish clitics from affixes, despite dedicating a section to clitics (142-151), where the authors claim "it is hard to make generalizations" about clitics (5). They then proceed to mistake Persian clitics for affixes (167) as well as Turkish clitics for affixes (155).

Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca's *Evolution of Grammar* (1994) surveys semantic shifts corresponding with grammaticization in such semantic domains as tense (243-279), aspect (51-105, 125-174), and mode (176-240). The authors discuss how markings start with free word descriptions (69-74) and then discuss how grammatical words become markers by degrees, systematically ranking such characteristics as phonetic reduction (107-110) and loss of autonomy (106-115). They finally go on to discuss the mechanisms which appear to motivate such changes (281-302).

What Bybee and colleagues do not do is systematically distinguish the clitic stage from the affix stage of grammaticization. As such, like Hopper and Traugott (2003), they classify Turkish clitics as affixes (141). Turkish clitics have presented an enduring stumbling block for several generations of researchers, dating back to pre-theoretical descriptions (Boyd 1842:42), which have since been perpetuated by many didactic and descriptive grammars that uncritically inherit such labeling. For example, Kornfilt (1997) discusses as instances of "suffixes" Turkish clitics which are clearly separated from the nouns they mark, such as in (1) below, where the noun *vazo* 'vase' is separated from the plural =*ler*, first person possessor =(i)*m* and accusative marker =*i* by another noun (122):

- (1) [vazo ve heykel]=ler=im=i sat=tı=mⁱ
 [vase and statue]=PL=1SG=ACC sell=PST=1SG
 'I sold my vases and statues'

Rather than reading the plural =*ler*, first person possessor =(i)*m* and accusative marker =*i* as clitics separated from the noun they mark, Kornfilt claims that these "suffixes for plural, possessive agreement, and case can be omitted under identity in the first conjunct, but not in the second conjunct" (122). However, she only evokes the transformation of omission under identity

ad hoc for this situation and evokes other transformations in other passages within the same work (110).

What is surprising is the caliber of work that this analysis is found in, as the typologist Bernard Comrie was the series editor for Kornfilt’s book and others from this collection of otherwise rigorous descriptive grammars (ii). However, even in Comrie’s (1989) own writing, he uncritically categorizes Turkish clitics as “affixes” and then goes on to add that they are agglutinating “as if the various affixes were just glued on one after the other” (44), not noting (or apparently noticing) that the non-fusional nature of these markers derives from the fact that they are, in reality, separate from the words they mark.

In contrast with Turkish, Persian clitics, especially those with their origins in free words, seem to be consistently regarded as clitics (Browning & Karimi 1994:95, Carnie 2013:348). For example, the Persian definite accusative clitic =*râ*—originally the free noun *râdiy* meaning ‘goal’ (Hopper & Traugott 2003:166-167)—is separated from the noun it marks by subordinated material, as seen in (2), where =*râ* is separated from *maʔnâ* ‘significance’ by the dependent genitive *ešq* ‘love’ (Haydarzâdeh 2008:714).

- (2) « را فهمیدم معنای لطیف عشق »
 [{maʔnâ **ye**= laʔif} **e**= {ešq}] =râ fahmid-am
 [{meaning **DEP**=tender} **DEP**= {love}] =ACC understood-1SG
 ‘I understood the tender meaning of love’

However, Hopper and Traugott (2003:167) uncritically follow the lead of descriptive grammarians who label =*râ* as a suffix (Fisiak 1988:299, Mahootian 1997:198).

Descriptive grammarians have a history of disregarding the distinction between clitic and affix. For example, in Wappo, case markers are separated from the noun they mark by subordinated material, as in (3). However, Thompson and colleagues describe them as “suffixes”

despite their admission that “Unlike some case languages, in Wappo case suffixes only appear on the last word of a complex noun phrase” (2006:18).

- (3) [ce k'ew hučew'iš]=i ew t'oh-ta?
 [DEM man happy]=NOM fish catch-PST
 ‘that happy guy caught the fish’

Perhaps, individual linguists or even co-authors cannot be expected to treat every linguistic phenomenon with the same weight. However, even the *World Atlas of Language Structures* (WALS), which brings linguists together for collective typological work, does not categorize the clitic-affix distinction according to systematic distributional criteria even for such well-known languages as Turkish (“Language Turkish” n.d.) and other Turkic languages (“Language Azerbaijani” n.d.), and Persian (Dryer n.d.), despite the fact that WALS aspires to be a repository of typologically significant distinctions worthy of rigorous morphophonological analysis (Dryer & Haspelmath n.d.).

2.1. A TOUCHSTONE CRITERION. What examples like (1), (2), and (3) in fact demonstrate is that the clitics of languages like Turkish, Persian, and Wappo act as we would expect clitics to behave in coordinated and subordinated phrases. For example, in coordinated phrases, these clitics appear distributed across all conjoined words, as with the genitive clitic =*in* and the possessed-state clitic =*sɪ* in (4) below, or separated from at least one term via factorization out of the conjunct phrase, as with the same morphemes in (5) below (Attaoullah 1998:68).

- (4) [istiklâl=in] ve cumhuriyet=in] [muhafaza=sɪ] ve müdafa=sɪ]
 [independence=GEN] and republic=GEN] [protection=PSD] and defense=PSD]
 ‘The protection and defense of independence and the republic’

- (5) [istiklâl ve cumhuriyet]=in [muhafaza ve müdafaa]=sı
 [independence and republic]=GEN [protection and defense]=PSD
 ‘The protection and defense of independence and the republic’

This corresponds with Carstairs’ (1987) proposal to distinguish clitics from affixes based on the fact that clitics enter into constructions with phrasal constituents, not simply single words (151-152). Carstairs gives examples like those from English in (6) and (7), as part of a series of examples exhibiting increasing degrees of head-enclitic separation (151), as well as that of Danish in (8) which far surpasses the degree of distance which English typically tolerates (155):

- (6) [that man we met]=’s daughter
 ‘the daughter of that man whom we met’
- (7) [that man we bumped into yesterday]=’s daughter
 ‘the daughter of the man we bumped into yesterday’
- (8) [et av de små børn som er her i feri=en]=s fødselsdag
 [one of the small children who are here for holiday=the]=’s birthday
 ‘the birthday of one of the small children who are here for the holidays’

While Carstairs uses modification following Germanic nouns to test his hypothesis of separability, the result is the same as it would be for Turkish. The only difference is that no modifiers can follow Turkish nouns since Turkish is a highly harmonic head-final language, and as such the only way to put space between a noun and its enclitics is to separate them via coordination (151).

2.2. USEFUL DIAGNOSTICS. Zwicky and Pullum (1983) provide a helpful short list of behaviors characterizing clitics, but as these are symptomatic rather than illustrative of the core phenomenon, they ultimately find it necessary to hedge their overgeneralizations for “special” sub-groups of clitics. Aikhenvald’s (2002) catalogue of characteristics is even longer and

subsequently does less to narrow down a defining criterion for identifying clitics, though she does provide an insightful list of symptoms (43).

Carstairs (1987) proposes a much clearer and more concise single criterion, namely that clitics enter into constructions with constituents larger than a single word (151-152). However, he provides no clear means of testing his claim cross-linguistically. Klavans (1985) makes a similarly useful contribution by expounding on a combination of syntactic, morphological, and phonological directionalities which intersect each other to create a diversity of clitic manifestations across languages (102-104).

In order to argue that change in usage progresses through a continuum and gauge the extent to which it does so, such a continuum should have stable milestones of a purely distributional nature, from which to measure such progress. Like Carstairs' (1987) analysis, the analysis herein is based on the criterion of separability between the clitic and the head word of the phrase it marks, incorporating the combinatory factors creating the diversity that Klavans (1985) discusses, as well as building upon the greater traditions of research in typology and grammaticization.

Zwicky (1985:284-286) refers to a list of clitic symptoms proposed by Zwicky and Pullum (1983:503-504), which accurately describe the way clitics of low grammaticization interact with morphosyntax:

- A. Clitics can exhibit a low degree of selection with respect to their hosts, while affixes exhibit a high degree of selection with respect to their stems.
- B. Arbitrary gaps in distribution are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.

- C. Morphophonological idiosyncrasies are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.
- D. Semantic idiosyncrasies are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.
- E. Syntactic rules can affect affixed words, but cannot affect clitic groups.
- F. Clitics can attach to material already containing clitics, but affixes cannot.

They also propose a subgroup of special clitics, bunching together clitics which have “no corresponding full forms” and those which “do not have the same distribution as the corresponding full forms” as in the pronominal clitics of many Romance languages (510).

However, English =’s while having no corresponding full form, follows all of the above outlined criteria and is in no way limited in distribution like the clitics of Romance languages are.

No less importantly, Zwicky (1985) clearly defines the other side of the clitic continuum, namely that which distinguishes clitics from full words (286-287), thus effectively dispelling the fallacy of “particles,” which Zwicky appropriately describes as “a pre-theoretical notion that has no translation into a theoretical construct of linguistics” and is thus worthy of being altogether “eliminated” from the vocabulary of linguistics (284).

3. A CONTINUUM WITH CLEAR NATURAL MILESTONES. As helpful as the analyses of Zwicky (1985) and Zwicky and Pullum (1983) are, recourse to such terms as “special” to refer to subgroups seems less than optimal. It makes far better sense to determine how and, if possible, why these forms differ in distribution. Both of these questions can be answered by observing a continuum-based analysis founded purely on distributional phenomena with an understanding of diachrony, as seen in Table 1 below.

SCALE	NAME	CHARACTERISTICS	EXAMPLES
Type I.	Low-Gram Clitics	separable by subordinated or coordinated material	Eng. = 's , = 've
Type II.	High-Gram Clitics	separable by coordinated material	Spn. =los, los=
Type III.	Low-Gram Affixes	inseparable, no agreement	Eng. -n't, -ed
Type IV.	High-Gram Affixes	inseparable, agreement	Grk. ACC -n, NOM-s

TABLE 1. Continuum-based Analysis of Clitics and Affixes.

The classifications of low-gram and high-gram reflect an understanding not only of placement along a continuum but also of grammaticization path, thus providing utility for theories of grammaticization and general typology alike, the latter of which is the focus of the following sections.

3.1. TYPE I: LOW-GRAMMATICIZATION CLITICS. The English genitive clitic = 's can be separated from the noun it marks by subordinated material, as seen in (9), where = 's is separated from *friend* by the subordinate genitive *mine* (Hacker 2008). Similarly, the Persian definite accusative clitic =râ is separated from the noun it marks by subordinated material, as seen in (9), where =râ is separated from *maʔnâ* by the dependent genitive *ešq* (Haydarzâdeh 2008:714).

(9) [a friend of mine]= 's dorm
'The dorm of a friend of mine'.

(2) « معنای لطیف عشق را فهمیدم »
 [{maʔnâ ye= latif} e={ešq}] =râ fahmid-am
 [{meaning DEP=tender} DEP={love}] =ACC understood-1SG
 'I understood the tender meaning of love'

According to the ranking scheme above, the fact that these clitics can be separated by subordinated material means that they can also be separated from the nouns they mark by coordinated material, as seen in (10), where = 's is separated from the first coordinate *Nigel* by

the second coordinate *girlfriend* (Gadd & Dixon 2011:129), and in (11), where =*râ* is separated from the first coordinate *daftar* by the second coordinate *qalam* (Avishan 2012:154).

(10) [Nigel and his girlfriend]=s relationship
 ‘The relationship between Nigel and his girlfriend’

(11) «دفتر و قلم را ... گذاشت»
 [daftar va qalam]=râ gozâš-t
 [notebook and pen]=ACC put-PST
 ‘He placed the book and pen’

3.2. TYPE II: HIGH-GRAMMATICIZATION CLITICS. In contrast, Spanish pronominal clitics only appear separated by coordinated material. This is true whether used as proclitics, as seen in (12), where the pronominal proclitic *los*= ‘them’ is separated from the head verb *oír* ‘hear’ (Tello 1997:190), or as enclitics, as seen in (13), where the pronominal enclitic =*los* ‘them’ is separated from the head verb *matar* ‘kill’ (Duro 1894:297).

(12) los= [ve-o y oig-o] amenazando=me
them=[see-1SG and hear-1SG] threatening=me
 ‘I see and hear them threatening me’.

(13) suele-n... [mat-ar y com-er]=los
 be.accustomed.to-3PL [kill-INF and eat-INF]=them
 ‘They are accustomed to killing and eating them’.

As for the position of Turkish, it could fall into either category 1 or category 2; there is no testable way to know since all subordinated material precedes its head and thus cannot intervene between such a head and its enclitics. What is certain is that the Turkish markers under investigation are clitics in that they are separable by some means. The degree of clitic they are does not appear to be investigable further, since subordinate material never follows nouns and only follows verbs in subordinate tensed clauses, which are unlikely candidates for carrying the verbal markers of the main clause. If necessary, however, it would be wise to err on the side of

safety and assess it only by what demonstrably happens; it should accordingly be deemed a Type 2: High-Grammaticization Clitic since only Type-2 Clitic separation has so far been attested in the literature.

3.3. TYPE III: LOW-GRAMMATICIZATION AFFIXES. The Spanish synthetic future used to be an enclitic variant of the auxiliary verb *haber* ‘have (done)’ which was separable from the verb it marked, as in (14), where it is separated from the head verb *ver* ‘see’ by the pronoun enclitic =*lo* ‘it’ (Genesis 9:16, La Santa Biblia).

- (14) *estar*=á el arco en las nubes, y [*ver*=lo]=**hé** para acordar=*me*
 be=will.he the rainbow in the clouds, and [see=it]=**FUT.1SG** for reminding=*me*
 de=*l* pacto
 of=*the* pact
 ‘The rainbow will be in the clouds, and I will see it so as to remind myself of the pact’.

However, in contemporary Spanish, the synthetic future is now a suffix, as in (15), which is fully inseparable from the verb it marks (Crego 2011:206), as it would now produce an ungrammatical result, as in (16), if the old construction were applied:

- (15) yo lo=[*filmar*-**é**].
 yo lo=[*filmar*-**FUT:1SG**]
 ‘I will film it’
- (16) *[*film*-ar=lo]=**hé**.
 [*film*-ing=it]=**FUT:1SG**
 ‘I will film it’

Hungarian is often ranked as typologically equivalent to Turkish, and it is commonly noted that its suffixes come from free nouns which evolved into clitics and then eventually suffixes (Hopper & Traugott 2003:110-111). However, unlike Turkish, Hungarian noun and verb markers,

as seen in (17), truly are suffixes (167), in that they can never be separated from the nouns and verbs they mark, as seen in (18):

- (17) ebben a [ház-ban es kert-ben] annyi gyönyoruk van
 this the [house-LOC and garden-LOC] many pleasures exist
 ‘there are so many pleasures in this house and garden’
- (18) *ebben a [ház es kert]-ben annyi gyönyoruk van
 this the [house and garden]-LOC many pleasures exist
 ‘~~there are so many pleasures in this house and garden~~’

In failing to be separated by coordinating material, the Hungarian case affixes, which were once separate words, show themselves to have clearly crossed over to affix status. However, their agglutinating nature is not the only thing that reveals their low degree of grammaticization, as seen in the next section.

The Hungarian examples above parallel the distribution that Zwicky and Pullum (1983) call attention to with regards to English *-n't* being an affix rather than a clitic. While *-n't* can mark each individual auxiliary verb it applies to, as in (19), it cannot be separated from one by conjunction, as in (20) or (21).

- (19) She [wo-n't and can-n't] do it.
 ‘She cannot do it and will not do it’
- (20) *She [wo and can]=n't do it.
 ‘~~She will not do it and cannot do it~~’
- (21) *She [will and can]=n't do it.
 ‘~~She will not do it and cannot do it~~’

Lest this be seen as a quirk of the formal alternation irregularities of *will/won't*, note that despite a similar *me/mine* alteration, *me* with *'s* can be interpreted as possessive when separated by coordination, as in (22):

- (22) I did forget [me and my girlfriend]=^s anniversary.
 ‘The anniversary of me and my girlfriend’ (Burton 2008:95)

Moreover, even when no such alternation irregularities exist, *-n't* cannot be separated from a verb by conjunction, as in (23), where *-n't* clearly does not apply to both *could* and *should*:

- (23) *She [could and should]=^{n't} do it.
 ‘~~She could not do it and should not do it~~’

Given that a bound morpheme’s separation from the head it marks is characteristic of clitics, it follows that such separation excludes affixes. Hence, we can state a primary symptom pair applying to clitics and affixes.

Symptom Pair 1. Since clitics mark phrases and not words, they can always be separated from the phrase heads they mark; consequently, since affixes mark words, they can never be separated from the heads they mark.

3.4. TYPE IV: HIGH-GRAMMATICIZATION AFFIXES. In addition to determining whether a marker is an affix, it is also possible to measure the degrees of affixation, as done in Croft (2003:252-261). However, only one distinction will be developed here, that of agreement vs. non-agreement.

Biblical Greek has case affixes which mark not only the noun but also its adjectival dependents, as seen in (24), where both *paráklêsi* ‘encouragement’ and *aiônía* ‘eternal’ are marked by the accusative *-n* (2 Thessalonians 2:16). Some languages go a step further, by marking not only adjectival dependents for case but also nominal dependents, in addition to the case marking they already have. In the Tangkic language of Kayardild in Australia, in (25) below, the *-nguni* affix signifying ‘with’ appears on both the head noun *walbu* ‘raft’ and on its dependent possessor noun *dangka* ‘man’, which is already marked with its own genitive *-naba*,

and both nouns further distribute their respective case affixes onto their own dependent adjectives (Evans 1995:105):

- (24) « δούς παράκλησιν αἰωνίαν »
do-us [paráklêsi-n] aiōnía-n]
give-ing [encouragement-ACC] eternal-ACC]
‘giving eternal encouragement’
- (25) [{dan-kinaba-nguni] dangka-naba-nguni}] {mirra-nguni walbu-nguni}]
[{this-GEN-with man-GEN-with} {good-with raft-with}]
‘... with this man’s good raft’

This phenomenon is not limited to nouns. Similarly, in Kayardild, as seen in (26), affirmative mood marking (generally with the suffix -ntha) is distributed on the nominal dependents of the verb (Plank 1995:29):

- (26) [ngijuwa yalawu-jarra-ntha yakuri-naa-ntha]
[I:SBJ:AFRM] catch-PST-AFRM] fish-UNREAL-AFRM]
waytpala-karra-nguni-naa-ntha mijil-nguni-naa-ntha]
white:man-GEN-INS-UNREAL-AFRM] net-INS-UNREAL-AFRM]
‘But yes, I did catch some fish with the white man’s net’

In contrast, while Hungarian has case affixes, they mark only the head noun and not its adjectival dependents, as seen in (27), where only the noun *szoknyák* ‘skirts’ is marked for accusative case, while the adjective *hosszú* ‘long’ is not (Rounds 2009:152). Any attempt to distribute case marking to the adjective results in an ungrammatical construction, as seen in (28):

- (27) [{hosszú} szoknyák-at] viselnek
[{long } skirts-ACC] wear:3PL
‘They are wearing long skirts’
- (28) *[{hosszú-at} szoknyák-at] viselnek
[{long-ACC} skirts-ACC] wear:3PL
‘They are wearing long skirts’.

Given that suffix agreement exists further along the continuum than suffixation does without agreement, it follows that clitics (which are less grammaticized than low-gram affixes) can never show agreement. Accordingly, since Turkish case marking consists of clitics, rather than affixes, it must be the entire noun phrase which is marked for case, as seen in (29), where a noun phrase, modified by an adjective, is marked externally by the dative clitic =*a* (Sakarya 2010:118).

- (29) [küçük çocuğ]=a bak=ıy^{or}=lar=^d_ı
 [small child]=DAT look=PROG=PL=PST
 ‘They were looking at the small child’

Any attempt at the high-grammaticization suffix behavior of pervading the noun phrase and distributing the case to the adjective results in an ungrammatical construction, as seen in (30):

- (30) *a [küçüğ-a çocuğ-a] bak=ıy^{or}=lar=^d_ı
 [small-DAT child-DAT] look=PROG=PL=PST
 ‘They were looking at the small child’

Given that agreement is characteristic of higher degrees of grammaticization for affixes, it follows that adjectival agreement excludes clitic case marking. Hence, we can state a second symptom pair applying to clitics and affixes.

Symptom Pair 2. Since affixes mark words and not phrases, they mark not only the head word but are often also distributed among its dependents as agreement markers; consequently, since clitics mark phrases and not words, they can never mark the head and be distributed among its dependents as agreement markers.

4. WHY THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN CLITICS AND AFFIXES MATTERS. As mentioned above, in order to drive home the proposition that grammaticization progresses through a continuum and accurately gauge the extent to which it does so, such a continuum should have stable milestones of a purely distributional nature. An accurate understanding of clitic separability from words, as

well as the conjunction which characteristically elicits this, provides just such a typological stability.

When linguists working along the lines of Comrie (1989) discuss asymmetrical behavior among numerals in Russian (107-110), they rely on the stable assumptions about morphosyntactic distribution which Comrie outlines. This should as a case in point where expanding the knowledge base of stable distributional phenomena can only contribute to a progressively developing body of research.

Likewise, when linguists working along the lines of Haspelmath (2004) discuss semantic maps, there are clear-cut patterns of distribution which demonstrate both the fact that change is occurring and the rate at which change is occurring. Again, expanding the knowledge base of stable distributional phenomena can only continue to enrich such analyses.

This sort of stability is especially true for dynamic analyses such as grammaticization (Bybee et al. 1994), as this type of analysis concerns itself with rates of change, and there is no way to measure such rates without a stable ground to work with. Indeed, if grammaticization is to be discussed with any certain accuracy at all, then the milestones along the continuum must be clearly defined. Usage change is akin to a figure moving across the ground of distribution, and without a stable ground to move across, it becomes impossible to measure such a figure's gradations of movement.

Not having a stable ground as a point of reference is tantamount to discussing two dynamic figures and attempting to describe the absolute position of one with reference to the other. Fortunately, this is not necessary, since distributional facts are clear and measurable, nor is it even practiced by Comrie (1989) or others of the same persuasion, who make continuum claims based on assumptions of distributional reliability in the majority of their work.

By building on this stable knowledge of distributional phenomena, it is possible to develop a foundation for a typologically consistent descriptive system of the distributive qualities of clitics and affixes which cuts across theoretical orientations, as well as one of coordinate and subordinate constructions. The enterprise we are proposing herein attempts to forward the pursuit of stable knowledge while not obtruding on particular orientations. Indeed, determining the distinctions between affixes, clitics, and full words is not merely a niche concern for linguistics. It is a fundamental need for working with everything from morphophonology to morphosyntax and beyond.

REFERENCES

- AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 2002. Typological parameters for the study of clitics, with special reference to Tariana. *Word: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. by Robert M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 42-78. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- ATTAOULLAH, FUAD A. 1998. *Beginner's Turkish*. New York, NY: Hippocrene Books.
- AVISHAN, ASHKAN. 2012. *The Bright Words of Silence*. London: H&S Media.
- BOYD, CHARLES. 1842. *The Turkish Interpreter: Or A New Grammar of the Turkish Language*. London, England: Smith Elder and Company.
- BROWNING, MARGUERITE, AND EZAT KARIMI. 1994. Scrambling to object position in Persian. *Studies on Scrambling: Movement and Non-movement Approaches to Free Word-order Phenomena*, ed. by Norbert Corver and Henk C. van Riemsdijk, 61-100. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- BURTON, SHANA J. 2008. *Suddenly Single*. West Babylon, NY: Kensington Publishing Corp.
- BYBEE, JOAN, REVERE PERKINS, AND WILLIAM PAGLIUCA. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- CARNIE, ANDREW. 2013. *Syntax: A generative introduction*. Malden, MA: John Wiley and Sons.
- CARSTAIRS, ANDREW. 1987. Diachronic evidence and the affix-clitic distinction. *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed. by Anna G. Ramat, Onofrio Carruba, and Giuliano Bernini, 151-162. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- COMRIE, BERNARD. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- CREGO, MIGUEL A. N. 2011. *Ford Y 'El Sargento Negro' Como Mito (Tras las huellas de Obama)*. Oveido, Spain: Editorial Eikasias.

- CROFT, WILLIAM. 2003. *Typology and Universals*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- DE GUIMARAENS, ALPHONSUS (Ed.). 1960. *Obra completa: Volume 20 of Biblioteca luso-brasileira: Série brasileira: Issue 20 of Biblioteca luso-brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Editôra J. Aguilar.
- DRYER, MATTHEW S. n.d. Feature 51A: Position of Case Affixes. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, ed. by Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath. Online: <http://wals.info/feature/51A#>.
- DRYER, MATTHEW S. AND MARTIN HASPELMATH (eds.). 2007. Home. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Online: <http://wals.info/>.
- DURO, CESÁREO F. 1894. *La marina de Castilla desde su origen y pugna con la de Inglaterra*. Madrid, Spain: El progreso editorial.
- EVANS, NICHOLAS. 1995. *A Grammar of Kayardild: With Historical-Comparative Notes on Tangkic*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- FISIAK, JACEK. 1988. *Historical Dialectology: Regional and Social*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- GADD, DAVID, AND BILL DIXON. 2011. *Losing the Race: Thinking Psychosocially About Racially Motivated Crime*. London, England: Karnac Books.
- HACKER, JONATHAN (Producer and Director). 2008. This World: Virginia Tech Massacre, Executive Producer Louise Norman. *BBC*, 8 April.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 2004. Coordinating Constructions: An Overview. *Coordinating Constructions*, ed. by Martin Haspelmath. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- HAYDARZÂDEH, MARYAM. 2008. Bahâneh. *Zanân-e sarâyandah-ye mu 'âşir 2*, ed. by Parvîn Shakîbâ, 713-714. Champaign, IL: Nashr-e Ketab-e Kayumars.
- HEINE, BERND, AND TANIA KUTEVA. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- HOPPER, PAUL J. AND ELIZABETH C. TRAUGOTT. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- KORNFILT, JAKLIN. 1997. *Turkish: Descriptive Grammars*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Language Turkish. n.d. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, ed. by Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath. http://wals.info/languoid/lect/wals_code_tur.
- Language Azerbaijani. n.d. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, ed. by Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath. Online: http://wals.info/languoid/lect/wals_code_aze.
- MAHOOTIAN, SHAHRZAD. 1997. *Persian: Descriptive Grammars*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- PLANK, FRANS. 1995. *Double Case: Agreement by Suffixaufnahme*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- ROUNDS, CAROL H. 2009. *Hungarian: An Essential Grammar*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- SAKARYA, MUSTAFA. 2010. *Bir Yazarın Dramı*. İstanbul, Turkey: KaNeS Yayinlari.
- TELLO, ANTONIO. 1997. *Los días de la eternidad*. Barcelona, Spain: Muchnik Editores.
- ZWICKY, ARNOLD M. 1985. Clitics and particles. *Language* 61(2).283-305.
- ZWICKY, ARNOLD M., and GEOFFREY K. PULLUM. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't*. *Language* 59(3).502-13.

¹ Spanish's sister language of Portuguese still maintains the older construction in the written register (De Guimaraens 1960: 329):

- (a) e a lua [beij-ar=me]=a.
and the moon [kiss-INF=me]=FUT.3SG
'and the moon will kiss me'