

## Cliticization: An Epiphenomenon of Tense Projection

Hassan Makhad  
Cadi Ayyad University  
Polydisciplinary Faculty, Safi

أثارت الضمائر المتصلة انتباها متميزا في اللسانيات الحديثة نظرا لما تتسم به من خصائص استثنائية، فهي تتميز بصفات تركيبية، وصرفية و صوتية. ويركز هذا المقال على دراسة الجانب التركيبي لهذا المقولة في تشلحيت. حيث يسلط الضوء على موقعها في الجملة والطبيعة التركيبية لمستضيفها. فيفسر، اعتمادا على مجموعة من البراهين، السلوك المحير للضمائر بفرضية مفادها أن بنية الجملة في تشلحيت تتضمن مركبا زمنيا، وأن هذا الأخير هو الذي يستضيف المقولة المعنية بالدراسة.

### Intoduction

In this paper, I investigate particular aspects of cliticization; namely its position in sentences, its order and the nature of its syntactic host. I focus on the accusative, the dative and the oblique clitics in Tashlhiyt Berber (TB). I argue that the apparent asymmetries in clitic behavior can be explained in terms of phrase internal assumptions in the minimalist theory. The main idea I emphasize here is that tense is the component that hosts clitics in TB. This view is consistent with the standard leftward adjunction of head movement derivations.

The paper is organized as follows: section one presents the facts about cliticization in TB as compared to other languages, namely Moroccan Arabic (MA), Literary Arabic (LA) and French (FR). Section two introduces the potential host for clitics. It argues that  $T^{\circ}$  is the restricted and classified head for clitics. Section three deals with the interaction of V-movement and cliticization. Section four shows how the absence of V-movement results in cliticization on other hosts. Section five discusses multiplicity of clitics under the proposal of  $T^{\circ}$  host.

### 1. Clitic Indistinctness

Given their structural representation, it is desirable to claim that clitics are maximal projections. Syntactically, they behave like phrases as they coordinate with phrase categories, namely preceding DPs. This view is supported by the following facts:

- (1) a. *ss-nu-γ sul imkli šš-γ-t* TB  
 cause-cook-I-Perf. Still lunch eat-I-it  
 ‘I ultimately cooked lunch and ate it.’
- b. *ištarayt-u tazkiratan wa ?adařtu-ha* LA  
 buy.perf.-I a-ticket and lost-perf.-I-it  
 ‘I bought a ticket and lost it.’
- c. *řayyab-t lyda u kli-t-u* MA  
 cook.perf.-I lunch and eat.perf.-I-it  
 ‘I cooked lunch and ate it.’
- d. *j’ ai préparé le déjeuner et je l’ ai mangé.* FR  
 I have prepared the lunch and I it-have eaten  
 ‘I prepared lunch and ate it.’

In addition, TB clitics may combine with posterior DPs (2a-b). They also allow clitic doubling constructions (2c).<sup>1</sup>

- (2) a. *ss-nu-γ-t d rruz* cause-cook.Perf.-I-it with rice  
 ‘I cooked it with rice.’
- b. *rwi-γ-t d uyu* mix.perf.-I-it with buttered-milk  
 ‘I mixed it with buttered milk.’
- c. *ajjur izr-a-t urgaz*  
 the-moon see-perf.-it the man  
 ‘The moon, the man saw.’

Despite the apparent conformity in (1) and (2), clitics have some paradoxical behavior. Consider (3):

- (3) a. *\*ssnu-γ sul t* TB  
 cause-cook.Perf.-I Still it  
 ‘I ultimately cooked it.’
- b. *\*ištarayt-u akhiran ha* LA  
 buy.perf.-I finally it  
 ‘I bought it finally.’

<sup>1</sup> This phenomenon is also true in many languages like Italian (Cinque 1990c: 71)

Gianni, lo vedrò domain  
 Gianni him will-see-I tomorrow  
 ‘I will see Gianni tomorrow.’

However unlike other languages, TB does not allow clitic doubling in absence of topicalization

\* *izr-a-t urgaz ajjur*  
 see-perf.-it the man the-moon  
 ‘The moon, the man saw.’

- c. \**tayyabt lyda u kli-t bkri u* MA  
 cook.perf.-I lunch and eat.perf.-I early it  
 'I cooked lunch and ate it early.'
- d. \**j'ai préparé le dîner et j'ai mangé finalement le.* FR  
 I have prepared the lunch and I it-have eaten finally it  
 'I prepared lunch and ate it finally.'

The ungrammaticality of (3) is particularly significant in light of the fact that I am dealing with here. On the basis of (3), clitics do not have syntactic (or morphological) autonomy as that of independent words/ phrases (cf. Kayne (1975)). They cannot appear in the normal syntactic position of a corresponding word of their category. Accordingly, they cannot stand alone as the ungrammaticality of (3) shows. Logically, comparing (1) and (3), one may conclude that clitics originate as syntactic phrases and operate like bound morphemes<sup>1</sup>; especially that they must be realized as clear affixes.

Nonetheless, unlike inflectional affixes, clitics are phonologically not restricted to a single host. Their hosts are unpredictable as they attach to different heads in TB.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (4) a). <i>zr-i-γ-t</i> ( <b>Verb</b> )<br>See-perf.-I-him<br>'I saw him.'               | b). <i>rad-t zr- γ</i> ( <b>Modal/Auxiliary</b> )<br>will-him see-I<br>'I will see him.'     |
| c). <i>ur-t zr-i-γ</i> ( <b>Negation</b> )<br>not-him see-perf.-I<br>'I didn't see him.' | d). <i>is-t zr-i-γ</i> ( <b>Complimentizer</b> )<br>that-him see-perf.-I<br>'Did I see him?' |

The immediate question that the data above raise is: how do clitics attach to their host? Basically, there are two proposals in literature. The first claim is represented in Kayne (1975; 1987) (and Jaeggli (1986)). Kayne argues that clitics are base-generated in argument positions. Subsequently, they rise to *Infl* through syntactic movements. Actually, this proposal is assumed in many works on Berber linguistics: (Ouhalla (1988), Bourkhis (1998)), among others. For instance, Boukhris analyzes clitics as DP heads that do not merge with a complement NP<sup>2</sup>. Being affixal, she proposes that clitics move upwards through Spec positions to end up on a V host, Aspect, Neg. or Comp<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Chomsky (1995: 249) considers clitics to be XPs. He proposes that they move like that in syntax. Yet he claims that head-adjunction only happens at their last stage in the derivations.

<sup>2</sup> Despite its desirability, generating a specifier position for a headless phrase is theoretically and empirically questionable. An empty head may only project if it is necessary to host some overtly raised category that has features requiring checking/agree.

<sup>3</sup> If this claim were true Berber would be expected to have proclitics and not enclitics. Actually, the empirical facts of TB show that it is an enclitic language, as the order is fixed, like in:

**Host-CL<sub>Dat</sub>-CL<sub>Acc</sub>-CL<sub>Obj</sub>**

The second account is that of Borer (1984), Jamari (1992), Sportiche (1993) and Uriagareka (1995). Borer argues that cliticisation does not involve syntactic movements as clitics are generated in *Infl* and are coindexed with a small *pro* in argument positions. She takes clitic doubling and properties of chains as a basis for her claim. She proposes that clitics are, in fact, agreement markers. Within the same line of reasoning, Jamari (ibid) suggests that Arabic clitics are either agreement markers or incorporated pronominals. The latter, for him, are bound pronouns which occupy A-positions and incorporate into their hosts at PF. Contradictorily, he analyzes agreement markers as affixes which occupy  $\bar{A}$ -positions and incorporate to their host either in syntax or the lexicon. I assume the central view of these claims in this paper.

So far, it is firmly established, on empirical grounds, that clitics are ambiguous categories. They have dual properties. They are XPs as they coordinate with XPs. Simultaneously, they show affixal/head properties namely that they attach to hosts.

## 2. T° as the Host Category

Given the data (1-4) above, I propose that clitics are base-generated in Tense<sup>1</sup>. Obviously, tense in TB is a null category, in the sense that it does not correspond to an overt morphological head. Nonetheless, it projects syntactically (cf. Makhad 1996, 2004, 2012). This syntactic projection is imposed by the temporal features of the head T°. Consider (5).

- (5) a. *ʒr-i-γ-t sul idgam/\*azkka*      b. \**sul ʒr-i-γ-t idgam*  
 See-perf.I-him still yesterday/tomorrow  
 ‘I ultimately saw him yesterday.’
- c. *ʒr-i-γ-t jadlli idgam/\*azkka*      d. \**jadlli ʒr-i-γ-t idgam*  
 See-perf.-I-him already yesterday/tomorrow  
 ‘I already saw him yesterday.’

The sentences in (5a) and (5c) characterize verb movement to T°. One of the long standing arguments in support of this process is adverb placement. The presence of the positive polarity adverbs (PPA) (*sul* & *jadlli*) to the right of the verb in (5a) and (5c) indicates v-movement to T (cf. Makhad (ibid)). In this sense, lack of overt tense morphology in TB does not indicate absence of a tense projection. The clauses in (5a) and (5c) are finite. Intuitively, they correspond to past tense meaning. This proposal is justified by the correlation between the verb category and the presence of the temporal adverb *idgam*. In both sentences, the temporal adverb specifies the time interval<sup>2</sup> when the event occurred. This specification is

<sup>1</sup> On the basis of the facts in (1-4), clitics may overtly incorporate to T° after merging syntactic phrases together.

[<sub>TP</sub> T° [<sub>MP</sub> M [<sub>AspP</sub> Asp [<sub>VP</sub> V [<sub>VP</sub> V Cl ]]]]]

However, it is hard to explain the manner of this operation as well as its motivation.

<sup>2</sup> It is a time before the moment of speech.

understood in terms of compatibility between the tense carried by the verb in T and the temporal meaning indicated by the adverbial *ıđgam*.

Accordingly, the licensing of the adverbial form *ıđgam* indicates presence of a tense element in (5a) and (5c). Based on empirical generalizations, the licensing imposes that the adverb of time must reflect the temporal values of the tense in the string. This is captured in terms of AGREE; where the adverb of time matches the temporal value of T. Incompatibility thus results in ungrammaticality. This condition explains the unacceptability of (5a) and (5c) in case *ıđgam* is replaced by *azkka*. The latter is obviously incompatible with the past tense peculiarity of T in (5).

If this analysis is true, it is expected that failure of V-to-T movement results in ungrammaticality. This expectation is fulfilled as (5b) and (5d) indicate. Note that the verb is to the left of the PPA (*sul & jadlli*). This arrangement indicates absence of V-to-T raising. The sentences are thus intolerable in the system. The reason is that the head T has an unvalued strong V-feature. The latter is uninterpretable, unless a [+V] category adjoins to T°. Likewise, V has an unvalued Tense feature that needs to be valued in terms of a probe (T°) and a goal (V). That is why T attracts the verb to move overtly before spell-out, as is the situation in (5a) and (5c).

Thus there is no doubt that T° is the locus of clitics in TB. This view is based on the interaction between V-movement and clitic attachments. Encliticization results as an effect of V-raising to T. This explains the linear order of clitics with regards to their host.

### 3. Cliticization and V-to-T

In terms of the suggestion put forward here, V-to-T adjunction takes place after T merges with whatever functional head below/adjacent to it. Assuming the Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA) (Kayne 1994)<sup>1</sup>. I propose that T° is headed by clitics prior to any V-movement. In this sense, clitics are base-generated in T°. The basic structural representation of tense in TB is as follows:

$$(6) \quad [_{TP} [_{T^{\circ}} [_{T^{\circ} [\mu V]}] [_{T^{\circ} [+D]} CL.]]]$$

The illustration in (6) indicates that the head T° in TB is actually a dual head with two distinct features: an unvalued V-feature and a D-feature<sup>2</sup>. Cliticization takes

<sup>1</sup> Kayne (1994) argues that the linear precedence of sentential categories is based on structural hierarchy.

<sup>2</sup> This actually may explain the construct state derivation of passives in TB

*i-ttaw-tš-a uyrum*  
 it-pass.-eat-perf. The-bread (construct state)  
 “The bread was eaten.”

The object in this example has acquired the properties of a subject. This may result from the D-features of T°.

place on the D slot of  $T^{\circ}$ . It activates tense projection to merge with contiguous phrases.

An intuition must be put across here. Cliticization, in this sense, induces a semantic association between a clitic and the position of its nonclitic counterpart. This correlation is caused by sharing semantic features. As a consequence of presence of such features a reconstruction operation may be triggered at LF. At this level, clitics are interpreted in the position of their corresponding nonclitic items. At the same time, I must stress that cliticization is spelled out in  $T^0$  at PF. This line of thinking is totally in agreement with the empirical reality of the language.

One strong argument in support of this analysis comes from the ordering of the verb and the clitic in (5a) for example. Note that the verb is to the left of the clitic. This situation indicates that V-movement raises the verb obligatorily into the V slot of  $T^{\circ}$ . According to LCA, this is the right order to be generated by V-adjunction to  $T^{\circ 1}$ .

This approach reconsiders the *Clitic Placement Condition*<sup>2</sup> proposed in Ouhalla (1988) and assumed in many works on clitics. At the same time, it explains cliticization in other languages, namely LA and MA. The examples in (1b) and (1c) are accounted for on the basis of (6). In both cases, the verbs left-adjoin to the clitics base-generated in  $T^0$ . V-movement results in V-CL order.

This consideration of facts receives more practical support from infinitival structures. Consider (7), as compared to (5c).

- (7)                *ri-γ ad-t jadlli z̄r- γ*  
                       want-I that-him previously see-I  
                       'I previously wanted to see him.'

The sentence in (7) is a form of a control structure<sup>3</sup>. Control structures are widely claimed to be non-finite clauses. Note that the subordinate verb *z̄r* is in the aorist/infinitive form<sup>4</sup>. Being so it does not carry temporal features. Thus it does not overtly rise to  $T^{\circ}$ , as it is spelled-out to the right of the PPA *jadlli*. Yet the presence of the accusative clitic *-t* denotes that the lower clause contains a TP. Certainly the head of the latter does not have V-features. Thus the verb is not supposed to rise up targeting  $T^{\circ}$ .<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Note that clitic movement into  $T^{\circ}$  would always generate procliticization which goes against the empirical reality of the language.

<sup>2</sup> Clitic Placement Condition

Clitics must attach to the highest head element in a clause Ouhalla (1988:35)

<sup>3</sup> Chomsky (1999) calls these structures defective clauses because they are TPs and not CPs.

<sup>4</sup> The Aorist is assumed in TB literature to be the less inflected or the infinitive form of the verb (cf. Makhad 1996).

<sup>5</sup> An interesting argument that supports TP projection in (7) comes from coordination. The assumption is that only the same kinds of constituents can be conjoined. On the basis of this claim consider:



In (10), the auxiliary verb *avoir* is unquestionably in T°, as it appears to the left of the adverb *déjà*. Note that the accusative clitic *le'* in (10b) is to the left of the verb in T. This fact supports overt clitic adjunction to T in FR.

The situation in TB is different. To illustrate this shift of perspective reflect on the contrast between (7) and (8). I propose that the clitic in (7) can only satisfy its affixal condition at the PF level. Basically, the derivation of (7) happens by projecting a TP. The latter merges with the complementizer *ad* projecting a CP<sup>2</sup>. The clitic heading T° needs a host. As V-to-T does not overtly apply, due to the absence of T-features on the verb, the structure is filtered to the PF branch.

I suppose that at PF the hierarchy of syntax is no longer respected. Phonological constraints have to determine the phonological spell-out of the sentence. It is during this moment that the phonological shape of sentential units is provided. Supposedly, the PF parsing detects the clitic in (7) as an abandoned element that needs a host. This inspection defines the closest element to the left as a potential host. The closer element in (7) is *ad*. The linking thus takes place and *ad* hosts the clitic by *PF* concatenations.

One legitimate argument that confirms this analysis comes from assimilation rules in TB. The PF spell-out of the sentence in (7) is like (11)<sup>3</sup>.

(11) *ri-γ at-t jadlli zɾ-γ*

Note that *ad* is realized as *at-* when the clitic *-t* combines with it. This combination results in a total regressive assimilation rule where the *d* component of the complementizer takes up the voiceless property of the clitic. This behavior definitely requires adjacency<sup>4</sup>. This practice is certainly the outcome of the fact that the two constituents form a prosodic unit at the PF level<sup>5</sup>.

Thus far, a clitic incorporates into a (tensed) verb if the latter rises to left-adjoin to T°; otherwise ungrammaticality results, as clitics need a (syntactic/phonological) host. A clitic attaches to complementizer if the verb is unable or does not need to rise to T°. In this case, cliticisation results as a PF operation.

---

<sup>1</sup> It realized as “l’ “as it is adjacent to a vowel.

<sup>2</sup> Makhad (2004:203-4) suggests that *ad* heads a modal phrase that merges with T/TP. In both analyses the desired goal is reached.

<sup>3</sup> Unnecessary details are omitted.

<sup>4</sup> This operation is very active in TB as in:

- (i) *ad i-ddu* ===== *qj-jddu*  
that he-go
- (ii) *ad-nn jašk* ===== *an-nn jašk*  
That-space-particle he-come

<sup>5</sup> This analysis adequately accounts for (4d) above.



- c.        *izz is rad-ttn sul ur-(\*-ttn) t-zr-t ?*  
           is-it that tns-them still not-(them) you-see-you  
           ‘Won’t you still see them?’

A detailed examination of (14) reveals empirical support to my analysis. In (14a) NEG is between the modal *rad* and the verb *zr*. Certainly, *rad* occupies  $T^{\circ}$ , after movement from *ModP*. This is evidenced by location to the left of the PPA *sul*. Note that NEG is to the right of the PPA. In this position, it can only have narrow scope. Note that in (14a) negativity is restricted only to the verb<sup>1</sup>. This restriction is implied in the transliteration associated with it. In (14b), NEG is positioned to the left of the modal in  $T^{\circ}$ . What is negated in this instance is the whole proposition. It is the *future seeing of the children* that is affected by the presence of *ur* to the left of the modal in  $T^{\circ}$ .

The sentence in (14c) shows two interesting ideas that are in accordance with my general claim. First, when NEG has narrow scope, it cannot host clitics. This is shown by the ungrammaticality implied in (14c). However, when NEG has wide scope, it hosts clitics. This is exemplified by (12b) and (13b). As mentioned above, the presence of NEG in (12b) and (13b) blocks V-movement<sup>2</sup>, in terms MLC. Similarly, the presence of a clitic suggests that TP projects. Yet the clitic remains stranding. At the same time, NEG adjoins to TP for wide scope requirements<sup>3</sup>. This adjunction makes it a potential host at the PF level, akin to the situation with the complementizer *ad* in (7) and (4d) above.

The second implication of (14c), if compared with (12b) and (13b), is that presence of a modal form precludes wide scope NEG from hosting a clitic. This inference is reasonably accounted for. Consider (15)

- (15)        *izz is ur rad-ttn sul t-zr-t?*  
           is-it that not tns-them still you-see-you  
           ‘Won’t you still see them?’

In (15), tense projects headed by the clitic *ttn*. The presence of the modal form *rad*, as well as NEG, prevents V-movement to left-adjoin to the clitic. Since the modal has T-fatures that  $T^{\circ}$  needs to match, *rad* raises to  $T^{\circ}$ . NEG left adjoins to TP. Cliticization takes place as it is supposed to happen. This is sufficiently precise to make the proposal adequately satisfactory.

On the basis of the hypothesis that clitics are base-generated in tense, I have demonstrated that both modals and NEG block V-movement. Modals left-adjoin to  $T^{\circ}$  overtly, thus end up hosting clitics. Absence of a modal and presence of a (wide scope) NEG blocks V-movement and negation hosts clitics at PF.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is equivalent to negative focus in some English sentences like:

I will give you not a single penny!

<sup>2</sup> V-movement will have to apply at LF, in such instances.

<sup>3</sup> Note that NEG in (14b) is between the complementizer (C) and tense (T).

## 5. Multiple Clitics

The last issue I intend to draw attention to here is the topic of multiple clitics alluded to in footnote number (4) above. Consider the sentences in (16).

(16)

- a). *i-rzm urgaz taggurt i-tmγart s-tsarut*  
 He-open.perf. The\_man the-door-fem. To-the-lady with-the-key  
 ‘The man opened the door to the lady with a key.’
- b). *i-rzm-a-s-tt-s-rs*  
 he-open.perf.-to-her-it-with-it  
 ‘He opened it to her with it.’
- c). *rad--a-s-tt-s-rs i-rzm*  
 tns- to-her-it-with-it he-open  
 ‘He will open it to her with it.’
- d). *ur--a-s-tt-s-rs i-rzm*  
 not-to-her-it-with-it he-open.perf.  
 ‘He did not open it to her with it.’
- e). *ad--a-s-tt-s-rs i-rzm*  
 that-to-her-it-with-it he-open  
 ‘(I want) that he opens it to her with it.’
- f). *is--a-s-tt-s-rs i-rzm?*  
 is-it- to-her-it-with-it he-open.perf.  
 ‘Did he open it to her with it?’

A simple reflection upon the sentences in (16) makes it unmistakably evident that they abide by the representation in (6). In essence, encliticization in (16) is derived under the assumption that the cluster forms an undividable morphosyntactic entity, as in (17)<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The oblique is between parentheses because it is optional in the cluster. It may be there as it may not. This simply means that the language is undergoing a historical development akin to LA and MA, where a preposition and its complement clitic form an independent category not needing a host. Consider these examples:

- (1) a. *Fki-γ jadlli taglajt i-TTalb s-turrgsa* TB  
 Give(perf.)-I previously the-egg to-the-religious-scholar with-disguise  
 “I gave the religious scholar an egg secretly.”
- b. *Fki-γ-as-tt-s-rs jadlli*  
 c. *Fki-γ-as-tt jadlli s-rs*
- (2) a. *?a<sup>h</sup>Tajt-u saDaqatan li-lmiskini bi-ljumna* LA  
 Give(perf.)-I charity to-the-beggar with-the-right-hand  
 “I gave the beggar charity with my right hand”
- b. *?a<sup>h</sup>Tajt-u-ha la-hu bi-ha*  
 give-I\_it to-him with-it
- (3) a. *kli-t lmarqa b-lxubz* MA  
 Eat(perf.)-I the-stew with-bread  
 “I ate the stew with/using bread.”
- b. *kli-t-ha b-ih*



As expected, the sentences in (19) are ungrammatical for the simple reasons that the internal structure of the order in (17) is not respected. In (19a), the oblique is ordered to the left of the accusative. The right order is quite the opposite. In (19b), the accusative is placed to the left of the dative. This order is completely unacceptable. The accusative must absolutely be placed to the right of the dative. In (19c), the dative is arranged after both the accusative and the oblique. This is fully against the empirical facts of the language. The same reasoning is true with regards to (19d). The dative and the oblique are rearranged with respect to their relative positions. This reordering is practically not allowed. As a matter of fact, the order in (17) is extremely fixed. Undeniably, this unchanging sequence is an indication that multiple clitics form a stable and inaccessible cluster.

Another argument in favor of the authenticity and accuracy of (17) comes from modifications. Basically, nouns allow adjectival modifications under convenient conditions. In this case, it is expected that the nominal forms in (16a) can be modified by appropriate adjectives, as in (19).

- (19) *i-r̥zm taggurt izgzawn i-tmyart igzzuln s-tsarut iwrrayn*  
 He-open.perf. the-door-fem. Blue To-the-lady short with-the-key yellow  
 ‘He opened the blue door to the short lady with the yellow key.’

However, when cliticization occurs, adjectives are disallowed in the structure. Consider:

- (20) *i-r̥zm-a-s-tt-s-rs (\*izgzawn) (\*igzzuln) (\*iwrrayn)*  
 he-open(perf.)-to-her-it-with-it (Blue) (short) (yellow)  
 ‘He opened it to her with it.’

The prohibition of adjectives in (20) can only be understood, if the derived clitics are perceived as a particular cluster inaccessible for external modification.

Within the same line of thoughts, it is noticeable that the verb, when hosting clitics, may be modified by an appropriate adverb. Consider (21).

- (21)  
 a. *i-r̥zm taggurt izgzawn i-tmyart igzzuln s-tsarut iwrrayn d-ulggud*  
 He-open.perf. the-door blue to-the-lady short with-the-key yellow with-immediate.  
 ‘He immediately opened the blue door to the short lady with the yellow key.’  
 b. *i-r̥zm-a-s-tt-s-rs d-ulggud*  
 he-open(perf.)-to-her-it-with-it with-immediate.  
 ‘He immediately opened it to her with it.’

Unlike the presence of the adjectives in (19-20), adverbs are omnipresent in (21) whether cliticization occurs or not. This is very significant. Obviously, (21a) is expected to be acceptable. The adverb of manner *d-ulggud* modifies the verb *rz̥m*, despite their being dissociated by other categories. Similarly, the adverb in (21b) is still capable of modifying the verb, despite the presence of clitics. This presupposes recognition of the verb as a unit and the clitics as another entity, prior to merge. Once combinations take place, the verb and the clitics become a single component.

This view takes the clitic cluster as a unit for granted. Another argument in favor of this claim comes from coordination.

- (22) a. *i-rzm\*(-a-s-tt-s-rs) i-rgwl\*(-a-s-tt-s-rs) day*  
 he-open(perf.)-to-her-it-with-it he-lock(perf.)-to-her-it-with-it again.  
 ‘He opened and locked it to her with it again.’
- b. *i-rzm-a-s-tt-s-rs i-rgwl-a-s-tt-s-rs s-ttjawil (day)*.  
 he-open(perf.)-to-her-it-with-it he-lock(perf.)-to-her-it-with-it. with-care  
 (again)  
 ‘He carefully opened and locked it to her with it (again).’
- c. *is--a-s-tt-s-rs i-rzm ndd is-a-s-tt-s-rs i-rgl?*  
 is-it-to-her-it-with-it he-open or is-it-to-her-it-with-it he-lock.  
 ‘Did he open or lock it to her with it.’

Coordination essentially requires association of two equal categories. In this sense, the coordinated forms in (22a) are two TPs. The coordinating conjunction is not phonetically realized in this example. It may be inferred from the presence of the adverb *day*. Moreover, note that the gapping that is shown in the English translation is impossible in TB, as is indicated by the stars. This intolerance results from the fact that the verb and the cliticized elements form a unit once they merge in T°. This view is supported by the adverbial modification in (22b). The adverb, *s-ttjawil*, modifies both clauses. Any interpretation in contradiction of such reading leads to ungrammaticality. The appropriateness of this explanation is further justified by (22c). Coordination here is indicated by the conjunction *ndd*. The coordinated forms in (22c) are two CPs. All the clitics are on the Cs, due to unavailability of V-movement to T°.

I have demonstrated that multiple clitics form a cluster, as they are merged in T°. I have shown that it is impossible to derive them otherwise. On the basis of data, they are established to have a fixed order that is not open for any alteration. I have proven that any modification of the arrangement in (17) results in ungrammaticality. This makes it evident that they form a single component.

## Conclusion

I conclude that cliticization in TB either takes place overtly in syntax or is realized as a PF requirement on clitics to have hosts. Overall, I have demonstrated that tense is the category that serves as a host for clitics. I have argued that despite the apparent multiple hosts for clitics, tense remains the only category that hosts them. Thus the apparent numerous heads that connect with clitics result as a trickery interplay between sentential elements. On the basis of this analysis, the paper gives a unified explanation of clitic behavior in TB. The proposal can be extended to account for a number of languages, namely LA, MA and FR. So tense –periphrastic or lexical- is a universal category that explains the behavior of cliticization.

## References

- Anderson, S. (1993), "Wackernagel's Revenge - Clitics, Morphology and the Syntax of 2<sup>nd</sup> Position", *Language* 69. 68-98.
- Berendsen, E. (1986), *The Phonology of Cliticization*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Bonet, E. (1995). "Feature Structure of Romance Clitics". *NLLT* 13. 607-647.
- Borer, H. (1981), *Parametric variation in clitic combinations*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Borer, H. (1984), *Parametric Syntax: Case Studies in Semitic and Romance Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Borer, H. (1986) *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*, *Syntax and Semantics* 19, Academic Press.
- Borsley, R. & Rivero, M. (1994), "Clitic Auxiliaries and Incorporation in Polish". *NLLT* 12. 373-422.
- Boucher, C. (2013), "Double Object Clitic Ordering in a Dialect of Corsican", ms. Stony Brook Uni.
- Boukhris, F. (1998), *Les Clitiques en Berbère Tamazighte*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University Mohamed V, Rabat.
- Chomsky, N. (1999), "Derivation by Phase". MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18. Cambridge, Mass.: MITWPL.
- Chomsky, N. (1995), *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1989) "Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation", *MITWPL* 10, 43-74.
- Chomsky, N. (2001a), "Derivation by phase." In: Michael Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2001b), "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy", unpublished manuscript, MIT.
- Cinque, G. (1990c), *Types of A'-Dependencies*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Harris, A. (2000), "Where in the Word is the Udi Clitic?". *Language* 76, PP 593-616.
- Jaeggli, O. (1986b), Three Issues in the Theory of Clitics: Case, Doubled Nps, and Extraction. In: *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*. Hagit Borer (ed.), 15-42. New York: Academic Press.
- Jamari, A. (1992), *Clitic Phenomena in Arabic*, PhD Thesis SOAS University of London.
- Kayne, R. S. (1975), *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Kayne, R. S. (1987), "Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing", ms. GLOW 1987, Venice.
- Kayne, R. S. (1994), *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. MIT Press.
- Kayne, R.S. (1991), "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO", *L I* 22, 647-686.
- Klavans, J. L. (1985), "The Independence of Syntax and Phonology in Cliticization". *Language* 61. 95-120.
- Korn, A. (2009), "Western Iranian Pronominal Clitics." *Orientalia Suecana, LVIII*, PP 159-171.
- Laabdlaoui R. (1997), *Binyat Laanasir Assarfiyah fi Allugha Al Amazighiyah*, DES Thesis, Med I University Ouajda.
- Makhad, H. (1996), *Tense and Aspect in Berber*, D.E.S. thesis, M<sup>ed</sup> V University, Rabat.
- Makhad, H. (2004). *The Syntax of Events and Temporality: A Comparative Approach*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University Mohamed V, Rabat.
- Makhad, H. (2012), "On the Existence of Tense in Tashelhiyt" in Boumalk, A. & Laabdellaoui, R. eds. *Faits de Syntax Amazighe*, publications of the Royal Institut of Amazigh Culture, PP 145-172.
- Migdalski K. M. (2006), *The Syntax of Compound Tenses in Slavic*, LOT The Netherlands.
- Nash, L. & A. Rouveret (2002), "Cliticization as Unselective Attract", *C. J. L.* 1, PP 157-199.
- Ouhalla, J. (1988), *The Syntax of Head Movement: A Study of Berber*, Ph. D. Thesis, UCL.
- Sportiche, D. (1993), "Clitic Constructions". In: J. Rooryck & L. Zaring (eds.). *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 213-276.
- Soltan, U. (2011), "On Issues of Arabic Syntax: An Essay in Syntactic Argumentation", ms. Middlebury College.
- Terzi, A. (1999), "Clitic Combinations, Their Hosts and Their Ordering". *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 17. 85-121.
- Uriagereka, J. (1995),. *Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance*. *LI* 26: 79-124.
- Zanuttini, R. (1997), *Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zwicky, A. M. (1977), "On Clitics", Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.