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Introduction
1. **Clitic placement** > insights about the contribution of morpho-syntactic and prosodic factors to HL grammar
   - finiteness, derivation patterns, and syntactic operators
   - prosodic constraints
   - L1 data: clitic derivation might be different in different languages

2. **Cross-linguistic inquiry** > commonalities in HL clitic acquisition
1. Finiteness sensitive: finite verbs > proclisis; non-finite > enclisis
2. Tobler-Mussafia: prosodic constraints on initial position of clitics
   + internal variability of the form and placement of clitics

Finiteness sensitive
- Spanish
- Italian
- French
- Romanian
- SMG

Tobler-Mussafia
- Cypriot Greek
- Bulgarian
- European Portuguese

(Mavrogiorgos, 2013)
## Clitic Placement in Monolingual Acquisition

### Table 1: Romance Languages + Bulgarian + Greek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct clitic placement</th>
<th>Clitic misplacement: biases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish</strong> Wexler et al. 2004</td>
<td><strong>Proclisis</strong> Eisenchlas 2003 (possibly due to lexical bias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italian</strong> Guasti 1993; Tedeschi 2009</td>
<td><strong>Enclisis</strong> Costa et al. 2015; Duarte &amp; Matos 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong> Rasetti 2003; Grüter 2006</td>
<td><strong>Enclisis in CG</strong> Petinou &amp; Terzi 2002; Neokleous 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EP</strong> Flores &amp; Barbosa 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romanian</strong> Babyonychev &amp; Marin 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulgarian</strong> Radeva-Bork 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMG</strong> Marinis 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Misplacement & the properties of TM languages: correlation

(Neokleous 2015)
1. **ENCLISIS**
   O rapaz leu-\textit{o} 
   ’The boy read it’

2. **NEGATION > PROCLISIS**
   Nonquém \textit{o} viu 
   ’No one saw him’

3. **WH-OPERATORS > PROCLISIS**
   Quem \textit{o} viu? 
   ’Who saw him?’

**L1 acquisition: Systematic enclisis persists until 7;0**

Mas ele \textit{já}  foi-\textit{se} embora. (3;3) 
but he already went CL away 
(Duarte & Matos 2000; Costa, Fiéis & Lobo 2015)
Clitic Placement in Bulgarian

-> Syntactic proclisis
-> Phonological proclisis - enclisis alternation

1. Proclitics: Maria go vze (‘Maria took it’)
   
   \[ U [i [w Maria]] [i [go [w vze]]] \]

2. Enclitics: Vze go Maria (‘Maria took it’)

   \[ U [i [*go [w vze]] [i [w Maria]]] > U [i [w vze]] [go [i [w Maria]]] \]

**Strong Start Constraint:** The leftmost constituent of a maximal Intonational Phrase should not be a prosodically deficient element

(Harizanov 2014)
Clitics in Heritage Language Acquisition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is clitic placement vulnerable in HL acquisition of TM languages?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what impacts it? If not, why not?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  a) Default position of clitics (preference for specific direction in L1)
  b) Syntactic and lexical factors
  c) Prosody: segmentation and edges
  d) Cross-linguistic influence: structural and prosodic differences
1. **Heritage Bulgarian** (Ivanova-Sullivan, forthcoming)
   Longitudinal study of a Bulg-Engl child, 2;0-4;0, spontaneous product.
   - Target-like proclisis and enclisis
     - *Toj go vze*
       He it took
     - *Iskam go*
       Want it
   - Enclisis bias
     - *Toj vze go*
       He took it
     - *Iskam da vidja go*
       Want to see it

2. **Heritage European Portuguese** (Flores & Barbosa 2014)
   7-to-15 years old EP-German bilinguals; oral production task
   - Target production of proclitics and enclitics in monolinguals
   - Proclisis on target, overgeneralization of enclisis in bilinguals
· Loss of optionality is attested in various domains:
  · Resolution of null and overt subject pronouns
  · Thematic topics in Japanese (Laleko & Polinsky 2016, 2017)
  · Clitic placement (Polinsky 2018)

· Whence optionality?
  Preference to one-to-one mapping between form and function
  (Polinsky 2018)

Generalization to one clitic position reduces optionality
Enclisis Bias: In Search for Answers
Generalization of the Default Position?

**Table 2:** Inherent/canonical position of clitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enclisis</th>
<th>Proclisis</th>
<th>No specified direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Portuguese</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Brazilian Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypriot Greek</td>
<td>MSG</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Counterevidence**

Enclisis bias is attested in Heritage Spanish and Bulgarian
Cross-linguistic influence?

POSSIBLE DUE TO THE:

- Linear (ostensible) surface overlap between the two languages
- Congruence btw pronoun and non-climbing clitic derivation
  (Pérez-Leroux et al. 2011 for Heritage Spanish)

BUT:

- No structural or prosodic overlap btw the two languages
- Dominant languages vary in their pronoun and WO properties
Prosodic Factors?

Edge Property in Tobler-Mussafia Languages

- **Edges of Prosodic Constituents** $\rightarrow$ positions of prosodic strength (Harizanov 2014; Selkirk 2010)
- **Left Edge of the Utterance** $\rightarrow$ non-tolerance for prosodically deficient elements (clitics), captured by the **Strong Start Constraint**
- **Problems with prosodic segmentation:** Utterance vs. I-Phrases

*Prosodic constraints are irrelevant to the syntax but they are important in the mapping to PF*
Conclusions

1. Outcomes in clitic placement in HLs
   a) Typological difference > prosodically constrained languages are more vulnerable to change than finiteness sensitive languages
   b) Protracted development compared to L1

2. Reduction of optionality in clitic placement
   a) Generalization of enclisis
   b) Misinterpretation of prosodic requirements: domains and edges
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