

## CLITICS IN ENGLISH AND POLISH

JANINA OZGA

*The Jagellonian University of Cracow*

### Abstract

The paper presents a review of English and Polish clitics. Clitics are defined as grammatical or functional formatives which do not, as a rule, receive stress but form a single stress unit with lexical formatives (N, V, Adj). Proclitics are those clitics which attach to formatives following them; enclitics are those which attach to formatives preceding them. Two groups of clitics are discussed in turn: I. those which appear both in English and Polish, i.e., prepositions, personal non-subject pronouns, reflexives, conjunctions, possessive adjectives; II. those which appear only in English (e.g. articles) or only in Polish (e.g. verb particles). In the analysis of the first group it has been attempted to find out whether the behaviour of the English and Polish clitics is comparable, within the particular classes, only by virtue of their being clitics and having the same grammatical function. In the analysis of the second group comparability by analogy or regular non-clitic equivalence has been sought. The points made in the paper are summarized in phonological formulas presenting the proclitic and enclitic conventions for English and Polish.

\*

The present paper is a sequel to an earlier study on the problems of stress in English and Polish (Ozga 1973). The arguments presented there follow those of Chomsky and Halle (1968)<sup>1</sup> and can, very briefly, be summarized in this way: the stress rules of Polish and English are cyclical rules of the phonological component of the TG grammar; the stress contour of utterances is determined by their phonological surface structure, which is derived

---

<sup>1</sup> *The sound pattern of English*, henceforth referred to as *SPE*.

from the syntactic surface structure through modifications in the readjustment component of the grammar.

Since the publication of *SPE* (1968) a number of works have appeared, which either enlarge on Chomsky and Halle's proposals or present alternative solutions to various phonological problems. Some of those studies refer to the question of stress assignment and related issues and they will have to be taken into consideration in the ensuing discussion.

A contrastive analysis of stress in English and Polish (as outlined in the introductory paper mentioned) should begin with a formulation of Main Stress Rule (MSR), which assigns "word" or "lexical" stress to lexical formatives. Since, however, several formulations of MSR, apart from the *SPE* one, have been given for English—the most recent one by Halle (1973) and a fairly exhaustive account of Polish lexical stress is contained in Comrie (1972), this paper will not deal with the lexical stress of the two languages. Let it suffice to state here that both the *SPE* rules and the alternatives are much more complex than the basic MSR for Polish, which is formulated by Comrie in the following way:

$$(1) V \rightarrow [+stress] / -C_0(VC_0)\#$$

Rule (1) accounts for stress in monosyllabic words and most polysyllabic words (in which stress falls on the penultimate vowel "irrespective of syllable structure and formative boundaries") (Comrie 1972). Exceptions to this rule, for which Comrie also accounts, are not numerous: mostly words of foreign origin with antepenultimate stress (*múzyka, uniwersytet*), which, however, conform to Rule (1) in certain case forms (*uniwersytetami*). All in all, the word stress of Polish is easier to master by English-speaking learners than vice versa (though having to "count from the end" occasionally leads to mispronunciations). Krzeszowski (1970: 68) says in this context:

"The Polish learner will encounter numerous difficulties learning the correct stress of polysyllabic words in English. It is impossible to work out rules in this area since the Polish language does not provide any analogies and the mistakes are not due to any sort of interference. Particular learners will place the stress on various syllables in a purely accidental manner".

It seems, however, that it might be possible to at least partly grade the vocabulary introduced to learners with respect to stress, i.e. starting from the most general (simplest) "variant" of the MSR and gradually introducing the more complex ones<sup>2</sup>.

The next problem which a contrastive analysis of English and Polish stress should account for is that of how the two languages assign stress con-

<sup>2</sup> As was done e.g. in Guierre's *Drills in English stress patterns* though it is rather sophisticated book for advanced students.

tour to their phonological phrases, i.e. primarily of locating the centre of the contour. The formulation and ordering of the nuclear stress rule (NSR) given in *SPE* has been questioned by a number of authors<sup>3</sup>. It appears that surface syntactic information given in terms of brackets and category labels is not sufficient for correct prediction of the place of the nucleus<sup>4</sup>. But even if it were sufficient, another problem would have to be solved prior to the operation of the NSR, i.e. that of assigning (by the rules of the readjustment component RC) phonological phrase boundaries, to mark the maximal domain of the NSR application. In turn, phrasing depends on the analysis of utterances into (phonological) words. Phonological phrase boundaries correlate with word boundaries associated with certain types of constituents, but not necessarily with syntactic surface structure constituents: the phonological word, relevant for the operation of the rules of the phonological component, need not be a constituent of the syntactic surface structure, (cf. Chomsky 1968: 368). This brings into focus the problem of *clitics*, i.e. those formatives which do not, as a rule, receive stress but form a single stress unit with a (lexical) formative which either precedes them (enclitics) or follows them (proclitics). Thus phonological words consist of (P) LC (E) (P-proclitic, LC-lexical category -N, V, ADJ, E-enclitic, (although a phonological word can also consist of P+E (cf. below, e.g. pp. 132, 133).

Stockwell (1972: 88-9) makes the following claim about clitics:

"...Prepositions and Personal Pronouns (and, I should have added, several other "grammatical" or "functional classes, like articles, some Auxiliaries, Modals, Conjunctions, certain classes of Particles and Adverbs — in general, all classes which can enter into satellite "clitic" relationships with Nouns, Verbs and Adjectives [though the matter is not simple: cf. Kingdon (1958: 170-207)]) are obligatorily destressed (or never receive stress) and do not "count", as it were, in computation of the center of the NEUTRAL contour."

From the above formulation it can be inferred that clitics *do* play a role, albeit a *negative* one in the determination of the correct stress contour of a phonological phrase (and, in fact, influence the demarcation of utterances into phonological phrases). Therefore, the aim of this paper will be to find out which classes of formatives in English and Polish have this "parasitic" character and whether their nature and behaviour in the two languages are comparable.

The first point to be established with reference to clitics is the place and form of the rules or conventions which attach them to their non-clitic neighbours. In Chomsky (1968: 367) a convention is mentioned, which readjusts

<sup>3</sup> An excellent discussion on the recent work on the NSR question is given in Stockwell (1972); therefore the various proposals will not be presented here.

<sup>4</sup> *Neutral* contour is meant here (emphasis and contrast are excluded).

surface structure so that words delimited by one of the following termini  $[_s \# X[ \#, \# ] X \# ]_{s1} \# ] X[ \#$  (with  $X = \emptyset$ ) which are not constituents, will be constituents. Chomsky and Halle (1968:367) say:

"Suppose that we have a string ...WX[ $\alpha$ YZ] $\alpha$ ..., where [ $\alpha$  and] $\alpha$  are paired brackets, X[ $\alpha$ Y is a word, and W contains no units. Then this will be readjusted by convention, to ...[ $\alpha$ WXYZ] $\alpha$ ... Similarly, a string ...[ $\alpha$ XY] $\alpha$ ZW... where Y] $\alpha$ Z is a word and W contains no units, will be readjusted to ...[ $\alpha$ XYZW] $\alpha$ ... Where this convention is relevant several times, we apply it in such a way as to preserve proper parenthesization."

The example given in *SPE* for the operation of the readjusting convention is the sentence *The book was in an unlikely place*, which is analysed into three words: *the book* (NP), *was in an unlikely* (A), *place* (N), and *was, in, an* are treated as proclitics to *unlikely*<sup>5</sup>.

The convention appears to be language-specific and belong to the RC of the grammars of particular languages. For example, in English personal subject pronouns cliticize to the following verb (*I sang*), unless marked for emphasis or contrast (*I/sang*). In Polish personal subject pronouns are not clitics. In fact, it might (with reservations) be said that where *I* is a clitic, its Polish equivalent is  $\emptyset$ : *I sang* — *Śpiewałem(am)*, and where *I* is to be stressed (for emphasis or contrast), its Polish equivalent is *ja*: *I/sang* — *Ja/śpie-wałem(am)* or (*Śpiewałem(am)/ja*)<sup>6</sup>. Foreigners speaking Polish (presumably also native speakers of English) make mistakes by introducing personal pronouns where they would use them clitically in their own language, as Pisarkowa (1967: 32) notes, e.g. *Ona oczywiście gra też na fortepianie, ale ona nie zajmuje się tak zawodowo muzyką*.<sup>7</sup>

In the description of clitics it is necessary to state whether they attach to preceding words (formatives, "words" in the morphological sense) i.e., are enclitics, as *us* in *John saw us* and *nas* in *Jan widział nas* or (*Jan nas widział*), or whether they attach to words following them, i.e., are proclitics, as *for* in *for John* and *dla* in *dla Jana*. It is, however, sometimes difficult to decide whether an atomic form is an E(nclitic) or P(roclitic), e.g. *Drinka*

<sup>5</sup> Although it is not mentioned in *SPE*, in fact, *the book*, there treated as NP may be treated as N (*book*) with proclitic *the*.

<sup>6</sup> The problems of interdependence of stress and word order will not be considered in the present paper.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. also mistakes of Polish learners (at the beginners' level), who omit the proclitic pronouns.

*pinta milka day* vs. *Drink a pint of milk a day*, (... ten tylko się dowie), *kto cię stracił* vs. *kto cię stracił*.

Broadly speaking, English and Polish share some classes of clitics: prepositions, personal non-subject pronouns, reflexives, conjunctions, possessive adjectives, but only English has clitic articles, personal subject pronouns and auxiliaries, while only Polish has clitic particles (but cf. Stockwell 1972: 89) and movable verb endings<sup>8</sup>. Let us consider the two groups in turn. In Group I (where the shared clitics belong) it will be attempted to find out whether the behaviour of the English and Polish clitics is comparable, within the particular classes, only by virtue of their being clitic and having the same grammatical function, i.e., carrying the same label in the syntactic surface structure. In Group II, where the only point in common is the clitic character of the formatives, comparability by analogy will be sought, or alternatively, regular non-clitic equivalents in the other language. In a sense the discussion to follow is meant to enlarge the presentation of Krzeszowski (1970: 69–70), which is practically the only passage concerned with the clitics of English that makes reference to the native (Polish) usage and possible sources of interference in that area of phonology, (though there are some "comparative" remarks in Mikulski 1961).

English clitics appear in various books on English pronunciation under the heading of weak (atonic) forms as opposed to strong (stressed) forms a group of function words. They are usually presented in the form of lists, followed by complicated rules of usage and non-usage. The distinction that is not always made clear on such occasions is the difference between unstressed (clitic) forms and their reduced obligatory or optional variants ("weak forms proper"). Although presumably all function words (also in Polish) are pronounced differently when stressed and differently when they are clitics, not all undergo such reduction as to require special Reduction Rules, e.g.,

*I know him* [Im][m] vs. *I know him* [him]  
*Znam go* vs. *Jego znam* (*Znam jego*)

The question of reduction as a process subsequent to cliticization will not be discussed here.

Let us begin the analysis of Group I with *prepositions*. In both languages they are proclitics:

*I go to school* and *Chodzę do szkoły*

<sup>8</sup> Other classes are mentioned in Kingdon (1958) and Szober (1957).

Their clitic character is not so obvious when they are polysyllabic (this is true of all clitics) and they then appear to bear some degree of stress:

<sup>3</sup> *against* <sup>1</sup> *the criminals*      and      <sup>3</sup> *przeciw* <sup>1</sup> *zbrodniarzom*

In view of the above it may be necessary to state, possibly in terms of restrictions on the readjusting convention, that cliticization applies to *monosyllabic* functional formatives, while all the others are phonological words in their own right, which undergo considerable lowering of their original stress in the transformational cycle operating on the phonological phrase to which they belong.

There is an apparent similarity of behaviour when prepositions are followed by personal non-subject pronouns which are enclitics. The combination P+E becomes a phonological word with the stress on the preposition: *for<sup>1</sup>us* and *dla<sup>1</sup>nas*.

The formula applies, however, only when both the preposition and the personal non-subject pronoun are monosyllables. While in English the formula P+E operates also in case of polysyllabic prepositions (personal non-subject pronouns are only monosyllabic), e.g. *around us, between us*, in Polish the combination P+E is subject to several rules:

1. if the preposition is M (monosyllabic), the combination P+E is stressed according to the basic MSR of Polish (which gives the 'P+E comparable to English in case of M+M), e.g. *do<sup>1</sup>nas* but *do<sup>1</sup>niego*.

2. if the preposition >M, the combination P+E does not form a single accentual unit, but both parts are stressed according to the basic MSR of Polish, e.g. *przeciw<sup>1</sup>mnie, między<sup>1</sup>nam, dookoła<sup>1</sup>nas* (exceptions are 1. combinations with *koło*+M, which *do* form one accentual unit: *koło<sup>1</sup>nas*, but *kołociębie*, and 2. combinations of closed monosyllabic prepositions with the oblique forms of *ja*, where special phonological adjustments have to be made):

*przed+mną* → *prze<sup>1</sup>de<sup>1</sup>mną* not \**przed<sup>1</sup>mną* (other examples: *na<sup>1</sup>de<sup>1</sup>mną, be<sup>1</sup>ze<sup>1</sup>mnie, but za<sup>1</sup>mną, do<sup>1</sup>mnie*).

Thus the P+E combination presents more difficulty to the English-speaking learner of Polish than vice versa, though the fluctuation of stress in various subdivisions of it may influence the Polish learners of English so as to depart from the simple pattern 'P+E (cf. Krzeszowski 1970:70). Another difficulty for the learner of Polish is in correct stressing of the combination Preposition (M) + personal non-subject pronoun (M) when the latter is stressed for emphasis or contrast. In English in such a case the formula P+LC holds true, i.e., *for<sup>1</sup>'me* behaves like *for<sup>1</sup>'John*. Comrie (1972) applies the same formula to Polish: "... *do<sup>1</sup>mnie* 'to me', but *do<sup>1</sup>mnie* with emphatic stress, the pronoun in this case being treated like a full noun." The form *do<sup>1</sup>mnie* seems to me, however, unacceptable. The Polish equiv-

alent of English *Speak to me (not to her)* is not \**Mów do mnie (nie do niej)*, but *Mów do<sup>1</sup>mnie (nie do<sup>1</sup>niej)* with emphatic high fall on the combination Prep+Pron (cf. unemphatic *Mów do<sup>1</sup>mnie* and possible shift in word order). Yet another problem that the English-speaking learner of Polish will have to face is that of the stress pattern in certain lexicalized combinations of Prep+Noun (M), in which stress falls on the preposition, e.g. *Odejdź na<sup>1</sup>bok* (cf. *Odwrócił się na<sup>1</sup>bok*). Examples of this usage are all set phrases, in which Prep+Noun (M) is an adverbial of manner or direction: *na<sup>1</sup>głos, na<sup>1</sup>czczo, do<sup>1</sup>snu, na<sup>1</sup>dół, do<sup>1</sup>dna, za<sup>1</sup>pas* (in the idiom *wziąć nogi za pas*), but cf. *na<sup>1</sup>sen, bez<sup>1</sup>dna, dla<sup>1</sup>psa, na<sup>1</sup>wiatr*. The old penultimate rule is not productive any more, and the pattern Prep+Noun (M) is used, especially with nouns of foreign origin: *na<sup>1</sup>mecz, na<sup>1</sup>rajd, na<sup>1</sup>spleen* (Topolińska 1961:82). Where the combination is felt to be fully lexicalized, the old rule still holds fast and stress does not shift to the noun even if emphasis or contrast are involved (cf. Prep+Pron (M) above): *Jestem ze<sup>1</sup>wsie (nie z miasta)* — not \**Jestem ze<sup>1</sup>wsie*. These phrases will be best taught as idioms to the foreign learner, comparable in structure (but not orthography and stress) to English *aside, beforehand, etc.*

An English problem, not shared by Polish, is that of postposed prepositions, as in *Where is he from? He's impossible to work with*. Postposed, final prepositions cannot, by definition, be proclitic in this usage and they do take part in the computation of the nucleus: the degree of stress they ultimately receive depends on the constituent structure of the given phonological phrases (cf. *Where from? Where is he from? Where is John from?*). Postposed non-final prepositions as in *It's the same one (that) you were looking at yesterday* (King 1970:135) cannot be treated as clitics either (... \*[lukij at jestedI]). There is, however, nothing in the syntactic surface structure to suggest that *at* should be separated from *yesterday*. King (1970) proposes that the syntactic surface structure should also contain "O anaphora" to mark the place where the complement of the preposition (now deleted or front-shifted) has been. He (King 1970:136) says:

"Some abstract, unsubstantial syntactic elements have to be carried along in some form or other to the very end of the generative process in order to make the phonological rules operate in a way that will yield correct final results".

A "deletion site"<sup>9</sup> following *at* in King's example will prevent it from cliticizing to *yesterday*. An alternative solution would be to specify the categories of constituents to which prepositions can cliticize and exclude adverbs like

<sup>9</sup> The empty place is called "deletion site" in Baker (1971). The effect of a syntactic deletion on the application of phonological rules is mentioned in Lakoff (1970).

yesterday from the class (unless they function as nouns, e.g. in a metaphor like *looking at yesterday*).

In the foregoing discussion on prepositions, personal nonsubject pronouns were mentioned as enclitics to the former<sup>10</sup>. Apart from serving as objects of prepositions, they also function as direct and indirect objects of verbs to which they attach as clitics unless stressed (and/or shifted in Polish) for emphasis or contrast (then "strong" forms are used where the pronouns have them, e.g. *I'm not asking YOU* [ju:] and *Nie pytam CIEBIE* or *Ciebie nie pytam*). In English direct and indirect object pronouns have the same forms and are used post-verbally only: *He saw you* (DIR) *He gave him* (IND) *an apple* (but cf. *He gave an apple to him*: *He gave the boy an apple*? *He gave the boy it*: *He gave it to the boy*) there are restrictions on the ordering and form of objects when one of them is a pronoun: although there are two possibilities when the indirect object is pronominalized, the (?) example shows that there is only one grammatical version if the direct object is pronominalized). When both objects in a single sentence are pronominal, the order is Verb — DIR Obj — PREP Obj, as in *He gave it to him*, i.e., the indirect object is, in fact, a prepositional object and as such can only follow the direct object \*(*He gave to him it*). The problem of the order of clitic pronouns is discussed by Perlmutter (1971 : 48) who says:

"In languages in which the clitics do not move to the same place in the sentence, the question of their order relative to each other does not arise. This is the case in English, for example, where pronouns can be clitics which form a single phonological word with the word they attach to, but since the clitics are not all in the same place there is no problem of specifying their relative order."

However, at least in British English object pronouns can move to the same place in the sentence, i.e., the post-V position and their order is IND — DIR (equivalent roughly to DAT — ACC in Polish and other "case" languages), e.g. *Give me it*.

In Polish the monosyllabic object pronouns (in oblique cases: Genitive, Dative, Accusative and Instrumental, but not Locative as requiring a preposition) appear post-verbally: *Nienawidził jej*. *Dał mi jabłko*; *Widział cię*; *Komenderuje mną*, but they can also appear pre-verbally, provided a stressed element precedes them to which they can cliticize: *Przecież cię znają*. *Próbują nim rządzić*. According to Dłuska (1947), it is difficult to decide

<sup>10</sup> Stockwell (1972:98) says that "pronouns always look for a prop to support them. They are stressable only when the prop has been removed, or when they are contiguous with even less able-bodied categories (like prepositions or conjunctions) as in the phrase *between 'you and 'me*." The examples with *'Prep + Pron* suggest, however, that it is the pronoun that is less able-bodied than the preposition. *You and me* appear to be more prominent in Stockwell's examples because a contrast is implied (cf. Polish *'między mną a (i) 'tobą*, or *between us*).

in such cases whether the pronouns are enclitics or proclitics. They appear to be proclitic to verbs to which they "belong sense-wise" (*należą wg sensu*), but can equally well be enclitic to the stressed constituent that precedes them. The latter interpretation, says Dłuska, is due to the "syntactic principle" which demands that object pronouns be enclitics. It seems, however, that the requirement is not of syntactic nature, but at most a syntactico-phonological one, if not entirely phonological; in *'On im/pokaże* the pronoun is both semantically and syntactically "closer" to the verb and it is the phonological criterion that joins the more distant syntactically *On im* into a phonological word. Such phonological considerations, unmotivated syntactically, are the very reason for introducing readjusting clitic conventions which allow proper phrasing. It may be worth while quoting Stockwell (1972: 98) at this point:

"Optional phrasing... operates on the general principle that pauses must be introduced between higher ranking constituents before they are introduced between lower ranking ones. The principle has the important qualification that you ignore the ranking of any constituent that has been attached as a clitic, intonationally, to some other constituent".

Thus, e.g., when an English subject pronoun is attached to the following verb, there is no pause, even though they are the two highest ranking constituents. The "syntactic principle" mentioned by Dłuska (1947) does refer to syntax in so far that it is necessary to block the shifting of the clitic object pronouns before the verb (or before pre-verbal modifiers) if the shift were to result in putting the pronouns in the absolute initial position: \**Go strasznie oszukali*, \**Mi nie dali* (but cf. *'Jego strasznie oszukali*. *'Mnie nic nie dali* and *'Ale go strasznie oszukali*. *'Wcale mi nie dali*)<sup>11</sup>. On the other hand, the shift is obligatory (or recommended<sup>12</sup>), if the enclitic is sentence-final and there are in the sentence pre-verbal elements to which the pronoun can attach: (?) *On sam to powiedział mi* vs. *On sam mi to powiedział*. It is also the function of syntax to specify the correct relative order of clitic pronouns where they appear in clusters, either next to the verb: V+E or next to the first stressable constituent X+E. The order (possibly to be stated in the form of surface structure constraints, cf. Perlmutter 1971) is as follows:

DAT — { GEN } — INS, e.g. *Żebyś mi ją nim nie straszyl! Daj mu ją, Niech mi jej nie odbiera, Nie zaimponujesz mi nią, Prześladuje nas nią*<sup>13</sup>.

The formula for Polish non-subject pronouns will be extended to include other enclitics whose order must be specified. One of those is the reflexive

<sup>11</sup> The first element cannot be a proclitic conjunction or particle: \**No mi się to nie oplaciło*, \**A mu nie dali*.

<sup>12</sup> As Szober (1957 : 321) says, "enklitycznych zaimków unikamy na końcu zdania, bo na to miejsce wysuwamy zwykle wyrazy, na które kładziemy największy nacisk".

<sup>13</sup> The *mi* in the first example is an "emphatic" dative.

pronoun *się*, which most commonly occurs after DAT, but before GEN, INS (*Ja mu się nie dziwię, Chyba się go nie boisz, Brzydzą się nią*). In English, what is called "reflexive pronoun" will be comparable to Polish *się* in a few cases where the pronoun is a "true" reflexive, replaceable by *siebie*: *I'm washing myself* vs. *Myję się (siebie)*. The role of *się* as a clitic in obligatory can be made in the case of conjunctions. In both languages conjunctions are proclitics and have to be stressed if no "prop" word follows them: *And don't do it again — I nie rób tego więcej* vs. *I'd like to help you, but... — Chciałbym panu pomóc, lecz...* The clitic character of conjunctions is not evident when they are polysyllabic: *Before I pass on to the next question — Zanim przejdę do następnego pytania*, and in stressing them English and Polish follow their respective lexical-stress rules.

The last class of clitics in Group I is that of possessive attributive pronouns (possessive adjectives) which cliticize to the following formative in English (*my house, my new book*) and which can be either proclitics (*mój dom, nasz stary pies*) or enclitics (*dom ich stał na wzgórzu*) in Polish. Only the monosyllabic forms of those pronouns are felt to be clitics, which means all forms in English and a few in Polish. The English forms cannot be used predicatively (*\*this house is my*, etc.) and a group of matched non-clitic possessive predicative pronouns (possessive pronouns "proper") has to be used (*this house is mine*, etc.). In Polish there is only one common paradigm for both usages, e.g. *Mój pies* and *Ten pies jest mój* where the second *mój* is always stressed. The ambivalent character of the Polish attributive pronouns (E or P?) can be explained only by reference to syntax and not phonology. A possessive pronoun is attracted to the noun which it modifies and cliticizes in its direction: *nasz mały domek* and *domek nasz / mały*. Since this is connected with the problem of word-order (pre- and postposed attributives) the learner of Polish will encounter more difficulties, connected with the relationship between stress and the information structure of sentences, emphasis and contrast.

The problems with clitics are even more acute in the case of clitics of Group II, where no direct categorial equivalence exists between the clitics of one language and their semantic equivalents in the other. It may be worth while, however, to look for some kind of analogy which may reveal deeper regularities to be utilized in teaching.

Let us deal with the English Group II clitics first. Articles are proclitics which have no straightforward formal equivalents in Polish. The fact that they cliticize to the following formatives is, however, easily grasped by the learners (although the subsequent obligatory vowel reduction is not always made). Examples: *a rose, a red rose, the eager student*.

English personal subject pronouns, when unmarked for stress, cliticize to the following constituent (see quotation from Stockwell (1972: 98) above).

In Polish the personal subject pronouns are usually stressed (except such enclitic cases as *Wiedziałem ja o tym* (Topolińska 1961)) and Polish learners often give undue stress to the English subject pronouns. The English pronouns of this class do not conform to the above proclitic principle when they occur next to auxiliaries. The combinations *Pron+Aux* and *Aux+Pron* together cliticize to the following formative (though possibly *Aux* cliticizes to the *Pron* first in *Pron+Aux*, as contracted forms suggest: *He'll, They're*), e.g. *They've gone, Can you close the door?* If, however, the combinations are found finally (or before a "deletion site"), *Pron+Aux* → *Pron+Aux*, while *Aux+Pron* → *Aux+Pron*. That is, if the *Aux* is final, it is stressed and the pronoun attaches to it: *I know he can, Where do you think it is?* and when the *Pron* is final, it is also the *Aux* that is stressed and the *Pron* cliticizes to it as "less able-bodied": *Why must he? Would you?*, etc.

As to the *Aux* itself, there is a number of problems connected with its stress and reduction possibilities. It is difficult to decide whether it is an enclitic or a proclitic. Contracted forms as in *The teacher's coming* suggest that it is an enclitic, but in forms where the contraction does not occur, e.g. *The teacher was coming*, the combination *was coming* is more likely than *the teacher was* if the sentence were to have an internal (optional) pause. An extensive analysis of stress and reduction of auxiliaries can be found in King (1970), Zwicky (1971), and Baker (1971).

The Polish clitics of Group II are particles. A general name of "particle" is given to a set of monosyllabic grammatical formatives which cannot occur independently. Some of them are clitics, e.g. intensifiers *no, że, li, bądź* of enclitic character (*Chodź no tu, Jakże smutno, Znasz li ten kraj, Jaki bądź zeszyt*), proclitic *nie* in the meaning of *not*, and so-called movable verb endings: *-śmy, -ście, bym, byście*, etc. The behaviour of the last two classes may present difficulties in teaching, therefore the two classes will be discussed below.

The negative particle *nie* is comparable to *not* in all usages but Verb Negation, e.g. *nie ja (not I), nie całkiem (not quite)*<sup>14</sup>. In Verb Negation (in English it is AUX-negation) English and Polish follow their respective lexical-stress rules. Thus, in Polish *nie+verb* receives the stress on the penult *\*nie wiem, nie było, nie zachytnaj* (cf. *\*nie mam, \*nie wiem*). English *not* cliticizes to the AUX, with obligatory contraction. Zwicky (1971: 328) comments on the behaviour of *not* in the following way:

"The lack of an intermediate form [nɔt] can be explained by having some occurrences of *not* enter the phonological component as affixes to verbs, like the "neutral" suffixes *-ness, -able* and the inflectional endings of nouns and verbs. These instances of *not* will then remain stressless because of their affixal character, and we require an obligatory vowel-deletion rule."

<sup>14</sup> Here a variant stressed *nie* is also possible: *\*nie ja (not I)*, but cf. *\*nie ja* and *\*not I*.

In Polish *nie* can be treated as a prefix to the verb, comparable to the prefixal *un-* in adjectives and nouns, as in *'niecny, nie'wierny, nieprzyt'omny, 'nieład, niełaska, niewyg'oda*.

The verbal endings are enclitics which either attach to the verb or to the first stressed element in the sentence. When they cliticize to the verb, they are not separated from it in spelling, which causes erroneous shift of stress that is becoming more and more common: *\*chodziliśmy* for *chodziliśmy*, *\*zrozu'miałbyś* for *zrozumiałbyś*, etc. This tendency is coupled with another tendency frowned upon by purists: locating the particles only post-verbally, which impoverishes the stylistic resources of the language and leads to errors of the type: *\*Prosiłbym, że przyszedłbyś; \*Gdyby nie korzystaliśmy; \*Gdy to zrobiłby kto inny* (cf. correct *Prosiłbym, żebyś przyszedł; Gdybyśmy nie korzystali; Gdyby to zrobił kto inny*). The enclitic verb particles move readily before the verb, to the so-called "second position" after the first stressed constituent: *Chętnie byśmy skorzystali; Wyście tego nie dostali; Policja by tego nie znalazła* (but *Bohaterski Odyseusz by oddał życie za swych towarzyszy*, Saloni 1971:81). The only requirement on their ordering is that they should not occur initially, i.e., have nothing to cliticize to (*\*Gdyby Prus wiedział, że jego umiłowane miasto będzie pamiętać, by się cieszył*), although there are also constraints on their ordering within a clitic cluster. A general rule for the order of Polish enclitics is given in Misz (1966) (it is an expanded version of the rule at page 135 above) and it can be presented in the form of the following chart:

ACC  
X — INTENS — V-PART — DAT — GEN — INS, where X the stressed  
REFL

first element (or verb), INTENS is the intensifying particle and V-PART is the verb particle (or movable verb ending), e.g. *Zrobił no'byś mi się grzeczniejszy; Cóżem ci się nagadał*. As the correct ordering causes a great deal of trouble even to the native speakers, it is to be expected that the foreign learner will find this aspect of Polish usage particularly difficult. Again, these matters are related to the whole mechanism of Polish word order, of which the clitic phonology and syntax are only a part.

The foregoing brief discussion of Polish particles concludes the present review of English and Polish clitics which was, of necessity superficial and merely outlined the areas to be studied in a major work which clitics undoubtedly deserve. For the time being, even such crude and imprecisely formulated rules (or conventions) as those given below may, if accompanied by appropriate examples and practice material, help learners in correct phrasing and consequently in achieving correct pausing, stressing and rhythm in their own utterances and in the vocal interpretation of texts (reading, acting). The formulas below include all the points made in the present paper.

ENGLISH	POLISH
PROCLITIC CONVENTION	PROCLITIC CONVENTION
WX [ <sub>a</sub> YZ] <sub>a</sub> → [ <sub>a</sub> WXYZ] <sub>a</sub> when W=∅, X [ <sub>a</sub> Y=Phonol. Word, Y ≠ ∅ X=1. Prep (M), Y ≠ Obj. Pron 2. Conj (M) 3. Poss. Adj 4. Subj. Pron 5. Aux, Y ≠ Subj. Pron Z= # #	WX [ <sub>a</sub> YZ] <sub>a</sub> → [ <sub>a</sub> WXYZ] <sub>a</sub> when W=∅, X [ <sub>a</sub> Y=Phonol. Word, Y=∅ X=1. Prep (M), Y ≠ Obj. Pron. X+Y ≠ Lexicalized 2. Conj (M) 3. NEG "nie", Y ≠ Verb
ENCLITIC CONVENTION	ENCLITIC CONVENTION
[ <sub>a</sub> XY] <sub>a</sub> ZW → [ <sub>a</sub> XYZW] <sub>a</sub> when W=∅, Y [ <sub>a</sub> Z=Phonol. Word, X ≠ ∅ Z=1. Obj. Pron 2. REFL 3. Neg "not", X=Aux	[ <sub>a</sub> XY] <sub>a</sub> ZW → [ <sub>a</sub> XYZW] <sub>a</sub> when W=∅, Y [ <sub>a</sub> Z=Phonol. Word, X ≠ ∅ Z=1. Obj. Pron (M) 2. Verb. Part. 3. Refl "się"

## REFERENCES

- Baker, C. L. 1971. "Stress level and auxiliary behaviour in English". *Linguistic inquiry* 2/2. 167-182.
- Bolinger, D. (ed.). 1972. *Intonation*. London: Penguin Books.
- Chomsky, N. and M. Halle. 1968. *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Comrie, B. 1972. *Lexicalized irregular stress in Polish*. Mimeo.
- Dłuska, M. 1947. *Prozodia języka polskiego*. Kraków: PAU.
- Fisiak J. (ed.). 1974. *Papers and studies in contrastive linguistics 2*. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.
- Guierre, L. 1971. *Drills in English stress patterns*. London: Longman.
- alle, M. 1973. "Stress rules in English: a new version". *Linguistic inquiry* 4/4. 451-464.
- ing, H. 1970. "On blocking the rules for concentration in English". *Linguistic inquiry* 1/1. 134-136.
- ingdon, R. 1958. *The groundwork of English intonation*. London: Longmans.
- rzyszowski, T. 1970. *Teaching English to Polish learners*. Warszawa: PWN.
- akoff, G. 1970. *Irregularity in syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- ikulski, Z. 1961. "Uwagi porównawcze o zagadnieniu intonacji, akcentu i rytmu w języku angielskim". *Języki obce w szkole* 4/61. 212-220.
- lisz, H. 1966. "Szyk się we współczesnej polszczyźnie pisanej". *Język polski* 2.
- zga, J. 1973. "Stress in English and Polish: an introduction to a contrastive analysis". In Fisiak J. (ed.). 1974. 123-135.
- erlmutter, D. 1971. *Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- isarkowa, K. 1967. "Zaimek w polskim zdaniu. 1. Obserwacja podmiotu zaimkowego w mowie potocznej". *Język polski* 1. 21-37.
- aloni, Z. 1971. *Błędy językowe w pracach pisemnych uczniów liceum ogólnokształcącego*. Warszawa: PZWS.

- Stockwell, R. P. 1972. "The role of intonation: reconsiderations and other considerations".  
In Bolinger, D. (ed.). 1972. 87-109.
- Szober, S. 1957. *Gramatyka języka polskiego*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Topolińska, Z. 1961. *Z historii akcentu polskiego od wieku XVI do dziś*. Prac. Jęz. PAN  
27. Ossolineum.
- Zwicky, A. 1970. "Auxiliary reduction in English". *Linguistic inquiry* 1/3. 325-335.