The data from the *dechi* study provide a fine-grained taxonomy of clitic types. This data is enriched by Anstey’s calculations (2006).\(^1\)

CF. Breuer (1982) “short words” class I (8), class II (10a) vs class III (10b)

N.B. Breuer’s classes are not useful: see below Classes Ib, II, III, V.


[See attached tables]

**Clitic Class I: Closed Syllable [Breuer = small word]**

Ia /CVC/

Bound Nouns (*ben*), Prepositions (*el, et, `al, `im, `ad, min*), Complementizers (*pen, im*), Negatives (*al, bal*)

Ib /CVCC/

Bound Nouns (*kol, `et, bat, etc., rav, har, etc., xay, etc.)*

*Average Anstey value ~ 3.0*

*Generally treated as if just another syllable in word*

**Clitic Class II: Open Syllable**

/CVV/

Bound Nouns (*pi*), Pronouns (*hu, hi, zeh*), Verbs? (*ba “come”?*), Complementizers (*ki, lu*), Negatives (*lo*), “Pd” (*ko*), “Pg” Interrogatives (*mi, ey, mah [qametz]*), “Pr” (*zu*)

*Average Anstey value < 4.5*

*Takes munach when exceeding three moras (i.e., when it itself is fourth mora)*

**Clitic Class III: Shwa + Closed Syllable**

*Nouns, Nouns, Verbs*

**Clitic Class IV: Shwa + Open Syllable**

*All?*

---

Takes metheg when not in clash; takes munach when exceeding four syllables

Clitic Class V: Pseudo-clitics ~ Particles
Va /CVC/ “Pd” (yesh, ak, raq), “Pi” (hen), “Pc” (gam, af), Imperatives (gal, hat), “Pg” (mah- [closed with gemination])
Vb /CV.CVC/ “Pr” Complementizer (asher)
Average Anstey value > 4.5
Takes munach when host has at least two moras

Clitic Class VI: Superheavies = Pseudo-clitics
/CVVC/ Nouns (tov, cuf, or), Adverbs (sham)
Major difference from V is that receives disambiguating phonetic metheg before monosyllables

Clitic Class VII: Cliticizables (extra mora always preventing clash)
VIIa /CV.CVC/ Segholates Average Anstey value ~ 5.0
VIIb /CVV.CV/ Participles with Nesiga (qone, gole, kore, etc.)
VIIIc /CV.CVVC/ Shwa + Superheavy
Subject to dechi-simplification only before monosyllables

[Clitic Class VIII: Shwa + VIIa/b: never subject to dechi-simplification]

DISCUSSION
- Classes V-VIII not really clitics: hence “pseudo-clitic” and “cliticizable”.
- Notice the effect of adding shwas like “and”, le “to” can be dramatic.
- The dramatic contrast between /CVC/ in Class I and Class V has a morphosyntactic basis. How can the lexical reps be adjusted?
- It should also be the case that these should analyzed as different clitic-types in Selkirk’s taxonomy/hierarchy (which ones?)
- Can we develop representations from Selkirk’s types, with attachment at different levels, that could explain the contrasts???
- Anstey finds subtle differences in his cliticizing-frequencies within the classes I have outlined above. This may be explained by observing the ubiquity of clitic stacking, and the necessary relative positions of different syntactic classes. For example, in a string clitic1-clitic2-word, the negative lo must be the inner clitic2, whereas the complementizer ki must be the outer clitic1. [review numbers: paper not handy]