

Further, as (13a) illustrates, the combination of clitic and host provides the appropriate environment for Raddoppiamento Sintattico, a phonological process found in Italian which in certain cases lengthens the initial consonant of words. Raddoppiamento Sintattico also applies to sequences of independent words, as shown in (13b).

(13) *Italian* (Nespor & Vogel 1986)

a. da-[m:]i
'give-me'

b. metà [f:]arfallè
'half (a) butterfly'

If the two processes shown above are used as diagnostic tools, the Italian clitic pronouns are separate phonological words. N&V are nevertheless reluctant to grant them the status of independent elements, since clitics are, as N&V note, phonologically dependent in a way that other words are not; specifically, clitics may never occur alone or receive contrastive stress. Because of this, and because of the ambiguous behavior of clitics demonstrated in (8)–(11), N&V conclude that clitics must have a special place in phonological theory.

If the original postulation of the clitic group in Hayes (1989)¹¹ is correct, clitics must share this place with all function words—for Hayes, any function word will be included in a clitic group with the content word that is closest to it structurally. At the same time, clitics often share characteristics with elements that are parts of compounds. For example, in compounds we also find constituents that are word-like but never occur in isolation, no matter what their prosodical status might be (so-called *cranberry morphs*). Furthermore, in Italian, the two parts of a compound behave as separate words with respect to intervocalic *s*-voicing and Raddoppiamento Sintattico, as shown below:

(14) *Italian* (Monachesi 1996:93)

a. tocca-[s]ana
touch-sound
'cure all'

b. blù [n:]otte
blue night
'dark blue'

It appears that the place of clitics in the prosodic hierarchy need not be so special after all. In fact, there is no *a priori* reason to believe that all clitics should have the same phonological properties. Even if they are all phonologically deficient, their deficiency may still be a matter of degree. Thus, while some clitics may be analyzed as words phonologically (see, e.g., Monachesi 1995, 1996), there are also many examples of clitics that enter into phonological word formation in the same way as affixes. Anderson (1992) claims that this is the case in Kwakwaka. As (15) illustrates, in Kwakwaka, the articles, possessives, and case markers that syntactically belong with the noun that follows them in the linear order are phonologically included in the word that precedes them. These elements can therefore not be seen as inflectional affixes but rather as word-internal clitics.