

## КЛИТИКИ И ИНТЕРФЕЙСЫ ГРАММАТИКИ: К ОПРЕДЕЛЕНИЮ «ПЕРВОЙ ПОЗИЦИИ» В ЧЕШСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

*Нина Адам*

*Гёттингенский университет*

В статье обсуждается характер «первой позиции» в чешском языке, то есть позиции, которая предшествует клитике второй позиции. Хотя первая позиция определяется в терминах структуры синтаксических составляющих, которая возникает независимо от требований клитики, размещение клитик не может быть описано только в синтаксисе. Даже те подходы, которые предполагают влияние постсинтаксических ограничений на итоговую фонетическую форму, сталкиваются с серьезными проблемами. Вместо этого я предлагаю анализ в рамках Теории оптимальности. Я показываю, как первая позиция возникает из ограничений, специфичных для клитики и относящихся к синтаксическим составляющим, а также из независимых от клитик синтаксических ограничений. Просодически определяемое размещение клитик в сербохорватском языке может быть объяснено при помощи ограничений тех же типов, только относящихся к другим составляющим.

**Ключевые слова:** чешский язык, славянские языки, клитики, вторая позиция, вспомогательный глагол, причастие, оптимальность, синтаксис, фонетическая форма.

## CLITICS AT THE INTERFACES OF GRAMMAR: DEFINING THE “FIRST POSITION” IN CZECH

*Nina Adam*

*University of Göttingen*

This paper is concerned with the nature of the “first position” in Czech, i.e. the position preceding second-position clitics. Although the first position is determined by syntactic constituency, independent of clitic requirements, clitic placement itself cannot be captured purely in the syntax. Even approaches which assume an influence of PF face serious problems. Instead I propose an OT analysis, showing how the first position results from clitic-specific constraints referring to syntactic constituents, as well as from independent syntactic constraints. The prosodically-determined clitic placement in BCMS can be explained using exactly the same constraint types, only referring to different constituents.

**Keywords:** Czech, Slavic, clitic, second position, auxiliaries, participles, optimality, syntax, PF.

## 1. Introduction

Second-position (2P) clitics are found in many of the world's languages, including Slavic. At first glance, finding an explanation for 2P clitics appears simple, if one does not consider language-specific deviations from the general pattern. Thus, on one hand, a thorough investigation into concrete linguistic patterns is necessary. On the other hand, it is important to bear in mind the cross-linguistic occurrence of 2P clitics. The Slavic languages are well-suited for this enterprise: For example, as will be shown below, both Czech and BCMS have 2P clitics, but the first position is defined in very different ways in the two languages.

In this paper, I address the question how to capture clitic placement from the viewpoint of defining the “first position”, i.e. I will provide an analysis of the material that can precede 2P clitics in Czech. I will first introduce the general clitic placement patterns in Czech, including clitics in a “third position”. With this basis, I will show how traditional purely syntactic approaches to clitic placement struggle to explain the data. I will then present more recent approaches which rely on interface effects and sketch some issues they encounter. After this, I will provide data of verb-plus-object fronting, which gives further insight into how clitic placement interacts with general syntactic mechanisms. Finally, I will entertain a constraint-based analysis of Czech data and briefly discuss an extension of this approach to BCMS.

## 2. Syntax and Prosody of Czech Cliticisation

This section lays the foundations for the discussion by introducing the placement patterns found with Czech 2P clitics, thus illustrating the nature of the first position. The data presented in this section will be discussed and analysed in the course of the paper.

### 2.1. Basic Patterns of Czech Clitic Placement

Clitics in Czech<sup>1</sup> appear after the first constituent of their clause, as shown in (1). Unlike in e.g. BCMS, they do not appear after the first word, as (2) demonstrates e.g. [Franks, King 2000: 111]:

---

<sup>1</sup> Czech 2P clitics mostly fall into two groups: auxiliaries and pronouns. Since these have the same positional distribution, they can both be used to illustrate the 2P phenomenon. An exception might be the reflexive *se*, which appears to have greater positional freedom [Short 1993: 495]. For an overview of Czech 2P clitics, see [Junghanns 2002].

- (1) a. *Dobrou knihu **jsi**<sup>2</sup> jistě četl.*  
 good book AUX.2SG certainly read.PTCP
- b. *Četl **jsi** jistě dobrou knihu.*  
 read.PTCP AUX.2SG certainly good book
- c. *Jistě **jsi** četl dobrou knihu.*  
 certainly AUX.2SG read.PTCP good book  
 ‘You have certainly read a good book.’
- (2) a. *Ten básník **mi** čte ze své knihy.*  
 that poet me.DAT reads from his book
- b. *Ten **mi** básník čte ze své knihy.*  
 that me.DAT poet reads from his book  
 ‘That poet reads to me from his book.’ [Halpern 1995: 17]

It has also been noted in previous work e.g. [Fried 1994: 159] that there are circumstances that allow clitics to appear in third position. This is the case in embedded sentences. The element that follows the complementiser and precedes the clitic in these configurations is usually the topic or focus [Lenertová 2001: 301]:

- (3) a. *že **se** Petr odstěhoval*  
 COMP REFL Petr moved.PTCP
- b. *že Petr **se** odstěhoval*  
 COMP Petr REFL moved.PTCP  
 ‘...that Petr has moved.’ [Fried 1994: 159]

There is an important restriction on clitic-third configurations: They cannot occur with verbs, i.e. a verb cannot occupy the position between complementiser and clitic [Veselovská 1995: 110].

- (4) *\*že odstěhoval **se** Petr*  
 COMP moved.PTCP REFL Petr  
 Intended: ‘...that Petr has moved.’ [Fried 1994: 159]

---

<sup>2</sup> Throughout the paper, 2P clitics in examples are marked by bold type. Examples for which no references are given are my own.

## 2.2. Prosodic Properties of Czech 2P Clitics

As is typical for clitics in general, Czech 2P clitics are not prosodically independent: they cannot appear alone, as a one-word answer, as (5c) shows, and they cannot carry stress, as shown in (6b).

(5) a. *Napsals* *to?*  
write.PTCP:2SG it  
'Did you write it?'

b. *Ano, napsal.*  
yes write.PTCP  
'Yes, I did.' {b = c} [Veselovská 1995: 272]

c. \**Ano, jsem.*  
yes AUX.1SG

(6) a. *Neposlal jsem ho JEMU, ale jí.*  
NEG:send.PTCP AUX.1SG it him.DAT but her.DAT  
'I did not send it to him, but to her.' {a = b} [Veselovská 1995: 272]

b. \**Neposlal jsem MU ho, ale jí.*  
NEG:send.PTCP AUX.1SG him.DAT it but her.DAT

However, Czech clitics are not necessarily prosodically enclitic [Toman 1986: 127]. In some sentences, they do not have a prosodic host to their left, although they occupy 2P. In (7), the position right after the intonational break is the only grammatical position for the reflexive *se*, since it is the position after the first constituent.

(7) *Ten doktor, co mu důvěruješ, se neholí.*  
that doctor REL him.DAT trust.2SG REFL.ACC NEG:shave.3SG  
'That doctor, whom you trust, doesn't shave.' [Toman 1986: 125]

## 3. Problems for Analysing Czech Clitic Placement

The previous section has shown that Czech clitics follow one syntactic constituent, and two in certain cases, and that they are prosodically dependent, though possibly not with a specified direction of attachment to a host. The following two subsections summarise some major arguments why these patterns present a challenge both for traditional purely syntactic accounts, and for theories that allow PF to alter the final representation.

### 3.1. Traditional Pure Syntax Accounts

At first glance, purely syntactic approaches to clitic placement seem plausible, especially in Czech, where the clitics follow a syntactic constituent. However, many arguments against purely syntactic analyses of 2P clitics have been made, and many authors e.g. [Anderson 2005; Bošković 2004; Richardson 1997] have concluded that syntax on its own cannot be responsible for clitic placement. I just summarise two of their major points here.

Syntactic approaches attribute the fact that clitics appear in 2P to phonological deficiency, in the sense that an element, e.g. the verb, moves in front of the clitic to provide a host for it. But this means that syntax must access phonology [Richardson 1997: 137], an assumption that is not compatible with generative syntax' modular view of language. In Czech, as we have seen, this view is additionally challenged by the fact that clitics do not seem to require a prosodic host to their left.

Another challenge is the fact that the syntactic type of the initial constituent is irrelevant, as has been shown in section 1; since heads and phrases occupy different syntactic positions, it is not possible to define only one position that the clitics follow [Richardson 1997: 142]. This also entails that the clitics themselves might not have a fixed syntactic position. This has been argued for e.g. by [Lenertová 2004] and [Bošković 2004], and below I will provide additional evidence that this cannot be so.

### 3.2. Syntax-and-PF Accounts

The fact that syntactic structure alone cannot explain the positioning of clitics has led to alternative proposals that rely on interface effects, although to different degrees. Some authors (e.g. [Halpern 1995, Bošković 2004, Franks 2017]) have proposed that, like other auxiliaries, pronouns etc., clitics move in the syntax, but that the final linearisation is influenced by prosodic requirements. For illustration, I will describe the account of [Bošković 2004] in more detail here.

Based on South Slavic data, [Bošković 2004] argues that clitics move in the syntax, but that the 2P effect results from PF requirements. In contrast to purely syntactic accounts, in this approach clitics do not occupy one shared syntactic position, thus do not cluster syntactically [Bošković 2004: 50]. Also, PF movement (i.e. Prosodic Inversion [Halpern 1995: 5]) is not required: PF restrictions instead prevent the pronunciation of the highest copy [Bošković 2004: 63]. As for the clitics' precise syntactic nature, they are generated as morphological heads in phrasal positions and thus undergo head movement [Chomsky 1994: 16].

Using the copy-and-delete mechanism and a clitic-specific PF requirement, the fact that clitics in BCMS do not occur directly after an intonational break, i.e. the left edge of an intonation phrase (iP), as shown in (8), can be captured as in (9) [Bošković 2004: 69]:

- (8) a. *Moja sestra, koja je u Sarajevu, sjeća vas se.*  
 my sister REL is in Sarajevo remembers you REFL  
 ‘My sister, who is in Sarajevo, remembers you.’ {a = b}  
 [Radanović-Kocić 1996: 437]

- b. \**Moja sestra, koja je u Sarajevu, vas se sjeća.*  
 my sister REL is in Sarajevo you REFL remembers

- (9) a. Clitics are placed in their syntactic position:<sup>3</sup>  
*Moja sestra, koja je u Sarajevu, vas se sjeća ~~vas se~~.*

- b. PF requirement that BCMS clitics must not be initial in an iP:  
*Moja sestra, koja je u Sarajevu, ~~vas se~~ sjeća vas se.*

Such approaches make sense in languages such as BCMS, where clitics are placed with respect to prosodic constituency, as (8) shows. In Czech, however, the relevant domains are syntactic; (10) demonstrates that prosodic breaks have no effect on clitic placement. The PF requirement in Czech would thus be that clitics must not be initial within their CP. This means that PF would have to access syntactic constituency. But if PF constraints apply after syntax, then this is something that PF cannot do: At this point, syntactic information is not available anymore.

- (10) a. *Linda, která je Angličanka, by chtěla cestovat*  
 Linda REL is Englishwoman COND.3 want.PTCP travel  
  
*do Londýna.*  
 to London  
 ‘Linda, who is English, would like to travel to London.’ {a = b}

<sup>3</sup> [Bošković 2004] assumes that auxiliary clitics raise to AgrS, dative clitics to AgrIO, and accusative clitics to AgrDOP, whilst the main verb remains in VP (which is also where the pronominal clitics are generated) [Bošković 2004: 59].

- b. \**Linda, která je Angličanka chtěla by cestovat*  
 Linda REL is Englishwoman want.PTCP COND.3 travel  
*do Londýna.*  
 to London

Another issue is raised by Lenertová 2004: Based on the fact that auxiliary clitics cannot host the negative particle *ne-*, as shown in (11), she argues that auxiliary clitics must be base-generated above NegP. However, if they originate in that high position, there is no lower copy that could be pronounced in a sentence such as (12), where the clitic conditional auxiliary is preceded by a negated verb [Lenertová 2004: 147]:

- (11) a. *Nespala bych.*  
 NEG:sleep.PTCP COND.1SG  
 ‘I would not sleep.’ {a = b}
- b. \**Spala nebych.*  
 sleep.PTCP NEG:COND.1SG
- (12) *Neodpověděla bych mu prý na tu*  
 NEG:answer.PTCP COND.1SG him.DAT supposedly at this  
*otázku správně.*  
 question properly  
 ‘I would supposedly not answer him properly to this question.’  
 [Lenertová 2004: 147]

It appears that within syntax-and-PF approaches, Czech cliticisation is difficult to capture, mostly due to how they view interface interactions. On the other hand, these accounts provide an important insight: 2P cannot be explained in terms of syntactic processes, but is due to restrictions on clitic placement independent from syntax. The next section will sharpen our picture of the interaction between syntactic processes and non-syntactic clitic placement.

#### 4. A Closer Look at the First Position

An interesting asymmetry concerning the first position is instantiated by the data in (13), where the combination infinitive + object in the first position is grammatical, but the combination participle + object is not:

- (13) a. *Posílat dopisy ti budu pravidelně každý týden.*  
 send.INF letters you.DAT will.1SG regularly every week  
 ‘I will send letters to you regularly every week.’
- b. \**Posílal dopisy jsem ti pravidelně každý týden.*  
 send.PTCP.M.SG letters AUX.1SG you.DAT regularly every week  
 Intended: ‘I sent letters to you regularly every week.’  
 [Avgustinova and Oliva 1995: 27–28]

In order to verify these judgments and to gain a broader image of the effects of verb-plus-object fronting in Czech, I collected acceptability judgments from five native speakers of Czech, additionally including embedded contexts and finite present tense verbs<sup>4</sup>. The results are summarised in Table 1, examples for sentences from each condition are given in (14)–(16).

Table 1. Acceptability judgments for verb + object fronting

	main clause	embedded clause
finite verb	*	*
past participle	*	*
infinitive	√	√

(14) Finite present tense verb and object:

- a. \**Udělíme cenu mu tajně.*  
 award. PRS.1PL price him.DAT secretly  
 Intended: ‘We are awarding him the price secretly.’
- b. \**Říkají, že udělíme cenu mu tajně.*  
 say.3PL COMP award. PRS.1PL price him.DAT secretly  
 Intended: ‘They say that we are awarding him the price secretly.’

(15) Past participle and object:

- a. \**Udělili cenu jsme mu tajně.*  
 award.PTCP.PL price AUX.1PL him.DAT secretly  
 Intended: ‘We awarded him the price secretly.’
- b. \**Říkají, že udělili cenu jsme mu tajně.*  
 say.3PL COMP award.PTCP.PL price AUX.1PL him.DAT secretly  
 Intended: ‘They say that we awarded him the price secretly.’

<sup>4</sup> Though not displayed here, all conditions were also tested for fronting of only the verb. This yielded the expected results: verb fronting in main clauses was perfectly acceptable, whilst the results for embedded clauses were intermediate. No difference between verb types was found here.

## (16) Infinitive and object:

a. *Udělit cenu mu chceme tajně.*  
 award.INF price him.DAT want.PRS.1PL secretly  
 ‘We want to award him the price secretly.’

b. *Říkají, že udělit cenu mu chceme tajně.*  
 say.3PL COMP award.INF price him.DAT want. PRS.1PL secretly  
 ‘They say that we want to award him the price secretly.’

Remarkably, fronting of finite verbs and of past participles yielded exactly the same results in all conditions, an important point that I will come back to later. What causes the difference between ratings of finite verbs and infinitives? It is clearly not prosody, since no prosodic difference between the sentences can be identified. Also, here, as is generally the case with the Czech first position, the length of the constituent or adjunction of phrases framed by pauses have no effect on judgments. The reason must thus lie in the syntactic mechanism that creates the first position.

There are two alternative explanations for the data presented in (14)–(16). The first, mentioned by [Franks, King 2000], is that inflected verbs and past participles, in contrast to infinitives, undergo head movement out of VP [Franks, King 2000: 112–113]. For ease of reference, I will label this the *head movement approach*. [Veselovská 2008] offers a range of arguments for the assumption that the participle, like the finite verb, moves out of VP. To mention one, the past participle carries negation, while e.g. the passive participle does not [Veselovská 2008: 557].

How does the head movement approach capture the data in (14)–(16)? It makes sense to assume that what occupies the first position in (16) is a topicalised phrase. If finite verbs and participles leave VP via head movement (e.g. to v [Veselovská 2008: 560]), then the verb and its object cannot be topicalised as one phrase. Thus, the sentences in (14) and (15) are ungrammatical because joint topicalization of finite verb/participle and object is not possible.

The second alternative, proposed by [Veselovská 1995], is the *strict adjacency approach*: In a configuration where the verb precedes the clitics, the clitics adjoin to the verb or complementiser in C, which thus means that nothing can intervene between verb and clitics [Veselovská 1995: 89]. This is why the structures in (14) and (15) are ungrammatical.

The head movement approach explains the difference between finite verbs and infinitives and captures the entire data set in (14)–(16). In contrast, the

strict adjacency approach has nothing to say about the difference between finite verbs and infinitives, i.e. it cannot explain the grammaticality of (16a) and (16b) — we would have to combine it with assumptions like those of head movement. Additionally, (16b) represents a clear counterargument to strict adjacency, which relies on the idea that clitics are located in C: if they were, they would be adjoined to the complementiser *že*, and we would not expect to find any phrasal material between *že* and the clitics. The fact that we do is additional counterevidence to the idea that clitics move to C, adding to what was sketched in section 3.1. If clitics do not move to C, and it is now clear that they do not, then strict adjacency cannot be correct.

Note that for our analysis to work, we must assume that the past participle behaves exactly like a finite verb. Why this might be desirable will be discussed in section 5.2. Either way, the data presented here is a clear case of a syntactic first position: what precedes the clitics is defined in purely syntactic terms. At the same time, though, we have seen an additional argument against clitics in a fixed position.

## 5. A Constraint-Based Analysis of Clitic Placement

So far, I have shown that clitics are subject to restrictions that cannot be translated into syntactic positions. On the other hand, PF restrictions cannot be the solution, as they apply only after syntax, at which point information about syntactic constituency is lost. Therefore, I will offer an alternative approach to clitic placement, developed by [Anderson 1992] and works thereafter. It relies on the assumptions of Optimality Theory (OT), which strives to explain the structures of languages through violable constraints, and the variation between languages through different rankings of these constraints [Prince and Smolensky 2006: 126–127].

### 5.1. Czech 2P Placement

Based on ideas from [Anderson 1992] and subsequent work, [Richardson 1997] offers an OT analysis of Czech 2P cliticisation, which I present here in a slightly adapted version. Two constraints are crucial here: one that prohibits clitics to occupy the left edge of CP, defined in (17a), and one that requires clitics to be initial in a lower projection, TP, defined in (17b). As is always the case in OT, the ranking of these constraints, given in (17c), is decisive for a language's structure.

- (17) a. \*EDGEMOST(Cl;L;CP): A clitic must not be at the left edge of CP.  
 b. EDGEMOST(Cl;L;TP): A clitic must be at the left edge of TP.  
 c. Ranking: \*EDGEMOST(Cl;L;CP) >> EDGEMOST(Cl;L;TP)  
 [Richardson 1997: 147–148]

Note that this account does not view clitics as syntactic objects, in the sense that their position does not correspond to a position in the syntax [Anderson 1992: 200]. However, this does not mean that we need to reject entirely that clitics occupy syntactic positions; pronominal clitics, for example, might still receive case in the relevant configurations.

Another important aspect of this approach is that OT assumes a parallel evaluation of candidates; there are thus no layers such as PF. This means that the problem mentioned in section 3.2 above cannot occur: since there is no PF, the constraints in (17) are not PF constraints, and thus we do not have to explain why phonology accesses syntax.

Using these constraints, we can now explain the data presented in this paper. Beginning with basic 2P patterns as shown in section 2.1, we immediately see the advantage of the constraint interaction that regulates clitic placement: With a topicalized object, as in (18a), which is raised to FinP, the optimal position for the clitic is at the left edge of TP, which means that both \*EDGEMOST(CP) and EDGEMOST(TP) are satisfied. The relevance of the constraint ranking comes into effect with a verb in first position, as in (18b): We do not need to assume verb fronting for obscure reasons. The verb can remain in a low position, but the clitic will not precede it, because this would cause a violation of \*EDGEMOST(CP). In such a configuration, one of the above constraints will always be violated, and given their ranking, the optimal candidate violates EDGEMOST(TP) [Richardson 1997: 147–148]<sup>5, 6</sup>.

- (18) a. [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> *Dobrou knihu* [<sub>TP</sub> *jsi četl*]]]  
           good           book           AUX.2SG read.PTCP

<sup>5</sup> I assume a phrase structure for Czech as employed e.g. by [Fehrmann and Junghanns 2012: 83], though this is not crucial to the claims made here.

<sup>6</sup> Note that the same logic applies if one does not want to assume that the object is topicalised in (18a): if the object is in a position below the left edge of TP, EDGEMOST(TP) will be violated to satisfy \*EDGEMOST(CP).



- b. [<sub>CP</sub> *že* [<sub>FinP</sub> *Petr* [<sub>TP</sub> *se odstěhoval*]]]  
 COMP Petr REFL move.PTCP  
 ‘...that Petr has moved’ {a = b}

We can now explain the topicalization of infinitive and object, discussed in section 4, with the same reasoning: The clitic can never precede a topic, whether it includes the verb or not, because the topic position is above TP. The presence of a complementiser does not change this situation.

- (22) [<sub>CP</sub> (*že*) [<sub>FinP</sub> [*udělit cenu*] [<sub>TP</sub> *mu chceme tajně*]]]  
 COMP award.INF price him.DAT want.1PL secretly  
 ‘(That) we want to award him the price secretly.’

As we have seen, the ungrammaticality of sentences where a finite verb and its object are topicalised is independent from clitic placement, but explained through the head movement approach: the finite verb leaves VP and this prevents topicalisation of verb and object. The first position is thus determined by general syntactic principles of the language, not by a clitic’s requirements.

To capture this syntactic principle in OT, I assume a constraint UNIFORMITY, which requires a chain to be uniform with respect to syntactic status. Since the finite verb/past participle undergoes head movement out of VP, it cannot be involved in phrasal movement to the left periphery later in the derivation. For concreteness, (23) illustrates the relevant structures without topicalisation: The infinitive in (23a) remains within VP, but the finite verb in (23b) has moved to vP [Veselovská 2008: 560]. Topicalisation of finite verb and object thus violates UNIFORMITY, but topicalisation of infinitive and object, i.e. of VP, does not.

- (23) a. [<sub>CP</sub> *že* [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *mu chceme udělit cenu*]]]]]  
 COMP him.DAT want.1PL award.INF price  
 b. [<sub>CP</sub> *že* [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *mu udělíme<sub>i</sub> t<sub>i</sub> cenu*]]]]]  
 COMP him.DAT award.PRS.1PL price  
 ‘... that we are awarding him the price’ {a = b}

Note that the fact that the past participle leaves VP, just like the finite verb in (23b), might suggest that it actually *is* a finite verb; this is not implausible, as the participle inflects for gender and number. But then, the clitic past tense auxiliary cannot also be a finite verb. Indeed, the assumption that clitic verbs are closer to suffixes than to independent verbs is not unique to OT accounts: [Toman 1980] already takes the past tense auxiliary to be suffixal [Toman 1980: 310].

### 5.3. A Note on BCMS 2P Placement

We have seen in section 3.2 that in BCMS, clitics are placed with respect to prosodic constituency: they follow the first phonological phrase of their  $\iota P$  [Radanović-Kocić 1996: 441]. Using the same constraint types as for Czech, I assume that both \*EDGEMOST and EDGEMOST refer to  $\iota P$  in BCMS. Their ordering prevents clitics from appearing at the left edge, and at the same time from appearing further to the right:

- (24) a. \*EDGEMOST(Cl;L; $\iota P$ ): A clitic must not be at the left edge of  $\iota P$ .
- b. EDGEMOST(Cl;L; $\iota P$ ): A clitic must be at the left edge of  $\iota P$ .
- c. \*EDGEMOST(CL;L; $\iota P$ ) >> EDGEMOST(CL,L; $\iota P$ )

Since EDGEMOST( $\iota P$ ) is always violated when \*EDGEMOST( $\iota P$ ) is satisfied, multiple violations of EDGEMOST( $\iota P$ ) must be possible, i.e. the constraint must be gradual. In contrast, \*EDGEMOST( $\iota P$ ) must be absolute: either something is initial or not — otherwise the optimal candidate would be the one where the clitic is the furthest from the left edge.

The advantage of this approach is that we can assume Czech and BCMS to function in entirely parallel ways with respect to clitics: they employ the same set of clitic-specific constraints — the only difference is the type of constituent these constraints refer to.

The fact that there are cases in BCMS where a clitic can appear inside a phrase, after the first prosodic word, as shown in (25), results directly from the constraint ranking in (24c): \*EDGEMOST( $\iota P$ ) is satisfied, and EDGEMOST( $\iota P$ ) is violated only once, thus the DP-internal position is optimal.

- (25) *Taj je čovek voleo Mariju.*  
 that AUX.3SG man love.PTCP Maria  
 ‘That man loved Maria.’ [Halpern 1995: 16]

The fact that not all constituents allow to be broken up like this can be captured by assuming INTEGRITY(XP) constraints, as proposed by [Anderson 2005]. This constraint family penalises the placement of material inside certain phrase types, and in fact their general splitting, which accommodates the observation that structures which clitics cannot enter resist being discontinuous in general [Anderson 2005: 143–144].

## 6. Conclusions

At the outset of the paper, I showed that Czech clitic placement is oriented towards syntactic constituency, but also that purely syntactic accounts fail to explain the data. This insight underlies syntax-and-PF approaches, but these too face severe problems, especially for Czech. The significance of syntactic processes in determining the first position was demonstrated through verb + object fronting, which at the same time provided further evidence against a fixed syntactic position for clitics.

In order to solve these various issues, I proposed to analyse clitic placement in Czech in the spirit of [Richardson 1997]: Czech 2P is the consequence of conflicting clitic-specific constraints that refer to syntactic constituency, but the clitics themselves do not occupy syntactic positions. UNIFORMITY, which is a general syntactic constraint unrelated to clitics, prevents finite verbs and their objects from being topicalised together. The properties of the Czech past participle provide additional evidence that auxiliary clitics are fundamentally different from finite verbs.

The fact that the first position is prosodic in BCMS can be captured using the same constraint types as for Czech, but with reference to prosodic constituents. The precise definition of the constraints that refer to 2P clitic placement in different languages and the possible grammars that their rankings produce provide an interesting field for further investigation.

## Abbreviations

ACC — accusative; AUX — auxiliary; COMP — complementiser; COND — conditional; DAT — dative; INF — infinitive; M — masculine; NEG — negation; PL — plural; PRS — present; PTCP — participle; REFL — reflexive; REL — relative; SG — singular.

## References

- Anderson 1992 — Anderson S. *A-Morphous Morphology*. Cambridge: CUP, 1992.  
Anderson 2005 — Anderson S. *Aspects of the theory of clitics*. Oxford, OUP, 2005.  
Avgustinova and Oliva 1995 — Avgustinova T., Oliva K. The position of sentential clitics in the Czech clause. Saarbrücken: CLAUS, 1995.  
Bošković 2004 — Bošković Ž. Clitic placement in South Slavic. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*. 2004. Vol. 12. P. 37–90.  
Chomsky 1994 — Chomsky N. *Bare phrase structure*. Cambridge: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 1994.  
Fehrmann, Junghanns 2012 — Fehrmann D., Junghanns U. “Missing” and “misplaced” subjects. *Generative investigations: Syntax, morphology, and phonology*. Bański P., Łukaszewicz B., Opalińska M., Zaleska J. (eds.). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012. P. 63–92.

- Franks 2017 — Franks S. *Syntax and spell-out in Slavic*. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers, 2017.
- Franks, King 2000 — Franks S., King T. *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford: OUP, 2000.
- Fried 1994 — Fried M. Second-position clitics in Czech. *Lingua*. 1994. Vol. 94. P. 155–175.
- Halpern 1995 — Halpern A. *On the placement and morphology of clitics*. Stanford: CSLI, 1995.
- Junghanns 2002 — Junghanns U. *Klitische Elemente im Tschechischen: eine kritische Bestandsaufnahme*. *Linguistische Beiträge zur Slavistik IX*. Daiber T. (ed.). München: Sagner, 2002. P. 117–149.
- Lenertová 2001 — Lenertová D. On clitic placement, topicalization and CP-structure in Czech. *Current issues in formal Slavic linguistics*. Zybatow G., Junghanns U., Mehlhorn G., Szucsich L. (eds.). Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2001. P. 294–305.
- Lenertová 2004 — Lenertová D. Czech pronominal clitics. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*. 2004. Vol. 12. No. 1/2. P. 135–171.
- Prince, Smolensky 2006 — Prince A., Smolensky P. *Optimality: From neural networks to Universal Grammar*. *The harmonic mind: from neural computation to optimality-theoretic grammar*. Smolensky P., Legendre G. (eds.). Cambridge: MIT, 2006. P. 123–143.
- Radanović-Kocić 1996 — Radanović-Kocić V. The placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics: a prosodic approach. *Approaching second: Second-position clitics and related phenomena*. Halpern A., Zwicky A. (eds.). Stanford: CSLI, 1996. P. 429–446.
- Richardson 1997 — Richardson M. Czech clitics: 2P or not 2P, that is the question. *Studies in the morphosyntax of clitics*. Kaiser L. (ed.). New Haven: Yale University, 1997. P. 131–150.
- Short 1993 — Short, D. Czech. *The Slavonic languages*. Comrie B., Corbett G. (eds.). London: Routledge, 1993. Pp. 455–532.
- Toman 1980 — Toman J. Weak and strong: Notes on *be* in Czech. *Wege zur Universalienforschung*. Brettschneider G., Lehmann C. (eds.). Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1980. P. 305–310.
- Toman 1986 — Toman J. Cliticisation from NPs in Czech and comparable phenomena in French and Italian. *The syntax of pronominal clitics*. Borer H. (ed.). New York: Academic Press, 1986. P. 123–147.
- Veselovská 1995 — Veselovská L. *Phrasal movement and X<sup>0</sup>-morphology*. Ph.D. dis. Palacký University Olomouc, 1995.
- Veselovská 2008 — Veselovská L. The extended verbal projection in Czech: Three variants of the verb *be*. *Formal Description of Slavic Languages: The fifth conference, Leipzig 2003*. Zybatow G., Szucsich L., Junghanns U., Meyer R. (eds.). Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2008. P. 555–569.

Статья поступила в редакцию 15.11.2019

The article was received on 15.11.2019

**Нина Адам**

магистр; Гёттингенский университет

**Nina Adam**

Master of Arts; Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

[nina.adam@uni-goettingen.de](mailto:nina.adam@uni-goettingen.de)