

Clitic and non-clitic forms of ‘to be’ in Czech

Nina Adam

University of Göttingen

nina.adam@uni-goettingen.de

Freitag,
06.03.2020
12:45–13:15
VMP5 2067/2071

Czech has a wide range of second-position (2P) clitics, including the past tense auxiliary, which derives from the present tense forms of the verb *být*, ‘to be’. However, these forms are also used for other purposes, namely as copula and for the formation of the passive. In these contexts, they do not behave like clitics, i.e. they are not restricted to 2P (cf. Fried 1994):

- (1) Pozval **jsem** Petra na pondělí. (2) ***Jsem** pozval Petra na pondělí.
invite.PTCP PASTAUX.1SG Petr.ACC to Monday
‘I invited Petr for Monday.’
- (3) Jsem doma. (4) Jsem pozván na pondělí.
COP.1SG at.home PASSAUX.1SG invite.PTCP to Monday
‘I am at home.’ ‘I am invited for Monday.’

In addition to this positional restriction, Czech 2P clitics have the following properties (cf. Toman 1980), some of which directly derive from their clitic status, whilst others seem more idiosyncratic: They cannot host other clitics such as *-li* ‘if’ or *ne-* ‘not’, and cannot appear in isolation or bear contrastive stress. They also display a paradigmatic gap in the third person, and can optionally be omitted in the first person when the subject is present.

The question arises whether the clitic and non-clitic variants of *být* are distinct lexical items, or the results of a (de-)cliticisation process. More specifically, are clitic auxiliaries verbal heads, or do they belong to a different category? Also, an explanation is required as to why the passive auxiliary patterns with the copula, and not with the past auxiliary. I will try to answer these questions from the starting point of modelling clitic positioning: What assumptions do we need to make about 2P clitics in order to capture their behaviour?

In the literature, the differences between clitic and non-clitic forms of *být* are captured in different ways: Fried (1994) classifies them as one lexical item with clitic and non-clitic uses. Franks and King (2000) elaborate on this: Clitics are created from non-clitics through the deletion of prosodic word structure. In contrast, Avgustinova and Oliva (1995) see them as distinct lexical items, an assumption which is pursued more radically by Anderson (2005): in his view, clitics are phrasal morphology, thus not syntactic entities at all, in contrast to non-clitics.

I will show how the views of Anderson (2005) are supported by Czech synchronic clitic placement data; only if clitic and non-clitic forms of *být* are assumed to be fundamentally different, can we explain the peculiar behaviour of Czech 2P clitics. Concerning the distinction between past and passive participles, I argue that the past participle is in fact a finite verb, and that consequently the clitic past auxiliary is not.

References: Anderson, S. (2005). *Aspects of the theory of clitics*. Oxford: OUP. Avgustinova, T. & K. Oliva (1995). The position of sentential clitics in the Czech clause. Saarbrücken: CLAUS. Franks, S. & T. King (2000). *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford: OUP. Fried, M. (1994). Second-position clitics in Czech. *Lingua* 94, 155–175. Toman, J. (1980). Weak and strong: Notes on be in Czech. In G. Brettschneider & C. Lehmann (eds.), *Wege zur Universalienforschung*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. Veselovská, L. (1995). Phrasal movement and X0 morphology. Olomouc: Palacký University.

AG 6