Czech questions with two wh-words

Hana Gruet-Skrabalova

▶ To cite this version:

Hana Gruet-Skrabalova. Czech questions with two wh-words. P. Kosta & L. Schürcks. Formalization of Grammar of Slavic languages, Peter Lang, pp.179-192, 2011. <hal-00599019>

Interrogative strategies in Czech

Hana Gruet-Skrabalova

1. Introduction

This paper discusses three question forms the Czech language uses in questions containing two wh-words. The three question forms are exemplified in (1). In (1a), both wh-words are fronted. In (1b), both wh-words are fronted and the conjunction *a* ('and') appears between them. In (1c), one wh-word is fronted and the other one is introduced by the conjunction *a* in clause-final position.

(1) a. **Kdo   komu** koupil knihu ?   (*multiple fronting*)
who-NOM who-DAT bought book
'Who bought a book for whom ?'
   b. **Kdo   a komu** koupil knihu ?   (*fronting and conjunction*)
who-NOM and who-DAT bought book
'Who bought a book, and for whom ?'
   c. **Kdo**   koupil knihu **a komu** ?   (*conjoined final wh-word*)
who-NOM bought   book   and who-DAT
'Who bought a book, and for whom ?'

Assuming that languages are economical, the fact that a language uses three question forms with the same linguistic material as in (1) implies that we should find differences in their interpretation and in their syntactic structure. Moreover, the syntax of these questions should tell us something about the structure of the CP domain in Czech.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, 3 and 4, I discuss semantic and syntactic properties of the question like in (1). The section 5 discusses some hypotheses about the structure of CP and IP domains in Czech and proposes an analysis of multiple fronting. The section 6 deals with conjoined wh-words. The section 7 deals with the questions containing a final wh-word.

2. Semantic interpretation

2.1 Questions with multiple fronting
Questions like in (1) do not receive the same interpretation. It has already been noted for other Slavic languages (Bošković 2002, Przepiorkowki 1994, Rudin 1988) and for Hungarian (Liptak 2001) that questions with multiple fronting trigger pair-list reading, as in (2).

(2) a. **Kdo**   **koho**   pozval na večírek ? [1]
    who-NOM who-ACC invited to party-ACC
    'Who invited whom to the party ?'
 b. for each *x* and *y*, which *x* invited which *y* to the party ?
 c. Petr   pozval Marii,   Pavel   Alenu   a Jan   Evu.
    Petr-NOM invited Marie-ACC, Pavel-NOM Alena-ACC and Jan-NOM Eva-ACC
    'Peter invited Mary, Paul (invited) Alena, and John (invited) Eva.'

However, specific reading is also possible for multiple fronting in cases there is a specific pair *x* and *y* given in the context, and the question simply asks to identify the role of both *x* and *y* in the event denoted by the verb, as in (4). The two wh-words here contrast with each other, so that we can speak about a contrastive specific reading.

(4) *(speaking about Caïn and Abel)*
 a. **Kdo**   **koho** zabil ? [2]
    who-NOM killed who-ACC ?
    'Who killed whom ?'
 b. given *x* and *y*, is it *x* who killed *y* or is it *y* who killed *x* ?
 c. Kain   zabil Abela, (a ne Abel   Kaina).
    Caïn-NOM killed Abel-ACC (and not Abel-NOM Caïn-ACC)
    'It is Caïn who killed Abel.'

2.2 Questions with conjunction
Questions with fronted wh-items and conjunction only receive specific reading, as we can see in (5). Contrary to multiple fronting, however, the single pair is not presupposed here, so that the specific reading is not a contrastive one.

(5) a. **Kdo**   **a koho**   pozval na večírek ?
    who-NOM and who-ACC invited to party-ACC
    'Who invited whom to the party ?'
 b. for which *x* and *y* is it true that *x* invited *y* to the party ?
 c. Petr pozval na večírek Marii.
    Petr-NOM invited Marie-ACC to party-ACC
    'Peter invited Mary to the party.'

---

1   Czech questions with multiple fronting do not show any superiority effects, although some order preferences have been repported by Meyer (2004). The order of wh-words simply indicates how the demand of information is structured.

2   Moreover, superiority effects hold in these questions, as noted by Meyer (2002).

The question in (5) cannot be paraphrased by a sentential coordination, nor the conjunction *a* ('and') replaced by the conjunction *nebo* ('or'). This also shows that both wh-words here are involved in a single event denoted by the verb.

(6) a. ***Kdo**   pozval na večírek **a   koho**   pozval na večírek ?
      who-NOM invited to party-ACC and who-ACC invited   to party-ACC
   b. ***Kdo**   **nebo koho**   pozval na večírek ?
      who-NOM or   who-ACC invited to party-ACC

On the contrary, questions with final conjoined wh-word are always interpretable as two independent questions. In (7), for instance, the first question asks to identify the *x* who came. The second one presupposes that *x* has been identified and only asks when *he/she/they* came.

(7) a. **Kdo**   přišel **a   kdy** (přišel) ?[3]
      who-NOM came   and when (came)
      'Who came, and when ?'
   b. for which *x* is it true that *x* came and when did *he/she* come ?
   c. Přišel Martin, a   to v úterý.
      came   Martin, and that on Tuesday
      'Martin came on Tuesday.'

We may thus conclude that questions in (1) are not semantically equivalent, since questions with multiple fronting trigger a pair-list or a contrastive specific reading, questions with fronting and conjunction a specific non contrastive reading, and questions with final conjoined wh-word a sentential reading.

3. Constituency of wh-words

3.1 Questions with multiple fronting
The questions in (1) also differ with respect to the constituency of their wh-words. In questions with multiple fronting, the two wh-words are syntactically independent constituents. Indeed, second position clitics, which must immediately follow the first phrasal constituent of the clause, normally follow the initial wh-word (Lenertova 2001).

(8) a. **Komu** <u>jsi</u>   **co**   koupil ?
      who-DAT CL:AUX-2SG what-ACC bought
      'what did you buy for whom ?'

---

3   Questions in (7) are only possible with non-argumental final wh-word (see section 4).

b. *__Komu co__ <u>jsi</u> koupil ?

Lenertova (2001) has also noted that, sometimes, both wh-words may precede the clitics, as in (9b). In such case, however, only a specific contrastive reading is available, as in (4) above. On the contrary, the question (9a) triggers a pair-list reading. I will propose in section 5 that wh-words in (9a) and (9b) respectively do not occupy the same positions both at surface and at *LF*.

(9) a. **Kdo**   <u>si</u>   **koho**   váží   víc ?   (Lenertová 2001)
     who-NOM CL:REFL who-ACC appreciated more
     = for every *x* et for every *y*, which *x* appreciated more which *y* ?
   b. **Kdo**   **koho**   <u>si</u>   váží   víc ?
     who-NOM who-ACC CL:REFL appreciated more
     = given *x* and *y*, is it *x* who appreciates more *y* or is it *y* who appreciates more *x* ?

Another evidence for independency of the fronted wh-words comes from the placement of the particle *že*, which must follow the first wh-words and precede the clitics, as in (10). Note that the question in (10a) is not interpreted as an information question, but rather as an echo-question, i.e. question asking what proposition was actually asserted or intended to be asserted (Arnstein 2002).

(10)a. **Kdo**   *že*   <u>mu</u>   **co**   koupil ?
     who-NOM that-PART CL:he-DAT what-ACC bought
     '(did he actually say that) the person A bought the thing B to him ?'
    b. *__Kdo co__ *že* <u>mu</u> koupil ?

3.2 Questions with conjunction
Turning to questions with conjunction, we observe that clitics as well as the particle *že* must follow both wh-words. This implies that wh-words and conjunction form a single constituant. Again, the presence of the particle *že* forces to interpret the question (11a) as an echo-question.

(11)a. **Kdo a co**   (*že)*   <u>mu</u>   koupil ?
     who-NOM and what-ACC that-PART CL:he-DAT bought
     without *že*: 'who bought what to him ?'
     with *že*: '(did he actually say that) the person A bought the thing B to him ?'
    b. *__Kdo__ *že* <u>mu</u> **a co** koupil ?

We may thus conclude that questions in (1) also differ with respect to their constituency, since wh-words do form distinct constituents in questions with

multiple fronting, while they do form a single constituent in questions with fronting and conjunction. In questions with conjoined final wh-item, the wh-words clearly do not form a constituent.

4. Argumental properties

Finally, wh-words are not equally acceptable in questions like in (1), depending whether they are arguments or adjuncts (see Przepiorkowski (1994) for asymmetry between arguments and adjuncts in other Slavic languages).

4.1 Argumental wh-words

Starting with argumental wh-words (subject and verb complements), we observe that both questions with multiple fronting and question with conjunction are felicitous. A slight preference for order subject > complement can be observed when both wh-words refer to the same semantic type, probably due to some processing difficulties, as suggested by Meyer (2004).

(12)a. **Kdo   koho** / ?**Koho kdo**   doporučil   komisi ? (Meyer 2004)
          who-NOM who-ACC / who-ACC who-NOM recommended committee-DAT

   b. **Komu   co**   / **Co   komu**   řekl ?
          who-DAT what-ACC / what-ACC who-DAT (he) said

(13)a. **Kdo   a koho** / **Koho   a kdo**   doporučil   komisi ?
          who-NOM and who-ACC / who-ACC and who-NOM recommended committee-DAT

   b. **Komu   a co**   / **Co   a komu**   řekl?
          who-DAT and what-ACC / what-ACC and who-DAT (he) said

On the contrary, questions with conjoined final wh-word are ruled out, except for those where the final wh-word is an optional complement, as in (14b'). This should not be not surprising, since these questions are interpreted as independent questions.

(14)a. *__Kdo__   doporučil   komisi   **a koho** ?
             who-NOM recommended committee-DAT and who-ACC

   a'.*__Koho__   doporučil   komisi   **a kdo** ?
           who-ACC recommended committee-DAT and wh

   b. *__Komu__   řekl **a   co** ?
           who-DAT said and what-ACC

   b'. **Co**   řekl **a komu** ?
          what-ACC said and who-DAT

4.2 Non-argumental wh-words

Turning to non-argumental wh-words, we observe that questions with multiple fronting are ruled out, while question involving conjunction are all felicious.

(15) ***Kdy jak** / ***Jak kdy** skončila stoletá   válka ?
       when how / how when finished   hundred-years' war

(16)   **Kdy a jak** / **Jak a kdy** skončila stoletá   válka ?
       when and how / how and when finished   hundred-years' war

(17)a. **Kdy** skončila stoletá   válka **a jak** ?
        when finished   hundred-years' war   and how
    b. **Jak** skončila stoletá   válka **a kdy** ?
        how finished   hundred-years' war   and when

4.3 Mixed wh-words

Finally, when the wh-words are of different types, questions with multiple fronting are good, except for those containing *proč* (why) and *jak* (how). Questions with *jak* (how) are however judged acceptable by some speakers[4].

(18)a. **Koho kde** / **Kde koho**   viděl ?
        who-ACC where / where who-ACC (he) saw
    b.??**Kdo jak** / ?**Jak kdo**   cestoval na konferenci ?
        who-NOM how / how who-NOM went   to conference-ACC
    c. ***Kdo proč** / ***Proč kdo**   přišel ?
        who-DAT why / why who-NOM came

Questions with conjoined wh-items are mainly good, although the order adjunct > argument seems a little degraded:

(19)a. **Koho a kde** / **Kde a koho**   viděl ?
        who-ACC and where / where and who-ACC (he) saw
    b. **Kdo a jak** / ?**Jak a kdo**   cestoval na konferenci ?
        who-NOM and how / how and who-NOM went   to conference-ACC
    c. **Komu a proč** / ?**Proč a komu** to   dal ?
        who-DAT and why /   why and who-DAT it (he) gave

It is plausible that the weak contrast in acceptability in (19bc) is again due to some processing difficulties, since it seems easier to obtain a construal in which

---

4   Acceptable judgements for examples like (18b) can also be found in Meyer (2004).

a manner is assigned to an individual, than a construal in which an individual is assigned to a manner.

Finally, questions with conjoined final wh-word are excluded when an obligatory argumental wh-word is in clause-final position, as in (14) above.

(20)a. **Koho**   viděl **a kde** ?
         who-ACC (he) saw   and where
    a'.***Kde**   viděl **a   koho** ?
         where (he) saw   and who-ACC
    b. **Kdo**   hodnotil studenty   **a jak** ?
         who-NOM evaluated students-ACC and how
    b'.***Jak** hodnotil studenty   **a kdo** ?
         how evaluated students-ACC and who-NOM

The table below gives an overview of the properties of the questions in (1):

	(1a) Wh1 Wh2	**(1b) Wh1 Conj Wh2**	**(1c) Wh1 ... and Wh2**
Reading	a) Pair-list b) Specific contrastive	Specific	Sentential
Constituency	a) Wh1 *že Cl* Wh2 b) Wh1 Wh2 *že Cl*	Wh1 Conj Wh2 *že Cl*	Wh1 *že Cl*.... Wh2
Wh-arguments	ok	ok	* / ok[5]
Wh-adjuncts	*	ok	ok
Wh-mixed	?? jak /* proč	ok	* / ok[5]

Table 1 : properties of questions with two wh-words

5. Multiple fronting
Evidence provided in previous sections to show that questions in (1) have different semantic and syntactic properties suggests that these questions also involve different constructions. Before turning to their analysis, I would like to introduce some preliminary hypotheses about the clause structure in Czech.

5.1 The CP and IP domain
Rizzi (1997, 2002) proposes that the CP domain of the clause contains several syntactic positions each dedicated to a particular element with respect to the type of the clause and its information structure, as indicated in (21):

(21)   [ForceP [TopP* [IntP [TopP* [FocP [TopP* [FinP [IP]]]]]]]]

---

5   If *Wh2* is an optional argument**.**

Contrary to Italian, the CP domain in Czech is less articulated, as already shown by Lenertova (2001). I follow Lenertova in assuming that clitics are hosted by the head of FinP, functionning as a boundary between the IP and CP domain. I also assume that Czech CP contains three other projections (Skrabalova 2008): ForceP whose head hosts complementizers, IntP whose specifier hosts a wh-word in single questions, and a projection between ForceP and FinP, which I call ContrastP and whose specifier may hosts a focussed or a topicalized XP that occurs between the complementizer/or the wh-word and the clitics, as in (22):

(22)a. Myslel, [ForceP *že* [ContrastP TY [FinP *jsi mu*   [IP to auto už vrátil]]]]
     thought   that   you CL:AUX-2SG CL:he-DAT this car-ACC already gave-back
     'He believed that YOU had already given him back this car.'
   b. A chtěl bys vědět [ForceP [IntP **co** [ContrastP MNĚ [FinP *se*   [IP stalo]]]]] ?
     and wanted CL:COND-2SG know   what   me-DAT   CL:REFL happened
     'And would you like to know what happened to ME ?'

An other evidence in favor of such Contrast projection comes from the particle *že*, which may follow a focussed XP or a wh-word in independent interrogative clauses. These clauses are however not information questions, but echo-questions (see section 3). I argued elsewhere (Gruet-Skrabalova 2010) that *že* in these questions is a focus particle, i.e. the head of ContrastP. The focused XP and the wh-word preceding *že* would then occupy the Spec(ifier) of ContrastP:

(23)a. [ForceP [ContrastP ON [Contrast' **že** [FinP mi   [IP zatelefonuje]]]]] ?
                     he-FOC   PART   CL:I-DAT will-call
   b. [ForceP [ContrastP Kam [Contrast' **že**   [IP šel]]]] ?
                     where   PART (he) went

Finally, it has been argued by Beletti (2004) that the architecture of the domain below IP and above little vP parallels that of the domain CP. It seems plausible to postulate in Czech an inner Topic projection between IP and vP which would host topics as the NP [to auto] in (22a):

(22)a'. Myslel, [ForceP *že* [ContrastP TY [FinP *jsi mu* [IP [TopP to auto [vP už vrátil]]]]]]
      thought   that   you CL:AUX-2SG CL:he-DAT this car-ACC already gave-back

5.2 The analysis of Multiple fronting
Assuming that a topic position occurs both in the CP and in the IP domain, I will propose that there is also an Interrogative projection in the IP domain. In questions with multiple fronting, the inital wh-word preceding the clitics will move to the Spec of IntP in the CP domain, while the lower one following the clitics would move to the Spec of IntP in the IP domain:

(24)   [ForceP [IntP **Kdo** [FinP *si* [IP [IntP **co** [ContrastP [vP přečetl]]]]]]] ?
                    who   CL:REFL   what   read

The higher wh-word in (24) takes scope over the lower wh-word. In their papers on distributive (i.e. pair-list) reading of quantifiers, Beghelli & Stowell (1994, 1997) define distributivity as a binary relation requiring the simultaneous presence of a distributor and a distributee. They propose that distributive reading follows from interaction between two specific positions at *L(ogical) F(orm)*, Dist(ributive) Phrase and Share Phrase, as in (25). The DistP hosts the distributor, i.e. the quantifier higher in the clause, and its head selects ShareP, which hosts the share of distribution, i.e. the quantifier lower in the structure.

(25)   [RefP [CP [AgrSP [**DistP** [**ShareP** [NegP [AgrOP [VP]]]]]]]]]

I claim that wh-words triggering a pair-list reading occupy DistP and ShareP positions at *LF*, see (26b). The ShareP can be identified with the lower IntP at surface, see (26a). The DistP occurs immediately above ShareP and below IP. The higher quantifier is reconstructed to the Spec of DistP:

(26)a.   [ForceP [IntP **Kdo** [FinP *se* [IP [IntP **komu** [vP omluvil]]]]]] ?
                    who-NOM CL:REFL   who-DAT apologized
         'Who apologized to whom ?'
    b.   [ForceP [IntP *t*i [FinP *se* [IP *t*i [DistP **Kdo**i [ShareP **komu** [vP *t*i omluvil t]]]]]]] ?

Assuming this analysis, we may now turn to questions in which both wh-words appear before clitics. I claim that in these questions, the lower wh-word does not occupy the lower Spec of IntP, but rather moves directly to the Spec of ContrastP, as in (27a). Consequently, a distributive relation between the two wh-words cannot be established, see (27b). On the contrary, activating of the head Contrast forces a contrastive specific reading:

(27) a.   [ForceP [IntP **Kdo** [ContrastP **komu** [Fin *se*   [IP [vP omluvil]]]]]] ?
                     who-NOM   who-DAT CL:REFL   apologized
          'Who apologized, and to whom ?'
     b.   [ForceP [IntP **Kdo** [ContrastP **komu** [FinP *se* [IP *t* [DistP [ShareP [vP *t* omluvil *t*]]]]]]]] ?

As for examples like (28), I suggest that the presence of the particle *že* activates the head of ContrastP, which attracts the lower wh-word at LF and forces again a contrastive specific reading of wh-words in these questions:

(28)a. [ForceP [IntP **Kdo** [ContrastP *že* [FinP *se* [IP [IntP **komu** [vP omluvil]]]]]]] ?
           who-NOM   FOC   CL:REFL   who-DAT apologized
      '(Did he say that) the person A apologized to the person B ?'

    b. [ForceP [IntP **Kdo** [ContrastP **komu**$_i$ *že* [FinP *se* [DistP [ShareP t$_i$ [FinP [IP *t* omluvil
    t $_i$]]]]]]]] ?

5.4 Argument-adjunct asymmetry

Let us turn now to questions with non-argumental wh-words. I claim that their unacceptability follows from the adverbial caracter of *how* and *why* which prevents them to enter both distributive and contrastive relation. To do that, I propose to distinguish quantifed and adverbial wh-words with respect to their capacity of being individualized and of being referential, as shown in table 2:

Q-wh [+Ind, +Ref]	>	**Adv-wh** [–Ind, -Ref]
kdo (who), *co* (what) > *kde, kam* (where), *kdy* (when) > *jak* (how) > *proč* (why)		

Table 2 : Quantified *vs.* adverbial wh-words

For the distributivity relation to be satisfied, both the Spec of DistP and the Spec of Share be must be filled with appropriate elements at *LF*. Namely, the operator in Dist° is defined to apply only to individuals, meaning that only QPs that can be individualized cas access the Spec of DistP. The Spec of Share is required to be semantically a QP that can co-vary with the distributor. It follows that only quntified wh-words endowed with the feature [+Ind(ividual)] may enter distributive relation, i.e. occupy DistP and ShareP.

Furthemore, contrastive reading will only apply to XP endowed with the feature [+Ref(erential)][6], which is compatible with the presupposition of a specific pair. Since *why* and *how* are adverbials, thus [-Ind] and [-Ref], they may enter neither distributive nor contrastive relation with another wh-word:

(29)a. *__Kde jak__ Petr   uhodil Pavla ?
       where how Petr-NOM hit   Pavel-ACC
    b. *__Proč kam__ Petr   poslal Pavla ?
       why   where Petr-NOM sent   Pavel-ACC

As for examples with *jak* in (18b) above, which were not judged degraded by all speakers, I suggest that their acceptability depends on speakers' capacity for interpreting *jak* as a quantified, rather than adverbial wh-word.

This analysis correctly predicts that the only way to combine two adverbial wh-words or different wh-word is to use the question form with conjunction, as

---

6   Moreover, their referent must be of the same type, otherwise it is not relevant to contrast them.

in (30), since theses questions trigger neither distributive nor contrastive reading. The next section will deal with the syntax of these questions.

(30)a. **Kde a jak** Petr   uhodil Pavla ?
   where and how Petr-NOM hit   Pavel-AC
  b. **Proč a kam** Petr   poslal Pavla ?
    why   and where Peter-NOM sent   Paul-ACC

6. Multiple fronting with conjunction

6.1 Conjunction as a focus particle
Penn (1999) claims that the morpheme *i* ('and') that occur between wh-words in Serbo-Croatian is not a conjunction, but a focus particle ('also'), as in (31ab). He thus proposes to consider questions in (31c) as questions with *multiple fronting* in which wh-words are simply focused.

(31)a. Ivan je   **i danes** sreo Mariju.[7]   (Penn 1999)
   Ivan   CL:AUX-3SG *also* today   met   Mary-ACC
   'Ivan also met Mary today (not only yesterday).'
  b. Knjigu **i Mariji**   odnesi.
   book-ACC *and* Mary-DAT bring-IMP
   'Bring the book to Mary.'
  c. **Ko   i kome** je   kupio auto ?
   who-NOM *and* who-DAT CL:AUX-3SG bought car
   'Who bought the car for whom ?'

There are however three pieces of evidence against Penn's analysis in Czech. First, fronted wh-words and conjunction form a single constituent (see section 3). Second, they do not trigger list-pair reading (see section 2). Finally, the conjunction *a* cannot be analyzed as a focus particle, contrary to the conjunction *i* ('and'), which may actually function as a focus particle ('also', 'even'), see (32ab). However, *i* cannot appear between wh-words, as shown in (32c).

(32)a. Jan   potkal Marii **včera   a / i dneska**.
   Jan-NOM met   Marie-ACC yesterday and / and today
   with *a* : 'John met Mary yesterday and today.'
   with *i* : 'John met Mary both yesterday and today.'

---

[7] The gloses and the translations in the example (31) are taken from Penn (1999).

   b.   Jan   potkal Marii   ***a / i   dneska**.
           Jan-NOM met   Marie-ACC and / even today
           'John met Mary even today (not only yesterday).'
   c.   **Kdo   a / *i   komu   koupil auto ?**
           who-NOM and / and who-DAT bought car-ACC
           'Who bought the car to whom ?'

I conclude thus that questions with conjunction do not involve multiple fronting, but rather coordination of wh-words.

6.2 Wh-coordination

Coordination of wh-words may seem problematic, since constituents with different syntactic functions cannot normally be coordinated (Peterson 2004), as shown in (33a). However, coordinations with conjuncts bearing different functions become felicitous with conjuncts being focussed (Liptak 2001), as in (33b). Note that the example (33b) is a possible answer to the question in (33c).

(33)a. *Jan   by   chtěl pozvat [ConjP [NP Marii]   **a** [PP do kina]].
         Jan-NOM CL:COND wanted invite   Marie-ACC and   to cinema-GEN
    b. Jan by   chtěl pozvat [ConjP[+Foc] **MARII a DO KINA**].
         John CL:COND wanted invite   Mary-ACC and to cinema
         'John would like to invite Mary to the movie.'
    c. [ConjWhP[+Foc] Koho   **a** kam] by   chtěl Jan   pozvat ?
               who-ACC and where CL:COND wanted Jan-NOM invite
         'Whom would John like to invite, and where ?'

Assuming that focusing licenses coordination of unlike categories, I suggest that coordinate wh-phrases are licensed because wh-words share two features: [+wh] and [+focus] (Liptak 2001). A coordinate wh-phrase, forming a single focused constituent, would move to a single position in the left periphery of the clause, the Spec of ContrastP. Embedding of the two words within a coordinate phrase would block their mutual scope, allowing only for their specific reading:

(34)   [ForceP [ContrastP [ConjWhP **Koho   a   kam**] [Contrast' [FinP *by* [IP chtěl
                      who-ACC and where   CL:COND wanted
     Jan   pozvat]]]]]] ?
     Jan-NOM invite

7. Questions with conjoined final wh-word

In questions with clause-final wh-word introduced by the conjunction *a*, the clause including the initial wh-word and the final wh-word are interpreted as

two independent single questions. I argue thus that these questions involve clausal coordination with one elliptical conjunct. Clausal coordination prevents the argument of the verb from occuring in the clause-final position and explains the sentential interpretation of these questions. It also predicts that such questions may combine with multiple fronting and wh-coordination:

(35) a. [**Kdo   komu** koupil knihu] **a** [**kdy**] ?
   who-NOM who-DAT bought book and when
   'Who bought a book to whom, and when ?'
  b. [**Kdo a kam** šel] **a** [**proč**] ?
   who-NOM and who-DAT went and why
   'Who went where, and why ?'

It seems however difficult to analyze the elliptic conjunct as a clause with deleted material. The deletion analysis would be indeed plausible if syntactic reconstruction with identity were always possible, which is not the case. The syntactic reconstruction is only possible when the initial wh-word is an adjunct; if it is an argument, an NP or a pronoun must appear in the second clause, as in (36c):

(36)a. [**Kdy** jsi   potkal Jana] **a** [**kde** (*jsi   potkal Jana*)] ?
   when CL:AUX-2SG met Jan-ACC and where CL:AUX-2SG met Jan-ACC
   'When did you meet John and where (did you meet him) ?'
  b. *[**Koho** jsi   potkal] **a** [**kde** (*jsi   potkal*)] ?
   who-ACC CL:AUX-2SG met and where CL:AUX-2SG met
   (*'Who did you meet John and where did you meet ?')
  c. [**Koho** jsi   potkal **a** [**kde** (*jsi   **ho** potkal*)] ?
   who-ACC CL:AUX-2SG met and where CL:AUX-2SG CL:him met
   'Where did you meet John and where did you meet *him* ?'

According to Ginzburg and Sag (2001), elliptical clauses as in (35) and (36) are syntactically clausal fragments, which are only interpreted as complete clauses. An analysis in terms of semantic reconstruction seems thus to be needed for this kind of question. Such an analysis goes however beyond the limits of this paper.

8. Conclusion

In this paper, I have discussed and analyzed three types of questions with two wh-words that occur in Czech. It was shown that these questions involve different syntactic constructions with different semantic representations. In questions with multiple fronting, wh-words either activate DistributiveP and ShareP projections at *Logical Form*, which leads to their pair-list reading, or the

second one moves to ContrastP, which leads to their contrastive specific reading. In questions with fronting and conjunction, the coordinate wh-phrase occupies the Spec of ContrastP, which leads to a specific reading of conjoined wh-words. Questions with a final conjoined wh-word involve conjoined single questions.

References

ARNSTEIN, R., 2002, A focus semantics for echo questions, in A. Bende-Farkas & A. Riester (eds), *Proceedings of the Workshop on Information Structure in Context*, 98–107.

BEGHELLI, F., 1994, Distributivity and Pair-list reading, in A. Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of Scope Taking*, 349-408, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

BEGHELLI, F. & STOWELL, T., 1997, Distributivity and Negation : the Syntax of *each* and *every*, in A. Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of Scope Taking*, 71-109, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

BELLETI, A., 2004, Aspects of the low IP area, in L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 2, New York : OUP.

BOŠKOVIČ, Ž., 1999, On multiple feature-checking: Multiple wh-fronting and multiple head-movement, in S. Epstein & N. Hornstein (eds*.) Working Minimalism*, 159-187, Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

BOŠKOVIČ, Ž., 2002, On multiple wh-fronting, *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 351-383.

GINZBURG, J. & SAG, I., 2000, *Interrogative Investigations,* CSLI Publications.

GREPL, M. & KARLÍK, P., 1998, *Skladba češtiny*, Praha: Votobia.

GRUET-SKRABALOVA, H., 2010, Le statut syntaxique de *že* ('que') dans les phrases indépendentes en tchèque, to appear in *Cahiers du Laboratoire de recherche sur le langage*, Presses Universitaires de Clermont-Ferrand.

LENERTOVÁ D., 2001, On Clitic Placement, Topicalization and CP-Structure in Czech, in P. Kosta & J. Frasek (eds.), *Current Approaches to Formal Slavic Linguistics*, 294-305, Frankfurt a/Main: P. Lang.

LIPTÁK, A., 2001, *On the Syntax of Wh-items in Hungarian*, PhD Dissertation: Utrecht, LOT.

MEYER, R., 2002, On multiple wh-fronting and wh-clustering in Czech, *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 11: Amherst meeting.

MEYER, R., 2004, Superiority effects in Russian, Polish, and Czech, *Cahiers linguistiques d'Ottawa*, 32: 44-65.

PENN, G., 1999, Linearization and WH-Extraction in HPSG: Evidence from Serbo-Croatian, in R. Borsley & A. Przepiorkowski (eds.), *Slavic in HPSG*, CSLI Publications.

PETERSON, P., 2004, Coordination: consequences of a lexical-functional accornt, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22.3, 643-679.

PRZEPIORKOWSKI, A., 1994, Critical Review of Approaches to multiple Wh-Movement, Research paper, Centre for Cognitive Science, University of Edinburgh.

RIZZI L., 1997, The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery, in L. Haegeman (ed), *Elements of grammar*, 281-337, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

RIZZI, L., 2002., Locality and Left Periphery, in A. Belletti (ed), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 3, Oxford: OUP.

RUDIN, C., 1988, On Multiple questions and Multiple Wh-fronting, *NLLT* 6, 445-501.

SKRABALOVA, H., 2007, Conjoined Wh-items, in P. Karlík *et al.* (eds.), *Czech in Generative Grammar*, 161-174, Munique: Lincom Europe.

SKRABALOVA, H., 2008, Détachement à gauche en tchèque, in D. Apothéloz *et al.* (eds.), *Les linguistiques du détachement*, 535-549, Bern: Peter Lang.

Hana Gruet-Skrabalova
Clermont Université, Université Blaise Pascal
EA 999, Laboratoire de recherche sur le langage
BP 10448
F-63000 CLERMONT-FERRAND
hana.gruet-skrabalova@univ-bpclermont.fr