

Three interrogative strategies in Czech questions with two wh-items

This paper examines three interrogative strategies the Czech uses in questions with two wh-items. The three strategies are exemplified in (1) : in (1a), the two wh-items are fronted, in (1b), the two wh-items are fronted and the conjunction *a* ('and') appears between them, and in (1c), one wh-item is fronted and the other one is introduced by the conjunction *a* in clause-final position.

In the first part of the paper, I show that questions using these interrogative strategies have different syntactic and semantic properties.

(i) In questions with *multiple fronting*, wh-items are syntactically independent constituents. In effect, second position clitics (Lenertová 2001) as well as focus particle *že* normally intervene between the two wh-items, as in (2a). Fronted wh-items in Czech do not show superiority effects. However, two wh-adjuncts cannot be fronted, except if they are conjoined (Przepiorkowki (1994) for other Slavic languages), as in (3). I claim that questions as in (3) are out because non argumental wh-items are incompatible with pair list reading triggered by fronted wh-items. (ii) In questions with *multiple fronting with conjunction*, the prosody and the clitics position show that wh-items and the conjunction form a single syntactic constituent, as in (2b). Contrary to multiple fronting, both argumental and non argumental wh-items can appear in this configuration, as in (1b) and (3b). Semantically, these questions trigger a single pair reading. (iii) In *questions with the 'conjoined' final wh-item*, the two wh-items clearly do not form a constituent. These questions differ from those with fronted and 'conjoined' wh-items. First, the final wh-item cannot be an argument of the verb in the interrogative clause, except if it is an optional argument, as in (1c). Second, although they trigger a single pair reading, the constituent that resolves the first wh-items can be either an atomic or a plural individual. Finally, these questions can be interpreted as conjoined questions, thus involving more than one questioning.

The second part of the paper aims to provide a syntactic analysis of these questions.

(i) Assuming that clitics occupy the head of FinP in the left periphery of the clause (Lenertová 2001), I argue that in *questions with multiple fronting* the wh-item preceding clitics moves to a syntactic position higher than FinP (ForceP or ContrastP, Rizzi (1997)), and the second wh-item to a syntactic position below FinP (adjunction to IP, Rudin (1988)). Wh-items being quantified expressions, the wh-item higher in the clause takes scope over the wh-item lower in the clause, which leads to the quantified (list pair) reading of fronted wh-items (Beghelli & Stowell 1997). This also predicts patterns where wh-items co-occur with some focussed or topicalized material, as in (4). (ii) I argue then that *multiple fronting with conjunction* involves coordination of wh-phrases, rather than focussing of fronted wh-items (Penn 1999 for Serbo-Croatian). Coordination of wh-phrases may however seem problematic, since constituents with different syntactic functions cannot normally be coordinated. I argue that coordinate wh-phrase is licensed not on syntactic, but on pragmatic ground, wh-items being focus elements (Lipták 2001). As a focus element, this coordinate phrase moves to a single position in the left periphery of the clause (Spec-ContrastP), which blocks the scope between two independently fronted wh-items, allowing only for a single pair reading of conjoined wh-items. (iii) Finally, I argue that *questions with 'conjoined' final wh-item* involve clausal coordination with one elliptical conjunct. Clausal coordination prevents the argument of the first interrogative verb from occurring in the clause-final position and explains the sentential interpretation of these questions. From syntactic point of view, I show however that the elliptical conjunct is better to be analyzed as a fragment (Ginzburg & Sag 2001) than as a clause with deleted material.

Finally, I show how these three interrogative strategies combine in questions with more than two wh-items.

- (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 ? (multiple fronting with conjunction)
 who-NOM and who-DAT bought book
 ‘who bought a book, and for whom ?’
- c. **Kdo** koupil knihu **a komu** ? (fronting and final conjunction)
 who-NOM bought book and who-DAT
 ‘who bought a book, and for whom ?’
- (2) a. **Komu (že) jsi co** koupil ? / ***Komu co (že) jsi** koupil ?
 who-DAT that-FOC CL:AUX-2SG what-ACC bought
 ‘What did you buy for whom ?’
- b. **Komu a co (že) jsi** koupil ? / ***Komu (že) jsi a co** koupil ?
 who-DAT and what-ACC that-FOC CL:AUX-2SG bought
 ‘What did you buy, and for whom ?’
- (3) a. ***Kde jak** ho Petr uhodil ?
 where how him Peter hit ?
 #for every x and for every y, in which place x and in which manner y did Peter hit him ?
- b. **Kde a jak** ho Petr uhodil ?
 where and how him Peter hit ? = ‘Where did Peter hit him, and how ?’
 for which x and y is it true that Peter hit him in the place x and in the manner y ?
- (4) a. [_{ForceP} **Kdo** [_{ContrastP} (že) [_{FinP} si [_{IP} **co** [_{IP} přečetl]]]]] ?
 who PART.FOC CL:REFL what-ACC read
- b. **Chceš vědět** [_{ForceP} **co** [_{ContrastP} **MNĚ** [_{FinP} se [_{IP} **kdy** [_{IP} stalo]]]]] ?
 want-2sg know what to-me CL:REFL when happened

Selected references :

- 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.
- 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, Mass. : MIT Press.
- Boškovič, Ž., 2000, Sometimes in SpecCP, sometimes in situ, in R. Martin & J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by Step : Papers on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, 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.
- Kazenin, K., 2001, On coordination of Wh-phrases in Russian, talk given at *FDSL 4*, Potsdam.
- Lenertová D., 2002. 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.
- Penn, G., 1999, Linearization and WH-Extraction in HPSG: Evidence from Serbo-Croatian, in R. Borsley & A. Przepiorkowski (eds.), *Slavic in HPSG*, CSLI Publications.
- 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.
- Rudin, C., 1988, On Multiple questions and Multiple Wh-fronting, *NLLT* 6, 445-501.
- Stepanovic, S., 2003. Multiple Wh-Fronting in Serbo-Croatian Matrix Questions and the Matrix Sluicing Construction, in C. Boeckx (ed), *Multiple-Wh Fronting*, 255-84, Philadelphia : J. Benjamins.