



HAL
open science

What kind of element is 'že' in Czech?

Hana Gruet-Skrabalova

► **To cite this version:**

Hana Gruet-Skrabalova. What kind of element is 'že' in Czech?. M. Docekal & M. Zikova. Slavic Languages in Formal Grammar, Peter Lang, pp.33-47, 2012. hal-00707064

HAL Id: hal-00707064

<https://hal.science/hal-00707064>

Submitted on 11 Jun 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

What kind of element is *že* in Czech?

Hana Gruet-Skrabalova (Université Clermont-Ferrand 2 & LRL-EA999)

This paper examines and compares the syntactic and semantic behaviour of the morpheme *že* ‘that’ in subordinate and independent clauses in Czech. I show that *že* does not have exactly the same properties in these two contexts. In embedded contexts, *že* combines with a declarative clause (proposition) and obligatorily marks its syntactic dependence. In independent contexts, *že* appears in interrogative clauses or in declarative clauses associated with exclamation, and it triggers a particular (echo or tag) interpretation. However, in all contexts, *že* seems to indicate a discrepancy between the speaker’s and someone else commitment to a same proposition. As for the syntactic analysis, I propose that *že* in embedded clauses is a complementizer generated in the head Force, while in independent clauses, *že* is a focus particle generated in the head Focus and moving to the head Force at *Logical Form*.

1. Basic data

The morpheme *že* typically introduces a subordinate complement or subject clause, as shown in (1). These clauses are subordinate since they are selected by the predicate of a matrix clause, on which they depend.

- (1) a. Všechny ženy pozůstalé po politických vězních říkají, **že** mají
all wives_{Nom} left_{PIFem} after political prisoners say_{3PI} *that* have_{3PI}
hezký život a hodné děti. **Že** jejich děti vycítily ten
nice life and nice children *that* their children_{Nom} felt_{3PI} this
zápas o pravdu a mají úctu ke svým rodičům. (ČNK¹)
struggle_{Acc} for truth and have_{3PI} respect_{Acc} to their_{Ref} parents
‘All widows of political prisoners say that they have a nice life and nice
children. That their children understood their struggle for truth and have
respect for their parents.’
- b. **Že** nepřišel na ten pohovor je zcela nepochopitelné.
that NEG-came_{3Sg} to this meeting is completely incomprehensible
‘That he did not come to this meeting is completely out of senses.’

¹ These examples are taken from Czech National Corpus (ČNK), subcorpus Syn2000.

Note that subordinate *že*-clauses may be graphically independent, as the second *že*-clause in (1a). In such case, however, they still depend on an explicit or implicit predicate in the preceding context and should not be mixed up with the clauses in (2) or (3). These *že*-clauses are independent to the extent that they are not selected by a preceding predicate. The examples in (2) and (3) differ with respect to the position of *že* inside the clause: in (2), *že* occurs in the left clause-periphery, while in (3), it appears dislocated in the clause-final position.

- (2) a. **Že** on si toho nevšiml? (Grepl & Karlík 1998)
that he_{Nom} REFL this_{Gen} NEG-noticed_{3Sg}
 ‘He would not have noticed it?’
- b. Kdo **že** tady zpíval? (ČNK)
 who *that* here sang
 ‘Who is it who sang here?’
- c. Voni se zasnoubili? **Že** to nevím! (ČNK)
 they REFL engaged_{3Pl} *that* this_{acc} NEG-know_{1Sg}
 ‘They are engaged? How is it possible that I do not know about it?’
- (3) a. Viděla jste ho, když přišel, **že**? (Grepl & Karlík 1998)
 seen_{Fem} AUX_{2Pl} he_{acc} when came_{3Sg} *that*
 ‘You did see him when he came, didn’t you?’
- b. I takové zprávičky patří do této rubriky, **že**! (ČNK)
 even such news belong_{3Pl} to this rubric *that*
 ‘Even such news should appear in this rubric, isn’t it true!’

Grepl & Karlík (1998) analyze the independent clause in (2a) as originally embedded in a complex sentence, see (4a), whose main clause *Vy myslíte* was afterwards deleted. They consider this *že*-clause as *a subordinate clause which has become free*, and, consequently, the morpheme *že* as a kind of particle, rather than a subordinator. In a similar way, Grepl & Karlík (1998) consider the final *že* in (3a) as a particle resulting from the ellipsis of the clause *je to tak* introduced by *že*, as shown in (4b):

- (4) a. (Vy myslíte,) **že** on si toho nevšiml? (Grepl & Karlík 1998)
 you think_{2Pl} *that* he_{Nom} REFL this_{Gen} NEG-noticed_{3Sg}
 ‘You think that he didn’t notice it?’
- b. Viděla jste ho, když přišel, **že** (je to tak)? (Grepl & Karlík 1998)
 seen_{Fem} AUX_{2Pl} he_{acc} when came_{3Sg} *that* is it so
 ‘You did see him when he came, didn’t you?’

Although an analysis in terms of ellipsis may explain the origin of independent *že*-clauses, I claim it is not appropriate from a synchronic point of

view. First, we do not need to reconstruct an elliptical clause in order to interpret the *že*-clauses in (2) and (3). Second, an analysis in terms of ellipsis implies that clauses with *že* have the same syntactic and semantic properties whether they are subordinate or not. Finally, the syntactic status of the particle *že* remains unclear. In this paper, I will propose another view on *že* in these contexts.

2. Clause type and lexical selection

The first difference that can be noted between subordinate and independent clauses with *že* concerns their syntactic and semantic type. Subordinate *že*-clauses are declarative clauses that denote a proposition (which can be true or false), exactly as independent declarative clauses². On the contrary, at least independent *že*-clauses containing a *wh*-word are not declarative clauses and do not denote a proposition (Ginzburg & Sag 2000³). This is confirmed by their lexical selection. Declarative *že*-clauses are selected by predicates of saying and by mental predicates, as *myslet*, *věřit*, *být si jistý*, as shown in (5a), while *wh*-questions with *že* are selected by predicates of asking as *ptát se*, *chtít vědět*, *zjišťovat*, as shown in (5b), thus by the same predicates as *wh*-questions without *že*. Predicates selecting a declarative *že*-clause cannot select a *wh*-question with *že* and *vice versa*, as shown in (6).

- (5) a. *Myslím / Věřím / Jsem přesvědčený, *(že) se bude ženit.*
 think_{1Sg} / believe_{1Sg} / am_{1Sg} convinced_{Sg.M} *that* REFL will_{3Sg} marry
 ‘I think / know / am convinced that he is going to get married.’
- b. *Tatínek se ptá / chce vědět / zjišťuje, kdo (že) se bude ženit.*
 Dad REFL ask_{3Sg} / want_{3Sg} know / find-out_{3Sg} who *that* REFL will_{3Sg} marry
 ‘Dad asks / wants to know / tries to find out who is going to get married.’
- (6) a. **Myslím / Věřím / Jsem přesvědčený, kdo (že) se bude ženit.*
 b. **Tatínek se ptá / chce vědět / zjišťuje⁴, že se bude ženit.*

Moreover, *že* is compulsory in (5a), although it does not convey any meaning. Its role here is to mark the syntactic dependence of the embedded clause. On the other hand, *že* can be omitted in (5b) as well as in (2) and (3) above, but its omitting has an interpretative effect (see section 3).

² Their matrix clause characterizes the mental state or attitude of the matrix subject about this proposition.

³ According to Ginzburg and Sag (2000), all clause types are associated in one-to-one manner with a type of content. Declaratives are associated with Propositions, Interrogatives with Propositional abstract, Imperatives with Outcomes and Exclamatives with Facts.

⁴ The sentence (6b) is acceptable if the verb *zjišťovat* means *to notice*, and not *to try to find out*, as it does in (5b).

The examples (5) and (6) suggest that we are dealing with two different *že*. One is associated with a declarative clause type (proposition) and marks a syntactic dependence. The other one is associated with a non-declarative clause type (non-proposition) and triggers a particular interpretation (see below). Therefore, it should not be surprising that these two *že* do never co-occur. The case of exclamatives being more complicated, I will treat them in detail in the section 4.

3. Interrogative *že*-clauses

3.1 Echo-questions

We have said that omitting *že* in independent clauses has an interpretative effect. Indeed, interrogative clauses with left-peripheral *že* do not ask to identify the proposition that is true or to identify the value of the variable associated to a wh-word. Rather, they indicate that the speaker has not heard or that he refuses to accept a previous utterance. These interrogatives are thus not information questions, but so-called *echo-questions* (McCawley 1987, Comorowski 1996).

Compare the questions in (7) and (8). (7A) is an information question asking to identify which of the following propositions is true: *Peter has already left* or *Peter has not yet left*. On the other hand, (8A) only wants to check whether the proposition *Peter has already left* was actually asserted in the previous context. It is an echo-question that cannot be answered with *yes* or *no*, but rather with: *this is (not) what A said*.

- | | |
|--|--|
| (7) A: Petr už odešel?
Peter already left _{3Sg}
'Has Peter already left?' | B: Ne, neodešel.
no NEG-left _{3Sg}
'No, he has not.' |
| (8) A: Že Petr už odešel?
that Peter already left
'Peter had already left?' | B: #Ne, neodešel. / Přesně to řekla.
no NEG-left _{3Sg} / exactly it said _{3Sg.Fem}
'No, he has not.' / 'That's what she said.' |

The contrast observed between (7) and (8) also applies to wh-questions. The information wh-question (9A) asks to identify the value of the variable *x* bound by the wh-word and the answer serves to identify *x* as *a restaurant*. On the other hand, (10A) only checks whether the part of the utterance returned by the wh-word was asserted in the previous context. Thus, although questions in (9A) and (10A) are syntactically identical, they differ with respect to their illocutionary force: demand of information for (9A) vs. checking of a given utterance for (10A).

- (9) A: Kam Petr šel?
 where Peter went_{3Sg}
 ‘Where did Peter go?’
- B: (Šel) do restaurace.
 (went_{3Sg}) to restaurant_{gen}
 ‘(He went) to a restaurant.’
- (10) A: Kam *že* Petr šel?
 where *that* Peter went_{3Sg}
 ‘Peter went WHERE?’
- B: Přece do restaurace!
 indeed to restaurant_{Gen}
 ‘(I said he went) to a restaurant.’

Some words should be now said about the prosody. Křížková (1968) notes that the question (7A) could be interpreted as an echo-question, provided it has a specific prosody (*i.e.* emphatic anticadence). Moreover, all interrogatives with *že* are associated with a specific prosody (Grepš & Karlík 1998). One could thus wonder whether it is the prosody itself that triggers the echo interpretation. It is true that, in spoken speech, the prosody has an important interpretative import. So, the prosody allows to interpret (7A) as a question. Furthermore, it allows a narrow scope interpretation for both (7A) and (8A), since the speaker can emphasize only a part of the sentence, e.g. the NP *Petr*. The interpretation of the yes-no question *PETR už odešel?* corresponds then to the wh-question *Kdo už odešel?*. A specific prosody also allows to interpret the echo question (10A) not as a reprise of an assertion, but rather as a reprise of an information question, *i.e.* ‘Did you really ask where Peter went?’. Both information and echo-questions can be thus associated with different readings, indicated by different prosodies. Nevertheless, questions with *že* must be interpreted as echo-questions even if no prosody is available. (7A) is thus ambiguous between an information question and an echo-question, while (8A) can only be interpreted as an echo-question. Therefore, I claim that it is *že* that triggers this interpretation, meaning that *že* in interrogative clauses is not semantically empty, contrary to *že* in embedded declarative clauses.

3.2 Tag-questions

Interrogative clauses with final *že* are not interpreted as information questions either. Rather, they ask to confirm their propositional content or a part of this content, as shown in (11). Such questions are called *tag-questions*. In (11a), the following context actually provides this confirmation. I claim again that *že* is responsible for this particular interpretation: without *že*, questions in (11) would be interpreted as yes-no questions.

- (11) a. Hodláte najít svůj klobouk, *že*? To bych rád. (ČNK)
 want_{2Pl} find POSS.REFL_{acc} hat_{acc} *that* this_{acc} COND_{1SG} glad
 ‘You want to find your hat, isn’t it true? That’s what I want.’

- b. Vy jste pan Novák, a ne pan Hrubý, *že*?
 you are_{2Pl} Mister Novák and not Mister Hrubý *that*
 ‘You are Mr. Novák, not Mr. Hrubý, aren’t you?’

Note that tag interpretation is not restricted to clauses with final *že*, but it may be available for questions with initial *že*. Both questions in (12) do actually ask for a confirmation of their propositional content, as shown by English translation.

- (12) a. [...] zažadonil: *Že* mi ten zbytek kuřat usmažíš? (ČNK)
 asked_{3Sg}: *that* me_{Dat} this left-overchickens fry-_{2Sg.Fut}
 ‘He asked: You will fry this left of chicken for me, won’t you?’
 b. *Že* to je skvělá myšlenka? (ČNK)
that it is wonderful idea_{Nom}
 ‘It is a wonderful idea, isn’t it?’

I conclude thus that *že* represents a lexical mean the language uses to trigger a particular (echo or tag) interpretation of interrogative clauses.

4. “Exclamative” *že*-clauses

Exclamative clauses with *že* first raise the question whether they are actually exclamatives or not. Zanuttini & Portner (2003) consider that true exclamatives contain an exclamative word and distinguish themselves from interrogative and declarative clauses by the following properties: their propositional content is always presupposed, they denote a set of alternative propositions introducing a conventional scalar implicature, and they are unable to function in question-answer pairs. Assuming these criteria, only (13c) would be an exclamative clause, contrary to the declarative in (13a) and the interrogative clause in (13b):

- (13) a. A: Petr shodí tu vázu!
 Peter_{Nom} makes-fall_{3Sg.Fut} this vase_{Acc}
 ‘Peter will make fall this vase!’
 B: Ale ne. / To tedy ano.
 but not / this so yes
 ‘Certainly not.’ / ‘Oh yes!’
 b. A: Je to možné!
 is it possible
 ‘It is possible!’
 B: To se ví že jo.
 it REFL know_{3Sg} that yes
 ‘Certainly yes.’
 c. A: **Jak** je tu krásně!
 how is here nicely
 ‘How it is nice here!’
 B: #Ale ne. / #Určitě.⁵
 but not / certainly
 ‘Certainly yes / not.’

⁵ I agree with an anonymous reviewer that it would be felicitous to respond with for instance *Máš pravdu!* (‘You are right!’). I do not however agree that this answer confirms the truth of the proposition *it is nice*. Rather, it confirms the fact that *it is nice to an unusual degree* (see notes 3 nad 6).

Moreover, exclamatives cannot be embedded neither under the verb *myslet* nor under the negated first person verb *vědět*, since denying the speakers knowledge conflicts with its presupposition, as shown in (14):

- (14) a. Myslím, že Petr shodí tu vázu. / ***jak** je tu krásně.
 think_{1Sg} that Peter_{Nom} makes-fall_{3Sg.Fut} this vase_{Acc} / how is here nicely
 ‘I think that Peter will make fall this vase. / *how it is nice here.’
 b. Nevím, zda je to možné. / ***jak** je tu krásně.
 NEG-know_{1Sg} if is it possible / how is here nicely
 ‘I don’t know if it is possible. / *how it is nice here.’

Returning to clauses with *že*, their exclamative clause type seems rather doubtful. On the one hand, *že* is incompatible with the adverbial wh-modifier *jak* in exclamatives, while it is compatible with the wh-word *jak* in questions. Contrary to the interrogative *jak* binding a variable in (15a), the exclamative *jak* in (15b) expresses the quantification that it is nice to an unusual degree (Ginzburg & Sag 2000)⁶.

- (15) a. ***Jak že** je krásně!
 how *that* is nicely
 b. **Jak že** tam jel? (No přece autem.)
 how *that* THERE gone_{3Sg} of-course car_{Instr}
 ‘How did he go there?’ (‘As I said: by car.’)

On the other hand, *že*-clauses are able to function in question-answer pairs, as shown in (16):

- (16) a. A: **Že** Petr shodí tu vázu! B: Ale ne.
that Peter_{Nom} makes-fall_{3Sg.Fut} this vase_{Acc} but no
 b. A: Co je dneska s tebou? B: **Že** se ptáš!
 what is today with you *that* REFL ask_{2Sg}

The examples (15) and (16) suggest that *že*-clauses are not syntactically exclamative, but rather declarative clauses. However, their propositional content is always presupposed and they have a particular illocutionary force. By using *že*, the speaker points out that he only relates a previous assertion, as in (17a): the proposition *General needs to speak with Otta* must be interpreted as a General’s assertion, not as a speaker’s one. In (17b), the speaker uses the *že*-

⁶ According to Ginzburg & Sag (2000), the exclamatives involve a specific quantification conveying that something is Adj/Adv to an unusual degree or quantity, *i.e.* a degree or a quantity beyond the end-points of degree or quantity scales.

clause to dispute a previous assertion, which he denies in the immediately following context.

- (17) a. Před dvěma měsíci volá starý Generál. **Že** potřebuje naléhavě
 before two months call_{3Sg} old_{Nom} General_{Nom} that need_{3Sg} urgently
 mluvit s Ottou.
 speak with Otta_{Instr}
 ‘Two months ago, the old General called up. He said that he urgently
 needed to speak with Otta.’
- b. **Že** my v tom hrajeme roli! vykřikla Weltonová. My
 that we in this play_{1Pl} role cried-out_{3Sg.Fem} Weltonova_{Nom.Fem} we_{Nom}
 s tím útokem nemáme nic společného! (ČNK)
 with this attack_{Instr} NEG-have_{1Pl} nothing_{Acc} common_{Gen}
 ‘WE play a role in that! cried out Ms. Welton. We have nothing to do
 with this attack!’

Že in declaratives thus marks that the speaker dissociates himself with a propositional content given in or entailed by the previous context. This dissociation operated by *že* can be of different degrees, making *že*-clauses compatible with an exclamation. Omitting *že*, though grammatically possible, would cancel this interpretation. In this sense, the role of *že* here is comparable to that in echo-questions.

5. The syntactic position of *že* in the left clause-periphery

In both subordinate and independent clauses, the left-peripheral *že* must precede clitics. Some differences can however be observed as for its position with respect to focused and topicalized constituents.

In subordinate clauses, a topicalized or a focused phrase normally follows *že*, as shown in (18a). A single phrase may also appear before *že*, provided it is prosodically emphasized, as noted by Meyer (2006). According to Meyer, this phrase may have different discourse functions and its move to the initial position is neither syntactically nor semantically motivated. In (18b), the movement of the contrastive topic to the initial position has actually no effect on its interpretation.

- (18) a. Vítězslav věděl, **že** uzávěrka se udělat musí. (ČNK)
 V_{Nom} knew_{3Sg} that accounts-balancing CL.REFL make must_{3Sg}
 ‘Vítězslav knew that it was necessary to make a balancing of accounts.’
- b. Tvrdil, **že** tentokrát se mýlím a **on že** má pravdu. (ČNK)
 affirmed_{3Sg} that this-time REFL mistake_{1Sg} and he_{Nom} that has_{3Sg} right
 ‘He affirmed that I’ve got mistaken this time and that he is right.’

On the other hand, two distinct positions are available before *že* in wh-questions. The first one clearly hosts a wh-word; the second one hosts a phrase which must be interpreted as a focus or a topic, as shown in (19).

- (19) a. **Kam** *že* jste to chtěli jet? (ČNK)
 what_{Acc} *that* AUX_{2Pl} *that*⁷ wanted_{Pl} go
 ‘Where did you want to go?’
- b. **Co** *že* já piji? (ČNK, syn2006pub)
 what_{Acc} I_{Nom} *that* drink_{1Sg}
 ‘What do I use to drink?’
- c. (My jsme ani tak moc přesně nevěděli,) **co vlastně** *že*
 we AUX_{1Pl} even_{neg} so much precisely NEG-known_{Pl} what in-fact *that*
 by ten sionismus měl jako bejt. (ČNK)
 CL.COND_{3Sg} this sionisme_{Nom} should_{3Sg} as be
 ‘We did not really know what this sionisme should even be.’

In yes-no questions, one position associated with focus or topic interpretation also precedes *že*, as shown in (20). But the position of the subject pronoun *já* ‘I’ in (20a) has effect on the interpretation of this echo-question: with initial *já*, the speaker does not check the asserted proposition as a whole, but rather the fact that it has been asserted about him.

- (20) a. **Já** *že* bych měl kandidovat? (ČNK) / **Že** *že* já bych měl kandidovat?
 I_{Nom} *that* CL.COND_{1Sg} had candidate?
 ‘Should I be a candidate?’
- b. **Peníze** *že* by neměl?!
 money *that* CL.COND_{3Sg} NEG-had_{Sg}
 ‘Should he have no money?!’

To conclude, we can say that the position of *že* with respect to foci and topics suggests that *že* is generated lower in the periphery of independent clauses than in the periphery of subordinate clauses.

6. Semantic status of *že*

6.1 *Že* and focalization

Arnstein (2002) proposes that echo-questions are interpreted through focus semantics. Such a proposition may seem surprising, since, contrary to information questions, echo-questions are precisely used to check a statement

⁷ Invariable demonstrative functioning as a focus particle, see section 7.3.

entirely given in the previous context, meaning that no constituent needs to be focused. According to Arnstein, however, what is focused in these questions is the fact that their content is not new, but rather disputed. Moreover, Arnstein argues that echo-questions are not only inquiry about a particular utterance, but rather an inquiry about alternatives of this utterance. This would make them also similar to constructions involving focalization, since the focused constituent denotes a set of alternatives.

Following Arnstein's semantic proposal, I propose that *že* in echo-questions is a focus element that marks a whole utterance or a part of an utterance as disputed, as shown in (21). In (21a), the whole propositional alternative *Marie přišla* 'Mary came' is marked as disputed. In (21b), the disputed part of the utterance corresponds to the wh-word *kdo* 'who'. The yes-no question involving a narrow scope in (21c) is similar to the wh-question in (21b): the disputed part of the utterance corresponds to the emphasized NP *Marie*, while the non-accented part of the utterance remains undisputed by the speaker.

- (21) a. **Že** Marie přišla? > Presupposed : *Mary came*
 FOC Mary came > New : *is it true that A said: 'Mary came'?*
 ' (Did he say that) Mary came?'
- b. **Kdo že** přišel? > Presupposed : *x came*
 who FOC came > New : *about which x is it true that A said:*
 'WHO came?' > *'x came'?*
- c. **Že** MARIE přišla? > Presupposed : *Mary came*
 FOC Mary came > New : *is it true that A said about Mary:*
 'MARY came?' > *'Mary came'?*

Assuming that the role of *že* in other independent clauses is similar to that in echo-questions, since *že* always indicates that the speaker takes up an assertion in order to comment upon its propositional content, I claim that the semantic analysis of *že* as a focus particle can be extended to all independent clauses.

6.2 *Že* and the illocutionary force

Recall that independent *že*-clauses are associated with a particular illocutionary force. Assuming that illocutionary force can be analyzed in terms of conversational moves (Ginzburg & Sag (2000)), I will suggest that the use of *že* is related to speaker's commitment and speaker's call on addressee.

Beysade & Marandin (2006) claim that the speaker's commitment and speaker's call on addressee need not be identical. The syntactic clause type determines the former, while other aspects of the utterance may specify the latter. So, in tag-questions as *Mary arrived, didn't she?*, the speaker is committed to a proposition, *i.e.* he presents himself as ready to stand for the truth

of the proposition *Mary arrived*, but the tag conveys the questioning call, meaning that the addressee should be interested in the issue *whether Mary arrived*. From this perspective, *že* in tag-questions represents a grammatical mean allowing the speaker to signal the discrepancy between his own commitment and his call on addressee.

Considering other clauses with *že*, I suggest what follows. In echo-questions, the speaker's commitment itself seems to be questioned: by taking up a proposition, the speaker signals that, for some reason, he cannot be committed to it. At the same time, echo-questions seem to convey a questioning call on addressee about his own commitment. By saying *Že Marie přišla?*, we actually check whether the addressee himself is committed to the proposition 'Mary came'. In *že*-clauses associated with exclamation, the speaker dissociates himself from their propositional content, meaning that he is not committed to it. However, these clauses do not seem to convey any call on the addressee. By saying *Že my prohrajem!*, the speaker only signals that he is not committed to the proposition 'we will lose'.

Without providing a detailed analysis, I suggest that relating *že* to speaker's commitment at least partially explains the homonymy between *že* in independent and subordinate clauses. Indeed, in case of subordinate *že*-clauses, *že* introduces an indirect speech; the speaker's commitment to the embedded proposition is thus not necessarily identical to the matrix subject's commitment, characterized by the matrix predicate. This is exactly what happens in independent *že*-clauses: the use of *že* signals a discrepancy between the speaker's commitment and the commitment of the person who uttered the reprise proposition.

7. Syntactic status of *že*

7.1 *Že* as the head of *ForceP*

Since Rizzi (1997), the left periphery of the clause has been claimed to be finely articulated. I will assume that clitics in Czech are hosted by the head of *FinP* (Lenertová (2001)) and that the left periphery of the Czech clause contains the following projections (Gruet-Skrabalova (2011))⁸:

- (22) a. *ForceP* - *IntP* - *FocP/TopP* - *FinP* - (*IP*)
 b. Chtěl bys vědět [*ForceP* [*IntP* *co* [*FocP* *MNĚ* [*FinP* *se* [*IP* *t* *stalo t*]]]]]?⁹
 wanted_{Sg} COND_{2Sg} know what_{Nom} I_{Dat} CL.REFL happened_{3Sg}
 'Would you like to know what happened to ME?'

⁸ Non contrastive XPs and non initial *wh*-words follow clitics, *i.e.* they appear in the left periphery of the *IP* (Belletti 2004).

⁹ This example is taken from Lenertová (2001), but the analysis is mine.

We have seen that *že* in subordinate clauses is semantically empty and only marks their syntactic dependence. It seems thus natural to analyze it as the head of a ForceP. The Force head *že* selects a declarative clause and its projection is itself selected by an appropriate predicate in the main clause. A focused or topicalized phrase normally appears in the Specifier of the Foc/TopP and thus follows *že*. When such phrase precedes *že*, it would appear in the Specifier of the ForceP. I assume with Meyer (2006) that the *Doubly-filled Comp Filter* does not apply in such cases, since this move is neither syntactically nor semantically motivated.

- (23) a. Věděl, [_{ForceP} **že** [_{FocP} uzávěrka [_{FinP} se [_{IP} t udělat musí]]]]. (= 18a)
 b. Tvrdil, že tentokrát se mýlím a [_{ForceP} on [_{Force'} **že** [_{FocP} t [_{FinP} [_{IP} t má pravdu]]]]]. (= 18b)

7.2 *Že* as the head of FocusP

I have argued in the section 6.1 that *že* in independent clause behaves as a focus element. I propose thus that it is merged in the head of FocusP, as shown in (24). Consequently, wh-words in the Spec of IntP as well as focused or topicalized constituents in the Spec of Foc/TopP precede *že*. They correspond to the constituents the most concerned by echo interpretation. When *že* is initial, all constituents are in the IP, which corresponds to the presupposed utterance.

- (24) a. [_{ForceP} [_{IntP} Kdo [_{FocP} **že** [_{FinP} si [_{IP} t tady zpíval]]]]] ? (= 2b)
 b. [_{ForceP} [_{FocP} Já [_{Foc'} **že** [_{FinP} bych [_{IP} t měl kandidovat]]]]]? (= 20a)
 c. [_{ForceP} [_{FocP} **Že** [_{IP} Petr shodí tu vázu]]]! (= 16a)

This proposal is compatible with the observation that the focus particle *že* does not mark the syntactic clause type. However, according to Rizzi (2004), Force expresses either clausal type or the illocutionary force (in main sentences). It seems thus that even if *že* is originally merged in the head of FocP, it should occupy the head of ForceP at least at the level of semantic interpretation. therefore, I propose that *že* moves to the head of ForceP at *Logical Form*, i.e. after *Spell-Out*. Furthermore, postulating that *že* always ends in ForceP allows to account for the fact that *že* can appear in embedded wh-questions, but not in embedded yes-no questions introduced by a complementizer, as shown in (25):

- (25) a. Ptala se, kdo **že** tady zpíval.
 asked_{Sg,F} REFL who_{Nom} *that* here sang_{Sg,M}
 ‘Ske asked who was singing here.’
 b. *Ptala se, jestli **že** tady zpíval.
 asked_{Sg,F} REFL whether *that* here sang_{Sg,M}

Finally, I propose to extend the analysis of *že* as a focus element the clause-final *že*. However, contrary to echo-questions, the whole IP (or FinP¹⁰) in tag questions moves to the specifier of the Focus head occupied by *že*, as shown in (26). This move should not exclude the cases with the narrow scope interpretation, since such interpretation depends on the prosody.

- (26) a. [_{ForceP} [_{FocP} [_{IP} Hodláte najít svůj klobouk] [_{Foc'} **že** [_{IP} *t*]]]]? (= 12a)
 b. [_{ForceP} [_{FocP} [_{FinP} Vy jste pan Novák] [_{Foc'} **že** [_{FinP} *t*]]]]? (= 12b)

As for questions compatible with both echo and tag interpretation (see section 3.2), I suggest that the tag interpretation could be obtained by moving the IP to the Spec of FocP at LF. The question however remains why difference between echo and tag interpretation should be related to different positions of the presupposed utterance.

7.3 *Že* vs. *to*

The claim that *že* is a Focus head may seem in contradiction with Šimík (2009), who argues that the Focus head in questions and exclamatives can be realized by the optional particle *to*, invariable ‘that’. *To* and *že* can however co-occur, as shown in (27):

- (27) Koho (**že**) jsi **to** včera navštívil? (Šimík 2009)
 who_{Acc} *that* AUX_{2Sg} *to* yesterday visited
 ‘At whom did you call yesterday?’

According to Šimík, *to* bears the factive feature and triggers a presupposition of a closed set of propositional alternatives. When co-occurring with *že*, *to* picks a domain of propositions that are known to have been uttered. As a head of Focus, *to* is supposed to trigger the movement of the focused constituent to its specifier. However, *to* is not adjacent to the focused or *wh*-phrase, since clitics always intervene. Therefore, Šimík claims that the focused constituent moves further for clause-typing reasons, as shown in (28).

- (28) [_{ForceP} *wh/foc* [_{clitics}.. [_{FocP} <*wh/foc*> **to** [_{IP} ..<*wh/foc*>]]]] (Šimík 2009)

Although I think it is right that *to* is a focus element, I claim that it is *že* that occupies the Focus head in the CP domain, meaning that *že* asks for the asserted propositional alternative. We can compare the semantic import of *že* and *to* by using the following context: a witch hears a noise on the top of her gingerbread

¹⁰ I assume that subject pronouns as *vy* ‘you’ in (26b) are in Spec-FinP.

cottage. She may then ask (29A), meaning that the question with *to* presupposes that there is *an individual* who is picking gingerbread and asks to identify this individual. *To* may therefore introduce the NP *větríček* ‘little wind’ resolving the wh-word in the answer. Then, if the witch does not accept this answer, she can use (30A) in order to check the propositional content *the wind is picking your gingerbread*. Though *to* may appear in (30A), only *že* allows to obtain the echo interpretation¹¹.

- (29) A: Kdo mi **to** tu loupá perníček? B: **To** větríček.
 who_{Nom} I_{Dat} *to* here picks gingerbread *to* wind_{Nom}
 ‘Who is picking my gingerbread?’ ‘It is the wind.’
- (30) A: Kdo **že** mi (**to**) tu loupá perníček? B: #**To** / Přece větríček.
 who_{Nom} *that* I_{Dat} *to* here picks gingerbread *to* / indeed wind_{Nom}
 ‘WHO is picking my gingerbread?’ ‘I said it was the wind.’

The examples above show that *to* is compatible with demand of information, while *že* is only compatible with checking of a given assertion. Moreover, assuming that clitics are hosted by the head of FinP indicates that *to* cannot be located in the CP domain. I suggest thus that *to* occupies the head of a lower FocP in the IP domain. Beletti (2004) argues actually that the architecture of the domain below IP and above little vP parallels that of the domain CP. The co-occurrence of two different focus heads would be thus possible.

8. Conclusion

In this paper, I have shown that the morpheme *že* does not have the same syntactic and semantic properties according to whether it appears in subordinate or independent clauses. In subordinate contexts, *že* is semantically empty and marks the syntactic dependence of a declarative clause (proposition) with which it combines. I thus proposed that it is generated as a head of ForceP, expressing the syntactic type of the embedded clause. In independent contexts, *že* appears in interrogative clauses or in declarative clauses associated with exclamation. The presence of *že* in these clauses triggers a particular (echo or tag) interpretation, meaning that *že* here is not semantically empty. Rather, its role is to mark a given or entailed utterance/part of an utterance as a disputed material. I claimed that this marking corresponds to a focalization and that *že* is a focus particle. Therefore, I proposed that *že* in independent clauses is generated as a head of FocusP. However, the focus particle *že* must also end up in the head of ForceP (at *Logical Form*), since it is associated with a particular illocutionary force of the independent clause. In particular, *že* seems to indicate a discrepancy between

¹¹ When the prosody is not available.

the speaker's and someone else commitment to a same proposition. In this respect, *že* in independent clauses resembles to *že* introducing an indirect speech in subordinate clauses.

References

- Arnstein, Ron. 2002. A focus semantics for echo questions. In A. Bende-Farkas & A. Riester, *Proceedings of the Workshop on Information Structure in Context*. ISM, University of Stuttgart. p. 98–107.
- Belletti, Adriana (ed). 2004. *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures* vol. 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beysade, Claire & Jean-Marie Marandin. 2006. The Speech Act Assignment Problem Revisited: Disentangling Speaker's Commitment from Speaker's Call on Addressee. In O. Bonami & P. Cabredo Hoffherr (eds.) *Empirical Issues on Syntax and Semantics 6*, <http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss6>. p. 37-68.
- Comorowski, Ileana. 1996. *Interrogative Phrases and the Syntax-Semantics Interface. Studies in Linguistics in Philosophy 59*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Ginzburg, Jonathan & Ivan Sag. 2000. *Interrogative Investigations. The Form, Meaning, and Use of English Interrogatives*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Grepl, Miroslav & Petr, Karlík. 1998. *Skladba češtiny*. Praha: Votobia.
- Gruet-Skrabalova, Hana. 2011. Czech questions with two wh-words. In P. Kosta *et al.* (eds.), *Formalization of Grammar in Slavic Languages*. Frankfurt/Main: P. Lang. p. 179-192.
- Křížková, Helena. 1968. Tázací věta a některé problémy tzv. aktuálního (kontextového) členění. *Naše řeč* 51.4, 200-209.
- Lenertová, Denisa. 2001. On clitic placement, topicalization and CP-Structure in Czech. In G. Zybatow & U. Junghanns, *Current Issues in Formal Slavic Linguistics*. Frankfurt/Main: P. Lang. p. 294-305.
- Marandin, Jean-Marie. 2008. The Exclamative Clause Type in French. In S. Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 15th HPSG Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. p. 436-456.
- Meyer, Roland. 2006. O pozici podřadicích spojek v ČNK. In F. Štícha & J. Šimandl, *Gramatika a korpus/Grammar & Corpora 2005*. Praha: ÚJČ AV ČR. p.189-198.
- McCawley, James, D. 1987. The syntax of English echoes. *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, vol. 23, p. 246-258.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In L. Haegeman, *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. p. 281-337.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. On the Cartography of Syntactic Structures. In L. Rizzi (ed), *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 3-15.
- Skrabalova, Hana. 2008. Détachement à gauche en tchèque. In D. Apothéloz *et al.* (eds.), *Les linguistiques du détachement*. Bern: P. Lang. p.535-549.
- Šimík, Radek. 2009. The syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of the focus particle *to* in Czech. In G. Zybatow & U. Junghanns, *Studies in Formal Slavic Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics and Information Structure*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.
- Zanutini, Raffaella & Paul Portner. 2003. Exclamative Clauses: At the Syntax-Semantics Interface. *Language* 79.1, p.39-81.