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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 věznicích říkají, že mají
all wivesNom leftPIFem after political prisoners say3Pl that have3Pl
hezký život a hodné děti.

b. Že nepřišel na ten pohovor je zcela nepochopitelné.

These examples are taken from Czech National Corpus (ČNK), subcorpus Syn2000.
Note that subordinate ţe-clauses may be graphically independent, as the second ţe-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 ţe-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 ţe inside the clause: in (2), ţe occurs in the left clause-periphery, while in (3), it appears dislocated in the clause-final position.

(2) a. ţe on si toho nevšíml? (Grepl & Karlík 1998)
   that he\textsubscript{Nom} REFL this\textsubscript{Gen} NEG-noticed\textsubscript{3Sg}
   ‘He would not have noticed it?’

   b. Kdo ţe tady zpíval? (ČNK)
   who that here sang
   ‘Who is it who sang here?’

   c. Voní se zasnobili? ţe to nevim! (ČNK)
   they REFL engaged\textsubscript{3Pl} that this\textsubscript{acc} NEG-know\textsubscript{1Sg}
   ‘They are engaged? How is it possible that I do not know about it?’

(3) a. Viděla jste ho, když přišel, ţe? (Grepl & Karlík 1998)
   seen\textsubscript{Fem} AUX\textsubscript{2Pl} he\textsubscript{acc} when came\textsubscript{3Sg} that
   ‘You did see him when he came, didn’t you?’

   b. I takové zprávčky patří do této rubriky, ţe! (ČNK)
   even such news belong\textsubscript{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 Vý myslíte was afterwards deleted. They consider this ţe-clause as a subordinate clause which has become free, and, consequently, the morpheme ţe as a kind of particle, rather than a subordinator. In a similar way, Grepl & Karlík (1998) consider the final ţe in (3a) as a particle resulting from the ellipsis of the clause je to tak introduced by ţe, as shown in (4b):

(4) a. (Vy myslíte,) ţe on si toho nevšíml? (Grepl & Karlík 1998)
   you think\textsubscript{2Pl} that he\textsubscript{Nom} REFL this\textsubscript{Gen} NEG-noticed\textsubscript{3Sg}
   ‘You think that he didn’t notice it?’

   b. Viděla jste ho, když přišel, ţe (je to tak)? (Grepl & Karlík 1998)
   seen\textsubscript{Fem} AUX\textsubscript{2Pl} he\textsubscript{acc} when came\textsubscript{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 ţe-clauses, I claim it is not appropriate from a synchronic point of
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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 clauses. On the contrary, at least independent že-clauses containing a wh-word are not declarative clauses and do not denote a proposition (Ginzburg & Sag 2000). 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).

   think1Sg / believe1Sg / am1Sg convincedSG.m that REFL will3sg 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 REFLEX ask3Sg / want3Sg know / find-out3Sg who that REFL will3sg marry
   ‘Dad asks / wants to know / tries to find out who is going to get married.’

   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?  B: Ne, neodešel.
   ‘Has Peter already left?’  ‘No, he has not.’

(8) A: Že Petr  už  odešel?  B: #Ne, neodešel. / Přesně to řekla.
   that Peter already left  ‘Peter had already left?’
   ‘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).
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(9) A: Kam Petr šel?
   where Peter went\textsubscript{3Sg}
   ‘Where did Peter go?’

B: (Šel) do restaurace.
   (went\textsubscript{3Sg}) to restaurant\textsubscript{gen}
   ‘(He went) to a restaurant.’

(10) A: Kam \( \text{že} \) Petr šel?
   where that Peter went \textsubscript{3Sg}
   ‘Peter went WHERE?’

B: Přece do restaurace!
   indeed to restaurant\textsubscript{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 (\textit{i.e} emphatic anticadence). Moreover, all interrogatives with \( \text{že} \) are associated with a specific prosody (Grepl & 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 \( \text{PETR} \text{ už odešel?} \) corresponds then to the wh-question \( \text{Kdo už odešel?} \). 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, \textit{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 \( \text{že} \) 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 \( \text{že} \) that triggers this interpretation, meaning that \( \text{že} \) in interrogative clauses is not semantically empty, contrary to \( \text{že} \) in embedded declarative clauses.

3.2 Tag-questions

Interrogative clauses with final \( \text{že} \) 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 \textit{tag-questions}. In (11a), the following context actually provides this confirmation. I claim again that \( \text{že} \) is responsible for this particular interpretation: without \( \text{že} \), questions in (11) would be interpreted as yes-no questions.

(11) a. Hodláte najít svůj klobouk, \( \text{že} \)? To bych rád. (ČNK)
   want\textsubscript{2Pl} find POSS.REFL\textsubscript{acc} hat\textsubscript{acc} that this\textsubscript{acc} COND\textsubscript{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 are2Pl 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)
asked3Sg: that meDat 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 ideaNom
‘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 shodi tu vázu!
PeterNom makes-fall3Sg.Fut this vaseAcc
‘Peter will make fall this vase!’

b. A: Je to možné!
is it possible
‘It is possible!’

b. A: Je to možné!
is it possible
‘It is possible!’

b. A: Je to možné!
is it possible
‘It is possible!’

b. A: Je to možné!
is it possible
‘It is possible!’

b. A: Je to možné!
is it possible
‘It is possible!’

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):


   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 Ottu_{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_{1Pl} role cried-out_{3Sg.Fem Weltonová_{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 grammatical 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 topicaized 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 če 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 če jste to chtěli jet?** (ČNK)
   what\textsubscript{Acc} that AUX\textsubscript{2Pl} that\textsuperscript{7} wanted\textsubscript{Pl} go
   ‘Where did you want to go?’

   b. **Co já če pijí?** (ČNK, syn2006pub)
   what\textsubscript{Acc} I\textsubscript{Nom} that drink\textsubscript{1Sg}
   ‘What do I use to drink?’

   c. (My jsme ani tak moc přesně nevěděli,) **co vlastně če**
   we AUX\textsubscript{1Pl} even\textsubscript{Neg} so much precisely NEG-known\textsubscript{Pl} what in-fact that
   by ten sionismus měl jako bejt. (ČNK)
   CL.COND\textsubscript{3Sg} this sionism\textsubscript{Nom} should\textsubscript{3Sg} as be
   ‘We did not really known what this sionisme should even be.’

In yes-no questions, one position associated with focus or topic interpretation also precedes če, 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 če bych měl kandidovat?** (ČNK) / **Že já bych měl kandidovat?**
   I\textsubscript{Nom} that CL.COND\textsubscript{1Sg} had candidate?
   ‘Should I be a candidate?’

   b. **Peníze če by neměl?!**
   money that CL.COND\textsubscript{3Sg} NEG-had\textsubscript{Sg}
   ‘Should he have no money?!’

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

6. Semantic status of če

6.1 Če 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

---

\textsuperscript{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?
   who FOC came > Presupposed : x came
   ‘WHO came?’ > New : about which x is it true that A said:
   ‘x came’?
   c. Že MARIE přišla?
   FOC Mary came > Presupposed : Mary came
   ‘MARY came?’ > New : is it true that A said about Mary:
   ‘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.

Beyssade & 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 prohrajiem!*, 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)):

\[(22) \text{a. ForceP - IntP - FocP/TopP - FinP - (IP)} \]

\[\text{b. Chtěl bys vědět [ForceP [IntP co [FocP MNĚ [FinP se [IP t stalo t]]]]]?} \]

\[\text{wanted}_{2Sg} \text{COND}_{2Sg} \text{know what}_{Nom} I_{Dat} \text{CL.REFL happened}_{3Sg} \]

‘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 \(ze\) 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 \(ze\) 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 \(ze\). When such phrase precedes \(ze\), 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.

\[(23) a. \text{Věděl, [ForceP } \text{že [FocP uzávěrka [FinP se [IP t udělat musí]]]]. (= 18a)}
\]  
\[\text{b. Tvaril, že tentokrát se mýlim a [ForceP on [Force } \text{že [FocP t [FinP [IP t mápravdu]]]]. (= 18b)}\]

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.

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

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):

\[(25) a. \text{Ptala se, kdo } \text{že tady zpíval. askedSg.F REFL whoNom that here sangSg.M}
\]  
\['Ske asked who was singing here.'\]
\[\text{b. *Ptala se, jestli } \text{že tady zpíval. askedSg.F REFL whether that here sangSg.M}\]
Finally, I propose to extend the analysis of ře as a focus element the clause-final ře. However, contrary to echo-questions, the whole IP (or FinP\(^{10}\)) in tag questions moves to the specifier of the Focus head occupied by ře, 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. [\text{ForceP } \text{FocP} [\text{IP} \text{Hodláte najít svůj klobouk} [\text{Foc'} \text{ře} [\text{IP} \text{?}]]]]? (= 12a)  
b. [\text{ForceP } \text{FocP} [\text{FinP} \text{Vy jste pan Novák} [\text{Foc'} \text{ře} [\text{FinP} \text{?}]]]]? (= 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 ře 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 ře can however co-occur, as shown in (27):

(27) Koho (ře) jsi \text{to} včera navštívil? (Šimík 2009)  
\text{who}_{\text{Ace}} that \text{AUX}_{2}\text{Sg} \text{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 ře, 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) [\text{ForceP} \text{wh/foc } \text{..clitics.. [\text{FocP} <\text{wh/foc}> \text{to} [\text{IP }..<\text{wh/foc}>]]}] (Šimík 2009)

Although I think it is right that to is a focus element, I claim that it is ře that occupies the Focus head in the CP domain, meaning that ře asks for the asserted propositional alternative. We can compare the semantic import of ře 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 vý ‘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 větříček ‘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 interpretation.11

(29) A: Kdo mi to tu loupá perníček?  B: To větříček.
    whoNom IDat to here picks gingerbread to windNom
    ‘Who is picking my gingerbread?’                ‘It is the wind.’

(30) A: Kdo že mi (to) tu loupá perníček?  B: #To / Přeče větříček.
    whoNom that IDat to here picks gingerbread to / indeed windNom
    ‘WHO is picking my gingerberad?’               ‘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.
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