Kašpar, Jiří

Czech left periphery: a preliminary analysis

Jiri Kaspar

CZECH LEFT PERIPHERY: A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

ABSTRACT

The consensus in the more recent literature on the Czech left periphery is that postulating only one functional projection above the highest head of the I-domain is not sufficient to account for certain data. The available analyses differ in detail, but most of them assume that particles such as že ('that') and aby ('for') are complementisers that are located in the highest head of the C-domain. Another assumption that is often made is that clitics such as se ('oneself') appear in either the highest head of the I-domain or the lowest head of the C-domain. Under certain unspecified conditions, clitics can optionally move to some higher functional head. In the account of the Czech left periphery proposed below, the positional (in)flexibility of complementisers and clitics is reversed. More concretely, the twofold claim advocated below is that clitics appear in I, and that complementisers might appear in either C or I. It follows that že and aby should not always be labeled 'complementisers'. While the above assumptions account for most of the attested distributional patterns, it is necessary to further assume that že, but not aby, might lexicalise a functional head immediately above CP. This is necessary to explain why contrastive left dislocation can take place below že, but not aby. The fully articulated structure of the Czech left periphery is taken to be the following: $[_{CP2} [_{C_2} \{že/*aby/\varnothing\}] [_{CP1} XP [_{CP1} [_{C_1} \{že/^{?(?)}aby/\varnothing\}] [_{IP} XP [_{IP} [_{I} \{že/aby/\varnothing\}+CL] [_{vP} ... XP ...]]]]]]$. (The curly brackets denote a set of mutually exclusive alternatives; the XP marks a possible landing site for X-bar movement.)

1. Introduction

Petr Karlík and I first met in Brno in 2014. During our meeting, he invited me to discuss the Czech left periphery in his syntax class. I was more than happy to accept the invitation, as I had never taken part in a discussion with a well-established linguist in front of an audience. The range of topics we covered was broad, but one particular question has remained in my memory: 'Why do the complementisers *že* and *aby* seem to have different syntactic properties?' In the following text, I address this question. I hope that Petr will find my answer amusing.

2. Matrix clauses

In Czech, the unmarked order of constituents in a declarative sentence is SVO. For expository ease, the examples used in this paper are mostly limited to sentences involving only the subject and the verb. The following two examples demonstrate that the subject must precede the verb, regardless of its Case.[1] Changing the order from SV to VS would result in markedness: (1) and (2) would be translated as 'It was that girl who smiled.' and 'It was that girl who did well.', respectively.

(1) *To   děvče   se   usmálo.*
     that girl$_{NOM}$ REFL.CL smiled
     'That girl smiled.'

(2) *Tomu děvčeti se   dařilo.*
     that girl$_{DAT}$ REFL.CL did-well
     'That girl did well.'

In (1) and (2), the verb is inherently reflexive. This forces the presence of the reflexive clitic *se*. Without it, the sentences would be ungrammatical. It has long been noted that Czech clitics are restricted to appear in the second position within their containing clause.[2] Placing *se* in the clause-initial position is not an option.

(3) **Se   to   děvče   usmálo.*
     REFL.CL that girl$_{NOM}$ smiled
     Intended: 'That girl smiled.'

---

1   Similarly to, for instance, German and Polish, Czech allows both NOM and DAT subjects.
2   Admittedly, this is a convenient oversimplification: LENERTOVÁ (2001) presents examples of clause-initial clitics and of third-position clitics; DOTLAČIL (2007) provides examples involving clitic climbing. What is crucial is that the relevant examples are compatible with an analysis that assumes that clitics appear in a fixed position. Indeed, LENERTOVÁ (2001) and STURGEON (2008) both note this possibility.

(4) **Se   tomu děvčeti dařilo.*
REFL.CL that girl$_{DAT}$ did-well
Intended: 'That girl did well.'

Following Sturgeon (2008), let us assume that clitics are located in I, that the subject moves to SpecIP and that its lower copy is deleted. An abstract structural representation detailing the left periphery of the matrix clauses in (1) and (2) is assumed to be the following.

(5) $[_{IP}$ DP $[_{IP}$ $[_{I}$ CL $]$ $[_{vP}$ ... ~~DP~~ ... $]]]$

The structure can be made more complex by left dislocating the subject. The subject in the examples below undergoes further movement to SpecCP, and its copy in SpecIP is spelled out as a demonstrative resumptive pronoun[3]. Sufficient evidence for the movement analysis of this type of left dislocation can be found in Sturgeon (2008)[4].

(6) *To děvče | to   se   usmálo.*
that girl$_{NOM}$ that$_{NOM}$ REFL.CL smiled
'That girl, she smiled.'

(7) *Tomu děvčeti | tomu se   dařilo.*
that girl$_{DAT}$ that$_{DAT}$ REFL.CL did-well
'That girl, she did well.'

Spelling out the higher copy of the subject as a resumptive pronoun results in ungrammaticality. In other words, the subject has to precede the resumptive pronoun.

(8) **To | to děvče se   usmálo.*
that$_{NOM}$ that girl$_{NOM}$ REFL.CL smiled
Intended: 'That girl, she smiled.'

---

3   The lines in the Czech sentences mark intonational phrase boundaries. Unless relevant, this information is omitted in the ill formed examples below.
4   The author claims that the left dislocate in this particular type of left dislocation construction is interpreted as CT. The resumptive pronoun is realised with a rising accent, which is typical of CTs in Czech; see Veselá et al. (2003).

(9) **Tomu | tomu děvčeti se   dařilo.*
    that$_{DAT}$ that   girl$_{DAT}$ REFL.CL did-well
    Intended: 'That girl, she did well.'

What is perhaps more crucial is to note that the resumptive pronoun has to precede the reflexive clitic.

(10) **To   děvče   se   to   usmálo.*
    that   girl$_{NOM}$ REFL.CL that$_{NOM}$ smiled
    Intended: 'That girl, she smiled.'

(11) **Tomu děvčeti se   tomu   dařilo.*
    that   girl$_{DAT}$ REFL.CL that$_{DAT}$ did-well
    Intended: 'That girl, she did well.'

Any vP-adjoined adverb has to follow the reflexive clitic. This is in accord with the analysis of clitics as being located in I.

(12) *To   děvče | to   (*dnes) se   (dnes)   usmálo.*
    that   girl$_{NOM}$ that$_{NOM}$ today REFL.CL   today   smiled
    'That girl, she smiled today.'

(13) *Tomu děvčeti | tomu   (*dnes) se   (dnes)   dařilo.*
    that   girl$_{DAT}$ that$_{DAT}$ today   REFL.CL today   did-well
    'That girl, she did well today.'

An abstract representation detailing the left periphery of the matrix clauses in (6) and (7) is assumed to be the following.

(14) $[_{CP}$ DP $[_{CP} [_C$ Ø $]$ $[_{IP}$ DP→RES $[_{IP} [_I$ CL $]$ $[_{vP}$ ... ~~DP~~ ... $]]]]]$

3. Embedded clauses

MEYER (2010) identifies three types of Mood in Czech: indicative, conditional and imperative. Indicative and conditional frequently appear in embedded clauses. These clauses are typically selected and introduced by syntactic elements that are compatible with the given Mood.[5] In his paper, Meyer implies that embedded clauses introduced by *že* ('that') are indicative, whereas those introduced by *aby*

---

5   A number of examples demonstrating that this is not always the case are presented in §3.4.

('for') are conditional. As a necessary consequence, the corresponding embedding predicates that select such embedded clauses have to be compatible with their Mood. Indeed, Meyer notes that certain verbs favour complements of certain Mood. To take but two examples, the verb *říct* ('to say') selects either an indicative or a conditional complement, and the verb *chtít* ('to want') selects only the latter. It is informative to see whether the distinction between indicative and conditional is in any way or form manifested in the structural make-up of the clause. To this end, the grammatical sentences that have been introduced in the foregoing might be used in indicative and conditional clauses embedded under *říct* and *chtít*, respectively. Before the relevant examples are presented, a note of caution is in order. The present analysis diverges from the traditional view that *že* and *aby* are complementisers that are restricted to appear in the C-domain by assuming that these syntactic elements can also appear in the I-domain. Hence, *že* and *aby* are not referred to as complementisers.

3.1 Indicative mood

The following two examples show that the subject in NOM (i.e., *to děvče*) can either precede or follow the reflexive clitic.[6] If *se* is located in I, one needs to assume that *že* is located in a higher functional head to explain the fact that the subject can intervene between it and the clitic in (16). In (15), *že* is realised in I. In (16), it is realised in C. The flexibility in the position of *že* ensures that the analysis of matrix clauses can be extended to embedded clauses: the embedded clause in (15) is IP, and the one in (16) is CP.

(15) *Jakub*   řekl / že *se*   *to*   *děvče*   *usmálo.*
      Jacob$_{NOM}$ said že REFL.CL that girl$_{NOM}$ smiled
      'Jacob said that that girl smiled.'

(16) *Jakub*   řekl / že *to*   *děvče*   *se*   *usmálo.*
      Jacob$_{NOM}$ said že that girl$_{NOM}$ REFL.CL smiled
      'Jacob said that that girl smiled.'

What is not predicted by the analysis proposed for matrix clauses is the possibility of having left dislocation below *že*. If the subject ended up in SpecCP and the resumptive pronoun was located in SpecIP, then *že* would have to be located in a functional projection above CP. The grammaticality of the following example

---

6   One might wonder why the movement of the subject is optional rather than obligatory. After all, the subject of the matrix sentence in (1) had to precede the reflexive clitic. A tentative explanation for this is provided in §3.3 below.

proves that such a conclusion is necessary if the assumption that clitics are always located in I is to be maintained.

(17) *Jakub* řekl | *že to děvče* | *to se usmálo.*
     Jacob_NOM said že that girl_NOM that_NOM REFL.CL smiled
     'Jacob said that that girl, she smiled.'

Before any analysis is proposed, let us consider a corresponding paradigm involving different Case. The following two examples show that the subject in DAT (i.e., *tomu děvčeti*) can either precede or follow the reflexive clitic. Even though the data set is not exhaustive, this is a good indication that Case does influence the availability of the movement operation at hand.

(18) *Jakub* řekl | *že se tomu děvčeti dařilo.*
     Jacob_NOM said že REFL.CL that_DAT girl_DAT did-well
     'Jacob said that that girl did well.'

(19) *Jakub* řekl | *že tomu děvčeti se dařilo.*
     Jacob_NOM said že that girl_DAT REFL.CL did-well
     'Jacob said that that girl did well.'

If Case does not influence the availability of movement, then it is predicted that left dislocation of the subject in DAT should be possible. This prediction is borne out.

(20) *Jakub* řekl | *že tomu děvčeti* | *tomu se dařilo.*
     Jacob_NOM said že that girl_DAT that_DAT REFL.CL did-well
     'Jacob said that that girl, she smiled.'

Again, if the subject ends up in SpecCP and the resumptive pronoun is located in SpecIP, then *že* must be located in a functional projection above CP.

3.2 Conditional mood

VESELOVSKÁ (1995) notes that *že* in embedded clauses can be followed by a maximal category that is itself followed by clitics (p. 289). This was shown in (16) and (19) above. In addition, the author claims that *aby* in embedded clauses does not allow this. The difference in the grammaticality of the following two examples instantiates this claim. To account for the variation in the acceptability of (22), it could be assumed that native speakers differ as to whether they allow the embed-

ded clause introduced by *aby* to be CP or not. The acceptability of (22) seems to improve if *to děvče* is interpreted as CT.

(21) *Jakub   chtěl | aby se   to   děvče usmálo.*
      Jacob$_{NOM}$ wanted aby REFL.CL that girl$_{NOM}$ smiled
      'Jacob wanted that girl to smile.'

(22) $^{?(?)}$*Jakub   chtěl | aby   to   děvče se   usmálo.*
      Jacob$_{NOM}$ wanted aby   that girl$_{NOM}$ REFL.CL smiled
      'Jacob wanted that girl to smile.'

What is crucial is that left dislocation cannot take place below *aby*. This can be taken to indicate that the functional projection above CP that is required to account for examples such as (17) is missing.[7]

(23) **Jakub   chtěl | aby to   děvče | to   se   usmálo.*
      Jacob$_{NOM}$ wanted aby that girl$_{NOM}$ that$_{NOM}$ REFL.CL smiled
      Intended: 'Jacob wanted that girl to smile.'

The paradigm involving subjects in DAT (see below) lines up with the paradigm involving subjects in NOM (see above).

(24) *Jakub   chtěl | aby se   tomu děvčeti dařilo.*
      Jacob$_{NOM}$ wanted aby REFL.CL that   girl$_{DAT}$ did-well
      'Jacob wanted that girl to do well.'

(25) $^{?(?)}$*Jakub   chtěl | aby   tomu děvčeti se   dařilo.*
      Jacob$_{NOM}$ wanted aby   that girl$_{DAT}$ REFL.CL did-well
      'Jacob wanted that girl to do well.'

(26) **Jakub   chtěl | aby tomu děvčeti | tomu se   dařilo.*
      Jacob$_{NOM}$ wanted aby that girl$_{DAT}$ that$_{DAT}$ REFL.CL did-well
      Intended: 'Jacob wanted that girl to do well.'

---

7   It is worth noting at this point that clauses introduced by *aby* have been argued to involve CP (see MEYER 2007). At the same time, it has been argued that infinitival clauses do not project CPs (see DOTLAČIL 2004). The verb here can embed clauses introduced by *aby* as well as infinitival clauses. In the light of such observations, stipulating that various matrix verbs select complements of various sizes does not seem too *ad hoc*.

3.3 *Syntactic analysis*

It turns out that maintaining a single-CP analysis of the left periphery of certain embedded clauses is untenable (see (17) and (20)). The structural position of *že* may sometimes be higher than that of *aby*. An abstract representation detailing the left periphery of the embedded clauses in (15), (18), (21) and (24) is assumed to be the following.

(27) $[_{IP} [_I \{že/aby\}+CL] [_{vP} ... DP ...]]$

The structure of the embedded clauses (16), (19), (22) and (25) is assumed to be the following.

(28) $[_{CP} [_C \{že/^{?(?)}aby\}] [_{IP} DP [_{IP} [_I CL] [_{vP} ... \text{DP} ...]]]]$

Finally, the embedded clauses in (17), (20), (23) and (26) are represented as follows.

(29) $[_{CP2} [_{C2} \{že/*aby\}] [_{CP1} DP [_{CP1} [_{C1} \emptyset] [_{IP} DP{\to}RES [_{IP} [_I CL] [_{vP} ... \text{DP} ...]]]]]]$

The quirky fact is that no phonologically realised syntactic material may intervene between either *že* or *aby* and the verb that selects the phrase that they head. Even in the simplest case (i.e., when IP is selected), *to děvče* cannot appear in Spec-IP and precede either *že* or *aby* in I.[8]

(30) *??Jakub*   řekl / to   děvče   že se   usmálo.
      Jacob_{NOM}   said   that   girl_{NOM} že REFL.CL   smiled
      Intended: 'Jacob said that that girl smiled.'

(31) *??Jakub*   chtěl / to   děvče aby se   usmálo.
      Jacob_{NOM}   wanted that   girl_{NOM} aby REFL.CL smiled
      Intended: 'Jacob wanted that girl to smile.'

In Minimalism, adjunction by movement subsumes adjunction by base-generation, because the operation MOVE subsumes the operation MERGE. To disable adjunction to nodes selected by embedding predicates, one could employ the following restriction on adjunction proposed in McCloskey (2006, 93).

---

8   Lenertová (2001) reports similar examples as grammatical. However, while a few of native speakers who provided acceptability judgments on (30) and (31) found the sentences only slightly degraded, most of the informats found them severely degraded. This seems to be another manifestation of inter-speaker variation.

(32)   Adjunction Prohibition

Adjunction to a phrase which is s-selected by a lexical (open class) head is ungrammatical.

As it stands, the condition above ensures that the highest functional head is spelled out immediately after the embedding predicate.

3.4 Mood, modality and polarity

A conclusion that could be drawn from the discussion so far is that CP-doubling is licensed only in indicative complements of lexical verbs. This, combined with the assumption that complements can be of varying sizes and the fact that there is some interspeaker variation, can account for the differences in the acceptability of the data above. The picture is, however, more complicated. The difference between the two types of Mood (i.e., indicative and conditional) cannot account for the following data. In each case, the complement is introduced by *že*, the presence of which signals that its containing clause is indicative. When the embedding predicate is modified by an epistemic modal, left dislocation cannot take place (see (34) and (36)).

(33)   *Jakub   možná* řekl | *že to   děvče   se   usmálo.*
Jacob$_{NOM}$ maybe said   že that   girl$_{NOM}$ REFL.CL   smiled
'Jacob might have said that that girl smiled.'

(34)   **Jakub   možná* řekl | *že to   děvče | to   se   usmálo.*
Jacob$_{NOM}$ maybe said   že that   girl$_{NOM}$ that$_{NOM}$ REFL.CL smiled
Intended: 'Jacob might have said that that girl smiled.'

(35)   *Jakub   možná* řekl | *že tomu   děvčeti se   dařilo.*
Jacob$_{NOM}$ maybe said   že that   girl$_{DAT}$ REFL.CL   did-well
'Jacob might have said that that girl did well.'

(36)   **Jakub   možná* řekl | *že tomu   děvčeti | tomu   se   dařilo.*
Jacob$_{NOM}$ maybe said   že that   girl$_{DAT}$ that$_{DAT}$ REFL.CL   did-well
Intended: 'Jacob might have said that that girl did well.'

Negating the embedding verb also prevents left dislocation from taking place (see (38) and (40)).

(37)   [?]*Jakub   neřekl* | *že to   děvče   se   usmálo.*
Jacob$_{NOM}$ not-said   že that   girl$_{NOM}$ REFL.CL   smiled
'Jacob did not say that that girl smiled.'

(38) **Jakub   neřekl | že to   děvče | to   se   usmálo.*
      Jacob_{NOM} not-said že that girl_{NOM} that_{NOM} REFL.CL smiled
      Intended: 'Jacob did not say that that girl smiled.'

(39) (?)*Jakub   neřekl | že tomu děvčeti se   dařilo.*
      Jacob_{NOM} not-said že that girl_{DAT} REFL.CL did-well
      'Jacob did not say that that girl did well.'

(40) **Jakub   neřekl | že tomu děvčeti | tomu   se   dařilo.*
      Jacob_{NOM} not-said že that girl_{DAT}   that_{DAT} REFL.CL did-well
      Intended: 'Jacob did not say that that girl did well.'

Inherently negative verbs that can select for complements introduced by *že* are not compatible with left dislocation either (see (42) and (44)).

(41) (?)*Jakub   pochyboval | že to   děvč   se   usmálo.*
      Jacob_{NOM} doubted   že that girl_{NOM} REFL.CL smiled
      'Jacob doubted that that girl smiled.'

(42) **Jakub   pochyboval | že to   děvče | to   se   usmálo.*
      Jacob_{NOM} doubted   že that girl_{NOM} that_{NOM} REFL.CL smiled
      Intended: 'Jacob doubted that that girl smiled.'

(43) (?)*Jakub   pochyboval | že tomu děvčeti se   dařilo.*
      Jacob_{NOM} doubted   že that girl_{DAT} REFL.CL did-well
      'Jacob doubted that that girl did well.'

(44) **Jakub   pochyboval | že tomu děvčeti | tomu se   dařilo.*
      Jacob_{NOM} doubted   že that girl_{DAT}   that_{DAT} REFL.CL did-well
      Intended: 'Jacob doubted that that girl did well.'

If indicative clauses always licensed left dislocation, then (34), (36), (38), (40), (42) and (44) should be grammatical, which they are not. The generalisation that can be drawn from the above can be formulated in the following way.

(45) CP-doubling
      CP-doubling is licensed in embedded clauses selected by non-irrealis, non-negative bridge verbs.

There has been some disagreement in the literature as to whether the realis-irrealis distinction should be maintained along the indicative-conditional distinction. The data presented in the foregoing show that neither of the two distinctions can

be reduced to the other. If indicative always corresponded to realis, then the ungrammaticality of (38) and (40), for instance, would remain unexplained. The data above therefore show that both distinctions are necessary.

3.5 *Alternative syntactic analysis*

One of the claims made above was that (modulo the restrictions placed on the embedded clause by the matrix clause) matrix and embedded clauses come in different sizes. Another claim was that *že* and *aby* should not be labelled complementisers, because they can appear not only in C, but also in I. There is, however, an alternative analysis which maintains that both particles are restricted to appear in C. On this analysis, *že*, but not *aby*, has the option of lexicalising a higher C in clauses in which CP-doubling is permitted. One potential problem with such an analysis relates to the position of clitics. If *aby* were always located in C, and if clitics were always located in I, then the subject in SpecIP could intervene between the two elements. In order to account for the inter-speaker variation noted above (see the discussion of (22)), it would have to be assumed that native speakers differ as to whether they allow movement of clitics from I to C. Assuming this, however, would prevent one from accounting for the contrast between, for instance, (16) and (22). If *že* and *aby* were always in C, and if the movement of clitics from I to C was either allowed or disallowed for a given speaker, then there should be no contrast between the acceptability of (16) and (22). Stipulating that clitics were always located in C, one could propose to explain the aforementioned contrast by allowing *že* to move to a higher C. What this would amount to saying would be that *že*, but not *aby*, could lexicalise different functional heads. As a consequence, the alternative analysis would begin to bear a strong resemblance to the analysis proposed here. However, while allowing *že* to lexicalise or move to a higher C would solve the issue related to the contrast between (16) and (22), it would require an unnecessary complication of syntax. In order to explain the contrast between the two examples, at least two CPs would be necessary. This would create another problem. In clauses that do not license CP-doubling, there is only a single C position. The alternative analysis that allowed *že*, and possibly *aby*, to appear in a higher C would therefore fail to account for the contrast between (37) and (22). Note that both examples were argued to disallow CP-doubling. Of course, the analysis could be 'saved' by further complicating syntax. One could assume that two CPs are the bare minimum, and that doubling of the higher CP is allowed in embedded clauses that meet the requirement in (45). In making the alternative analysis work, one would therefore end up adapting the analysis proposed in the foregoing, only a syntactic level higher. Since the alternative analysis is theoretically less elegant than the one proposed in the present paper, it is not considered further.

3.6 Crosslinguistic parallelism

In Germanic languages, finite verbs in matrix clauses are often restricted to appear in the second position within their containing clause. The traditional analysis of the verb-second (V2) phenomenon assumes that some eligible phrase moves to SpecCP and that the finite verb moves to C. The impossibility of V2 in embedded clauses introduced by overt complementisers follows: the finite verb cannot move to C, because C is already occupied by the complementiser. However, Frisian, which is a verb-final language, allows V2 even in a subset of embedded clauses introduced by overt complementisers. Interestingly, DE HAAN – VEERMAN (1985) argue that the availability of V2 is dependent on the availability of CP-doubling,[9] which, in turn, follows from the generalisation in (45). When CP-doubling is licensed, the complementiser that introduces the embedded clause is located in the higher C, and the finite verb can move to the lower C. Let us consider some Frisian data taken from DE HAAN – VEERMAN (1985, 84f.). The verb 'believe' can select a complement introduced by the complementiser 'that'.

(46) *Ik leau   dat hy him wol rêde **kin**.*
      I believe that he   him save   can
      'I believe that he can save him.'

In the embedded clause, the finite verb 'can' may undergo movement to the left periphery.

(47) *Ik leau   dat hy   **kin** him wol rêde.*
      I believe that he   can him   save
      'I believe that he can save him.'

Taken together, the following two examples show that, when the embedding verb is negated, V2 is no longer licensed in the embedded clause.

(48) *Ik leau   net dat   hy him wol rêde **kin**.*
      I believe not that he him save   can
      'I do not believe that he can save him.'

(49) **Ik leau   net dat   hy **kin** him wol rêde.*
      I believe not that he can   him   save
      'I do not believe that he can save him.'

---

9   The authors use a different type of notation.

The verb 'say' can also select a complement introduced by the complementiser 'that'.

(50)   *Pyt   sei   dat   hy my   sjoen   **hie**.*
     Pyt   said   that   he me   seen   had
     'Pyt said that he had seen me.'

In the embedded clause, the finite verb 'had' may undergo movement to the left periphery.

(51)   *Pyt   sei   dat   hy   **hie** my   sjoen.*
     Pyt   said   that   he   had me   seen
     'Pyt said that he had seen me.'

Taken together, the following two examples show that, when the embedding verb is modified by an epistemic modal, V2 is no longer licensed in the embedded clause.

(52)   *Pyt   woe   sizze   dat er   my sjoen   **hie**.*
     Pyt   wanted to-say   that he me   seen   had
     'Pyt wanted to say that he had seen me.'

(53)   **Pyt   woe   sizze   dat hy   **hie**   my   sjoen.*
     Pyt   wanted to-say   that he   had me   seen
     'Pyt wanted to say that he had seen me.'

The availability of CP-doubling in Czech embedded clauses therefore coincides with the availability of CP-doubling in Frisian embedded clauses. Iatridou – Kroch (1992) note that Danish behaves like Frisian. The analysis of CP-doubling in Czech thus receives independent empirical support.

4. Embedded coordinated clauses

The coordination data introduced below show that the structure of the Czech left periphery would have to be complicated substantially if one did not allow *že* and *aby* to lexicalise different functional heads. It happens to be the case that looking at matrix and embedded clauses is of little help when investigating the syntactic distribution of the two left-peripheral particles: matrix clauses do not (easily) permit *že* or *aby* when left dislocation takes place, and embedded clauses permit them only immediately after the verb that selects them.[10] Fortunately, the proposed

---

10   There is some inter-speaker variation with respect to the possibility of the left dislocate to intervene between the embedding predicate and *že* or *aby*: a small proportion of speakers seem to find such construc-

analysis of the distribution of the two particles can be tested by investigating embedded clauses involving coordination. As argued in KASPAR (to appear), only the initial conjunct in an embedded coordinated clause is selected by the embedding predicate. If this observation is correct, then at least some of the requirements usually placed on complements should be lifted in any and every non-initial conjunct. One of these requirements prevented adjunction to the phrase selected by the embedding predicate. As the following examples show, this requirement does not seem to hold in non-initial conjuncts.[11]

(54) *Jakub | že tomu chlapci ta zkouška nevyšla | ale tomu děvčeti že*
 J.$_{NOM}$ said že that boy$_{DAT}$ that exam$_{NOM}$ failed but that girl$_{DAT}$ že
 se dařilo
 REFL.CL did-well
 'Jacob said that the boy failed the exam, but that the girl did well.'

(55) *Jakub chtěl | aby tomu chlapci ta zkouška nevyšla | ale tomu děvčeti aby*
 J.$_{NOM}$ wanted aby that boy$_{DAT}$ that exam$_{NOM}$ failed but that girl$_{DAT}$ aby
 se dařilo.
 REFL.CL did-well
 'Jacob wanted the boy to fail the exam, but the girl to do well.'

What is even more interesting is that left dislocation can take place in the second conjunct of the embedded clause introduced by *aby*.

(56) *Jakub řekl | že tomu chlapci ta zkouška nevyšla | ale tomu děvčeti | tomu že*
 J.$_{NOM}$ said že that boy$_{DAT}$ that exam$_{NOM}$ failed but that girl$_{DAT}$ that$_{DAT}$ že
 se dařilo.
 REFL.CL did-well
 'Jacob said that the boy failed the exam, but that the girl did well.'

(57) *Jakub chtěl | aby tomu chlapci ta zkouška nevyšla | ale tomu děvčeti | tomu aby*
 J.$_{NOM}$ wanted aby that boy$_{DAT}$ that exam$_{NOM}$ failed but that girl$_{DAT}$ that$_{DAT}$ aby
 se dařilo.
 REFL.CL did-well
 'Jacob wanted the boy to fail the exam, but the girl to do well.'

If left dislocation in the second-conjunct of the embedded clause proceeds in the same way as left dislocation in matrix clauses and uncoordinated embedded claus-

---

tions marginally acceptable. Interestingly, LENERTOVÁ (2001) reports similar examples as perfectly acceptable.

11   For expository ease, the relevant parts of the examples presented in this section involve only subjects in DAT.

es, then the analysis which assumes that *že* and *aby* are restricted to appear in the C-domain fails to account for the grammaticality of the coordination data above. Apparently, *že* and *aby* must be allowed to appear in I. The following examples show that the two particles can also intervene between the left dislocated phrase and the resumptive pronoun. In structural terms, they must be allowed to appear in C.

(58) *Jakub* řekl | *že tomu   chlapci ta   zkouška nevyšla | ale tomu   děvčeti | že*
    J.$_{NOM}$ said že that   boy$_{DAT}$ that exam$_{NOM}$ failed   but that   girl$_{DAT}$ že
    tomu   se   dařilo.
    that$_{DAT}$ REFL.CL did-well
    'Jacob said that the boy failed the exam, but that the girl did well.'

(59) *Jakub chtěl | aby tomu chlapci ta   zkouška nevyšla | ale tomu   děvčeti | aby*
    J.$_{NOM}$ wanted aby that boy$_{DAT}$ that exam$_{NOM}$ failed   but that   girl$_{DAT}$ aby
    tomu   se   dařilo.
    that$_{DAT}$ REFL.CL did-well
    Jacob wanted the boy to fail the exam, but the girl to do well.'

Interestingly, the impossibility of left dislocation below *aby* in uncoordinated embedded clauses carries over to coordinated embedded clauses.

(60) *Jakub* řekl | *že tomu chlapci ta   zkouška   nevyšla | ale že tomu   děvčeti | tomu*
    J.$_{NOM}$ said že that boy$_{DAT}$ that exam$_{NOM}$ failed   but že that girl$_{DAT}$ that$_{DAT}$
    se   dařilo.
    REFL.CL did-well
    'Jacob said that the boy failed the exam, but that the girl did well.'

(61) **Jakub chtěl | aby tomu chlapci ta   zkouška   nevyšla | ale aby tomu děvčeti |*
    J.$_{NOM}$ wanted aby that boy$_{DAT}$ that exam$_{NOM}$ failed   but aby that   girl$_{DAT}$
    tomu   se   dařilo.
    that$_{DAT}$ REFL.CL did-well
    'Jacob wanted the boy to fail the exam, but the girl to do well.'

One might wonder whether the ungrammaticality of (61) is due to the unavailability of CP-doubling or the inability of *aby* to appear in the higher C. Since the second conjunct is not selected by the embedding predicate, it should, in principle, license CP-doubling. Recall that the claim that the second conjunct is not selected was based on the observation that the restriction on adjunction (see (32)) did not seem to apply to it. What is problematic is the fact that in order for the second

conjunct not to be selected, it must be treated as an adjunct to the first conjunct.[12] Since (32) is a general ban on adjunction to phrases selected by lexical heads, it also rules out adjunction to the first conjunct. The problem thus becomes circular. A possible solution might be to assume that the second conjunct is adjoined not to the selected phrase, but rather to some lower phrase.[13] This solution is at odds with the assumption that the selected phrase might be as small as IP. If only IP was selected (see (15), (18), (21) and (24)), adjunction would have to be to vP or VP. Since this seems highly unlikely, it might be better to change the structural restriction in (32) to the linear one below.

(62)   Adjacency Restriction
       A head of a phrase s-selected by a lexical head has to be linearly adjacent to the phrase headed by that lexical head.

There is, however, one additional caveat which concerns the functionality of the proposed analysis. Lenertová (2001) argues that embedded clauses introduced and headed by *aby* are CPs. Dotlačil (2007) notes that, while *wh*-movement out of such clauses is possible, clitic climbing is blocked. The author attributes the possibility of clitic climbing out of infinitival clauses to the lack of CP projection. The present analysis could be saved by assuming that various functional heads can encode finiteness.[14] The I of IPs headed by *aby* is specified as [+finite], and the I of infinitival IPs is specified as [-finite]. On this analysis, clitic climbing is blocked by I if it is specified as [+finite]. A similar restriction is proposed in Lenertová (2001).

5. Conclusion

In the light of the data presented above, I propose that Czech be added to the existing list of languages exhibiting CP-doubling. The (im)possibility of CP-doubling in certain contexts combined with the varying sizes of complements and varying positions of particles allows for a unified analysis of a number of constructions involving movement to the left periphery of the clause. As far as the distribution of left-peripheral particles and other elements is concerned, the analysis proposed above improves upon the existing ones by having a broader empirical coverage and by requiring fewer functional projections.

---

12   This is argued for in, for instance, Munn (1993).

13   This is in accord with the analysis proposed in McCloskey (2006), whose restriction on adjunction in (32) does not block adjunction to IP if it is selected by C (i.e., a functional head).

14   This line of reasoning conforms to the analysis of English and Serbo-Croatian proposed in Wurmbrand (2015). Among other things, she assumes that functional heads in both the C-domain and the I-domain might be either [+finite] or [-finite].

REFERENCES

De Haan, Germen – Weerman, Fred. 1985. Finiteness and verb fronting in Frisian. In: Haider, Hubert – Prinzhorn, Martin, eds. *Verb Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris, pp. 77–110.

Dotlačil, Jakub. 2004. The syntax of infinitives in Czech. Master's thesis. CASTL, University of Tromsø.

Dotlačil, Jakub. 2007. Why clitics cannot climb out of CP: A discourse approach. Ms.

Iatridou, Sabine – Kroch, Anthony. 1992. The licensing of CP-recursion and its relevance to the Germanic verb-second phenomenon. In: *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*. 50, pp. 1–24.

Kaspar, Jiri. to appear. Topicalisation in coordination under subordination. In: *The Proceedings of the FASL 24*.

Lenertová, Denisa. 2001. On clitic placement, topicalization and CP-structure in Czech. In: Zybatov, Gerhild et al., eds. *Current Issues in Formal Slavic Linguistics*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 294–305.

McCloskey, James. 2006. Questions and questioning in a local English. In: Zanuttini, Raffaella et al., eds. *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics: Negation, Tense, and Clausal Architecture*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pp. 87–126.

Meyer, Roland. 2007. O pozici podřadících spojek v ČNK. In: Štícha, František – Šimandl, Josef, eds. *Gramatika a Korpus*. Praha: ÚJČ AV ČR, pp. 170–178.

Meyer, Roland. 2010. Mood in Czech and Slovak. In: Rothstein, Björn – Thieroff, Rolf, eds. *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 358–375.

Munn, Alan Boag. 1993. Topics in the syntax and semantics of coordinate structures. Ph.D. thesis, University of Maryland.

Sturgeon, Anne. 2008. *The Left Periphery: The Interaction of Syntax, Pragmatics and Prosody in Czech*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Veselá, Kateřina – Peterek, Nino – Hajičová, Eva. 2003. Topic-focus articulation in PDT: Prosodic characteristics of contrastive topic. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics*, pp. 79–80.

Veselovská, Ludmila. 1995. Phrasal movement and X-morphology: word order parallels in Czech and English nominal and verbal projections. Ph.D. thesis. Palacký University in Olomouc.

Wurmbrand, Susi. 2015. Cross-linguistic investigation of restructuring and finiteness: implications for clausal domains and locality. Lecture series at the Eastern Generative Grammar Summer School (EGG 22), Brno.

Jiri Kaspar
Department of Linguistics, UCL
2 Wakefield Street, WC1N 1PF London
United Kingdom
jiri.kaspar.10@ucl.ac.uk