Gruet-Skrabalova, Hana

**Ellipsis in sequences of multiple wh-words**

Stable URL (handle): https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/135450
Access Date: 17. 02. 2024
Version: 20220831

Hana Gruet-Skrabalova

# ELLIPSIS IN SEQUENCES OF MULTIPLE WH-WORDS

**Abstract**

*This article deals with elliptical sequences of multiple wh-words in Czech. It is argued that such sequences involve two different constructions, elliptical multiple questions and elliptical assertions. Wh-words in elliptical multiple questions share the properties of wh-words in non-elliptical questions; they have the same syntactic distribution and semantic interpretation, they do not show superiority effects, and their combinability depends on their reading. Moreover, elliptical questions can be reconstructed into syntactically complete questions. In contrast, elliptical assertions differ from elliptical questions in several aspects. They always contain the word 'jak' in initial position, they do not have question interpretation and cannot be reconstructed into full clauses. I propose that elliptical multiple questions result from TP-deletion after movement of the wh-words into CP domain (so-called multiple sluicing) and the TP-ellipsis is driven by the Focus feature. This explains that it can also apply to referential focused DPs. As for elliptical assertions, I claim that they are base-generated and involve semantic ellipsis, i.e. a null category, which gets its interpretation from a TP in the previous context.*

## 1. Introduction

This paper deals with elliptical sequences of multiple *wh*-words, as in (1) and (2). These sequences are elliptical in that they have sentential interpretation despite the absence of a syntactically full clause. I argue however that they cannot receive a uniform analysis. In particular, only sequences in (1) can be derived from full

multiple questions by TP-deletion (MERCHANT 2001). In contrast, sequences in (2) are base-generated and contain a null category *e* that receives its clausal content by a semantic reconstruction (CHUNG ET AL. 1995).

(1)     *Přenáší informace, ale nevím od koho komu.*

        (he) brings information, but (I) don't know from who$_{GEN}$ who$_{DAT}$ (he brings information)

        'He brings information but I don't know to whom he brings information, and from whom.'

(2)     *Prý jsou hotely u pláže už plné? Jak kde.*

        they say hotels on the beach are full? how where

        'It seems that the hotels on the beach are full. Some are and some are not.'

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I present the properties of ellipsis in questions with a single *wh*-word, known as sluicing. In Section 3, I compare the properties of *wh*-words in multiple questions and in elliptical sequences. I show that sequences in (1) share most properties with non-elliptical questions, while those in (2) behave differently, in particular with respect to ordering and interpretation. Section 4 deals with the type of ellipsis in these sequences: deletion of a syntactic structure driven by the focus feature in (1), and semantic reconstruction in (2). Section 5 sums up the paper.

## 2. Sluicing

Sluicing refers to ellipsis of an interrogative clause in which everything except for the interrogative word was elided (ROSS 1969). Sluicing appears both in embedded contexts and in independent clauses related to a previous utterance, as shown in (3). The antecedent of the elided clause can be found in independent utterances as in (3b), and in coordinate and subordinate clauses, see (3a) and (4a) respectively. It usually precedes the *wh*-remnant, but it can follow it in an appropriate context, see (4b).

(3)     a.  *John bought something, but I don't know what.*          (= what John bought)

        b.  *John bought something. What?*          (= what did John buy?)

(4)     a.  *Pokud chceš někoho pozvat, dobře si rozmysli koho.*

            if (you) want (to) invite someone, bethink well who$_{ACC}$

        b.  *(Ukázal jsem jí mapu): Nevím ještě kam, ale někam si určitě vyjedeme.*

            (i showed her the map): I don't know where, but we will go out somewhere.

58

The sentence containing the antecedent of sluicing also contains an explicit or an implicite correlate of the *wh*-word, corresponding to an indefinite DP or AdvP, like *někdo, něco, někde*, etc.:

(5)  *Domluvil si (s někým) práci v Tel Avivu, ale nevzpomínám si s kým.* (ČNK)[1]
  (he) arranged (with someone) a job in Tel Aviv, but (I) do not know with whom

In languages with morphological case-marking, the *wh*-remnant must bear the same case as its antecedent or as the *wh*-word in non-elliptical questions[2], see (6). The *wh*-remnant must also be accompanied by the same preposition as its correlate, in contrast to languages like English that allow preposition-stranding, see (7).

(6)  a.  *Jan koupil* někomu *dárek, ale nevím* komu / *koho. *(komu / *koho koupil dárek).*
    John bought someone$_{DAT}$ a gift, but (I) don't know who$_{DAT}$ / who$_{ACC}$
  b.  *Jan chce* někoho *pozvat, ale neví ještě* koho / *komu. *(koho / *komu chce pozvat).*
    John wants (to) invite someone$_{ACC}$, but (he) doesn't know who$_{ACC}$ / who$_{DAT}$

(7)  a.  *Musel dostat* od někoho *informaci. A já se ptám,* *(od) koho.*
    (he) must have received information from someone and I ask (from) whom
  b.  *He was talking* to somebody, *and I want to know* (to) whom.

The case-marking and the possibility (or not) of preposition stranding constitute two principal pieces of evidence for deriving sluicing by TP-deletion from non-elliptical questions (Ross 1969, Lasnik 2001, Merchant 2001), as illustrated in (8):

(8)  a.  *John bought something but I don't know* [$_{CP}$ *what*$_i$ [$_{TP}$ ~~John bought t$_i$~~]].
  b.  *Jan něco koupil, ale nevím* [$_{CP}$ **co**$_i$ [$_{TP}$ ~~Jan koupil t$_i$~~]].

Assuming the analysis in (8), I make hypothesis that the elliptical sequences we are dealing with are derived from questions with more than one *wh*-word, so-called multiple questions (cf. Stjepanović (2003) for Serbo-Croatian, Grebenyova (2006) for Russian). This hypothesis predicts (i) that the *wh*-remnants have the same properties as the *wh*-words in non-elliptical multiple questions, and (ii) that they can be syntactically reconstructed into full questions. In the following section, I show that these predictions are only born out for *wh*-sequences like in (1).

---

1    ČNK is a shorthand for Czech National Corpus. In this paper, I use the subcorpus SYN2010 available on http://www.korpus.cz.

2    Contrary to cleft-sentences where the *wh*-word is in nominative case (cf. Grebenyova 2006).

# 3. Properties of *wh*-words in multiple questions and in elliptical sequences

There exists substantial literature about the properties of multiple *wh*-words in Slavic.[3] In this section, I compare *wh*-words in multiple questions and in elliptical sequences, focusing on their adjacency, ordering, interpretation and combinability. I show that elliptical *wh*-sequences fall into two groups: sequences that behave like multiple questions[4], and sequences with an initial *jak* ('how') that behave differently, in particular with respect to their ordering and interpretation.

## 3.1 Adjacency

All *wh*-words in informative multiple questions in Czech must be fronted. They can however be separated by second position clitics (auxiliary verbs and pronouns), as in (9). The clitics' position is related to interpretation, see Section 3.3.

(9)   a.   <u>*Co komu*</u> *jsi koupil? /* <u>*Co*</u> *jsi* <u>*komu*</u> *koupil?*

what who$_{DAT}$ CL.2SG you bought / what CL.2SG who$_{DAT}$ bought
'What did you buy, and for whom?'

   b.   *Rád bych věděl,* <u>*kdo*</u> *se* <u>*kde*</u> *schovává / ?*<u>*kdo kde*</u> *se schovává.*

I wonder who CL.REFL where hides / who where CL.REFL hides.
'I wonder who is hiding, and where.'

In contrast, *wh*-remnants in elliptical sequences must always be adjacent, see (10). Assuming that clitics constitute a barrier between TP and CP domains, the ellipsis site in *wh*-sequences must involve TP and clitics.

(10)   a.   *Prý jsi každému něco koupil. Řekni mi* <u>*co komu*</u> */ \**<u>*co*</u> *jsi* <u>*komu*</u>*.*

they say (you) CL.2SG bought something to everyone tell me what who$_{DAT}$ / what CL.2SG    who$_{DAT}$
'It seems that you bought someone something. Tell me what you bought, and to whom.'

   b.   *Každý se někde schovává, ale nevím* <u>*kdo kde*</u> */ \**<u>*kdo*</u> *se* <u>*kde*</u>*.*

everyone CL.REFL somewhere hides, but I don't know who where / who CL.REFL where
'Everyone is hiding somewhere, but I don't know who, and where.'

---

3     E.g. Rudin (1988), Bošković (1999, 2002), Meyer (2002, 2004), Gruet-Skrabalova (2011).

4     With some differences that will be explained in Section 4.

## 3.2 *Ordering and correlates*

We observe no superiority effects in multiple questions in Czech, whether they are embedded or not (Meyer 2004):[5]

(11)  a.  <u>*Co komu* koupil?</u> / <u>*Komu co* koupil?</u>

what who$_{DAT}$ (he) bought / who$_{DAT}$ (he) what bought

b.  *Řekni mi,* <u>*kdo koho*</u> / <u>*koho kdo* pozval k tanci.</u>

tell me who who$_{ACC}$ / who$_{ACC}$ who invited to dance

Although both orders are possible in elliptical sequences, parallel ordering of *wh*-remnants with respect to their correlates is often preferred, see (12b).[6] The correlates of multiple *wh*-remnants correspond to quantified and indefinite XPs as in (12), or to plural referential DPs, as in (13), and the *wh*-remnants always bear the case of their correlates.

(12)  a.  *Každému něco koupil, ale* <u>*komu co*</u> / <u>*co komu, to nevím.*</u>

everyone$_{DAT}$ something (he) bought, but who$_{DAT}$ what / what who$_{DAT}$, I don't know

b.  *Každý pozval někoho k tanci, ale nevzpomínám si* <u>*kdo koho*</u> / <u>*??koho kdo.*</u>

everyone invited someone to dance but I don't remember who who$_{ACC}$ / who$_{ACC}$ who

c.  *Spojka [...] přenáší informace, ale nevím* <u>*od koho komu.*</u> (ČNK)

(the liaison officer) brings information, but (I) don't know from who$_{GEN}$ who$_{DAT}$

(13)  a.  *Domluvili se, že je budou střílet do srdce. A rozdělili si,* <u>*kdo koho.*</u> (ČNK)

(they) arranged to shoot them into the heart. And they decided who who$_{ACC}$

b.  *Moji kamarádi se na tu oslavu (nějak) přestrojili, ale nevzpomínám si už,* <u>*jak kdo*</u>

my friends for the party (somehow) dressed up, but I don't remember how who

On the contrary, sequences introduced by *jak* ('how') as in (14) behave differently because (i) the order of the *wh*-remnants is strict, and (ii) the *wh*-remnants do not have indefinite nor quantified correlates. So, contrary to (13b) where *jak* has an indefinite correlate *nějak*, *jak* in (14) is linked to specific adverbials (of different semantic types) in the antecedent clause, i.e. *full, nicely, main, very*. The *wh*-word

---

5     In the corpus (ČNK, subcorpus SYN2010), *jak* appears much more frequently in the initial position.
6     According to Grebenyova (2006), the parallelism is obligatory in Russian.

following *jak* always has a plural referential correlate, generally implicit, which bears the same case, see (14b,c).

(14)  a.  *Prý jsou hotely u pláže už plné?  Jak kde / *kde jak.*  (ČNK)

they say hotels on the beach are full? how where / where how

b.  *Je pravda, že se tady (lidem) příjemně tráví čas? Jak komu / *komu jak.*

is (it) true that (people_DAT) have a nice time here? how who_DAT / who_DAT how

c.  *Bylo vaší hlavní inspirací Chile? Záleží jak v **čem** / *v **čem** jak.*

was your main inspiration Chile? it depends how in what / in what how

## 3.3 Distribution

Multiple questions can be both independent and embedded, see (11) above. In comparison, elliptical sequences mostly appear embedded under predicates that subcategorize an interrogative clause, except for *jak*-sequences in (14). These latter mostly constitute independent utterances, or appear embedded under the predicate *záleží* ('it depends on'), which is due to their interpretation (see Section 3.4).

Furthermore, elliptical sequences usually follow their antecedent clause. However, we can find sequences *nevím jak kdo* ('I don't how who') preceding their antecedent, as in (15a), in which the *wh*-word *kdo* contrasts with an explicit referential correlate and can be itself replaced by another referential DP. When the antecedent precede the *wh*-remnants, *kdo* refers to each individual included in the correlate, thus *I don't know how each one of us was satisfied* in (15b). This order is therefore impossible when the correlate denotes a single individual, compare (16a) and (16b). In Section 4, I show that these sequences can receive the same syntactic analysis as other sequences embedded under 'to know'.

(15)  a.  *Nevím, jak kdo / jak vaši kolegové, ale **my** jsme byli velmi spokojeni.* (ČNK)

(I) do not know how who / how your colleages but **we** were very pleased

b.  *My jsme byli velmi spokojeni, ale nevím, jak kdo.*

(16)  a.  *Nevím, jak koho / jak Pavla, ale **mě** docela rozčiluje, když…* (ČNK)

(I) do not know how who_ACC / how Paul_ACC but (it) quite irritates **me** when…

b.  *\*Mě docela rozčiluje, ale nevím jak koho, když….*

## 3.4 Interpretation

Multiple questions can have pair-list (PL) reading and specific-pair (SP) reading. In Czech, non-adjacent *wh*-words require pair-list (distributive) reading and conjoined *wh*-words require specific reading, see (15). In absence of clitics, the

question is compatible with both readings (Gruet-Skrabalova 2011). Adjacent and conjoined *wh*-items can also have contrastive reading if the participants are known and the question only asks to identify their respective roles.

(17)   a.   <u>Kdo</u> se <u>komu</u> omluvil? Jan se omluvil Petrovi, Pavel Tomášovi a Martin Ondrovi. (PL)

whoCL.REFL who$_{DAT}$ apologized? J.CL.REFL apologized to P., P. to T. and M. to O.

b.   <u>Kdo komu</u> se omluvil? Jan se omluvil Petrovi (a ne Petr Janovi). (SP)

who who$_{DAT}$CL.REFL apologized? J.CL.REFL apologized to P. (and not P. to J.)

c.   <u>Kdo a komu</u> se omluvil? Jan se omluvil Petrovi (a ne Petr Janovi). (SP)

who who$_{DAT}$CL.REFL apologized? J.CL.REFL apologized to P. (and not P. to J.)

Elliptical sequences in (12) and (13) can be reconstructed into full multiple questions, as shown in (18), and are interpreted like that. Their specific interpretation depends on the correlates of *wh*-remnantes, see (19): quantified correlates require distributive reading and therefore adjacent *wh*-remnants, while indefinite correlates require specific reading and occur more frequently with conjoined[7] *wh*-remnants.

(18)   a.   *Každému něco koupil, ale <u>komu co</u> koupil, to nevím.*

b.   *Každý pozval někoho k tanci, ale nevzpomínám si <u>kdo koho</u> pozval k tanci.*

c.   *Moji kamarádi se na tu oslavu přestrojili, ale nevzpomínám si už, <u>jak kdo</u> se na tu oslavu přestrojil.*

(19)   a.   *Každý se někde schovává, ale nevím <u>kdo kde</u>. / *<u>kdo a kde</u>.* (PL)

everyone CL.REFL somewhere hides, but I do not know who where / who and where

b.   *Někdo se někde schovává, ale nevím ??<u>kdo kde</u> / <u>kdo a kde</u>.* (SP)

someone CL.REFL somewhere hides, but I do not know who where / who and where

c.   *Věděl, že někdo někomu napsal, ale <u>kdo komu</u> / <u>kdo a komu</u>, to nevěděl.* (SP)

(he) knew that someone someone$_{DAT}$ wrote, but who (and) who$_{DAT}$ (he) didn't know

In contrast, elliptical *jak*-sequences in (14) are interpreted as assertions. They imply that a previous assertion, given or presupposed in the context, is true for some *x* (individuals, objects, moments, etc.), but not for all, as shown by the paraphrase and the context in (20). Thus, they always have distributive reading. The type of

---

7    Cf. *Tak se mi zdá, že se tady <u>někdo někomu</u> líbí. No to by mě teda vážně zajímalo, <u>kdo a komu</u>.* (ČNK)
it seems to me that here someone someone$_{DAT}$ pleases I really wonder who and who$_{DAT}$

*x* is given by the *wh*-word following *jak*: *x* is an individual from the set *kdo* ('who') in (20a), and a moment from the set *kdy* ('when') in (20b). *Jak* behaves here therefore not as an interrogative word, but as an adverbial quantifier that distributes the affirmative or the negative value of the preceding assertion over the set of *x* given by the subsequent *wh*-word. The syntactic reconstruction in (21) is impossible, because the deleted TP should be both affirmative and negative.

(20)  a.  *Je pravda, že se tady příjemně tráví čas? <u>Jak komu</u>.* = Někomu ano, někomu ne.

        is (it) true that (one) has a nice time here?   how who$_{DAT}$ = some have, and some have not

    b.  *Za co utrácíš kapesné? <u>Jak kdy</u>, někdy to utratím, někdy šetřím.*

        for what (you) spend money? how when, sometimes (I) spend it, sometimes (I) spare it

(21)  a.  *Je pravda, že se tady příjemně tráví čas? *<u>Jak komu</u> se tady (příjemně) tráví čas.*

    b.  *Za co utrácíš kapesné? *<u>Jak kdy</u> (za co) utrácím kapesné.*

## 3.5 Combinability

Although all *wh*-words can appear in multiple questions, two adjacent adjuncts are usually considered as less felicitous in comparison to conjoined adjuncts. This is however due to the possibility or not to obtain a distributive reading (see above): in (22), distributive reading of *kdy kde* ('when where') is possible only in the example (b): 'for each period of holidays, where will you be?'. In (23), distributive reading of *jak kdy* ('how when') also better obtains in (b): 'he does not know for each party how his girlfriends were dressed'.

(22)  a.  *<u>Kdy kde</u> / <u>Kdy a kde</u> se máte setkat?*

        when where / when and where should you meet

    b.  *Řekni mi <u>kdy kde</u> / <u>kdy a kde</u> budete během prázdnin.*

        tell me when where / when and where (you) will be during holidays

(23)  a.  *??<u>Jak kdy</u> / <u>Jak a kdy</u> hodnotíte studenty na univerzitě?*

        how when / how and when (you) evaluate students at the university

    b.  *Neví vůbec, <u>jak kdy</u> byly oblečeny jeho přítelkyně.* (ČNK)

        (he) does not know how when were dressed his girlfriends

In my corpus study of 16 combinations[8], I have found almost 1.800 occurrences of multiple questions, the five most frequent combinations being *co kdo* (253), *co kdy*

---

8    My corpus study focused on 16 combinations of the following *wh*-words in both orders and all cases: *kdo* (who), *co* (what), *kdy* (when), *kde* (where$_{LOC}$), *kam* (where$_{DIR}$), *jak* (how).

(223), *jak co* (188), *kdo kdo* (163), a *kdo co* (137). I have not found any occurrence of sequences *kdy jak, kde kam / kam kde, kde jak*, and *kam jak / jak kam*. In contrast, we have found less than 100 elliptical sequences[9], the most frequent being independent *jak*-sequences (88): *jak kdo* (67), *jak co* and *jak kdy / jak kde*. I have only found 5[10] elliptical sequences with other *wh*-words than *jak*. In one of them, the *wh*-words have indefinite interpretation (see Section 4.1):

(24)  *Líp ti to neřeknu a nevím, zda <u>kdy kdo</u>.*
      (I) cannot say it better to you and I do not know whether when who.
      'I cannot say it better, and I don't know whether someone could at some other moment.'

### 3.5 Summary

The properties discussed in this section show that elliptical *wh*-sequences fall into two groups: those that share the properties of multiple questions (that I call *E*-sequences) and those that do not (*jak*-sequences):

**Tab. 1. Properties of multiple questions and elliptical sequences**

| | Adjacency | Interpretation | Free order | Contexts | Correlates | Combinations | Reconstruction |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Multiple questions | not necessarily | question distributive / specific | yes | main or embedded | – | all | – |
| E-sequences ex. (1) | yes | question distributive / specific + contrastive | yes | mostly embedded under 'to know' | indefinites, quantifiers, referential XPs | all but less acceptable | yes |
| jak-sequences ex. (2) | yes | assertion distributive | no | mostly main or embedded under 'to depend' | specific adverbial + referential XPs | jak + wh-word | no |

# 4. Two types of ellipsis

In this section, I propose that elliptical sequences involve two different types of ellipsis: *E*-sequences involve syntactic deletion in multiple questions, while *jak*-sequences contain a null base-generated category *e*.

### 4.1 Deletion in multiple questions

*Wh*-remnants in *E*-sequences behave as *wh*-words in multiple questions. Consequently, *E*-sequences can receive the syntactic analysis of sluicing constructions

---

9    Sequences of conjoined adjuncts are also very frequent.
10   I do not consider the lexicalized sequence *kdo s koho* ('who of who$_{GEN}$') meaning 'who of them two will prevail over': *Den konečného zúčtování se přiblížil. Nyní se ukáže, <u>kdo s koho</u>.* (ČNK) 'The day of final judgement came close. Now it will reveal who will have the upper hand.'

discussed in the Section 2: they contain a clausal structure, the *wh*-words move to the left-periphery, and TP is deleted under identity with the TP in the antecedent clause (Merchant 2001):[11]

(25)   *Každý někoho pozval, ale nevím [~CP~ ~kdo₁~ ~koho₂~ [~TP~ t̶₁̶ p̶o̶z̶v̶a̶l̶ t̶₂̶]].*

In Merchant's (2001) analysis, TP-deletion is licensed by the head C which bears the features [+Q] and [+Wh]. It has been however argued (Bošković 1998, 2002, Stepanov 1998, Stjepanović 2003) that movement of multiple *wh*-words in Slavic is driven by the Focus feature, and that multiple sluicing is licensed by every head bearing a Focus feature (Grebenyova 2006). I propose that a focus-driven analysis of sluicing is appropriate for multiple sluicing in Czech, because it allows to explain adjacency and specific, or at least contrastive, interpretation of *wh*-remnants (see Section 3). I assume that only adjacent wh-words in multiple questions appear both in the CP domain, i.e. before clitics, and occupy the specifiers of IntP and FocP respectively (Rizzi 1997, Lenertová 2001, Gruet-Skrabalova 2011), see (26). Consequently, sluicing licensed by the head Focus will results in sequences of adjacent *wh*-remnants with specific or contrastive interpretation. The elided structure corresponds to TP and clitics, thus FinP. Semantically, the contrast obtains more easily with the wh-words of the same type, which explains the preference for elliptical sequences *kdo kdo*.[12]

(26)   a.   [~ForceP~ [~IntP~ Kdo [~FinP~ se [~TP~ komu [~vP~ t omluvil t]]]]]?
             => *..., ale nevím [~ForceP~ [~IntP~ <u>kdo</u> [~FinP~ se [~TP~ k̶o̶m̶u̶ [~vP~ t̶ o̶m̶l̶u̶v̶i̶l̶ t̶]]]]]

       b.   [~ForceP~ [~IntP~ Kdo [~FocP~ komu **[foc]** [~FinP~ se [~TP~ [~vP~ t omluvil t ]]]]]]?
             => ale nevím [~ForceP~ [~IntP~ <u>Kdo</u> [~FocP~ <u>komu</u> **[foc]** [~Fin~ s̶e̶ [~TP~ [~vP~ t̶ o̶m̶l̶u̶v̶i̶l̶ t̶ ]]]]]]

Finally, focus-driven analysis of sluicing predicts that sluicing should also be possible after focused referential DPs (Grebenyova 2006). This is actually true for both a single DP and a sequence of two DPs, as shown in (27). Thus, the proposed analysis can also account for sequences combining *wh*-words, referential DPs and indefinite pronouns, as long as they are contrastively focused, see (28).

(27)   a.   *Mohl to někdo udělat sekerou? Spíš bych řekl, že <u>mačetou</u>.* (ČNK)
             could someone do it (with) axe$_{INSTR}$? I would say that (with) truncheon$_{INSTR}$

---

[11]   The identity of ellipsis does not concern agreement features (Merchant 2001, 2006).

[12]   This also explains that three and more *wh*-remnants are better conjoined or separated by a comma.

b. *Že Češi spolupracují s Francouzi je jisté, ale jestli <u>Francouzi s Čechy</u> už tak jisté není.*

that Czechs cooperate with French is sure, but that French with Czechs is not so sure

(28) a. *Každý s někým tancoval, ale <u>kdo s Evou</u> (tancoval), na to si už nevzpomínám*

everyone with someone danced but who with Eva (danced) I don't remember

b. *Nevím, <u>jak koho</u> / <u>jak Pavla</u> (to rozčiluje), ale **mě** to teda rozčiluje.*

(I) don't know how who$_{ACC}$ / how Paul$_{ACC}$ (it irritates) but (it) certainly irritates **me**

c. *Líp ti to neřeknu a nevím, zda <u>kdy kdo</u> (ti to řekne líp).*[13]

(I) cannot say it better and I don't know whether someone could say it better at another moment

## 4.2 *Semantic reconstruction*

*Jak*-sequences do not allow syntactic reconstruction, although they have clausal interpretation. These non-sentential assertions confirm the value of a previous (presupposed) assertion for some but not all *x* in a set given by the *wh*-word following *jak*. The variable *x* has an implicit correlate in the presupposed assertion, see (29a). The syntactic reconstruction is impossible because these sequences imply both an affirmative and a negative clause, see (29b) and Section 3.4.

(29) a. *Je pravda, že se tady (lidem) příjemně tráví čas? <u>Jak komu</u>.*

is (it) true that (people$_{DAT}$) have a nice time here? How who$_{DAT}$

b. *Někomu se tady tráví čas příjemně, někomu ne.*

some have a nice time here, some have not

I suggest that *jak*-sequences are base-generated and contain a null category [*e*] that is semantically reconstructed at LF as other anaphors (Chung et al. 1995, Lobeck 1995). The fact that the interrogative DP following *jak* must bear the same case as its correlate is necessary to ensure its syntactic and semantic integration into the ellipsis site (Chung 2013, 29). More detailed semantic analysis of these constructions is however beyond the scope of this paper.

(30) a. *Je pravda, že se tady příjemně tráví čas?* [$_{CP}$ *Jak komu* [$_{TP}$ *e*]].
    b. LF: [$_{CP}$ Jak <u>komu</u>$_i$ [$_{TP}$ *lidem*$_i$ *se tady příjemně tráví čas*]]

---

13 We assume that the polarity feature of the clause is checked in the CP (Laka 1990), thus not relevant for TP identity.

# 5. Conclusion

In this paper, I dealt with elliptical sequences of multiple *wh*-words in Czec. I argued that they involve two different constructions, elliptical multiple questions and elliptical assertions. I first showed that *wh*-words in elliptical multiple questions share the properties of *wh*-words in non-elliptical questions: they have the same syntactic distribution and semantic interpretation, they do not show superiority effects, and their combinability depends on their reading. Moreover, elliptical questions can be reconstructed into syntactically complete questions. In contrast, elliptical assertions differ from elliptical questions in several aspects. They always contain the word *jak* in initial position (the order of *wh*-words is therefore not free), they don't have question interpretation and cannot be reconstructed into full clauses. I then proposed that elliptical multiple questions result from TP-deletion after movement of the *wh*-words into CP domain (so-called multiple sluicing) and that the TP-ellipsis is driven by the focus feature. Thus explains that it can also apply to referential focused DPs. As for elliptical assertions, I claimed that they are base-generated and involve semantic ellipsis, i.e. a null category, which is interpreted anaphorically with respect to a TP in the previous context.

## REFERENCES

Bošković, Željko. 1999. On multiple feature-checking: Multiple wh-fronting and multiple headmovement. In: Epstein, Samuel – Hornstein, Norbert, eds. *Working Minimalism.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, pp. 159–187.

Bosković, Željko. 2002. On multiple wh-fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry.* 33, pp. 351–384.

Chung, Sandra – Ladusaw, William – McCloskey, James. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics.* 3, pp. 239–282.

Chung, Sandra. 2013. Syntactic Identity in Sluicing: How Much and Why. *Linguistic Inquiry.* 44(1), pp. 1–44.

Grebenyova, Lydia. 2006. Sluicing and Multiple Wh-fronting. In: Richa, Srihti – Sinha, Samar, eds. *Proceedings of GLOW in Asia.* Vol. 5. pp. 219–242. Also available at: http://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=ling_facpub.

Gruet-Skrabalova, Hana. 2011. Czech questions with two wh-words. In: Kosta, Peter – Schürcks, Lilia, eds. *Formalization of Grammar in Slavic Languages.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 179–192.

Laka, Itzar. 1990. On the syntax of negation. Cambridge, Mass. Ph.D. thesis. MIT.

Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When you can save a structure by destroying it? In: Kim, Minjoo – Strauss, Uri, eds. *Proceedings of NELS 31.* Amherst, Mass.: GLSA, pp. 301–320.

ČLÁNKY – ARTICLES

Lenertová, Denisa. 2001. On Clitic Placement, Topicalization and CP-Structure in Czech. In: Kosta, Peter – Frasek, Jens, eds. *Current Approaches to Formal Slavic Linguistics.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 294–305.

Lobeck, Anne. 1995. *Ellipsis: functional heads, identification, and licensing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence*: *Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and Ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy.* 27(6), pp. 661–738.

Merchant, Jason. 2006. Sluicing. In: Everaert, Martin – van Riemsdijk, Henk, eds. *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 269–289.

Meyer, Roland. 2002. On multiple wh-fronting and wh-clustering in Czech. In: Brown, Wales et al., eds. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 11: The Amherst Meeting.* Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, pp. 393–412.

Meyer, Roland. 2004. Superiority effects in Russian, Polish, and Czech. *Cahiers linguistiques d'Ottawa.* 32, pp. 44–65.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In: Haegeman, Liliana, ed. *Elements of grammar.* Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 281–337.

Ross, John. 1969. Guess who? In: Binnick, Robert et al., eds. *Papers from the 5th regional Meeting of CLS.* Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 252–286.

Rudin, Catherine. 1988. On multiple questions and multiple Wh-fronting. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory.* 6(4), pp. 445–501.

Stepanov, Arthur. 1998. On Wh-Fronting in Russian. In: Tamanji, Pius – Kusumoto, Kiyomi, eds. *Proceedings of NELS 28.* Amherst, Mass.: GLSA, pp. 453–467.

Stjepanović, Sandra. 2003. Multiple Wh-Fronting in Serbo-Croatian Matrix Questions and the Matrix Sluicing Constructions. In: Boeckx, Cedric – Grohmann, Kleanthes, eds. *Multiple Wh-fronting.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 255–284.

*Hana Gruet-Skrabalova*
UBP & LRL (EA 999), Clermont University
29 boulevard Gergovia, 630 00 Clermont-Ferrand
France
hana.gruet-skrabalova@univ-bpclermont.fr