3.

Felicia Lee - *University of British Columbia*
WH- and Focus are not the same projection

leefa@interchange.ubc.ca

Wh- and focus movement have been argued to target the same projection across a range of languages (Italian (Rizzi 1995); Hungarian (Horvath 1986, Kiss 1988, 1994, Kenesei 1993); Standard Arabic (Ouhalla 1997)). However, data from San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec (SLQZ), an Otomanguean language of Mexico, suggests they are distinct operations involving two separate, but interacting, projections: FocP and WhP.

SLQZ superficially appears to pattern with other languages with focus movement. It is primarily VSO, but both wh-words and focused constituents appear immediately preverbally (1-2). In most cases, focus-fronting blocks wh-movement (3-4):

(1) Gye'eihlly y-tàa'az Li'eb
     Mike   irr-beat Felipe
     "MIKE will beat Felipe/Felipe will beat MIKE"

(2) Tu   y-tàa'az Li'eb?
     who irr-beat Felipe
     "Who will Felipe beat/Who will beat Felipe?"

(3) Xi   r-ralloh   lìu' [g-a'u Gye'eihlly t] ?
     what hab-think 2s   irr-eat Mike
     "What do you think Mike will eat?"

(4) *Xi r-ralloh   lìu' [Gye'eihlly g-a'u t] ?
     what hab-think 2s   Mike   irr-eat
     "What do you think MIKE will eat?"

There are contexts in SLQZ, however, where wh-movement is allowed, but focus movement is not. *A'ti'* negation is such as case: the negative marker *a'ti* is used to negate nonverbal predicates, which, like focused constituents, appear preverbally:

(5) Studya'aann n-àa   Gye'eihlly
     Student   neut-be Mike
     "Mike is a student"

(6) A'ti' studya'aann-dya'   n-àa   Gye'eihlly
     neg student   neg   neut-be Mike
     "Mike isn't a student"

A'ti' negation structures disallow focus-fronted constituents, but allow wh-fronting:

(7)   *Gye'eihlly a'ti' studya'aann-dya'   n-àa

       Mike   neg student   neg   neut-be
      "MIKE isn't a student"

(8)   Tu   a'ti' studya'aann-dya' n-àa?
       who neg student   neg neut-be
       "Who isn't a student?"

A second case involves sentences whose verbs are marked with the Definite aspect marker. The Definite marker is used to describe future events with emphatic assertive force:

(9)   S-tòo'oh Gye'eihlly ca'rr.
       def-sell   Mike   car
       "Mike will *definitely* sell the car"

Sentences with Definite-marked verbs disallow focused arguments, but allow wh-movement:

(10)   *Gye'eihlly s-tòo'oh ca'rr
        Mike   def-sell car
       "MIKE will definitely sell the car"

(11)   Tu   s-tòo'oh ca'rr?
        who def-sell   car
       "Who will definitely sell the car?"

In Lee 1999, I argued that Definite verbs force TPs they head to raise to Focus: this provides their emphatic assertive force and accounts for their incompatibility with other focused constituents.

Since sentences with Definite-marked verbs raise to FocP themselves, there would be no landing spot for fronted wh-words if both wh- and focus movement targeted the same position. Likewise, *a'ti* negation targets constituents in focus position and thus blocks additional focus-fronting, yet permits wh-movement. The only option is to posit separate positions for focus and wh-movement, while seeking independent motivation for the cooccurrence restrictions in (1-4).

References
Horvath, J. (1986). FOCUS in the Theory of Grammar and the Syntax of Hungarian, Foris.
Kenesei, I. (1993). "A Minimalist Program for the Syntax of Focus." Ms., Department of English, University of Szeged.
Kiss, È. (1988). Configurationality in Hungarian, Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, Reidel.
Kiss, E. (1994). "Sentence Structure and Word Order", in Syntax and Semantics, Volume 27: The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian, Academic Press.
Lee, F. (1999). Antisymmetry and the Syntax of San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec, Doctoral dissertation, UCLA.

Ouhalla, J. (1997). "Remarks on Focus in Standard Arabic", in Mushira Eid and Robert R. eds, Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics X, John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Rizzi, L. 1995. "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery", Ms.