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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 Quiaví 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-tää'az Li'eb
   Mike   irr-beat Felipe
   "MIKE will beat Felipe/Felipe will beat MIKE"

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

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

(4) *Xi r-ralloh liu'[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\'iti negation is such as case: the negative marker a'iti is used to negate nonverbal predicates, which, like focused constituents, appear preverbally:

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

(6) A'ti' studya'aann-dya' n-àà 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-à à
  Mike neg student neg neut-be
  "MIKE isn’t a student"

(8) Tu a’ti’ studya’aann-dya’ n-à à?
  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-tôo’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-tôo’oh ca’rr
    Mike def-sell car
    "MIKE will definitely sell the car"

(11) Tu s-tôo’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).
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