Marcin Orszulak

University of Wrocław

Focus and Wh-Movement in English and Polish: The Cartographic Approach

1. Introduction[1]

The notion of focus has at least three dimensions: semantic-pragmatical and, finally, syntactic. This complexity is especially problematic for generative theory, which assumes a T-model of grammar, in which there is no direct link between the interfaces (Logical Form and Phonological Form). Thus, focus phenomena need to be integrated into the syntactic component, from which information is transferred to LF and PF (Tajsner 2008: 12). Therefore, focus has its syntactic machinery in the form of focus movement, focus features and focus licensing positions (Horvath 2005: 1). Furthermore, the treatment of focus in terms of syntactic operations allows for comparing focalization with other types of movement, such as wh-movement.

The aim of this paper is to analyse the left periphery of the clause in English and Polish, with particular emphasis on the focus area. Following Rizzi's concept of Split CP, we investigate into the affinities between focus movement and wh-movement. Our conclusions serve to support the claim that English and Polish differ with respect to the landing sites of wh-phrases.

2. Information and contrastive foci

Focus was originally analysed in terms of discourse properties. In this sense focus was defined by Jackendoff (1972) as "the non-presupposed new information …, i.e. information assumed not to be shared by the speaker and the hearer at the point

---

[1] This article is part of the author's MA thesis, written under the supervision of prof. dr hab. Joanna Błaszczak.

in the discourse where the sentence is uttered" (after Horvath 2005: 2). Thus *focus* (also called *rheme* or *comment*) can be opposed to *topic* (also *theme*), which is old information, already given in the discourse.

At this juncture, focus is considered a more complex phenomenon that can be subdivided into various types. Jackendoff's definition can be related to *information focus*, which according to Tajsner is the most unmarked type of focus; see (1) from (2008: 58):

(1) They lent some money to John.

In (1) John constitutes information focus, and as such it receives nuclear stress, which is a default mechanism for specifying unmarked focus.

Szendröi (2006), among others, suggests that the context of wh-question is a good test for information focus:

(2) Q: What did John buy?
    A: John bought A BOOK.

In (2) focus (A BOOK) corresponds to the wh-phrase (WHAT), which is "a well-known characteristic of wh-questions that they require an answer whose focus is the constituent corresponding to the wh-phrase" (Szendröi 2006: 276). Hence, wh-phrases and information foci are in complementary distribution.

According to Tajsner (2008: 324), information focus in Polish is typically found in the sentences with the canonical word order (SVO) with the sentential stress placed on the rightmost constituent:

(3) Q: Gdzie poszedł Janek?
        "Where has John gone?"
    A: Janek poszedł DO SZKOŁY.
        "John has gone to school."

(3) shows that Polish patterns with English with respect to the placement of pure information focus — the most embedded constituent marked by prosodic prominence.

Another distinct category of focus is *contrastive focus*. On the semantic side, contrastive focus "picks out an element from a presupposed set of alternatives" (Pereltsvaig 2004: 331). Notice that in this sense contrastive focus is partially presupposed, i.e. the new element that is selected is actually selected from a given set of alternatives. Thus, the notion of contrastive focus is close to contrastive topic and it is often difficult to separate them.

For our purposes, it is essential to emphasize quantificational nature of contrastive focus. Specifically, focus can be analysed in terms of operator-variable relation analogous to a wh-question. Rizzi (1997: 292), following Lasnik and Stowell (1991), proposes that the movement of quantificational elements is sensitive to weak cross-over effects (WCO). Thus, WCO occurs in wh-questions like (4) from Rizzi (1997: 291):

(4) *Who$_i$ does his$_i$ mother really like t$_i$?

(4) becomes degraded if *his* is interpreted as referring to *who*. Analogously to (4), focalizing movement in Italian also results in WCO[2], cf. (5) from Rizzi (1997: 290):

(5) $^{??}$**GIANNI**$_i$, sua$_i$ madre ha sempre apprezzato t$_i$ (non Piero).
  "Gianni his mother always appreciated, not Piero."

(5) demonstrates that the focused constituent (**GIANNI**) triggers WCO and the whole sentence becomes slightly degraded.

   Polish seems to be similar to Italian in terms of structural position of contrastively focused elements — usually contrastive focus is placed on a moved element (as opposed to an element *in situ* bearing usually information focus). Lubańska (2000) claims that scrambling in Polish is not neutral, usually leading to contrastive interpretation. Therefore, in (6) *klucze* (*keys*) can bear information focus (for unmarked SVO in (6a)) or contrastive focus (for a scrambled order in (6b&c))[3]:

(6) a. Piotr zgubił **KLUCZE**.
     Peter lost   keys
     "Peter lost his keys."
   b. Piotr **KLUCZE** zgubił.
   c. **KLUCZE** Piotr zgubił.

   It should be also noted that in (6a) *klucze* can also bear contrastive stress. However, according to our intuition, for contrastive focus in Polish, the scrambled versions are preferable.

   Similarly to Italian, focus movement in Polish is sensitive to WCO. Consider first an example with a topic that is argued not to trigger WCO[4]:

(7) <u>Wałęsę</u>$_i$ to   jego$_i$ zwolennicy poprą.
     Wałęsa$_{ACC}$ part his   followers   support
     "Wałęsa, his followers will support him."

In (7) no WCO can be found and the possessive pronoun (*jego*) can be interpreted as referring to *Wałęsa*. In contrast, when we place contrastive focus on *Wałęsa*, the sentence under the same interpretation becomes degraded:

(8) $^{??}$**WAŁĘSĘ**$_i$ jego$_i$ zwolennicy poprą.
     Wałęsa$_{ACC}$ his   followers   support

---

   [2] It is difficult to offer an equivalent example for English. Brinton (2000: 293) claims that in English fronting results in topicalization:

   (i) Christmas I like the best.

   In (i) the fronted element (*Christmas*) becomes the topic. Brinton (ibid.) concludes that "fronting is thus a means of echoing topically what has been contextually given."

   [3] This does not mean that *klucze* in the scrambled versions is always contrastively focused. Topic reading also seems possible, however, with different intonation.

   [4] We follow Tajsner's (2008) claim that in the structure with particle *to*, topics always precede *to*.

"It is Wałęsa that his followers will support."
(intended interpretation: *Wałęsa and not someone else*)

(8) is perfectly grammatical only if the possessive pronoun (*jego*) refers to someone else than *Wałęsa*. Hence, (8) shows that focus movement in Polish triggers WCO, which proves the quantificational nature of Polish contrastive focus.

In English, contrastive focus exhibits different structural properties. Syntactically, it is expressed by cleft sentences or adverb *only*; consider (9) and (10) from Tajsner (2008: 60):

(9) It was **HIS MOTHER** that lent him some money.

(10) Only **HIS MOTHER** lent him some money.

As visible in (9) and (10), contrastive focus can be expressed as a clefted element or as a constituent modified by *only*. Moreover, Tajsner (2008: 60) notes that other constituents (sentence-final or sentence-initial) can also bear special contrastive stress; cf. (11) as roughly equivalent to (9) and (10) from Tajsner (2008: 60):

(11) His **MOTHER** lent him some money.

Generally, English differs from Polish in terms of contrastive focus. In Polish, contrastive focus usually stems from scrambling. On the other hand, scrambling is not operative in English, and hence English exhibits different strategies of contrastive focus formation. Nonetheless, it should be noted that there exist some operations in English that are equivalent to scrambling — fronting and left-dislocation.[5] They, however, do not lead to focalization but to topicalization.

3. Focus movement and wh-movement

We have already pinpointed one affinity between focus movement and wh-movement in the previous section. Focus, similarly to wh-phrases, is quantificational and as such it exhibits Weak Cross-Over (compare (4) and (5)). However, there exist further similarities.

Another syntactic parallelism between focus movement and wh-movement is the ability to license parasitic gaps (Szendröi 2006: 300). First consider (12), which presents grammatical and ungrammatical versions of the same sentence:

---

[5] Additionally, Radford (2009: 324) mentions that in English negative preposing, the preposed element receives focus:

(i) No other colleague would he turn to.

Furthermore, the preposed element in (i) has similar interpretation to contrastive focus — the selection from the set of alternatives. Nonetheless, this structure is completely different from Polish scrambling for contrastive focus.

(12) a. Wyrzuciłem szefa   płytę   nie słuchając **jej**.
        dumped_{1SG}   boss_{GEN} record_{FEM} not listening her
        "I dumped the boss's record without listening to it."
     b. *Wyrzuciłem szefa   płytę   nie słuchając *e*.
         dumped_{1SG}   boss_{GEN} record_{FEM} not listening
         "I dumped the boss's record without listening to it."

The version in which the pronoun is omitted is ungrammatical (12b). However, the elliptical version is licit in the case of wh-question:

(13) Czyją **płytę**   wyrzuciłeś nie słuchając *e*?
     whose record_{FEM} dumped_{2SG} not listening
     "Whose record did you dump without listening?"

Similar effect is visible in the case of focus movement, consider (14) with contrastive focus:

(14) ^?**Szefa**   płytę   wyrzuciłem nie słuchając *e*.
      boss_{GEN} record dumped_{1SG} not listening
      "It was the boss's record that I dumped without listening."

It is difficult to assess the exact status of (14), which seems better than (12b) but still slightly degraded. Nonetheless, focus movement improves this sentence.

Yet another correlation between focus movement and wh-movement is the occurrence of pied-piping (Szendröi 2006: 309). Although, this similarity can be found in Polish, it is difficult to draw firm conulsions on its basis. Specifically, in Polish, pied-piping is obligatory, so the whole prepositional phrase that contains a wh-element needs to be moved. The same requirement concerns focus movement. Still, obligatory pied-piping for wh-movement and focus movement in Polish may not stem from the similar nature of these movements but from the general ban on preposition stranding.

Other similarities between wh-movement and focus movement are pointed out by Lubańska (2005). As already mentioned, Lubańska (2000: 180) claims that scrambling in Polish usually results in contrastive focus interpretations. Thus, scrambling, in many cases, can be seen as focus movement, or to be more specific, as the movement for contrastive focus.[6] Following this line of reasoning, Lubańska (2005: 69–70) finds numerous correlations between scrambling and wh-movement. Crucially, both scrambling and wh-movement are subject to island constraints, for instance DP Island and Wh-Island; consider (15) and (16), respectively (Lubańska 2005: 69–70):

---

[6] Lubańska (2005) proposes that in Polish wh-questions are derived via wh-fronting, which is an instance of focus movement. In this way, she seems to equate wh-movement with focus movement. Similar proposals have been put forward for other languages, for instance, Serbo-Croatian (Bošković 1997) and Russian (Stepanov 1998). Our line of reasoning will be similar, but, in this paper, we focus our attention on the landing sites of wh-phrases and focused elements.

(15) a. *Jana$_i$ czytałem [$_{DP}$ książkę, która   krytykowała t$_i$].
          John$_{ACC}$ read$_{1SG}$ book   which criticised
        "I read a book which criticised John."

    b. *Kogo$_i$ przeczytałeś [$_{DP}$ książkę, która   krytykowała t$_i$]?
          who$_{ACC}$ read$_{2SG}$ book   which criticised
        "Who did the book that you read criticise?"

(16) a. *Jana$_i$ oni zastanawiali się, [$_{CP}$ kto   odwiedza t$_i$]?
          John$_{ACC}$ they wondered   REFL   who   visits
        "They wondered who visited John."

    b. *Jak$_i$ Jan   kazał   Marii,   [$_{CP}$ co   ugotować t$_i$]?
          how John ordered Mary$_{DAT}$ what   cook
        "What did John order Mary to cook in what way?"

As shown, in Polish, wh-movement bears a strong resemblance to focus move-
ment (understood as scrambling for contrastive focus interpretation). Semantically,
wh-phrases and focalized phrases share quantificational nature, which is confirmed
by the presence of WCO. It should be noted, however, that their interpretations still
remain distinct — focus is new information, whereas wh-phrases cannot be treated
as information at all since they denote the request for it.

As far as the syntactic aspects are concerned, wh-movement and focus move-
ment exhibit, to a large extent, a uniform behaviour. The syntactic similarities
are especially visible in Polish, where focus movement constitutes an instance
of scrambling, which itself is closely related to wh-movement (as evidenced, for
instance, by the same locality constraints).

Taking into account all the syntactic similarities, at least in Polish, wh-phrases
and focused elements should share the same landing sites. This intuition is followed in
the next section, in which we conduct a cartographic analysis of wh-questions
in English and Polish.

4. The main tenets of Split CP

Rizzi (1997) divides CP into four functional projections to accommodate interrogative
and relative pronouns as well as topicalized and focalized constituents. In detail, CP
has a double function, and thus it can be analysed with respect to discourse properties
and inflectional material below. The first function concerns the type of a clause, which
can be interrogative, indicative, exclamative, etc. Thus, CP is connected with clause-
typing (Cheng 1991), i.e. specifying the illocutionary force of a clause (Rizzi 1997:
283). For accommodating this function, Rizzi (1997) proposes Force Phrase (ForceP),
which serves, for instance as a host for complementizers. In English, ForceP can ac-
comodate *that* (complementizer with declarative force) or *whether* (complementizer
with interrogative force). The second role concerns temporality and, more specifically,

finiteness understood as "tense and other inflectional specifications on the verbal system" (Rizzi, 284). Thus, elements responsible for finite and non-finite distinction are placed in Finiteness Phrase (FinP). In English, this distinction is not clear-cut as, for instance, *that* introduces both declarative force and finite forms. However, English, has *for* complementizer that is solely responsible for introducing non-finite forms.

Another distinction on the CP map concerns topicalized and focalized constituents. To accommodate such constituents, Rizzi (1997: 286–287) proposes two separate projections: Topic Phrase (TopP) and Focus Phrase (FocP). Consequently, topicalized and focalized constituents land in the specifiers of these projections, entering the proper spec-head relation.

Overall, the C system, as proposed by Rizzi (1997), comprises four separate projections, which are ordered as follows:

(17) ForceP … TopP … FocP … FinP

The logic behind the system is simple. Whenever topic and focus are present, CP splits into four projections, in which TopP and FocP are located in-between ForceP and FinP. Similarly, when either topic or focus is present, CP is divided into three projections, in which the ordering remains the same. However, when structure has neither topic nor focus, ForceP and FinP are syncretised into CP (Radford 2009: 336).

5. Split CP in English

In English, all the projections devised by Rizzi (1997) can be found. Force-finiteness distinction is present in the form of declarative and interrogative complementizers (selecting finite TP) as well as the complementizer *for* (selecting non-finite TP). The separate locations of finite and non-finite complementizers are shown in (18) (from Radford 2009: 335):

(18) a. Q: What was the advice given by the police to the general public?
     b. A1: [$_{FocP}$ Under no circumstances [$_{FinP}$ **for** anyone to approach the escaped convicts]].
     c. A2: [$_{ForceP}$ **That** [$_{FocP}$ under no circumstances should anyone approach the escaped convicts]].

As shown in (18), locating *for* in FinP and *that* in ForceP predicts the correct word order. Focalized phrase *under no circumstances* appears above *for* (18b) and below *that* (18c), which is in compliance with the order of projections proposed in (17). English exhibits also topicalization and focalization to the left periphery. For topicalization consider (19) (from Radford 2009: 326):

(19) [$_{TopP}$ That kind of behaviour, [$_{TP}$ we cannot tolerate in a civilised society]].

Focalization to the left of a clause seems to be reserved for negative preposing; see (20) (from Radford 2009: 325):

(20) [$_{FocP}$ Under no circumstances [$_{Foc°}$ would [$_{TP}$ I cheat in exams]]].

Focus and topic in English can also appear together in an embedded clause; cf. (21) (from Radford 2009: 326):

(21) He had seen something truly evil: prisoners being ritually raped, tortured and mutilated. He prayed [$_{ForceP}$ that [$_{TopP}$ atrocities like those, [$_{FocP}$ never again would [$_{TP}$ he witness]]]].

Examples (18–21) demonstrate that, in general, English conforms to the pattern in (17). Nonetheless, Rizzi (1997: 289), on the basis of Italian data, argues that "relative operators occupy the highest specifier position, the Spec of Force, while question operators can occupy a lower position within the Topic/Focus field." This line of reasoning is followed by Radford (2009), who argues that such a dichotomy is also present in English. In particular, it seems that wh-phrases move to ForceP in the case of relative clauses, embedded questions and exclamatives, whereas for matrix questions, the landing site is FocP (Radford 2009: 329). Radford shows that relative pronouns in English always precede topicalized and focused constituents; see (22) (from Radford 2009: 327):

(22) a. A university is the kind of place [$_{ForceP}$ in which, [$_{TopP}$ that kind of behaviour we cannot tolerate]].
    b. Syntax is the kind of subject [$_{ForceP}$ which [$_{FocP}$ only very rarely will students enjoy]].

Similar ordering can be found in embedded questions, in which wh-phrases land in the highest projection; consider (23) (from Radford 2009: 327):

(23) Lee wonders [$_{ForceP}$ why [$_{FocP}$ under no circumstances at all would Robin volunteer]].

Analogous evidence is proposed for exclamatives; cf. (24) (from Radford 2009: 328):

(24) [$_{ForceP}$ How many of their policies [$_{FocP}$ only rarely do politicians get around to implementing]]!

In contrast, Radford (2009) argues that in matrix questions wh-phrases land in FocP and do not move as high as to ForceP. Consequently, if focused constituents and wh-phrases are licensed in the same, unique projection, they should not appear in one sentence. This is shown in (25) (from Radford 2009: 329):

(25) *What will never again you do?

However, in our view, the ungrammaticality of (25) results from the position of *will* (the outcome of head movement) and not from the placement of *what* and *never again* (for Radford (2009) they compete for the same spec-FocP). If we ana-lyse negative preposing as focalization (the analysis proposed by Radford (2009)), then the auxiliary should be located in Foc°, so it should follow the proposed con-stituent (see example (20)). In (25) *will* moves further to another head and thus it is not the head of the projection that has the preposed constituent in its specifier. Therefore, it may be the case that the auxiliary in negative preposing constructions needs to be in the spec-head relation with a preposed element (solution à la Focus Criterion; see Rizzi (1997)).

Another argument for the focus status of wh-phrases is that multiple wh-questions are excluded in English since there exists only one Focus Phrase; cf. (26) (from Radford 2009: 329):

(26) *Who where did he send?

Notice, however, that the ungrammaticality of (26) does not have to be caused by the lack of the landing site for another wh-phrase. The reason may be that English exhibits different strategy of forming multiple wh-questions — only one wh-phrase moves overtly, wheras the rest undergoes covert movement.

Finally, Radford (2009) notices that topicalized constituents can precede wh-phrases in matrix questions; see (27) (from Radford 2009: 329):

(27) a. [$_{TopP}$ That kind of behaviour, [$_{FocP}$ how can we tolerate in a civilised society]]?
     b. [$_{ForceP}$ *How [$_{Force°}$ can [$_{TopP}$ that kind of behaviour [$_{Top°}$ we tolerate in a civilised society]]]]?

In our opinion, the ungrammaticality of (27b) does not stem from the ordering constraints. As Radford (2009: 329) himself notices, the problem may be caused by the movement of auxiliary, which cannot skip Top°, but also, it cannot be attracted by this head (due to the lack of relevant features).

To conclude, we disagree with Radford's (2009) assumption that in English matrix questions wh-phrases land in FocP. First of all, problems pinpointed by Radford (2009) seem to result from other factors than the ordering of projections. Second, we believe that wh-movement in embedded questions and relative clauses should be analysed on separate grounds since it is subject to different requirements, such as selectional properties of verbs or the requirements of clause-typing.

Finally, we would like to highlight an interesting example from Belfast Eng-lish; consider (28) (from Henry 1995 after Radford 1997: 271):

(28) a.   I wonder [$_{ForceP}$ **which dish** *that* they picked].
     b.   They didn't know [$_{ForceP}$ **which models** *that* we had discussed].

If we agree that in English the complementizer *that* is base-generated in the head of Force Phrase, then (28) proves that, at least in the case of embedded questions, English wh-phrases move to spec-ForceP. In our view, there is no strong evidence that this landing site in English should not be extended to matrix questions.

6. Split CP in Polish

Similarly to English, Polish has both declarative and interrogative complementizers, which are *że* and *czy*, respectively. However, there exists no equivalent to English *for*, which introduces non-finite TP.

As far as topic and focus are concerned, they appear in the left periphery, due to scrambling, and always follow complementizers:

(29) a.

Ania powiedziała, [$_{ForceP}$ że [$_{TopP}$ taki rodzaj kremu] najbardziej jej odpowiada].
Ania said   that   this kind   cream best   her suits
      "Ania said that this kind of cream suits her best."

      b.

Kasia zmieniła zdanie. Teraz mówi, [$_{ForceP}$ że [$_{FocP}$ do kina]   jutro   idziemy].
Kate changed mind   now say$_{3SG}$ that   to cinema tomorrow go$_{1PL}$
      "Kate has just changed her mind. Now she says that it is to the cinema that we are going."

Furthermore, topics and foci can appear together in one clause; consider (30):

(30) a. [$_{TopP}$ Te   dokumenty [$_{FocP}$ w szafie [$_{TP}$ najlepiej   ukryjmy]]].
       these documents   in cabinet   best   hide$_{1PL}$
    "It is in the cabinet that we should hide these documents."

     b. [$_{FocP}$ W szafie [$_{TopP}$ te   dokumenty [$_{TP}$ najlepiej   ukryjmy]]].
        In cabinet   these documents   best   hide$_{1PL}$
    "It is in the cabinet that we should hide these documents."

It seems that the order of topics and foci is not so strict in Polish (compare (30a) with (30b)). Nonetheless, we are far from arguing that this is a general principle. Certainly, the ordering of topicalized and focalized constituents in Polish requires additional research.

Other interesting data can be found in Polish cleft sentences, in which particle *to* is used. Tajsner (2008) shows that *to* can serve as a borderline between topic and focus areas. According to him, *to* selects a constituent which is designated for focus; see (31) from Tajsner (2008: 355):

(31) a. To **ANIA**   spotkała Marka   w kinie.
     part Ania$_{NOM}$ met   Mark$_{ACC}$ in cinema

"It was Ann that met Mark in the cinema."
(intended interpretation: *Ann and not someone else*)

b. To **W KINIE** Ania   spotkała Marka.
part in cinema Ania$_{NOM}$ met   Mark$_{ACC}$
"It was in the cinema that Ann met Mark."
(intended interpretation: *in the ciniema and not in the theatre*)

However, in structures with *to*, both topics and foci can be present; consider (32) from Tajsner (2008: 356):

(32) <u>Marka</u>   to **W KINIE** Ania   spotkała.
Mark$_{ACC}$ part in cinema Ann$_{NOM}$ met
"As for Mark, it was in the cinema that Ann met him."

It is visible in (32) that the topic precedes *to*, whereas the focus follows the particle. Tajsner (2008: 358) proposed that *to* is the head of TopP that selects FocP. Thus, topics land in the specifier of TopP and foci land in the specifier of FocP. (32) is then structured as follows:

(33) [$_{Spec-TopP}$ <u>Marka</u> [$_{Top}$ to [$_{Spec-FocP}$ **W KINIE** [$_{Foc}$ *e* [$_{TP}$ Ania spotkała]]]]].

7. Landing sites of wh-phrases in English and Polish — concluding remarks

We have already shown that wh-movement in Polish should be analysed on similar grounds to focus movement. It would be a natural consequence of this assumption to propose the specifier of Focus Phrase as a landing site for Polish wh-phrases. Such a solution would allow for intergrating our observations on Polish wh-questions with already existing cartography of the left periphery. Recall also that FocP was proposed as landing site for contrastively focused elements in Italian. We demonstrated in Section 3 that in Polish wh-movement resembles scrambling, which itself leads to contrastive focus interpretation.

Another piece of evidence can be found in sentences in which topics precede wh-phrases:

(34) [$_{TopP}$ Dla Marka [$_{FocP}$ co [$_{TP}$ mamy   kupić   na obiad]]]?
         for Mark   what should$_{1PL}$ buy$_{INF}$ for dinner
     "What should we buy for Mark for dinner?"

It should be mentioned that the opposite ordering (focus then topic) is also possible for (34) — as we noted earlier, the ordering of topics and foci in Polish is not strict.

Moreover, in Polish cleft sentences, wh-phrases follow particle *to*, which means that they are located in the focus area[7]:

(35)

[$_{Spec-TopP}$ Markowi [$_{Top}$ to [$_{Spec-FocP}$ jak [$_{Foc}$ e [$_{TP}$ mam   to wytłumaczyć]]]]]?
        Mark$_{DAT}$ part   how   should$_{1SG}$ it explain$_{INF}$
        "How should I explain it to Mark?"

Finally, that we need extra space for wh-phrases in Polish is especially visible in long wh-scoping constructions, which seem to fit into the ordering proposed by Rizzi (1997):

(36) Mama mówiła, [$_{ForceP}$ że [$_{FocP}$ co [$_{TP}$ mamy   kupić]]]?
        Mum   said   that   what should$_{1PL}$ buy$_{INF}$
        "What did Mum said that we should buy?"

In (36), it is visible once again that wh-phrases in Polish are located below complementizers. Furthermore, (36) contrasts with the example from Belfast English (28). In (28), the wh-phrases land in the specifier of ForceP, whereas in the similar Polish example in (36), they move to spec-FocP. We concede that (28) and (36) are different types of questions (indirect and direct), but only in these constructions we can compare the order of wh-phrases and complementizers at the clausal boundary (as only in these constructions both elements appear overtly). Therefore, we conclude that English and Polish are different in terms of the landing sites for wh-phrases. In English, wh-phrases move to the specifier of Force Phrase, whereas in Polish, the landing positon is provided by the specifier of Focus Phrase.

References

Bošković, Ž. 1997. "Fronting Wh-Phrases in Serbo-Croatian." In: Franks, S. and M. Lindseth (eds.). *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Indiana Meeting 1995.* Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 86–107.
Brinton, L. 2000. *The Structure of Modern English.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Cheng, L. 1991. *On the Typology of Wh-Questions.* Doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

---

7 It is also possible for a wh-phrase to precede particle *to* in sentences that express surprise; consider (i)

(i) Kogo   to Ania   zaprosiła!
       who$_{ACC}$ part Ann$_{NOM}$ invited
       "Who is the person that Ann invited?"

However, we argue that questions like (i) are not genuine requests for information. They are used as a rhetorical device for expressing amazement.

Henry, A. 1995. *Belfast English and Standard English: Dialect Variation and Parameter-Setting*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horvath, J. 2005. "Separating focus movement from focus." Unpublished manuscript. http://cite-seerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.134.6090&rep=rep1&type=pdf. Date of access: 13 June 2011.

Jackendoff, R. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lasnik, H. and P. Stowell. 1991. "Weakest cross-over." *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 687–720.

Lubańska, M. 2000. "Contrastive Scrambling in Polish." In: Rozwadowska, B. (ed.). *PASE Papers in Language Studies. Proceedings of the 8th Annual Conference of the Polish Association for the Study of English*. Wrocław: Aksel, 171–183.

Lubańska, M. 2005. *Focus on Wh-Questions*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Pereltsvaig, A. 2004. "Topic and focus as linear notions: Evidence from Italian and Russian." *Lingua* 114, 325–344.

Radford, A. 1997. *Syntactic Theory and the Structure of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Radford, A. 2009. *Analysing English Sentences: A Minimalist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rizzi, L. 1997. "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery." In: Haegeman, L. (ed.). *Elements of Grammar*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281–337.

Stepanov, A. 1998. "On Wh-Fronting in Russian." In: Tamanji, P.N. and K. Kusumoto (eds.). *Proceedings of NELS 28*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 453–467.

Szendröi, K. 2006. "Focus Movement (with Special Reference to Hungarian)." In: Everaert, M., H. van Riemsdijk, R. Goedemans and B. Hollebrandse (eds.). *Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. 2. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 272–337.

Tajsner, P. 2008. *Aspects of the Grammar of Focus: A Minimalist View*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Witkoś, J. 1995. "Wh-extraction from clausal complements in Polish: A minimality/locality account." *Folia Linguistica* 39, 223–264.