



dict that the overt C would survive sluicing, and would furthermore render mysterious the disappearance of the overt C; C is, after all, by hypothesis outside the TP that is deleted.

Both of these problems are solved if we adopt the view of the left periphery advanced by Rizzi (1997). He proposes that C is decomposed into four separate projections, given in (4).

- (4) [Force [Topic [Focus [Finite . . . ]

Force and Topic will not concern me here, but Foc(us) and Fin(ite) will play a role. Rizzi (1999) posits Spec,FocP as the landing site for *wh*-phrases.<sup>2</sup> Henry (1995) provides some evidence that Fin, in Rizzi's system, may be the position for the elements *that* and *for* in English, given the acceptability of (5), courtesy of Alison Henry (pers. comm.).

- (5) They wanted to do something, but they weren't sure what for to do.

Putting (5) together with (1), it seems clear that English *that* and *for* introduce finite and nonfinite complements, respectively. Taking sluicing to be deletion of the complement of Foc, a structure that has the characteristics in (5) would cause any element in Fin to be deleted, be it a base-generated particle such as *that* and *for* or their cognates, or a T that fronts to Fin (as we might more definitively specify T-to-C movement).

Additional evidence for sluicing as deletion of the complement of Foc is found in certain African languages of the Kwa family such as Gungbe, analyzed by Aboh (2004). Aboh provides a detailed analysis showing that certain clause-initial particles in this language directly instantiate Rizzi's projections. In particular, he takes the particle *wè* as marking Focus, and notes that it obligatorily follows questioned *wh*-phrases.

- (6) Été; \*(wè) Séná xià t<sub>i</sub>?  
 what FOC Sena read-PERF  
 'What did Sena read?'  
 (Aboh 2004:279, (7.82a))

Aboh's analysis of *wè* as instantiating Foc, together with my analysis of sluicing as deletion of the complement of Foc, leads to the prediction that *wè* must be retained in Gungbe sluicing. (7) would seem to point

<sup>2</sup> Actually, postulating that Spec,FocP is universally the landing site of *wh*-phrases is too strong, in view of Richards's (2001) arguments (following Rudin (1988)) that at least some languages with overt *wh*-movement (Bulgarian and Chinese) use what in Rizzi's system would be Spec,TopP as the landing site, and Grohmann's (2006) arguments that Spec,TopP is the locus of German *wh*-phrases.

in this direction,<sup>3</sup> under the assumption that *wè* is indeed the Foc marker.<sup>4</sup>

- (7) a. *Ūn sè dɔ́ Súrù xò mótò àmón mǎ nyón mótò*  
 1SG hear that Suru buy car but 1SG.NEG know car  
*dě wè.*  
 DET.REL FOC  
 ‘I heard that Suru bought a car but I don’t know which car.’
- b. *Súrù nù àmàsìn dě àmón íyà étòn má nyón*  
 Suru drink medicine DET but mother his NEG know  
*àmàsìn dě wé.*  
 medicine DET.REL FOC  
 ‘Suru took a medicine, but his mother does not know which medicine.’

The analysis of sluicing that is presented here, in which sluicing is taken to be deletion of the complement of Foc, makes some very tight crosslinguistic predictions that, to the best of my knowledge, are confirmed. For one thing, sluicing should be able to occur in the complements of Foc heads when the specifier is noninterrogative—in other words, when the element is simply focused. Van Craenenbroeck and Lipták (2006) document an instance of this in Hungarian relative clauses.<sup>5</sup>

I have united the systematic crosslinguistic restrictions on sluicing in so-called doubly filled Comp languages with the inability of so-called T-to-C movement to feed sluicing. The answer in both cases,

<sup>3</sup> The Gungbe examples in (7) are due to Enoch Aboh (pers. comm.), whom I would like to thank.

<sup>4</sup> An anonymous reviewer suggests that these examples might not illustrate sluicing; rather, they might illustrate focus-marked DP complements to the verb ‘know’ acting as concealed questions. In that case, *wé* in these examples would not be a clausal Foc head, contra Aboh’s analysis. Examples in which non-DP sluicing remnants occur, constituting minimal pairs with (7a–b), would presumably settle the point.

<sup>5</sup> One possible case in English would be Merchant’s (2004) analysis of fragment answers to questions, like the answer in (i).

- (i) Q: Who did John visit?  
 A: [FocP Mary][Foc’ Foc (he visited)]

Merchant provides extensive crosslinguistic evidence that such focused remnants in answers involve movement, but, as a reviewer notes, he does not account for the fact that such movement occurs only in matrix answers and cannot occur in embedded contexts.

- (ii) John said that Mary \*(he visited).

I suspect that the answer may lie in deletion of the complement of Foc, leading to a violation of selectional properties of the main predicate (here, *say*), which requires a proposition. Such a view of deletion would require that deletion occur much earlier than PF, a view with which I am personally comfortable (see Baltin 2008 for extensive justification for this view of deletion), but development of this idea would require a fuller discussion.

I have argued, lies in Rizzi's (1997) more articulated theory of complementizers, in which they are not instances of a single category C, but rather are decomposed into a number of distinct projections, including Foc and Fin. In languages that require the invariant particle to be omitted in sluicing, the particle is argued to reside in Fin, but as we have seen in Gungbe, when the particle specifically marks Focus, it is obligatorily retained in sluicing. Viewing sluicing as deletion of the complement of Foc explains simply the two phenomena that I have discussed in this squib.

This analysis almost supports Koopman's (2000) Generalized Doubly Filled Comp Filter, which prohibits lexical material in both the specifier and the head of a given X-bar projection, as a consequence, Koopman argues, of Kayne's (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom. However, the operative word here is "almost." The Generalized Doubly Filled Comp Filter would seem to rule out Gungbe, if the *wh*-phrase is an operator, residing in Spec,Foc, and assuming that the invariant particle is truly a Foc head. Hence, deriving the results of this squib from the Linear Correspondence Axiom would require re-analyzing Aboh's (2004) analysis, as far as I can see.

### References

- Aboh, Enoch Oladé. 2004. *The morphosyntax of complement-head sequences: Clause structure and word order patterns in Kwa*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baltin, Mark. 2008. Deletion versus pro-forms: An unrealistic dichotomy? Ms., New York University.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes. 2006. Top issues in questions: Topics – topicalization – topicalizability. In *Wh-movement: Moving on*, ed. by Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver, 249–288. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Henry, Alison. 1995. *Belfast English and Standard English: Dialect variation and parameter setting*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Koopman, Hilda. 2000. *The syntax of specifiers and heads*. London: Routledge.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1999. On feature strength: Three minimalist approaches to overt movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:197–217.
- Lobeck, Anne. 1995. *Ellipsis: Functional heads, licensing, and identification*. 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* 27:661–738.
- Richards, Norvin. 2001. *Movement in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1999. The position Int(errogative) in the left periphery of the clause. Ms., University of Siena.
- Rudin, Catherine. 1988. On multiple questions and multiple *wh* fronting. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6:445–501.
- van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen, and Anikó Lipták. 2006. The cross-linguistic syntax of sluicing: Evidence from Hungarian relatives. *Syntax* 9:248–274.

OVERT EVIDENCE FROM LEFT-BRANCH EXTRACTION IN POLISH FOR PUNCTUATED PATHS

Bartosz Wiland

University of Poznań

In Polish, *wh*-questions are formed by the pied-piping of an entire *wh*-NP or by the extraction of a left-branch *wh*-phrase (left-branch extraction; LBE). A question formed by a fronted *wh*-NP is given in (1). In this squib, I argue that an NP stranded by a *wh*-phrase marks a position in which the *wh*-NP has been merged in its derivational history; thus, the LBE facts provide evidence for successive-cyclic movement. There can be at least four such positions, all marked by a stranded NP: the base-generated position of the *wh*-NP, (2); the left edge of the VP, (3); the left edge of the vP, (4); and—in the case of long-distance *wh*-movement—the left edge of the embedded CP, (5).

- (1) **Jaki samochód** Paweł kupił swojej żonie *t<sub>wh</sub>*?  
 what car<sub>ACC</sub> Paweł<sub>NOM</sub> bought his wife<sub>DAT</sub>  
 ‘What car did Paweł buy his wife?’
- (2) **Jaki** Paweł kupił swojej żonie **samochód**?  
 what Paweł<sub>NOM</sub> bought his wife<sub>DAT</sub> car<sub>ACC</sub>
- (3) **Jaki** Paweł kupił **samochód** swojej żonie *t<sub>wh</sub>*?  
 what Paweł<sub>NOM</sub> bought car<sub>ACC</sub> his wife<sub>DAT</sub>
- (4) **Jaki** Paweł **samochód** kupił swojej żonie *t<sub>wh</sub>*?  
 what Paweł<sub>NOM</sub> car<sub>ACC</sub> bought his wife<sub>DAT</sub>
- (5) ?**Jaki pro** myślisz **samochód** (\*że) Paweł kupił  
 what (you) think car<sub>ACC</sub> that Paweł<sub>NOM</sub> bought  
 swojej żonie *t<sub>wh</sub>*?  
 his wife<sub>DAT</sub>  
 ‘What car do you think that Paweł bought his wife?’

Interestingly, some speakers also accept a long-distance *wh*-question construction in which a *wh*-NP is stranded at the edge of the upper vP.

Many thanks to David Pesetsky and Jacek Witkoś for excellent comments and discussion. I am also indebted to the *LI* reviewers. Needless to say, all errors are my own responsibility.