

## Structural Differences in Polish vs. Czech *wh*-Questions and the Taxonomy of *wh*-Movement in Slavic

*Wh*-questions in Polish have received a fair amount of attention in the generative literature (cf. Giejgo 1981, Willim 1989, Witkoś 1993, Dornisch 1998, and many others), whereas Czech *wh*-questions have not yet been analyzed in much detail (but cf. Toman 1981). Both languages are commonly taken to belong to the group of Rudin's (1986) [-Multiple Filled Specifier] languages (along with all Slavic languages except Bulgarian), which move one *wh*-phrase to SpecC and adjoin all others to IP. Bošković (1998) challenges this taxonomy and sets up a three way distinction between (i) languages which move all their *wh*-phrases overtly to multiple specifiers of CP; (ii) languages in which no *wh*-phrase reaches CP overtly, but all move to specifiers of a lower focus head; (iii) languages that look like (ii) in main clauses, but move one *wh*-phrase to SpecC in embedded clauses. The only criterion for classification is whether a language shows superiority effects with multiple *wh*-movement in main and/or embedded(-like) contexts. Russian (Stepanov 1998) and Polish (Citko & Grohmann 2000) have been claimed to belong to class (ii).

Whereas this taxonomy definitely has its theoretical merits, we argue that it should be developed further: The *wh*-constructions of Polish and Czech, two genetically very closely related languages, differ empirically to a surprising extent; however, both should be grouped alike with respect to the superiority criterion. We first back up the latter claim by some results from a corpus and questionnaire study on superiority. We then go on to show that adjoining all *wh*-phrases to the same projection (as in Bošković's class (ii)) creates a problem with all elements possibly intervening between the *wh*-phrases (clitics, background XPs, pronouns): Their position relative to the *wh*-phrases would have to be a matter of chance or of PF realization principles (the latter route being taken by Bošković 2001). We argue that this is quite implausible for Czech and Polish.

Syntactic differences between Polish and Czech *wh*-questions (which are being overlooked by a purely superiority-based account) include the following:

- (a) Moved single *wh*-phrases may be lower than SpecC in main clauses in Polish, but not in Czech.
- (b) Single *wh*-movement shows signs of being syntactically truly optional in Czech, but not in Polish. E.g., the occurrence of quantifiers or clausal negation is compatible with *wh*-in situ in Czech, but not in Polish.
- (c) Czech allows very free extraction from complement clauses (no subjunctive effect, no subject-trace effect), whereas Polish is known to be quite restrictive in this area (cf. Witkoś 1995 for details). At the same time, Polish uses two special *wh*-scope marking constructions, which do not occur in Czech.
- (d) On the surface, the movement of the non-first *wh*-phrase in multiple *wh*-questions seems to be optional in Czech but obligatory for simplex *wh*-phrases in Polish.

We argue that of these four, only (d) seems to be due to an independent effect, namely optional verb movement in Czech (cf. Borsley & Rivero 1994 and Dornisch 1998 on the matter for Polish). The evidence for (a) cannot be reduced to a difference in the conditions on clitic placement or adjunction to

CP, because on the one hand, clitics may be placed lower than after the first constituent in Czech, and, on the other hand, adjunction to CP seems to be generally disallowed in Polish. However, as shown also by the discussion of (b), it would make little sense to assume *wh*-movement to be syntactically optional in Polish – rather, it seems to be optional in Czech. (c) might be taken to indicate that Polish never uses SpecC as a landing site or escape hatch for *wh*-phrases, whereas Czech does. At any rate, the evidence from extraction and *wh*-scope constructions points to the assumption of an operator position below CP for Polish (but not for Czech). We wish to show that assuming this richer structure for Polish (independent from a focus position in the sense of Bošković 1998) leads to a more adequate picture of the fine-grained empirical differences between Polish and Czech *wh*-questions than a purely superiority-based description.

## References

- Borsley, R. & Rivero, M.-L. (1994). “Clitic Auxiliaries and Incorporation in Polish”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12, 373–422.
- Bošković, Ž. (1998). *Wh-Phrases and Wh-Movement in Slavic*. Arbeitsber., Dept. of Linguistics, University of Connecticut.
- (2001). *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface. Cliticization and Related Phenomena*, vol. 60 / *North Holland Linguistics Series: Linguistic Variations*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Citko, B. & Grohmann, K. (2000). “The (Non-)Uniqueness of Multiple WH-Fronting: German = Bulgarian”. In: Franks, S., King, T. H. & Yadroff, M. (eds.) *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Bloomington Meeting, 2000 (to appear)*, Michigan Slavic Materials, Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Dornisch, E. (1998). *Clitics and Multiple Wh-Movement in Polish*. PhD dissertation, Cornell University.
- Giejgo, J. (1981). *Movement Rules in Polish Syntax*. PhD dissertation, University College London.
- Rudin, C. (1988). “On Multiple Questions and Multiple Fronting”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 445–501.
- Stepanov, A. (1998). “On Wh-Fronting in Russian”. In: Tamanji, P. & Kusumoto, K. (eds.) *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society*, Bd. 28, 453–467.
- Toman, J. (1981). “Aspects of multiple *wh*-movement in Polish and Czech”. In: May, R. & Koster, J. (eds.) *Levels of Syntactic Representation*, Dordrecht: Foris, 293–302.
- Willim, E. (1989). *On Word Order: A Government-Binding Study of English and Polish*. Zeszyty naukowe uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego: Prace językoznawcze 100.
- Witkoś, J. (1993). *Some Aspects of Phrasal Movement in English and Polish*. Dissertation, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.
- (1995). “Wh-Extraction from Clausal Complements in Polish: A Minimality/Locality Account”. *Folia Linguistica* 29 (3-4), 223–264.