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1. Outline. In Polish, wh-questions are formed by pied-piping of an entire wh-NP or by the extraction of a left-branch wh-phrase (LBE). A question formed by a fronted wh-NP is given in (1a). In this paper we argue that an NP stranded by a wh-phrase marks a position in which a wh-NP has been merged in its derivational history. There can be three such positions, all marked by a stranded NP: the base generated position of the wh-NP (1b); the left edge of the vP (1c); and – in the case of long distance wh-movement – the left edge of the embedded CP (2). Interestingly, a percentage of speakers also accept a long-distance wh-question construction in which an NP is stranded at the edge of the upper vP (3). Constructions in which the movement of the left branch strands the NP in a fronted position then provide new evidence for successive-cyclic movement and, more broadly, for punctuated paths in syntax. In this paper, apart from revealing constructions like in (1c), (2), and (3), we show that positions marked by the stranded NP are indeed edges of phases, vP and CP.

2. The position of arguments in Polish. Polish is a consistent head-initial language. Witkoś (2003, 2007), a.o., on the basis of binding, reconstruction, clitic positions, idioms, and VP-adverbs argues that (i) the basic (unmarked) word order in Polish is S-V-IO_DAT-DO_ACC (as in (4b)) and (ii) that the vP-structure is as in (4a) with the lexical verb in V0 raising overtly to the little v'. Accordingly, we will continue to assume that the basic position of both objects is post-verbal and the verb occupies V0.

3. Wh-fronting. Polish is a multiple wh-fronting language, which allows for Superiority violations. However, none of the wh-phrases moves to Spec-CP in questions, but to a projection between the CP and the subject in Spec-IP (cf. Citko & Grohmann 2001). This is indicated by the overt complementizer że `that', which always precedes all fronted wh-phrases (cf. (5a)); examples in (5b,c) are ruled out by the Doubly Filled Comp Filter (DFCF). Single wh-questions can also be construed by the subextraction of the wh-phrase from the wh-NP, as in the synonymous examples in (6a,b).

4. LBE from fronted wh-NPs. Consider (7), where the wh-NP jaki samochód `what car' is split by the extraction of the wh-word jaki `what'. In (7a), the wh-word strands the NP in its base-generated position. In (7b), the NP is stranded in a fronted position, which arguably corresponds to the edge of the vP, given what has been established about the structure of (4b). Since a well-formed wh-question involves movement of either an extracted wh-phrase or an entire wh-NP, a construction like in (7b) provides visible evidence for intermediate derivational stages. In embedded questions, the NP can also be stranded at the edge of the embedded vP (8). A percentage of speakers also accept long-distance wh-questions, in which the NP can be stranded in its base-generated position (9b), at the edge of the embedded vP (9c), or at the edge of the embedded CP (9d). The variant with a pied-piped wh-NP is given in (9a) and is synonymous with (9b,c,d). In (9c), the extraction of the wh-word takes place from the wh-NP fronted to a position between the Subject and the verb in V0, which arguably corresponds to the edge of the vP. In (9d) we also see that the stranded NP at the edge of the embedded clause cannot be followed by an overt complementizer, as this is prohibited by the DFCF (cf. (5b,c)). (It must be noted that long distance wh-questions with stranded NPs like in (9b-d) receive a slightly forced reading and their acceptability among speakers vary).

Despite the fact that wh-phrases in Polish do not move to Spec-CP but to a projection below the complementizer (`ΣP"), stranding the NP in the ΣP is impossible even for speakers who accept (9b-d), as indicated by (10). This shows that before the NP is stranded, the full wh-NP is fronted to the phonological edge of the clause, not to the intermediate ΣP. Note that at the same time the presence of the overt complementizer że `that' is obligatory in embedded declarative clauses (11), and there is no that-trace effect in Polish (cf. Szczegielniak 1999). (9d) then provides evidence for successive-cyclic movement through the edge of the CP phase in a language in which wh-phrases do not target CPs in clause-bounded wh-questions. What is also particularly interesting is the fact that a percentage of speakers accept also long-distance wh-questions as in (12), where the NP is stranded at the vP-edge of a matrix clause.

5. Successive-cyclic movement, not scrambling. It remains to be shown whether the dislocations of wh-NPs to the edges of phases indeed provide evidence for successive-cyclic movement and are not instances of scrambling. This needs to be unambiguously determined since there does not exist a prima facie argument against a scenario in which a subextraction of a wh-phrase is preceded by scrambling of a wh-NP to the phase edge. Nevertheless, (12) already provides strong evidence for successive-cyclicity. The wh-NP is fronted here to the edge of the vP of the upper clause, while scrambling in Polish is strictly clause-bound, as shown for instance in (13). Scrambling of the direct object is felicitous across any constituent, as long as it does not cross the CP-boundary. Since NPs do not scramble across the CP-boundary, it appears that wh-NP-fronting which targets intermediate phase edges en route to the matrix ΣP is induced by successive-cyclic movement. LBE from displaced wh-NPs in Polish then provides overt evidence for punctuated paths in syntax.
Examples:

(1) a. **Jaki samochód** Paweł kupił swojej żonie t? what car-ACC Paweł-NOM bought his wife-DAT
b. **Jaki** Paweł kupił swojej żonie **samochód**? what Paweł-NOM bought his wife-DAT car-ACC
c. **Jaki** Paweł **samochód** kupił swojej żonie t? what Paweł-NOM car-ACC bought his wife-DAT "What car did Paweł buy his wife?"

(2) **Jaki** pro myśli **samochód** (*że* Paweł kupił swojej żonie t? what pro think-2SG.MSC car that Paweł-NOM bought his wife-DAT "What car do you think that Paweł bought his wife?"

(3) **Jaki** Maria **samochód** myślała, że Paweł kupił żonie t? what Mary-NOM car-ACC thought that Paweł-NOM bought wife-DAT "What car did Mary think Paweł bought his wife?"

(4) a. …[VP V′+v′ [VP NP-DAT [v′ t′ NP-ACC]]]
   b. [IP Jan [VP szybko [VP Marii [v′ t′ książkę ]]]]
   Jan-NOM quickly sent Mary-DAT book-ACC

(5) a. Jan myślił [CP że [2P co komu] Paweł kupił t1 t2]? Jan-NOM thought that whom Paweł-NOM bought "Jan thought that what car Paweł bought to whom?"
   b. *Jan myślił [CP co2 że [2P komu] Paweł kupił t1 t2]?
   Jan-NOM thought that whom Paweł-NOM bought
   c. *Jan myślił [CP jaki samochód, że [2P komu] Paweł kupił t1 t2]?
   Jan-NOM thought that what car that whom Paweł-NOM bought

(6) a. **Jaki samochód** Paweł kupił swojej żonie t? what car-ACC Paweł-NOM bought his wife-DAT
b. **Jaki** Paweł kupił swojej żonie **samochód**? what Paweł-NOM bought his wife-DAT car-ACC "What car did Paweł buy his wife?"

(7) a. [CP [2P jaki Paweł [VP kupił swojej żonie **samochód**]!]? what Paweł-NOM bought his wife-DAT car-ACC
   b. [CP [2P jaki Paweł [VP **samochód** kupił swojej żonie t]]]? what Paweł-NOM car-ACC bought his wife-DAT "What car did Paweł buy his wife?"

(8) ? Jan myślił, [CP że [2P jaki Paweł [VP **samochód** kupił swojej żonie t]]]? Jan-NOM thought that what Paweł-NOM car-ACC bought his wife-DAT "Jan thought that what car Paweł bought his wife?"

(9) a. [CP2P jaki samochód [IP pro [VP powiedziałaś [CP (ze) [IP Paweł [VP kupił żonie t]]]]? what car-ACC said-2SG.MSC that Paweł-NOM bought wife-DAT
   b. ? [CP2P jaki [IP pro [VP powiedziałaś [CP (ze) [IP Paweł [VP kupił żonie **samochód**]!]]? what said-2SG.MSC that Paweł-NOM bought wife-DAT car-ACC
   c. ? [CP2P jaki [IP pro [VP powiedziałaś [CP (ze) [IP Paweł [VP **samochód** kupił żonie t]]]]? what said-2SG.MSC that Paweł-NOM car-ACC bought wife-DAT
   d. ? [CP2P jaki [IP pro [VP powiedziałaś [CP **samochód** (*że* [IP Paweł [VP kupił żonie t]]!)]? what said-2SG.MSC car-ACC that Paweł-NOM bought wife-DAT "What car did you say Paweł bought his wife?"

(10) *[CP2P jaki [IP pro [VP powiedziałaś [CP że [2P **samochód** [IP Paweł [VP kupił żonie t]]]]? what said-2SG.MSC that car-ACC Paweł-NOM bought wife-DAT

(11) Maria powiedziała, że*/Ø Robert wygrał wybory. Maria-NOM said that Robert-NOM won election-ACC "Maria said that Robert had won the election."

(12) %[CP2P jaki [IP Maria [VP **samochód** powiedziała [CP że [IP pro1 [VP myślała what Maria-NOM car-ACC said-3SG.FEM that thought-3SG.FEM [CP że [IP pro1 [VP dostanie t ]]]]]? what receive-3SG.FUT "What car did Maria say she thought she would receive?"

(13) Maria (*pieniądze) powiedziała, [CP że (*pieniądze) Piotr (*pieniądze) oddał (*pieniądze) bratu tWP]. Maria money said that money Piotr money returned money brother "Mary said that Piotr had returned the money to his brother."