

# Focusing (on) *Wh*-Subjects

Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng  
Leiden University/LUCL

Cable (2017), using data from Hungarian (and Dholuo), suggests that the relationship between *wh*-words, *wh*-questions and focus is more indirect than current work suggests. I take this as the starting point of my talk. I use data from Zulu, a *wh*-in-situ language, to argue that both syntactically and prosodically, *wh*-phrases do behave like focused phrases. I then discuss the subject-non subject asymmetry in Zulu *wh*-questions: though *wh* non-subjects can stay in-situ, *wh*-subjects cannot; they have to be clefted. I argue that the subject-restriction in Zulu is on a par with anti-agreement facts in languages like Berber. This requires that the *wh*-phrases, regardless of whether they are in-situ or clefted, have to undergo subsequent covert *wh*-movement. I show that we can analyze Hungarian exactly the same way (following Lipták, 2001).

## References

- Cable, Seth. 2017. Focusing in on *Wh*-words, focus and focus movement. Talk presented at Workshop Pesetsky 60.
- Lipták, Anikó. 2001. On the syntax of *wh*-items in Hungarian. Doctoral Dissertation, Leiden University.