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This paper is concerned with reduced contrastive *wh*-clefts and reduced identificational *wh*-clefts. I argue that cases of apparent *wh*-movement of bare *wh*-expressions are instances of reduced contrastive *wh*-clefts and reduced identificational *wh*-clefts. This paper first deals with the semantics and syntax of reduced contrastive *wh*-clefts which have the same properties as contrastive *wh*-clefts. The three major consequences of analyzing apparent cases of *wh*-movement are considered. First, only *wh*-subjects can occur as a cleftee. Second, *wh*-objects can occur as a cleftee only when passive markers are present. Last, only *who* can occur as a cleftee. These restrictions result naturally from the analysis. The remainder of the paper is devoted to reduced identificational *wh*-clefts. In particular, they involve clefting of D-linked *wh*-expressions. I argue that the semantics and syntax of reduced identificational *wh*-clefts share the same properties as identificational *wh*-clefts. Two predictions that result from the analysis are discussed.
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1. Introduction

In Thai, when *wh*-questions are formed, the *wh*-expression—be it subject (henceforth *wh*-subject), object (*wh*-object), indirect object (*wh*-indirect object) or possessor (*wh*-possessor)—occurs in the same position as the corresponding non-*wh*-expression in declarative sentences. This is illustrated in (1) for *wh*-subjects, in (2) for *wh*-objects, in (3) for *wh*-indirect objects, and in (4) for *wh*-possessors.

(1) \[k^{h}\text{ray}\] si: nānśi: mī:awa:nñi:
VARIABLE+HUMAN buy book yesterday
‘Who bought a book yesterday?’ \(WH\)-SUBJECT

(2) Nit si: \[\hat{\text{ray}}\] mī:awa:nñi:
buy VARIABLE–HUMAN yesterday
‘What did Nit buy yesterday?’ \(WH\)-OBJECT

(3) Nit háy nānśi: \[k^{h}\text{ray}\] mī:awa:nñi:
give book VARIABLE+HUMAN yesterday
‘To whom did Nit give a book yesterday?’ \(WH\)-INDIRECT OBJECT

* I would like to express my thanks to Rose-Marie Déchaine, Martina Witschko, Henry Davis, Lisa Matthewson, Felicia Lee, Kayono Shiobara, Keying Woo and anonymous reviewers for their insightful and helpful discussions and comments. I am, however, solely responsible for the content of the paper.

The examples in (1) through (4) establish that Thai \textit{wh}-expressions occur in their base-generated position, i.e. Thai is a \textit{wh} in-situ language.

In this paper, I am primarily concerned with an apparent case of \textit{wh}-movement, as exemplified in (5) and (6), where a \textit{wh}-expression is found in the sentence-initial position.

(5) [kʰray] rāk Nít THAI \textit{WH} IN-SITU VARIABLE+HUMAN love ‘Who loves Nít?’

(6) [kʰray tʰi:] rāk Nít THAI APPARENT \textit{WH}-MOVEMENT VARIABLE+HUMAN DET love ‘Who is the one that loves Nít?’

I also look at another case of apparent \textit{wh}-movement, which involves discourse-linked \textit{wh}-expressions such as \textit{which} man, as in (7).

(7) [pʰuːtʰa:y kʰon nāy tʰi:] Nít ñà:p cʰā:p man CL VARIABLE COMP hide like ‘Which man does Nít secretly have a crush on?’

At first glance, taken together, the examples in (6-7) suggest that, in addition to \textit{wh} in-situ, there is also \textit{wh}-movement in Thai. This apparent two-way split might seem unsurprising, given that there is independent cross-linguistic evidence for the distinction between \textit{wh} in-situ, partial \textit{wh}-movement and long-distance \textit{wh}-movement. See (8) for examples of these types from Mandarin, German and English.


b. Was meinst du [wen] (dâβ) sie wirklich liebt [+\textit{wh}] think you who that she really loves ‘Who do you think that she really loves?’ (Müller and Sternefeld 1993:486)

c. [\textit{What}] did you think (that) Joey bought?
Despite the surface parallels between the Thai examples in (6-7) and the examples of partial and long-distance wh-movement in (8b-c), I argue that all wh-expressions in Thai are in-situ. Crucially, apparent cases of wh-movement involve the obligatory presence of the determiner \( \tilde{t}i \): immediately following the wh-expression. I argue that \( \tilde{t}i \) clauses such as those in (6) and (7) involve different types of clefting as seen in Malay (Cole and Hermon 2000).

2. Contrastive wh-clefts

In this section, I show that apparent instances of wh-movement of bare wh-expressions equivalent to English who or what are in fact reduced contrastive wh-clefts. I discuss the semantics of contrastive clefts with the overt copula pen and the syntax of contrastive pen clefts and argue that the semantics and syntax of reduced wh-clefts have the same properties as contrastive wh-clefts.

2.1 The semantics of contrastive clefts with the overt copula pen

In Thai, contrastive clefts have the following semantic properties: the cleft clause is associated with an existential presupposition, and the cleftee is associated with a uniqueness presupposition and a contrastive focus. Consider how these properties are exemplified.

(9) \( [\text{DP } \tilde{t}i:] \text{ pen } [\text{aP } \tilde{h} \text{on } \tilde{t}am \text{ ca:n } \text{ tæ:k}] \)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{DEF} & \text{be} \\
\text{NOM} & \text{cause plate break} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Nick was the one that broke a plate.’

Here the cleft clause corresponds to an nP, which is in fact a nominalized clause. This cleft clause has an existential presupposition in that it presupposes the existence of someone who broke the plate. In (9), the cleftee is a DP. This DP has a uniqueness presupposition: Nick is the unique individual that satisfies the existential presupposition introduced by the cleft clause. The source of the uniqueness presupposition is the definite marker \( \tilde{t}i \). The cleftee, in addition to satisfying a uniqueness presupposition, is also contrastively focused, so \( \tilde{t}i \text{k} \) is here contrasted with any other accessible discourse referent. Thus, (9) can be uttered in the situation where \( \tilde{t}i \text{k} \), and no one else, broke a plate.
2.1.1 Contrastive clefts have an existential presupposition

Semantically, the cleft clause in contrastive clefts in Thai is associated with an existential presupposition, as shown in (10).

(10) [DP尼克 [tʰǐː] pen [H蒙 tʰ Amend แคน tæk]]
    DEF be NOM cause plate break
    ‘Nick was the one that broke a plate.’
    → Existential presupposition: x broke a plate.

A context is created where the presence of an existential presupposition is explicitly denied. In such contexts, we expect that contrastive clefts will be infelicitous.

(11) nobody [tʰ Amend แคน tæk]
    noun cause plate break
    ‘Since nobody broke a plate,…’
    a. ไม่ [Rɔːn máy Dop tʰ Amend แคน tæk]
       NEG PAST cause plate break
       ‘…it follows that Ron did not break a plate.’
    b. #ไม่ [Rɔːn tʰǐː: pen H蒙 tʰ Amend แคน tæk]
       NEG yes DEF be NOM cause plate break
       ‘…it follows that it was not Ron that broke a plate.’

(11a) is felicitous as an existential presupposition is unexpected in a non-clefted clause. (11b), however, is infelicitous because the cleft induces an existential presupposition due to the open variable (x broke a plate and Ron is x such that Ron broke a plate) in the cleft clause. As such, the contradiction between the absence of the existential presupposition and a cleft clause results in infelicity.

2.1.2 Contrastive clefts have a uniqueness presupposition

Another semantic property of contrastive clefts in Thai is that the cleftee is associated with a uniqueness presupposition. In a cleft focus, only the unique value can be substituted for the focus position x.

1 # denotes infelicity.
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(12) \[[\text{DP } \text{Nik } t^h] : \text{ pen } [\text{np } k^h \text{ on } t^h \text{ am } ca:n \ tæ:k]\]

\[\text{DEF} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{cause} \quad \text{plate} \quad \text{break}\]

‘Nick was the one that broke a plate.’

→ Existential presupposition: x broke a plate.

→ Uniqueness presupposition: x = only Nick

In a situation containing a contextually given set of individuals, like (13), a unique individual has to be picked out from the set of individuals.

(13) Context: Nick broke a plate, but Nat and New didn’t; i.e. only Nick broke a plate.

Individuals in domain: \{Nick, Nat, New\}

a. \[x \quad t^h \text{ am } ca:n \ tæ:k\]

cause plate break

‘X broke a plate.’

b. alternative propositions

\{Nick broke a plate, Nat broke a plate, New broke a plate\}

focus value of the open proposition

c. \[[\text{DP } \text{Nik } t^h] : \text{ pen } [\text{xp } k^h \text{ on } t^h \text{ am } ca:n \ tæ:k]\]

\[\text{DEF} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{cause} \quad \text{plate} \quad \text{break}\]

‘Nick was the one that broke a plate.’

An additive particle test shows that Thai contrastive clefts are associated with a uniqueness presupposition. Contrastive clefts should not be compatible with additive particles due to their uniqueness presupposition. In the focus position of a cleft, there is a presupposition that the proposition holds true of no other individual(s) than the set referred to in the focus position. Shank (2004) claims that in a focus construction, when a speaker does not aim to contradict another speaker by asserting an alternative proposition, but merely wants to add more information, the speaker can do so by adding an additive particle such as also or too as long as the alternative set of individuals is taken as a true proposition in the given context.

(14), however, demonstrates that only a unique value is acceptable in a cleft focus construction. When an additive particle is inserted, the sentences become infelicitous as seen in (14a-b). This is what we predict in a cleft focus. There is a presupposition that the proposition holds true of no other individual(s) than the set referred to in the focus position. And in Thai, it is this morpheme \(t^h\): that imposes a uniqueness requirement on the cleftee.
(14) Individuals in domain: \{Nick, Nat, New\}
   Context: Nick and Nat each broke a plate, but New didn’t.
   a. #Nick tʰiː: pen kʰ on tʰ am ca:n tæːk
       DEF be NOM cause plate break
   Nát kʰ: dú:ay tʰiː: pen kʰ on tʰ am ca:n tæːk
       also together DEF be NOM cause plate break
   ‘*Nick was the one that broke a plate. Nat was also the one that broke a plate.’
   b. #Ník tʰiː: pen kʰ on tʰ am ca:n tæːk
       DEF be NOM cause plate break
   læʔ? Nát kʰ: tʰ am mìː an kan
       and also do same each
   ‘*Nick was the one that broke a plate, and so did Nat.’

2.1.3 Contrastive clefts have a contrastive focus

   Contrastive pen clefts encode a contrastive focus reading which comes from the
definite marker tʰiː: that introduces a definite reading on the NP that it marks in a
nominal predicational construction. I introduce tʰiː: as a definite marker.\(^2\) tʰiː: functions
as a definite marker in characterizational copula sentences (Kuno and
Wongkhomthong 1981). When tʰiː: is acting as a definite marker, it is only restricted to
characterizational pen copula sentences which take a nominalized clause.

\(^2\) This departs from the traditional view, which treats tʰiː: as a complementizer introducing complement
also treat this morpheme as a complementizer in relative clauses in the next section. There are two
complementizers in Thai that can be used to introduce complement clauses: tʰiː: and wâ:. While tʰiː:
introduces infinitive clauses, wâ: introduces finite clauses.

(i) Nít tǎŋcay tʰiː: càŋ pen kʰ ru:
    intend COMP FUT be teacher
    ‘Nit intends to be a teacher.’
(ii) Nít tǎŋcay wâ: càʔ pen kʰ ru:
    intend COMP FUT be teacher
    Lit.: ‘Nit, intends that (she) will be/become a teacher.’
As for relative clauses, they can be introduced by tʰiː: but not by wâ:.
(iii) a. nəŋšː (lêm) tʰiː: Nít yá:kdyáː pʰæːŋ mák
    book CL COMP want expensive very
    ‘The book that Nit wanted to buy was very expensive.’
b. *nəŋšː (lêm) wâ: Nít yá:kdyáː pʰæːŋ mák
    book CL COMP want expensive very
    ‘The book that Nit wanted to buy was very expensive.’

126
Context: B is talking to A about Ník, but there are two Níks in their high school who they both know: one is a professor, and the other is a high school dropout. A is not sure if they are talking about the same Ník, so he asks B to identify which Ník is under discussion.

A: kʰun pʰuːt tʰrjː [Ník náy]  
    you talk about VARIABLE  
    Lit.: ‘You are talking about which Nick?’  
    ‘Which Nick are you talking about?’

B1: Ník tʰiː pen ¿aːn  
    DEF be teacher  
    Lit.: ‘The Nick who is a professor.’  
    (as opposed to the Nick who is a high school dropout)

B2: #Ník pen ¿aːn  
    be teacher  
    ‘Nick is a professor.’

In (15B1), a specific definite interpretation correlates with the presence of tʰiː; this suggests that tʰiː should be treated as a definite marker. If tʰiː were acting as a complementizer in a relative clause, we would expect the sentence below to be infelicitous because it is a sentence fragment, illustrated in the context below.

(15′) A: kʰun pʰuːt tʰrjː [Ník náy]  
    you talk about VARIABLE  
    Lit.: ‘You are talking about which Nick?’  
    ‘Which Nick are you talking about?’

B1: #Ník tʰiː sɔːn mahāːwitʰayaːlay  
    COMP teach university  
    ‘The Nick that teaches at a university.’

B2: pʰuːt tʰrjː Ník tʰiː sɔːn mahāːwitʰayaːlay  
    talk about DEF teach university  
    ‘(I) am talking about the Nick that teaches at a university.’

In this context, the definite marker tʰiː is obligatory. We saw in (15) the presence of the overt pen copula in nominal predicates. In Thai, predicational/characterizational contexts are distinct from equative/identificational contexts: the former requires the copula pen, and the latter requires the copula kʰiː: (Kuno and Wongkhomthong 1981). This is illustrated in (16).
(16)  a.  cʰán  pen  kʰru:
    I  be  teacher
    ‘I am a teacher.’
  b.  *cʰán  kʰiː:  kʰru:
    I  be  teacher
    ‘I am a teacher.’

According to Kuno and Wongkhomthong (1981), the contrast between (16a) and (16b) is attributable to the nature of characterizational sentences such that ‘being a teacher’ is one of the characteristics that the subject possesses. (16b) is ungrammatical due to the mismatch between a characterizational sentence and the use of the identificational copula kʰiː: in the sentence. (17) shows the opposite of (16), namely, a context where kʰiː: can occur and pen cannot.

(17)  a.  Ník  kʰiː:  kʰon  tʰiː:  cʰán  rák
    be  CL  COMP  I  love
    ‘Nick is the one that I love.’
  b.  *Ník  pen  kʰon  tʰiː:  cʰán  rák
    be  CL  COMP  I  love
    ‘Nick is the one that I love.’

(17a) is an identificational sentence such that the speaker identifies the person whom she loves. This is compatible with the identificational nature of kʰiː: (17b), on the other hand, produces a conflict by the use of the characterizational copula pen in an identificational context, and hence the sentence is ungrammatical. Contrastive clefts are only compatible with the characterizational copula pen, as shown in (18). When the identificational copula kʰiː: is used, the sentence is ill-formed and does not give a contrastive focus interpretation. We see that there is a correlation between the presence of the pen copula and the availability of a contrastive focus reading.

(18)  Context: A mother is furious to know that her expensive china was broken into pieces. She looks fiercely at Nick, Nat and New. Nat suddenly shouts (18a) that Nick is the one who did it, NOT him.
  a.  pen as a characterizational copula
    Ník  tʰiː:  pen  kʰon  tʰam
    DEF  be  NOM  do
    ‘Nick was the one who did it.’
b. $k^h$ i: as an identificational copula

\*Ník $t^h$ i:  $k^h$ on  $t^h$ am  
DEF be  NOM do

‘Nick was the one who did it.’

2.2 The syntax of contrastive clefts with overt pen

Contrastive pen clefts have the following syntactic properties: the cleftee is in the subject position of the pen copula, the cleft is a nominalized clause with the nominalizer $k^h$ on, and the morpheme $k^h$ on is a subject-oriented nominalizer. The example in (19) illustrates a contrastive cleft where the cleftee is introduced by the definite marker $t^h$ i: . The cleft is a nominalized clause headed by the nominalizer $k^h$ on. This nominalized clause is co-indexed with its cleftee linked by the characterizational copula pen.

(19) [Ník $t^h$ i:] pen [NomP $k^h$ on  $t^h$ am  ca:n  t gà:k]  
DEF be  NOM cause  plate  break

‘Nick was the one that broke a plate.’

The structure is shown in (20). Assuming the nP as a nominalized phrase, the referential argument in the Specifier of nP is co-indexed with a pro subject.

(20)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Ník $t^h$ i:} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{pen} \\
\text{‘be’} \\
\text{n} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{k$^h$ on} \\
\text{pro$_i$} \\
\text{t$^h$ am} \\
\text{ca:n} \\
\text{t gà:k} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘cause’ ‘plate’ ‘break’

The morpheme $k^h$ on acts as a subject-oriented nominalizer in contrastive pen clefts, and thus the nominalized clause behaves like a normal noun. To test whether $k^h$ on is a real nominalizer, one can introduce the future marker cà $?$ in the sentence.
Since the nominalizer and the verb cannot be separated, we expect that when the future marker is added, the sentence will be ill-formed. This is confirmed by the data in (21).

(21) a. \( k^h \)on câŋ
   \[\text{NOM employ} \]
   ‘an employer’
   b. *\( k^h \)on câʔ câŋ
   \[\text{NOM FUT employ} \]
   ‘a future employer’

In addition to occurring pre-verbally, \( k^h \)on also occurs post-verbally, as in (22a), in which case it functions as an indefinite pronoun rather than a nominalizer. The introduction of a future marker in such contexts is well-formed, as shown in (22b).

(22) a. pro câŋ \( k^h \)on
   \[\text{employ one} \]
   ≠ (i) ‘an employee’
   = (ii) ‘(pro) employs someone.’
   b. pro câʔ câŋ \( k^h \)on
   \[\text{FUT employ one} \]
   ‘(pro) will employ someone.’

Like an ordinary noun phrase, a nominalized clause like \([k^h \on câŋ]\) can be modified as in (23b), quantified as in (23c) or pluralized by adding a numeral and classifier as in (23d).

(23) a. chán pen \([k^h \on câŋ]\)
   \[\text{I be NOM employ} \]
   ‘I am an employer.’
   b. \([k^h \on câŋ]\) cay rá:y
   \[\text{NOM employ heart cruel} \]
   ‘The cruel employer’
   c. \([k^h \on câŋ]\) baŋ \(k^h \on\) cay rá:y
   \[\text{NOM employ some CL heart cruel} \]
   ‘Some cruel employers’
As a nominalizer, the morpheme $k^h$on is subject-oriented. When we try to nominalize the object with the nominalizer $k^h$on, the sentence becomes ungrammatical, as in (24b). An object can only be nominalized if it is first promoted to a subject via passivization.

(24) a. $k^h$on câ:no $k^h$un
   NOM employ you
   ‘an employer’

b. *$k^h$on $k^h$un câ:no
   NOM you employ
   ‘an employee’

c. $k^h$on tû:k câ:no
   NOM PASS employ
   ‘an employee’

In a contrastive cleft, the cleft clause is nominalized by $k^h$on. In so much as it appears that the cleft clause in contrastive pen clefts is nominalized, only the subject argument is available. Moreover, the nominalizer $k^h$on can only nominalize the subject of a transitive verb, as shown in (25-27). The (b) examples of (26-27) show that the nominalizer nák is used with intransitive verbs.

(25) $k^h$on kêp $\phi$n
   NOM collect money
   ‘a bill collector / a waiter’

(26) a. *$k^h$on wîŋ
   NOM run
   ‘a runner’

b. nák wîŋ
   NOM run
   ‘a runner’

---

3 However, we will see in Section 3 that it can also appear as a classifier, in which case it is not subject to a restriction interpretation. When there is no subject restriction, we have a relative clause.
As a nominalized clause, we can expect that no future marking is allowed in the cleft clause. In (28), when the future tense marker is introduced before the contrastive *pen* copula, the copula is associated with the future tense meaning ‘will be’. However, the example in (29), as expected, is ill-formed when the nominalizer and its verbs get separated by the future tense marker.

(28) *kʰâw tʰiː: câ? pen kʰon hên pʰiː:
    he DET FUT be NOM see ghost
    ‘He **will be** the one who sees the ghost.’
(29) *kʰâw tʰiː: pen kʰ on câ? hên pʰiː:
    he DET be NOM FUT ghost see
    ‘He is the one who **will** see the ghost.’

### 2.3 The semantics of reduced contrastive *wh*-clefs

This section shows that the semantics of reduced *wh*-clefs have the same properties as contrastive *wh*-clefs. There are semantic parallels between contrastive *wh*-clefs and the apparent cases of *wh*-movement, while *wh* in-situ lacks such properties. I propose that apparent cases of *wh*-movement involve no movement but are in fact reduced *wh*-clefs.

(30) [DP kʰray tʰiː: ] pen [NomP kʰon tʰam caːn təːk]
    VARIABLE+HUMAN DEF be NOM cause plate break
    ‘Who was the one that broke a plate?’

The cleft clause, which is in fact a nominalized clause, has an existential presupposition in that it presupposes the existence of someone who broke the plate. In (30), the cleftee is a DP, here *kʰray tʰiː*: This DP has a uniqueness presupposition: in this example *who* seeks the unique individual that satisfies the existential presupposition introduced by the cleft clause. The cleftee, in addition to satisfying a uniqueness presupposition, is also contrastively focused (due to the *pen* copula), so
the *wh*-expression is here contrasted with any other accessible discourse referent. Thus, (30) can be uttered in a situation where there is a presupposition that the proposition holds true of no other individual(s) than the set referred to in the focus position.

### 2.3.1 Reduced contrastive *wh*-clefs have an existential presupposition

A question-answer pair diagnostic shows that apparent cases of *wh*-movement are associated with an existential presupposition, parallel to contrastive *wh*-clefs. *Wh* in-situ, on the other hand, is not associated with an existential presupposition. To illustrate this, consider a context where the answer to the *wh*-question is the empty set ‘no one’. Such an answer is infelicitous with *wh*-clefs as in (31a-b), but felicitous with *wh* in-situ as in (31c).

(31) a. Q: [kʰray] tʰi: pen kʰon tʰam ca:n tæ:k
   VARIABLE+HUMAN DEF be NOM cause plate break
   ‘Who was the one that broke a plate?’ CONTRASTIVE *WH*-CLEFTS
   A: #mây mi: nî
   NEG have speech-level particle
   ‘No one.’

b. Q: [kʰray] tʰi: tʰam ca:n tæ:k
   VARIABLE+HUMAN DEF cause plate break
   ‘Who was the one that broke a plate?’ REDUCED *WH*-CLEFTS
   A: #mây mi: nî

c. Q: [kʰray] tʰam ca:n tæ:k
   VARIABLE+HUMAN cause plate break
   ‘Who broke a plate?’ *WH* IN-SITU
   A: mây mi: nî

### 2.3.2 Reduced contrastive *wh*-clefs have a uniqueness presupposition

Using the same question-answer test, one can show that reduced *wh*-clefs have the same semantic property as contrastive *wh*-clefs in that a speaker expects a unique entity to be singled out. While contrastive *wh*-clefs and their reduced counterpart do not permit more than one person to be singled out as in (32a-b), *wh* in-situ questions do as in (32c).
(32) a. Q: [kʰray]  tʰiː pen kʰ on tʰ am caː n tɛː k
VARIABLE+HUMAN DEF be NOM cause plate break
‘Who was the one that broke a plate?’ CONTRASTIVE WH-CLEFTS
A: #Nick Nát
‘Nick and Nat.’
b. Q: [kʰray]  tʰiː tʰ am caː n tɛː k
VARIABLE+HUMAN DEF cause plate break
‘Who was it that broke a plate?’ REDUCED WH-CLEFTS
A: #Nick Nát
c. Q: [kʰray]  tʰ am caː n tɛː k
VARIABLE+HUMAN cause plate break
‘Who broke a plate?’ WH IN-SITU
A: Nick Nát

2.3.3 Reduced wh-clefts have a contrastive focus

One of the clearest ways of showing the presence of a contrastive focus reading is to create a context where such a contrastive reading is explicitly accepted. In such contexts, we expect that answers that encode a contrastive focus reading are felicitous with contrastive wh-clefts and reduced wh-clefts, but are infelicitous with wh in-situ. The data in (33) show that this is indeed the case.

(33) a. Q: [kʰray]  tʰiː pen kʰ on tʰ am caː n tɛː k
VARIABLE+HUMAN DET be NOM cause plate break
‘Who was the one that broke a plate?’ CONTRASTIVE WH-CLEFTS
A: Ník pen kʰ on tʰ am māy cʰ āy Nát
Nick be NOM cause NEG yes Nat
‘Nick was the one who did it and Nat wasn’t the one who did it.’
b. Q: [kʰray]  tʰiː tʰ am caː n tɛː k
VARIABLE+HUMAN DET cause plate break
‘Who was the one that broke a plate?’ REDUCED WH-CLEFTS
A: Ník pen kʰ on tʰ am māy cʰ āy Nát
c. Q: [kʰray]  tʰ am caː n tɛː k
VARIABLE+HUMAN cause plate break
‘Who broke a plate?’ WH IN-SITU
A: #Ník pen kʰ on tʰ am māy cʰ āy Nát
2.4 The syntax of reduced contrastive *wh*-clefts

The syntactic structure of a contrastive *wh*-cleft is shown in (34). The cleftee is a *wh*-expression marked by the definite marker $t^h\text{î}$. The cleft is a nominalized clause headed by the nominalizer $k^h\text{on}$. This nominalized clause is co-indexed with its cleft, linked by the characterizational copula *pen*.

Reduced contrastive *wh*-clefts have syntactic properties that parallel those of contrastive clefts as follows: the *wh*-expression as the cleftee is in the subject position of an abstract predicational copula (the covert counterpart of *pen*), the cleft is a nominalized clause with an abstract nominalizer (the covert counterpart of $k^h\text{on}$), and the nominalizer is a subject-oriented nominalizer. The question that naturally arises is how reduced *wh*-clefts are associated with an existential presupposition and a contrastive focus reading when the nominalizer $k^h\text{on}$ and the *pen* copula are absent. I repeat the examples in (32).
(35) a. [kʰray]  
   tʰiː  pen kʰɒn tʰam ca:n tæːk  
   VARIABLE+HUMAN DEF be NOM cause plate break  
   ‘Who was the one that broke a plate?’  
   CONTRASTIVE WH-CLEFTS

b. [kʰray]  
   tʰiː  tʰam ca:n tæːk  
   VARIABLE+HUMAN DEF cause plate break  
   ‘Who was the one that broke a plate?’  
   REDUCED WH-CLEFTS

The definite marker tʰiː induces a uniqueness presupposition, which in turn implies an existential presupposition in that the existence of someone must be presupposed before a unique individual is picked out. We can say that the presence of tʰiː in reduced wh-clefts is the source for both existential and uniqueness presuppositions. For contrastive focus, reduced wh-clefts can only allow “bare” wh-expressions as opposed to “D-linked” wh-expressions. We will see later that D-linked wh-expressions involve reduced identificational wh-clefts. This suggests that there might be a correlation between contrastive focus and “bare” wh-expressions.

The structure of the reduced wh-cleft is illustrated below.
We thus conclude that Thai does not exhibit *wh*-movement, although superficially it looks as if it does. The apparent instances of *wh*-movement are attributable to contrastive *wh*-clefts.

### 2.5 Consequences of the contrastive *wh*-cleft analysis

Considered together, the semantic and syntactic evidence reviewed above suggests that the apparent cases of *wh*-movement are derived from contrastive *wh*-clefts. I now consider three consequences of analyzing them as reduced *wh*-clefts. First, there will be an asymmetry between the subject and the object. Second, *wh*-objects are only promoted to *wh*-subjects via passivization. Third, only [+human] subjects are allowed.

#### 2.5.1 An asymmetry between *wh*-subjects and *wh*-objects

In contrastive *wh*-clefts, only *wh*-subjects can occur as a cleftee. As discussed, the nominalizer *khon* is subject-oriented, as shown in the contrast between (37a) and (37b).

(37) a. \[khon\] \(^t^h\): pen \(khon\) câ:ŋ Britney
\[VAR+HUMAN\ DEF be NOM employ\]
‘Who was the one that hired Britney?’

b. \(*[khon]\) \(^t^h\): pen \(khon\) Britney câ:ŋ
\[VAR+HUMAN\ DEF be NOM employ\]
‘Who was the one that Britney hired?’

If the apparent cases of *wh*-movement are derived from contrastive *wh*-clefts, we predict the presence of a subject/object asymmetry whereby only *wh*-subjects can occur as cleftees. This prediction is confirmed by the data in (38), where we can see that there is a subject/object asymmetry in reduced *wh*-clefts. The reduced counterpart is grammatical in (38a) when the copula and the nominalizer are absent, corresponding to the full form of the contrastive *wh*-cleft in (38a). In contrast to this, (38b) is ill-formed, the ungrammaticality arising due to the subject restriction on the nominalizer *khon*.

(38) a. \[khon\] câ:ŋ Britney
\[VAR+HUMAN\ DEF employ\]
‘Who was the one that hired Britney?’
b. *[kʰray tʰi:] Britney câ:ŋ
   VARIABLE+HUMAN DEF employ
   ‘Who was the one that Britney hired?’

2.5.2 *Wh-object can occur as a cleftee with the presence of passive markers

The contrastive *wh-cleft analysis correctly predicts that in reduced *wh-clefs, *wh-objects can occur as a cleftee when the object in the cleft clause is passivized before being nominalized. The data below show that *wh-objects can occur as the cleftee if they are promoted to a subject by one of the passive markers don, dá:y or tʰü:k.

(39) a. [kʰray] tʰi: don tʰamtʰöt mːawa:nːi:
   VARIABLE+HUMAN DEF PASS punish yesterday
   ‘Who was the one that was punished yesterday?’

b. [kʰray] tʰi: dá:y ráp kʰát fiːak pay kʰæ:ŋkʰăn
   VARIABLE+HUMAN DEF PASS receive select choose go contest
   ?o:limpik Olympic
   ‘Who was the one that was chosen to go to the Olympic?’

c. [kʰray] tʰi: tʰü:k fiːak háy ráp tʰun ka:n
   VARIABLE+HUMAN DEF PASS choose give receive scholarship NOM
   siksä: study
   ‘Who was the one that was chosen for a scholarship?’

2.5.3 Only [+human] subjects are allowed

Another consequence of analyzing apparent cases of *wh-movement as reduced *wh-clefs is that [−human] *wh-expressions are not expected to occur as cleftees. As we saw earlier, the nominalizer kʰon is subject-oriented and more specifically, is restricted to [+human] entities. Hence, *wh-expressions with a [−human] feature, a feature equivalent to English *what, are not compatible with the nominalizer kʰon. This explains why the full form on *wh-clefs in (40a) is ungrammatical. Supposing that (40b) is a reduced *wh-cleft of (40a), we would predict that the [+human] mentioned will hold, and it does.
We have seen the following three restrictions apply to reduced wh-clefts: only wh-subjects can occur as a cleftee (due to the inability of the nominalizer $k^h$ on to nominalize the object), wh-objects can occur as a cleftee only when passive markers are present (the object can only nominalize through passivization), and only [+human] subjects can occur as cleftees (due to the incompatibility of the nominalizer $k^h$ on with [−human] arguments). These restrictions result naturally from the contrastive wh-cleft analysis: the apparent cases of wh-movement are reduced wh-clefts, so they have the same structure as contrastive wh-clefts.

3. Identificational wh-clefts

There is another apparent case of wh-movement that crucially allows only discourse-linked wh-expressions (equivalent to English which N) to occur at the left edge. I call these “D-linked wh-expressions”. Consider the ungrammatical example in (41a), in which the wh-expression appears to have undergone movement from its base-generated position. The ungrammaticality is attributable to the absence of the morpheme ลิ, which is required to co-occur with the wh-expression. In contrast, (41b) is a grammatical example in which ลิ is present following the wh-expression in the clause-initial position.

(41) a. *[\text{พุ:ช:าย ก:อน นาย}] \quad \text{นิ: אט:พ ช:ภ:พ}
   \quad \text{man CL VARIABLE hide like}
   \quad \text{‘Which man does Nit secretly have a crush on?’}
   \quad \text{THAI WH IN-SITU}

b. [\text{พุ:ช:าย ก:อน นาย}] \quad ลิ: \quad \text{นิ: אט:พ ช:ภ:พ}
   \quad \text{man CL VARIABLE COMP hide like}
   \quad \text{‘Which man does Nit secretly have a crush on?’}
   \quad \text{THAI APPARENT WH-MOVEMENT}

Despite the surface appearance of wh-movement, I argue that ลิ: clauses with
D-linked \(wh\)-expressions such as those in (41b) are identificational \(wh\)-clefts, and as such are the reduced counterparts of identificational \(k^{bi}\): clefts. Identificational \(k^{bi}\): clefts have a head noun or a classifier, an overt copula (\(k^{bi}\)), and an overt complementizer (\(t^{bi}\)): the clefted element may be a nominal expression, as in (42a), or a \(wh\)-expression, as in (42b). The reduced counterparts of identificational clefts appear in (43). I adopt the same convention by referring to the reduced identificational clefts like (43a) as “reduced clefts”, and the reduced identificational \(wh\)-clefts such as (43b) as “reduced \(wh\)-clefts”.

(42) a. Ron \(k^{bi}\): \(k^{bi}\)on \(t^{bi}\): Nit ?e;p c\(b^{5}\):p

be CL COMP hide like

‘Ron is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on.’

IDENTIFICATIONAL CLEFT

b. [\(p^{h:ch:a:y}\) k\(b^{on}\) n\(a:y\)] \(k^{bi}\): \(k^{bi}\)on \(t^{bi}\): Nit ?e;p c\(b^{5}\):p

man CL VARIABLE be CL COMP hide like

‘Which man is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on?’

IDENTIFICATIONAL \(WH\)-CLEFT

(43) a. Ron \(t^{bi}\): Nit ?e:p c\(b^{5}\):p

COMP hide like

Lit.: ‘(It is) Ron that Nit secretly has a crush on.’

‘Ron is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on.’

REDUCED (IDENTIFICATIONAL) CLEFT

b. [\(p^{h:ch:a:y}\) k\(b^{on}\) n\(a:y\)] \(t^{bi}\): Nit ?e:p c\(b^{5}\):p

man CL VARIABLE COMP hide like

‘Which man is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on?’

REDUCED (IDENTIFICATIONAL) \(WH\)-CLEFT

3.1 The semantics of identificational clefts with the overt copula \(k^{bi}\):

Like the contrastive clefts, identificational clefts are associated with an existential presupposition and a uniqueness presupposition. Identificational clefts, however, do not have a contrastive focus, as seen in (44). In (44b), there is no contrastive focus between Ron and someone else. This illustrates that a cleftee may be unique without being contrastive. This is attributable to the presence of the identificational \(k^{bi}\): copula.
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(44) a. \([NP \text{ Ron}] \quad k^{\text{hi}}: \quad [XP \quad k^{\text{h}} \text{on} \quad t^{\text{hi}}: \quad \text{Nit} \quad ?\text{æːp} \quad c^{\text{h}}\text{ːp}]\]

\[\text{be} \quad \text{CL} \quad \text{COMP} \quad \text{hide} \quad \text{like}\]

‘Ron is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on.’

→ Existential presupposition: there is an x such that Nit secretly has a crush on x.

→ Uniqueness presupposition: only x such that Nit secretly has a crush on x.

b. \(*[\text{Ron}] \quad k^{\text{hi}}: \quad [XP \quad k^{\text{h}} \text{on} \quad t^{\text{hi}}: \quad \text{Nit} \quad ?\text{æːp} \quad c^{\text{h}}\text{ːp}] \quad \text{māy} \quad c^{\text{h}}\text{ːay} \quad \text{Bill}\]

\[\text{be} \quad \text{CL} \quad \text{COMP} \quad \text{hide} \quad \text{like} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{yes}\]

‘Ron is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on, not Bill.’

3.2 The syntax of identificational clefts with overt \(k^{\text{hi}}\):

The syntax of identificational clefts contains an overt copula \(k^{\text{hi}}\): Identificational \(k^{\text{hi}}\): clefts have the following syntactic properties: the cleftant is in the subject position of the identificational \(k^{\text{hi}}\): copula, and the cleft clause is a relative clause with a head noun and/or a classifier followed by the complementizer \(t^{\text{hi}}\), as shown in (45-46). The cleftant is the subject of the \(k^{\text{hi}}\): copula. The cleft is a relative clause that contains a head noun and/or a classifier \(k^{\text{h}} \text{on}\) followed by the complementizer \(t^{\text{hi}}\):

(45) \([\text{Ron}] \quad k^{\text{hi}}: \quad [\text{de pro} \quad [CP \quad k^{\text{h}} \text{on} \quad t^{\text{hi}}: \quad \text{Nit} \quad ?\text{æːp} \quad c^{\text{h}}\text{ːp}]])\]

\[\text{be} \quad \text{CL} \quad \text{COMP} \quad \text{hide} \quad \text{like}\]

‘Ron is the one that secretly has a crush on Nit.’

(46)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\mid \\
\text{I'} \\
\mid \\
\text{I} \\
\mid \\
\text{DP} \\
\mid \\
\text{D'} \\
\mid \\
\text{D} \\
\mid \\
\text{C'} \\
\mid \\
\text{C} \\
\mid \\
\text{IP} \\
\mid \\
\text{k^{h}on} \\
\mid \\
\text{t^{hi}}: \\
\mid \\
\text{Nit} \\
\mid \\
\text{?æːp} \\
\mid \\
\text{c^{h}ːp} \\
\mid \\
\text{e_i} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘CL’ ‘hide’ ‘like’
The head noun can be optional when the classifier is present. Assume that pro is a head noun in the cleft clause. The classifier agrees with the pro in terms of the feature [+human] that is co-indexed with the cleftee (Ron). And the cleftee is linked by the identificational $k^h i$: copula. The head noun is in turn related to a null operator in [Spec, CP]. The null operator does not involve A’ movement. I follow Cheng and Sybesma’s (1999) argument and assume that the $k^h on$ classifier in Thai is functioning as a determiner.

3.2.1 Identificational $k^h i$: copula

In addition to the characterizational pen copula that is used in contrastive clefts, Thai also has an identificational $k^h i$: copula. Kuno and Wongkhomthong (1981) argue for this semantic distinction between these two copulas. One syntactic property that the $k^h i$: copula has is that the subject and the predicate can be switched. This is unsurprising, given that the subject and the predicate are identified as the same person, as in (47), where there is no semantic distinction between (47a) and (47b).

(47) a. $t^h âk신 k^h i$: na:yōk $k^h on$ pâtcuban
   prime.minister CL present
   ‘Thaksin is the present Prime Minister.’

   b. na:yōk $k^h on$ pâtcuban $k^h i$: $k^h un$ $t^h âk신$
   prime.minister CL present be TITLE PREFIX
   ‘The present Prime Minister is Thaksin.’

This predicts that in an identificational cleft, the cleft clause should be able to precede the cleftee (due to the nature of identificational $k^h i$: copula). This prediction is borne out, as in (48), in which Ron and the person that Nit secretly has a crush on are interpreted as one and the same person. This shows that an identificational cleft sentence makes use of identificational $k^h i$: to assert that there is a particular entity that is identified by the definite description contained in the relative clause.

(48) a. [Ron] $k^h i$: [XP $k^h on$ $t^h i$: Nit $?æ:p$ $c^b:\hat{\iota}:p$]
   be CL COMP hide like
   ‘Ron is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on.’

   b. [XP $k^h on$ $t^h i$: Nit $?æ:p$ $c^b:\hat{\iota}:p$] $k^h i$: [Ron]
   CL COMP hide like be
   ‘The one that Nit secretly has a crush on is Ron.’
3.2.2 Cleftee is a relative clause

In this section, I argue that in an identificational $k^h_i$: cleft, the cleft is a relative clause. This differs from the contrastive $pen$ cleft, which I have shown to be a nominalized clause. The cleft is in the subject position of the identificational $k^h_i$: copula in a cleft clause, a head noun is dropped, the morpheme $k^h on$ is a classifier and a relative operator in a relative clause, and the morpheme $t^h_i$: is a complementizer in a relative clause.

3.2.2.1 pro as a head noun in relative clauses

In the present analysis, the cleftee is in a relation with a relative clause which takes a pro head. In Thai relative clauses, the head noun and the classifier usually co-occur; however, when the head noun is overt, the classifier is optional. On the other hand, the classifier is obligatory when the head noun is covert in order to allow recoverability of the head noun. The classifier must agree in feature with the noun that it occurs with. In (49a), $k^h on$ is a classifier for a [+human] noun and agrees with the head noun man in terms of the feature [+human]. On the other hand, tua in (49b) is a classifier for a [−human] noun, and it produces a conflict in feature agreement between the classifier and the head noun man, resulting in ungrammaticality.

(49) a. $p^hû:c^hâ:y$ $k^h on$ $t^h_i$: Nit $?æ:p$ $c^hâ:p$
  man  CL  COMP  hide  like
  ‘The man that Nit secretly has a crush on…’

b. $*p^hû:c^hâ:y$ tua $t^h_i$: Nit $?æ:p$ $c^hâ:p$
  man  CL  COMP  hide  like
  ‘The man that Nit secretly has a crush on…’

In the previous section, I analyzed the morpheme $k^h on$ as a nominalizer which was subject-oriented. This means that when there is no subject restriction, we have a relative clause, which gives us an identificational cleft; however, when there is a subject restriction, we have a nominalized clause, which is used to construct contrastive clefts.

3.2.2.2 The morpheme $t^h_i$: as a complementizer in a relative clause

In Thai, there is never an overt wh-operator in relative clauses; however, a head noun and/or a classifier are obligatorily followed by $t^h_i$: Cross-linguistically, relative
clauses are embedded inside a nominal expression which the relative clause modifies. Examples of English relative clauses are given below.

(50) a. *[The man [who that I like]]
   b. [The man [who Ø I like]]
   c. [The man [Ø that I like]]
   d. [The man [Ø Ø I like]]

In (50a), the relative pronoun and the complementizer are both overt, which gives rise to the ungrammaticality of the sentence. In (51b), the relative pronoun who is overt, and the complementizer is covert, in (51c), the relative pronoun is covert, and the complementizer is overt, and in (51d), both the relative pronoun and the complementizer are absent. The restrictions on relative operator and complementizer patterning are illustrated in (51) for Thai relative clauses. Taken together, the examples in (51a-d) show that ใih: is an overt complementizer and must be obligatorily present in a relative clause.

(51) a. pʰūːcʰaːy kʰon ṭʰːi: Nit cʰːp
    man CL VARIABLE like
    ‘The man that Nit likes…’
   b. *pʰūːcʰaːy kʰon Ø Nit cʰːp
   c. pʰūːcʰaːy Ø ṭʰːi: Nit cʰːp
   d. *pʰūːcʰaːy Ø Ø Nit cʰːp

3.3 The semantics of reduced identificational wh-clefts

In this section, I argue that there are semantic parallels between identificational wh-clefts and ṭʰːi: clauses with D-linked wh-expressions. Wh in-situ constructions, however, lack these properties. With this in mind, consider the example in (52).

(52) [pʰūːcʰaːy kʰon nāy] kʰːi: kʰon ṭʰːi: Nit ?ǣːp cʰːp
    man CL VARIABLE be CL COMP hide like
    ‘Which man is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on?’

It is the definite description in the cleft relative clause that gives rise to a uniqueness presupposition. The cleftee pʰūːcʰaːy kʰon nāy ‘which man’ and the cleft clause are connected by the identificational kʰːi: copula. The identificational kʰːi: copula, in turn, is the source of an existential presupposition. However,
identificational *wh*-clefts do not have a contrastive focus reading. The cleftee is a unique individual but need not be contrasted with any other accessible discourse referent.

### 3.3.1 Reduced identificational *wh*-clefts have an existential presupposition

I use the same diagnostic to show that *tî* clauses with D-linked *wh*-expressions are associated with an existential presupposition parallel to identificational *wh*-clefts. Reduced *wh*-clefts require the existence of someone in the answer. In contrast, an answer to a *wh* in-situ question is not restricted to the presence of an existential presupposition. In identificational *wh*-clefts, the speaker presupposes the existence of the cleft that *Nit likes x* and asks the question to find out *who is x such that Nit has a crush on x*. When the answer is given as *Nit has a crush on no one*, the presupposition is explicitly denied. The fact that the answer of *no one* is infelicitous in (53b) entails that (53b) behaves in parallel with the identificational *wh*-cleft in (53a). This follows if (53b) is a reduced form of (53a). In contrast to *wh*-clefts in (53c), the *wh* in-situ is not associated with an existential presupposition. So the answer *no one* is acceptable.

(53) a. Q: [pʰʰ:ɕʰːaːy kʰːon nʰːy] kʰːon tʰːiː: Nit ʔæːp ɕʰːp
   man CL VARIABLE be CL COMP hide like
   ‘Which man is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on?’
   IDENTIFICATIONAL *WH*-CLEFT

   A: #mây mi: nî
      NEG have SPEECH-LEVEL PARTICLE
      ‘No one.’

   b. Q: [pʰʰ:ɕʰːaːy kʰːon nʰːy] tʰːiː: Nit ʔæːp ɕʰːp
      man CL VARIABLE COMP hide like
      ‘Which man is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on?’
      REDUCED *WH*-CLEFT

   A: #mây mi: nî

   c. Q: Nit ʔæːp ɕʰːp [pʰʰ:ɕʰːaːy kʰːon nʰːy]
      hide like man CL which
      ‘Which man does Nit secretly have a crush on?’
      *WH* IN-SITU

   A: mây mi: nî
3.3.2 Reduced identificational *wh*-clefts have a uniqueness presupposition

The answer to (54a) is infelicitous because two members are picked out from the answer set and identificational clefts require an answer to be uniquely singled out. Reduced *wh*-clefts behave the same way, as in (54b). On the other hand, with *wh* in-situ questions, the answer is not required to be a unique individual. The question can be uttered in a situation in which the speaker does not expect Nit to like only one person.

   man CL which be CL COMP hide like
   ‘Which man is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on?’

   IDENTIFICATIONAL *WH*-CLEFT
   like two CL and
   ‘She likes both: Sompong and Somchaay.’

   man CL VARIABLE COMP hide like
   ‘Which man is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on?’

   REDUCED *WH*-CLEFT

   hide like man CL which
   ‘Which man does Nit secretly have a crush on?’

   *WH IN-SITU

3.3.3 Reduced identificational *wh*-clefts lack a contrastive focus

This section shows that reduced identificational *wh*-clefts lack contrastive focus. The contrastive focus answer given to identificational *wh*-clefts, as in (55a-b), is infelicitous because the identificational *wh*-cleft is asking the hearer to pick out a single and unique member from the answer set, rather than asking for a person who is being contrasted with any other accessible discourse referent. Notice that the same answer is infelicitous with the *wh* in-situ construction as well.

The reduced *wh*-clefts have the same semantic properties as identificational *wh*-clefts: an existential presupposition (due to the infelicity of a negative answer to a *wh*-cleft), a uniqueness presupposition (due to the infelicity of the answer denoting
more than one member in the answer to a wh-cleft), and the lack of a contrastive focus (due to the infelicity of a contrastive focus answer).

   man CL VARIABLE be CL COMP hide like
   ‘Which man is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on?’
   IDENTIFICATIONAL WH-CLEFT
   A: #Sompɔːŋ māy cʰāy Sōmɛchʰa:y
   NEG yes
   ‘Sompong, not Somchaay.’

   b. Q: [pʰû:chʰa:y kʰon nāy tʰː:] Nit ?æːp cʰːːp
   man CL VARIABLE COMP hide like
   ‘Which man is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on?’
   REDUCED WH-CLEFT
   A: #Sompɔːŋ māy cʰāy Sōmɛchʰa:y

   c. Q: Nit ?æːp cʰːːp pʰû:chʰa:y kʰon nāy
   hide like man CL VARIABLE
   ‘Which man does Nit secretly have a crush on?’
   WH IN-SITU
   A: #Sompɔːŋ māy cʰāy Sōmɛchʰa:y

3.4 The syntax of reduced identificational wh-clefts

   I established above that identificational wh-clefts have the following syntactic properties: the cleftee as a D-linked wh-expression is in the subject position of the identificational kʰː: copula, and the cleft clause is a relative clause with a head noun and/or a classifier followed by the complementizer tʰː:. The structure of (56) is illustrated in (57).

(56) [pʰû:chʰa:y kʰon nāy] kʰː: [pro [kʰon tʰː: Nit ?æːp cʰːːp]]
   man CL VARIABLE be CL COMP hide like
   ‘Which one is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on?’

   The question that arises with respect to the cleft clause of (57) is why it is possible in reduced wh-clefts to drop both the pro subject and the classifier at the same time. We see that only the complementizer tʰː: is overt, as illustrated in (58).
The answer is that the head noun and its classifier are spelled out, but only in the cleftee via the D-linked \textit{wh}-expression. There is no need to spell it out twice. Recall that identificational \textit{wh}-clefts can have the cleft and the cleftee reversed. In reduced \textit{wh}-clefts, however, the cleft clause \textit{that Nit secretly has a crush on} is not allowed to be in the subject position. The D-linked \textit{wh}-expression must occur at the left edge. Why is this so? It may be because the left edge position is a structurally dedicated focus position in this language as in topicalization (Hoonchamlong 1991).

3.4 Consequences of the identificational \textit{wh}-cleft analysis

This section considers two major consequences of analyzing $\textit{ti}$: clauses with D-linked \textit{wh}-expressions as reduced \textit{wh}-clefts. First, there should be no asymmetry between \textit{wh}-subjects and \textit{wh}-objects. They are both predicted to occur in a cleftee position. Second, there should be no featural restrictions on D-linked \textit{wh}-expressions. In particular, both [+human] and [–human] are predicted to occur in a cleftee position.

3.4.1 The lack of asymmetry between \textit{wh}-subjects and \textit{wh}-objects

Analyzing D-linked \textit{wh}-expressions as reduced \textit{wh}-clefts, we expect that the D-linked \textit{wh}-expressions in the cleftee position can be associated with a gap in either the subject or the object position of a relative clause. In (59a), the D-linked \textit{wh}-expression is construed as a \textit{wh}-subject in a cleftee position, while in (59b), the D-linked \textit{wh}-expression is construed as a \textit{wh}-object. The cleftees are co-indexed with the relativized head nouns in both positions. The relativized head nouns, in turn, are co-indexed with the (optional) resumptive pronoun in subject and object positions inside the relative clause, as in (59a-b). The reduced identificational \textit{wh}-clefts with D-linked \textit{wh}-expressions show the lack of a subject-object asymmetry. In (59a), the reduced D-linked \textit{wh}-expression is construed as a \textit{wh}-subject, and in (59b) it is construed as a \textit{wh}-object.

(59) a. $[\text{p}^h\text{ú}:\text{c}^b\text{a}^y \text{k}^b\text{on náy}]$ \textbf{k}^b\text{i}: \text{k}^b\text{on} \textbf{t}^b\text{i}: \text{?æ}:\text{p} \text{c}^b\text{ò}:\text{p} \text{Nit}$

\hspace{1cm} ‘Which man is the one that secretly has a crush on Nit?’

b. $[\text{p}^h\text{ú}:\text{c}^b\text{a}^y \text{k}^b\text{on náy}]$ \textbf{k}^b\text{i}: \text{k}^b\text{on} \textbf{t}^b\text{i}: \text{Nit} \text{?æ}:\text{p} \text{c}^b\text{ò}:\text{p} \text{Nit}$

\hspace{1cm} ‘Which man is the one that Nit secretly has a crush on?’
(60) a. \[p^h\dot{u}:c^h:a:y \quad k^h:on \quad t^h:i: \quad ?æ:p \quad e^h:ɔ:p \quad Nît\]...
   man \quad CL \quad COMP \quad hide \quad like
   ‘The man that secretly has a crush on Nît…’

   b. \[p^h\dot{u}:c^h:a:y \quad k^h:on \quad t^h:i: \quad Nît \quad ?æ:p \quad e^h:ɔ:p\]...
   man \quad CL \quad COMP \quad hide \quad like
   ‘The man that Nît secretly has a crush on…’

(61) a. \[p^h\dot{u}:c^h:a:y \quad k^h:on \quad nîy\] \quad t^h:i: \quad ?æ:p \quad e^h:ɔ:p \quad Nît
   man \quad CL \quad VARIABLE±HUMAN \quad COMP \quad hide \quad like
   ‘Which man is the one that secretly has a crush on Nît?’

   b. \[p^h\dot{u}:c^h:a:y \quad k^h:on \quad nîy\] \quad t^h:i: \quad Nît \quad ?æ:p \quad e^h:ɔ:p
   man \quad CL \quad VARIABLE±HUMAN \quad COMP \quad hide \quad like
   ‘Which man is the one that Nît secretly has a crush on?’

These above examples in (59-61) suggest that reduced D-linked \textit{wh}-expressions are indeed derived from identificational \textit{wh}-clefts because \textit{wh}-subjects and \textit{wh}-objects are able to occur in a clefted position, as expected, if relativization is involved.

### 3.4.2 Both [+human] and [−human] are allowed in a clefted position

In reduced \textit{wh}-clefts with D-linked \textit{wh}-expressions, a [+human] feature (\textit{which man}) is in a clefted position. We expect that the clefted should not be restricted to only [+human]. The cleft clause is formed by a relative clause, in which case any [+human] head noun feature can be relativized. Reduced \textit{wh}-clefts are given a parallel analysis to identificational \textit{wh}-clefts. Hence, we should expect to see [−human] occur in a clefted position. This prediction is in fact borne out, as shown in (62).

(62) a. \[mâ: \quad tua \quad nîy \quad t^h:i: \quad kât \quad Nît\]
   dog \quad CL \quad VARIABLE \quad COMP \quad bite
   ‘Which dog was the one that bit Nît?’

   b. \[mâ: \quad tua \quad nîy \quad t^h:i: \quad Nît \quad sî: \quad ma:\]
   dog \quad CL \quad VARIABLE \quad COMP \quad buy \quad come
   ‘Which dog was the one that Nît bought?’

### 3.5 Predictions of the identificational \textit{wh}-cleft analysis

This section discusses the two predictions of treating \textit{t^h:i:} clauses with D-linked \textit{wh}-expressions as identificational \textit{wh}-clefts. These predictions help shed some light on the nature of \textit{wh}-intervention effects and \textit{wh}-argument locatives in Thai. Both
wh-intervention effects and wh-argument locatives are derived from reduced (identificational) wh-cLEFTs.

### 3.5.1 Identificational wh-cLEFTs rather than wh-intervention effects

Beck and Kim (1997) investigate wh-intervention effects cross-linguistically and argue that wh-expressions cannot move across certain interveners (i.e. negation quantifiers, focus phrases) to take scope over the clauses at LF. However, these interveners do not block overt wh-movement. The following data from Korean and Mandarin illustrate their generalization (Beck and Kim 1997). In (63a), *anyone* is an intervener when the wh-expression *who* covertly moves across the intervener at LF. This intervention effect results in the ungrammaticality of the sentence. In contrast, in (63b), it is grammatical when the wh-expression overtly moves across the intervener *anyone*.

(63) a. *amuto nuku-lûl po-cian-ass-ni
t anyone who-ACC see-NEG-PAST-Q
‘Whom did no one see?’  Wf-INTERVENTION EFFECTS: KOREAN
b. nuku-lûl amuto tî po-cian-ass-ni
who-ACC anyone see-NEG-PAST-Q
‘Whom did no one see?’  Wf-INTERVENTION EFFECTS: KOREAN

In (64a), *anyone* is an intervener and blocks the LF movement of the D-linked wh-expression *which book*. Hence, ungrammaticality of the sentence arises. In (64b), the intervener *anyone* does not block the overt wh-movement of the D-linked wh-expression, resulting in a grammatical sentence.

(64) a. *[shei ye] kan bu dong [na-ben shu]
who also (=anyone) read not understand which-CL book
‘Which book could no one understand?’  Wf-INTERVENTION EFFECTS: CHINESE
b. [na-ben shu] [shei ye] kan bu dong
which-CL book who also (=anyone) read not understand
‘Which book could no one understand?’  Wf-INTERVENTION EFFECTS: CHINESE

At first glance, it seems that there are wh-intervention effects in Thai. This is illustrated in the examples below. The wh-word does not have a wh-construal when
the intervener mâymi:\textsuperscript{k}ray ‘no one’ appears between the in-situ variable and the clause over which the variable takes scope. It can only have an NPI-construal, as in (65a). However, in (65b), where the \textit{wh}-word is at the left edge, it only gets a \textit{wh}-construal.

(65) a. mâymi:\textsuperscript{k}ray $\text{c}^{5:p}$ $[\text{\textsuperscript{k}ray}]$
    no-have-VARIABLE$+$HUMAN like VARIABLE$+$HUMAN
    $\neq$ (i) ‘Who does nobody like?’
    = (ii) ‘Nobody likes anyone.’

b. $[\text{\textsuperscript{k}ray}]$
    $\text{t}^{\text{âi}}$: mâymi:\textsuperscript{k}ray $\text{c}^{5:p}$
    VARIABLE$+$HUMAN COMP no-have-VARIABLE$+$HUMAN like
    = (i) ‘Who is the one that no one likes?’
    $\neq$ (ii) ‘Nobody likes anyone.’

In (66a), the D-linked \textit{wh}-expression does not have an NPI construal, in contrast to the previous example given in (65a). The example (66a) is ungrammatical instead. But when the D-linked \textit{wh}-expression is at the left edge, the sentence becomes grammatical. It can have a \textit{wh}-construal.

(66) a. *mâymi:\textsuperscript{k}ray $\text{k}\text{âwca\textsuperscript{y}}$ [nā\textsuperscript{šī}: lēm nāy]
    no-have-VARIABLE$+$HUMAN understand book CL VARIABLE$-$HUMAN
    ‘Which book did no one understand?’

b. [nā\textsuperscript{šī}: lēm nāy]
    $\text{t}^{\text{âi}}$: mâymi:\textsuperscript{k}ray
    book CL VARIABLE$+$HUMAN COMP no-have-VARIABLE$+$HUMAN
    $\text{k}\text{âwca\textsuperscript{y}}$
    understand
    ‘Which book was the one that no one understood?’

Despite the surface parallels between the Thai examples in (65b) and (66b), and the corresponding examples of \textit{wh}-intervention effects in Korean and Chinese in (63b) and (64b), I will argue that (65b) and (66b) are a kind of reduced (identificational) \textit{wh}-clefts. Consider the example (65a), where a variable receives only an NPI construal. This can be straightforwardly accounted for by the operator-variable analysis. The closest [NEG] operator is the one that gives the variable the interpretation. We would expect the D-linked \textit{wh}-expression in (66a) to be construed as an NPI. However, the sentence (66a) is ungrammatical. This raises an interesting question regarding why the negative quantifier blocks \textit{wh}-construal for the D-linked \textit{wh}-expression in (65a) and does not license NPI construal either, but forces the overt
movement. Intuitively, what is happening is that the NPI reading is ruled out for pragmatic reasons. The D-linked \(wh\)-expression is only chosen to have a \(wh\)-construal in this context. This results in ungrammaticality, as in (65a). The variable looks for the closest operator and cannot look past the closest c-commanded operator (due to a locality condition). In order for a \(wh\)-construal to be available for (65a) and (66a), the \(wh\)-expressions must be at the left edge via a reduced \(wh\)-cleft construction. In reduced \(wh\)-clefts, the \(Q_{[wh]}\) operator is now the closest c-commanding operator. The negative quantifier is generated lower than the \(wh\)-expression, and hence is not qualified to be the operator for the \(wh\)-expression. Rather than treating (65b) as a \(wh\)-intervention effect, I argue that (65b) is a reduced \(wh\)-cleft. Recall that there are two notable properties about the clefted element in reduced identificational \(wh\)-clefts. First, the clefted element may only be a D-linked \(wh\)-expression. Secondly, it may have a \(wh\)-object construal that is linked to the gap inside the relative clause. (65b) contradicts the first property. It is the bare \(wh\)-expression that occupies the clefted element position. However, this bare \(wh\)-expression is equivalent to the D-linked \(wh\)-expression \textit{which} \(N\). This question requires an answer restricted to the set of individuals common to both the speaker and hearer. Crucially, there is a presupposed set of individuals from which the answer is selected. The \(wh\)-expression \textit{who} in (65b) has a \(wh\)-object construal linked to the gap inside the relative clause \textit{who/which one; is the one; that nobody likes} \(e_i\). The \(wh\)-object construal in the clefted element is not possible for a reduced (contrastive) \(wh\)-cleft (due to the internal structure of a nominalized clause). I show that (65b) has the same semantic properties as identificational \(wh\)-clefts by using a question-answer pair test. As predicted, the answer (Ai) to the question (67), repeated from (65b), is pragmatically odd. Another semantic property discussed is that \(wh\)-clefts have a uniqueness presupposition. Only a single and unique individual can be identified in order to satisfy the uniqueness presupposition. The answer (Aii) to the question (67) turns out to be infelicitous, just as one would predict given that there are two individuals identified in the answer. These semantic and syntactic effects are attributable to a cleft structure.

\[ (67) \text{Q: } [k^h\text{ray } t^h\text{i:}] \text{ m\text{\text{\text{'}}}ay\text{\text{\text{'}}}m\text{\text{\text{'}}}k^h\text{ray } c^b\text{s}:p \]
\[ \text{VARIABLE+HUMAN \ COMP no-have-VARIABLE+HUMAN like} \]
\[ \text{‘Who/which one is the one that no one likes?’ REDUCED WH-CLEFT} \]

Ai: #m\text{\text{\text{'}}}ay \ mi: \ n\text{\text{\text{\text{}}}i \]
\[ \text{NEG have SPEECH-LEVEL PARTICLE} \]
\[ \text{‘No one.’} \]

Aii: #Paris, Nicole
3.5.2 *Wh*-argument locatives as D-linked *wh*-expressions

In this section, I first argue that *tʰiː* clauses with *wh*-argument locatives are instances of reduced *wh*-clefts. Then, I consider the consequence of analyzing *tʰiː* clauses with *wh*-argument locatives as reduced identificational *wh*-clefts. I claim that a *tʰiː* clause with a *wh*-argument locative in Thai is a D-linked *wh*-expression *which place*, rather than a bare *wh*-expression *where*, as shown in (68-69). In (68), the *wh*-argument locative occurs with a *tʰiː* clause. As a clefted element, it is linked to the gap in the relative clause in the subject position. The *wh*-argument locative in (69) is related to the gap in the object position. The *tʰiː* clauses with *wh*-argument locatives appear to have the same properties as identificational *wh*-clefts.

(68) Q: [tʰiː nāy] tʰ: tʰamhāy kʰ: un prathāpcay
   place VARIABLE COMP make you impress
   ‘Which place impressed you?’
   REDUCED *WH*-CLEFT: LOCATIVE SUBJECT

(69) Q: [tʰiː nāy] tʰ: Nit cʰːp pay nāŋ
   place VARIABLE COMP like go sit
   ‘Which place does Nit hang out?’
   REDUCED *WH*-CLEFT: LOCATIVE OBJECT

Recall that the clefted element may only be a D-linked *wh*-expression in identificational *wh*-clefts. By this claim, there is a possibility that Thai *wh*-argument locatives may have the status of D-linked *wh*-expressions. There is also independent evidence to treat *wh*-argument locatives as D-linked *wh*-expressions. The evidence comes from how *wh*-argument locatives are morphologically composed, as in (70b). Compare the examples of Thai D-linked *wh*-expressions in (70a) and (70b). In (70a), the NP *man* is optional and is accompanied by its counterpart classifier. Notice that in (70b), the noun and its classifier are homophonous. This is not accidental because some nouns can serve as a classifier on their own; in this case, *place* serves as its own classifier.⁴

(70) a. (pʰːuːcʰːːy) kʰ on nāy
    man CL VARIABLE
    ‘Which man?’

⁴ *tʰiː* ‘place’, on the other hand, is accidentally homophonous with the complementizer *tʰiː*.
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b. (tʰː /iː) tʰː: nāy
   place CL VARIABLE
   ‘Which place?’

(70b) illustrates that the locative tʰː /iː: is in fact functioning as both a noun place and its counterpart classifier. In the Thai how many question construction, how many only takes classifiers as its noun. It is ungrammatical when how many is followed by the noun book. But when it is followed by its classifier (lêm), the sentence becomes grammatical. In order to show that tʰː /iː: has a dual function—place and a classifier for place, we expect tʰː /iː: to be grammatical when we introduce it in a how many type question. The example in (71b) turns out just as predicted.

(71) a. *kʰun sî: ma: ki: *nāŋsî/lêm
   you go come how many book/CL
   ‘How many books did you buy?’
b. kʰun pay du: ma: ki: tʰː /iː:
   you go look come how many CL
   ‘How many places did you take a look at?’

The fact that tʰː /iː: can function as a classifier on its own suggests that tʰː /iː: nāy ‘(place) CL which’ is a D-linked wh-expression.

4. Summary

I have argued, in this paper, that tʰː /iː: clauses with bare wh-expressions and D-linked wh-expressions in Thai take the form of a contrastive and an identificational wh-cleft type structure⁵ respectively. I have provided several arguments to show that these tʰː /iː: clauses with D-linked wh-expressions have the same predictably semantic and syntactic properties as both contrastive and identificational wh-clefts.
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⁵ I reject a focus phrase analysis because it cannot account for the full range of facts associated with the semantic and syntactic properties of the tʰː /iː: clause in Thai.
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泰語子句左端的 wh-疑問詞：對比與識別分裂句

Sugunya Ruangjaroon
Srinakharinwirot University

本研究旨在探討泰語中簡化的對比分裂句與識別分裂句。個人認為一個句子中的單純 (bare) wh-疑問詞若有明顯的 wh-移位現象，即是簡化的對比分裂句或識別 wh-分裂句。本文首先就語意與句法的層面來討論簡化的對比分裂句，主要的發現有三：其一，只有 wh-主語可以作為受分裂的對象 (cleftee)；其二，wh-賓語只有在句中出現被動標記時才可作為受分裂的對象；其三，wh-疑問詞中只有 who 可作為受分裂的對象。本文其餘部分則是探討簡化的識別分裂句的 wh-疑問語詞在涉及與篇章接連 (D-linked) 的用法。本研究認為簡化的識別分裂句與一般的識別分裂句具有相同的語意與句法特性。

關鍵詞：(簡化的)對比 wh-分裂句、(簡化的)識別 wh-分裂句、單純 wh-疑問詞、篇章接連的 wh-疑問詞