Wh-Clefting

1. Potsdam (2009)

1.1. WO and WH correlations

Starting point:

(1) *Greenberg’s Universal 12* (Greenberg 1963)
   If a language has dominant order VSO in declarative sentences, it always puts interrogative words or phrases first in interrogative word questions.

Given that V-initial word order is (can be) derived in different ways, is it the case that all derivational paths result in the same correlation?

(2) *Derivational paths to V1* (Potsdam 2009:740)
   a. right specifier (RIGHT SPEC)
   b. verb raising (V RAISING)
   c. predicate fronting (VP RAISING)
   d. subject lowering (S LOWERING)

(3) *Derivational paths to Wh1* (Potsdam 2009:743)
   a. wh-movement (WH MVT)
   b. focus fronting (FOCUS MVT)
   c. cleft or pseudocleft structure (CLEFT)

Research question:

(4) Are there any correlations between the derivational strategy that a language employs to obtain V1 (V RAISING, VP RAISING, RIGHT SPEC, or S LOWERING) and its strategy for forming Wh1 wh-questions (WH MVT, FOCUS MVT, CLEFT)?  (Potsdam 2009:746)
(5) Reported approaches to V1 and Wh1 for Austronesian languages (Potsdam 2009:749)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANG</th>
<th>WO</th>
<th>V1 DER</th>
<th>Wh1 DER</th>
<th>Wh-ARGS IN-SITU?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malagasy</td>
<td>VOS</td>
<td>VP raising</td>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>VSO</td>
<td>VP raising</td>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuean</td>
<td>VSO/VOS</td>
<td>VP raising</td>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seediq</td>
<td>VOS</td>
<td>VP raising</td>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toba Batak</td>
<td>VSO/VOS</td>
<td>VP raising</td>
<td>??, Mvt</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>VSO/VOS</td>
<td>V raising</td>
<td>Cleft, Mvt</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>VSO/VOS</td>
<td>V raising</td>
<td>Cleft, Mvt</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvaluan</td>
<td>VSO/VOS</td>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>VSO/VOS</td>
<td>S lowering</td>
<td>Mvt</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palauan</td>
<td>VOS</td>
<td>Right spec</td>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) Universal 12-VP: If a language uses VP raising to derive V1 word order, then it cannot have wh-movement. (Potsdam 2009:749)

1.2. Wh-clefts and Verb-initial Word Order in Austronesian Languages

Connection with VP-fronting:

Infl has a [Pred] feature and not a [D] feature.

Pseudo-noun incorporation:

Niuean (Massam 2001: 157)

(8) [VP Tagafaga ika] tumau ni a ia.

hunt fish always Emph ABS he

‘He is always fishing.’

WH-cleft: WH word contained in clause-initial predicate

Niuean (Massam 2003: 97)

(9) [IP [Ko hai] [Γ [DP [CP ne lalaga e kato e:]]]]?  
PRED who C weave ABS basket this

‘Who wove this basket?’

Connection with TP-fronting:

=> Seediq WH-clefts for nominative DPs, in-situ for non-nominative DPs:

Seediq

(10) a. Rulu [DP ka [CP b<n>ari=na]].

car NOM <PRV>buy=3SG.GEN

‘What he/she bought is a car.’
b. Maanu [DP ka [CP b<n>ari=na]]?
   what NOM <PRV>buy=3SG.GEN
   ‘What did he/she buy?’
c. [CP [TP Wada m-ari manu ] ka Ape tTP ]?
   PAST INTR-buy what NOM APE
   ‘What did Ape buy?’

TP-fronting analysis:

Seediq
(11) a. Wada burig-un na Ape ka patis.
   PAST buy-TR ERG Ape ABS book
   ‘Ape bought the book.’
b. Wada=na s-tabu huling ka buuts rodux.
   PAST=3SG.ERG APP-feed dog ABS bone chicken
   ‘She fed the chicken bones to a/the dog.’
c. Wada m-ari hulama ka Ape.
   PAST INTR-buy treat ABS Ape
   ‘Ape bought a treat.’
d. FocP=CP
   TP Foc’
   Foc TopP
   DP Top’
   Top[D*] <TP>
   …tDP…

Applied to wh-questions:

Seediq (Chang 1997:146)
(12) a. Ima (ka) [CP Op [TP s<m>ebut top laqi ]]
   who Abs <Intr>hit child
   ‘Who hits a child?’
b. *S<m>ebut laqi ka ima?
   <Intr>hit child Abs who
   ‘Who hits a child?’
Some support:
=> Inverse pseudoclefts in English: (Heggie 1998)

(13) a. Bill’s tie is what Mary hates.  (Pseudocleft)

b.  
```
  IP  
  /   
 /    
DP   I'  
   /    
Bill’s tie  I  
   /     
  be  VP  
     /  
   CP2 
      /  
   tDP  CP1  
      /  
   what  C’
      /  
   C  IP  
      /  
Mary hates
```

(14) a. What Mary hates is Bill’s tie.  (Inverse)

b.  
```
CP3 
 /  
 CP1  C’
   /  
 is  IP  
  /  
 DP  I’  
   /  
 Bill’s tie  tv+1  VP  
       /  
      tv  CP2  
         /  
        tDP  tCP1
```
But Tagalog (and perhaps other Austronesian) pseudoclefts do not seem to be reversible:

\[ \text{Initial XP is always focused} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{Tagalog} \\
(15) \quad \text{a.} & \quad [\text{Ang \ lalaki}] \text{ ang na-kita ng babae.} \\
& \text{Abs man Abs Perf-see Erg woman} \\
& \text{‘It is the man that the woman saw.’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad [\text{Ang na-kita ng babae}] \text{ ang lalaki.} \\
& \text{Abs Perf-see Erg woman Abs man} \\
& \text{‘It the one that the woman saw which is the man.’}
\end{align*}

2. Extending the Correlation

\begin{align*}
(16) \quad \text{Universal 12-VP: If a language uses VP raising to derive V1 word order, then it cannot have wh-movement.} & \quad \text{(Potsdam 2009:749)}
\end{align*}

This generalization may very well prove to be true, but is it general enough?

2.1. Clefting and wh-fronting

Tagalog \(wh\)-questions: Cleft (or in-situ) for DP WH-words; Movement for non-DPs

\begin{align*}
\text{Tagalog} \\
(17) \quad \text{a.} & \quad \text{Ano} \quad [\text{DP ang} \quad [\text{CP ga-gaw-in=mo}]]? \\
& \text{what} \quad \text{FUT-do-TR=2SG.GEN} \\
& \text{‘What are you going to do?’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad [\text{CP Saan=siya} \quad \text{[TP bi-bili ng bahay t\text{saan}]]}. \\
& \text{where}=3\text{SG.NOM} \quad \text{FUT-buy GEN house} \\
& \text{‘Where will he/she buy a house?’}
\end{align*}

Tagalog focus movement:

\[ \text{PP can front; need not be predicate} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{Tagalog} \\
(18) \quad \text{a.} & \quad \text{Bi-bili si Maria ng bahay sa Maynila.} \\
& \text{FUT-buy NOM Maria GEN house in Manila} \\
& \text{‘Maria will buy a house in Manila.’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Sa Maynila bi-bili si Maria ng bahay.} \\
& \text{in Manila FUT-buy NOM Maria GEN house} \\
& \text{‘Maria will buy a house \textit{in Manila}.’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Tagalog} \\
(19) \quad \text{a.} & \quad \text{*Sa Maynila si Maria.} \\
& \text{in Manila NOM Maria} \\
& \text{‘Maria is in Manila.’}
\end{align*}
b. Na-sa Maynila si Maria.
   be-in Manila NOM Maria
   ‘Maria is in Manila.’

2.2. SVO languages with clefting

2.2.1. Indonesian

Standard Indonesian is SVO but requires either clefting or in-situ for DP wh-questions.

Indonesian
     Ali Act-buy buku
     ‘Ali bought a book.’
   b. Siapa [yang mem-beli buku-nya]?
     who C Act-give book-Def
     ‘Who bought the book?’

The clause introduced by yang is indeed a relative clause.

Indonesian (Cole & Hermon 2005: 66)
(21)  a. [Buku [yang tidak akan kami baca]] sangat menarik.
     book that not will we read very interesting
     “The book that will not be read by us is very interesting.”
     child that not we hit-Appcl that meN-cry
     “The child that wasn’t hit by us is crying.”

2.2.2. Zulu

Basic SVO word order:

(22)   Zulu (Cheng & Downing 2007, 2009)
   a. (Bá-níké ú-Síphó í-maali.)
      2SUBJ-give 1-Sipho 9-money
      ‘They gave Sipho money.’
   b. (Ú-Síph’ ú-phékél’ ú-Thánd’ in-kúukhu.)
      1-Sipho 1SUBJ-cooked for 1-Thandi 9-chicken
      ‘Sipho cooked chicken for Thandi.’

Subject wh-in-situ:

(23)   Zulu (Cheng & Downing 2011)
   a. (kú-fúnda baaní)
      17SUBJ-read who
      ‘Who is reading?’
   b. (kw-ázi baaní)
      17SUBJ-know who
      ‘Who knows?’
No subject *wh*-movement; preverbal *wh*-DP must be cleft predicate:

(24) **Zulu** (Cheng & Downing 2011)
    a. (u-báan’) (6-thwel’ ámá-thaanga) (Zulu; Cheng & Downing 2011)
        COP-who REL.1SUBJ-carry 6-pumpkin
        ‘Who is carrying the pumpkins?’ [lit. ‘It is who who is carrying the pumpkins?’]
    b. *ú-bani a-thwel’ ámá-thanga
       1-who 1SUBJ-carry 6-pumpkin

Non-subjects are *wh*-in-situ (immediate post-verbal position):

(25) **Zulu** (Cheng & Downing 2011)
    (U-wa-thwéle ngáan’) (amá-thaanga)?
    2S.SUBJ-6OBJ-carry how 6-pumpkin
    ‘How are you carrying the pumpkins?’

3. V-raising versus VP-raising

(26) (Oda 2005:118-9; cited in Potsdam 2009:751)
    a. rich and uniform subject-verb agreement  V RAISING  VP RAISING
       required  disallowed
    b. **nominal predicate fronting**  disallowed  required
    c. SV/VS alternation  possible  disallowed
    d. *wh*-in-situ  possible  required
    e. **wh*-movement  possible  disallowed
    f. questioning of VP-internal elements  possible  disallowed

Nominal predicate fronting in Irish:

**Irish** (Doherty 1997)

(27) Sin thall Dónallj.
that over.there Dónall
Is [cara leisj] mo dheartháir.
friend with.him my brother
‘That’s Dónall over there. My brother is a friend of his.’

Scottish Gaelic *wh*-questions appear to be clefts.

**Scottish Gaelic** (Adger and Ramchand 2005:164-5)

(28) a. an leabhar a cheannaich thu an diugh
    the book C-REL bought you today
    ‘the book that you bought today’
    b. Co a bha sgith?
    who C-REL be-PAST tired
    ’Who was tired?’
c. ‘S e Iain a bha sgith.
   it’s Iain C-REL be-PAST tired
‘It is Iain that was tired.’
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