**Dr. Sugunya Ruangjaroon**
**Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities, Srinakharinwirot University**

**Thai Wh-adjuncts**

**Abstract**
In this paper, I claim that Thai wh-adjuncts occur in a predictable order relative to one another. They have been traditionally described as not occuring in a rigid order with respect to one another (Hoonchamlong 1991, Sornlertlamvanich, Charoenporn, and Isahara 1997). Their claim is based on non wh-adjuncts (i.e. locative, temporal and rationale) that may occur in-situ or at the beginning of the clause. I contradict such a claim and argue that Thai wh-adjuncts occur in a predictable order relative to one another.

Also, I establish a further claim that there are two distinct classes of wh-adjuncts: VP wh-adjuncts and IP wh-adjuncts. This distinction can explain why there are asymmetries within the class of wh-adjuncts with respect to focus movement. Some wh-adjuncts are only locally re-ordered (short scrambling) and others undergo A' movement. This is attributable to the fact that VP wh-adjuncts and IP wh-adjuncts choose different strategies for focus displacement. Focus is derived by short scrambling for the former, while it is derived by A' movement for the latter. This supports Hoonsringam's claim (2001) that wh-adjuncts, in particular 'why' in-situ, can also be interpreted as a focus asking for a reason that motivates proposition. She however argues that the fronted 'why' and the in-situ 'why' are semantically different in that the former asks for a reason that motivates an event, while the latter asks for a reason/purpose or something which is a result of an event.

Data

(1)  a.   Q: Lék     **cà?**    riːancòp     **[mɨ̂ːarày]**
              *fut     graduate         when*
          When will Lek graduate?                                    Wh in-situ

          A: piː  nâː
          *year next*
          Next year

     b.   Q: **[mɨ̂ːarày]**  Lék   **cà?**   riːancòp
              *when*              fut     graduate*
          When is it exactly that Lek will graduate?            Wh-movement

          A: hên      wâː    cà?    sɔ̀ːp    klaːN   dɨːan   nâː
             *see      comp  fut    defend  middle  month  next*
          She told me that she will be defending in the middle of next month.


(2)  a.   Nít    mây    yàː   **[tʰammay]**
                 *neg    divorce   why*
       = (i)  Nit did not divorce and why is that so?            Wh in-situ
       ≠ (ii) Why was it exactly that Nid did not divorce?

     b.   **[tʰammay]**   Nít    mây    yàː
          *why*                  neg    divorce*

Why was it exactly that Nit did not divorce?      Wh-movement

(3) a. * Nít   tʰɨN   yà:   **[tʰammay]**
     *even*   *divorce*   *why*
     Why was it exactly that Nit divorced?      Wh in-situ

     b. **[tʰammay]**   Nít   tʰɨN   yà:
     *why*      *even*   *divorce*
     Why was it exactly that Nit divorced?      Wh-movement

(4) a. * man   cɨN   **càʔ**   mɔ̀ʔ      **[yaNNay]**
     *it*      *fut*   *appropriate*      *how*
     How will it be appropriate?      Wh in-situ

     b. **[yaNNay]**   man   cɨN   **càʔ**   mɔ̀ʔ
     *how*      *it*      *fut*   *appropriate*
     How will it be appropriate?      Wh-movement

## Bibliography

Blain, Eleanor. 1997. Wh-constructions in Nêhiyawêwin. Doctoral dissertation, UBC.

Cole, Peter and Gabriella Hermon. 1998. The typology of Wh-movement: Wh questions in Malay. *Syntax* 1, 221-258.

Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon and Norhaida Bt. Aman. 2000. Clefted questions in Malay? In David Gil and James Collins (eds.), To appear in Malay/Indonesian Linguistics. London: Curzon Press.

Cole, Peter and Gabriella Hermon. 2000. Partial Wh movement: evidence from Malay. In Lutz. U, Mueller. G, and A. Von Stechow (eds.), To appear in *The Syntax and Semantics of Partial Movement.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, Clare. 2004. Adjunct extraction in Nêhiyawêwin and Yorùbá: neither adjunction nor extraction. Syntax generals paper, University of British Columbia.

Cook, Clare. 2004. Argument-adjunct asymmetries in wh-construction. CLA presentation, Manitoba, May 2004.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie. 2002. Decomposing focus: evidence from Yorùbá. Triggers for Movement workshop, Tilburg University, 24-26 October, 2002.

Denham, Kristin. 2000. Optional Wh-movement in Babine-Witsuwit'En. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 18 (2), 199-251.

Guglielmo, Cinque. 1999. Adverbs and functional heads: a cross-linguistic perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hagstrom, Paul. 1998. Decomposing questions. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. Indefinite pronouns. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hedburg, Nancy. 2000. The referential status of clefts. *Language* 76 (4), 891-920.

Kuno, Susumo and Preya Wongkhomthong. 1981. Characterizational and identificational sentences in Thai. *Studies in language* 5, 65-109.

Lee, Felicia. 2001. Wh- and focus are not the same projection. In K. Megerdoomian and L.A. Bar-el (eds.) WCCFL 20 Proceedings. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer

Saddy, Douglas. 1991. Wh scope mechanisms in Bahasa Indonesia. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 15, 183-218.

Thomas Ernst. 2002. The syntax of adjuncts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.