Optional *wh*-movement is discourse-connected movement in Eastern Cham
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**Abstract.** Eastern Cham (Austronesian: Vietnam) exhibits apparent optional *wh*-movement, which shares properties with apparent topicalization. This paper demonstrates that it is not true *wh*-movement, but *discourse connected*, or DC-movement. DC requires a phrase to have an antecedent in a prior sentence and for the antecedent’s sentence and the anaphor’s sentence to be in a particular discourse structural configuration. Data from complex DP’s, specifically partitives, inventory forms, and close appositives demonstrate that DC is a property of referential indices that bind DP’s. The incompatibility of *wh*-phrases and topicality is then explained as the inability of *wh*-phrases to supply referential indices on their own.
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1. **Introduction.** *Ā*-movement operations to the left periphery seem to exhibit variation as to whether they are optional or obligatory. *Wh*-movement in languages like English is taken to be obligatory (1a). In situ *wh*-phrases (setting aside *do*-support) are typically argued to mark echo questions, with special pragmatic and prosodic properties, labelled ‘EQ’ below. Topicalization, however, appears to be optional (1b). Moved and in situ topics can have comparable pragmatic interpretations and prosody.

(1) a. {Which soup} do you like {which soup}_{EQ}?
   b. {THE GAZPACHO}, I like {THE GAZPACHO}…

In terms of syntax, these movement operations have been distinguished in terms of Agree (cf. Chomsky 2005, 2008). *Wh*-movement involves an Agree relation between C and the *wh*-phrase. Topicalization, or any movement operation with information structural or discourse-related effect, has been argued to be triggered just by an Edge Feature, in the absence of an Agree relation (contra the Cartographic enterprise: Rizzi 1997, among others, who do posit topic features).
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In some languages, such as Eastern Cham (Austronesian: Vietnam), however, *wh*-phrases appear to be optionally Ā-moved.\(^1\) *Wh*-phrases can be moved to the left periphery (2a), much like topicalization (2b), with only a discourse-related effect. This raises a problem: how can *wh*-movement be optional if it involves an Agree relation with C? Denham (2000) argues for an analysis with optional projection of CP. Cheng (1991, 1997) and others argue through the Clausal Typing Hypothesis that optional *wh*-movement does not exist: the *wh*-phrases must have been moved for some other reason, such as clefting.

(2) a. *Hagait há daok mbeng? / Há daok mbeng hagait?*  
{\textit{kɛɪt}} hi t\textcircled{p} bāŋ {\textit{kɛɪt}}  
what 2SG PROG eat what  
‘What are you eating?’

b. *Ing-aong ni kau daok mbeng. / Kau daok mbeng ing-aong ni.*  
{\textit{ʔiŋʔɔŋ ni}} kāw t\textcircled{p} bāŋ {\textit{ʔiŋʔɔŋ ni}}  
frog this 1SG PROG eat frog this  
‘This frog, I am eating.’

In this paper, optional *wh*-movement is argued not to be true *wh*-movement, but the same movement operation as topicalization (cf. also Mathieu 2004; Pan 2014 for similar analyses). However, this raises a second problem: how can *wh*-phrases be topicalized? Owing to their interrogative or focal nature (assuming a dichotomy between topic and focus), some have claimed that *wh*-phrases cannot be topics (e.g. Cable 2008; Cruschina 2012; 158). This paper proposes a solution to this problem with two parts. First, the movement operations in (2a–b) are due not to topicality, but discourse connectedness (DC), a property defined in terms of discourse structure. DC is not incompatible with focus, as it is not an information structural notion. Second, it is shown that DC marks not a whole DP, but its referential index. *Wh*-phrases can be pied-piped if they have a DC-marked referential index. However, they themselves cannot directly be marked as DC, affirming the intuition that *wh*-phrases should not be referential.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. First, Section 2 demonstrates that there is no phrasal *wh*-movement in Eastern Cham, only covert movement of the Q-particle. Second, locality effects indicate that topicalization and the movement of *wh*-phrases are triggered by the same syntactic feature (Section 3). Section 4 presents a new analysis of both movement operations as discourse connected-, or DC-movement. Section 5 presents data from partitives, and other complex DP’s that elucidates the role of referential indices in DC-marking and their interaction with *wh*-phrases. Section 6 concludes.

\(^1\)Data for this paper were collected by the author in Vietnam from 2015–2018 with 33 native speaker consultants born and raised in the Cham villages near Phan Rang, Vietnam. Eastern Cham is an SVO language with little bound morphology. For Eastern Cham examples, the first line represents a Romanization of Cham script known as Rumi. The second, IPA, in line with the Chamic linguistic tradition. Open circles underneath consonants indicates falling, breathy tone or register on the following vowel. The following abbreviations are used \text{CLF} = \text{numeral classifier}, \text{COMP} = \text{complementizer}, \text{EMPH} = \text{emphatic particle}, \text{FEM} = \text{feminine proper noun}, \text{NEG} = \text{negation particle}, \text{PROG} = \text{progressive aspect marker}, \text{ROOT} = \text{root modal}, \text{SG} = \text{singular}, (\text{VN}) = \text{loanword or code-switching in Vietnamese}.  
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2. Covert Q-movement. Before addressing whether there is optional wh-movement in Eastern Cham, it is necessary to understand the underlying mechanism by which wh-phrases are interpreted. In the basic case, wh-phrases are in situ in Eastern Cham, much like many languages of East and Southeast Asia (cf. Cheng 1991, 1997). Cable (2010) makes a finer-grained distinction between types of wh-in situ languages: those that involve covert phrasal movement to C and those that involve movement of just the Q-particle. At issue is whether wh-phrases show effects of moving at LF to the left periphery.

Eastern Cham wh-phrases do involve some relation with C, as they are sensitive to island constraints. As shown in (3a), an in situ wh-phrase is ungrammatical within a relative clause island, even though no overt movement has occurred. The same context is grammatical without a wh-phrase (3b). This implies that there exists some Agree relation between C and wh. Note that wh-phrases are generally acceptable in situ in embedded clauses.

(3) a. *Hâ blei dò mbeng baow thei ngap?
   *hɨ plɛ̆j d̥̣̄j po thɛ̆j nã?
   2SG buy stuff(VN) eat COMP who make
   INTENDED: ‘You buy the food that who makes?’

b. Kau blei dò mbeng baow amaik kau ngap.
   kăw plɛ̆j d̥̣̄j po mɛʔ kăw nã?
   1SG buy stuff(VN) eat COMP mother 1SG make
   ‘I buy the food that my mother makes.’

However, intervention effects demonstrate that in situ wh-phrases cannot covertly move. In (4a), a wh-phrase is under the scope of tha çɛ̆j ‘only’, an intervention effect trigger in Eastern Cham. Kotek (2014, 2017) argues that intervention effects arise when a wh-phrase cannot escape the scope of an intervention trigger through overt or covert movement. The ungrammaticality of (4a) indicates that wh-phrases have no option to covertly move. As predicted, overt movement is sufficient to obviate intervention (4b).

(4) a. *Sa drei sa-ai Thuận takrâ aia bai halei min?
   *tha çɛ̆j ?aj thuán ki ?jæ pæj hlej mĩn
   only older.sibling Thuận like soup which EMPH
   INTENDED: ‘Which soup does only Thuận like to eat?’

b. Aia bai halei sa drei sa-ai Thuận takrâ mĩn?
   ?jæ pæj hlej, tha çɛ̆j ?aj thuán ki ?jæ pæj hlej mĩn
   soup which only older.sibling Thuận like EMPH
   ‘Which soup does only Thuận like to eat?’

Cf. also true wh-in situ languages like Vietnamese (Tsai 2009), where wh-phrases have been argued to be interpreted in situ as variables.

The complementizer po is necessary to distinguish between a relative clause reading and a serial verb construction.
Thus, Eastern Cham *wh*-phrases are not interpreted by covert phrasal movement. They must be interpreted by movement of the Q-particle. It should be noted that this Q-particle is null in Eastern Cham, but perhaps overt in closely related languages like Moken (Baclawski Jr. & Jenks 2016). Given that in situ *wh*-phrases are interpreted in this way, it would be surprising for there also to be optional phrasal movement.

3. **Locality effects.** In this section, apparent *wh*-movement is shown to be featurally identical to topicalization by locality effects. Both are sensitive to island constraints (5a–b). It should be noted that there is a hanging topic construction, not shown here, that is distinguished by a pause and resumptive pronoun, not seen in the kind of topicalization examined in this paper.

(5) a. *Thei, hâ blei dô mbeng baow ngap?*
   *thɛ̆j hi plɛ̆j dɔ̀ bæŋ po thɛ̆j nɔ̀?
   who 2SG buy stuff(VN) eat COMP make
   INTENDED: ‘You buy the food that who makes?’

b. *Amaik kau, kau blei dô mbeng baow ngap.*
   *mɛʔ kɔ̀w p̥lɛ̆j dɔ̀ bæŋ po mɛʔ kɔ̀w nɔ̀?
   mother 1SG buy stuff(VN) eat COMP make
   INTENDED: ‘I buy the food that my mother makes.’

Locality effects arise when there are multiple phrases in the left periphery. In general, when there are multiple phrases in the left periphery, the movement chains must be nested in the sense of Pesetsky (1982). (6a) gives an example of nested paths: the movement path of *han ni ‘this cake’* does not cross that of *nî? mɛj thît nà ‘that little girl’*. However, in (6b), the paths cross, and the result is ungrammatical. Baclawski Jr. & Jenks (2016) analyze the same effect in Moken (Austronesian: Thailand) with multiple probes in the left periphery.

(6) a. *Ahar ni anâk kumei sit nan Thuận da-a mai mbeng.*
   han ni nî? mɛj thît nà, thûn ʔa nî? mɛj thît nà maj
   cake this child woman small that Thuận invite come
   bâŋ han-ni
eat
   ‘This cake, Thuận invited that little girl to come eat.’

b. *Anâk kumei sit nan ahar ni Thuận da-a mai mbeng.*
   nî? mɛj thît nan han ni thûn ?a nî? mɛj thît nà maj
   child woman small that cake this Thuận invite come
   bâŋ han-ni
eat
   INTENDED: ‘This cake, Thuận invited that little girl to come eat.’

When there is one topic and one *wh*-phrase in the left periphery, the same effect holds. If the paths are nested (7a), the result is grammatical. If they are crossed (7b), it is strongly and consistently ungrammatical. This follows if there are two probes in the left periphery both searching for the same feature.
One hypothesis is that these probes are searching for a general Ā-feature in the sense of Aravind (2017, 2018), and others. Such an Ā-feature could include topic and wh. Aravind (2017) uses these general features to explain similar path containment effects in English. A general Ā-feature would not account for Eastern Cham, though, because in situ wh-phrases do not intervene on movement of topics or other wh-phrases (8a–b).

Wh-phrases, in situ or not, are taken to be assigned a general Ā-feature, and in other languages such as English and Malayalam, they do in fact intervene on movement (Aravind 2017). Something else is driving the movement in Eastern Cham.

Topicalization and the movement of wh-phrases in Eastern Cham are instances of the same movement operation from a featural standpoint. Both are driven by the same syntactic feature. However, this raises a problem. If that feature is [topic], it would require wh-phrases to be able to be marked as topical. This is problematic under certain views of information structure. Cruschina (2012), and others argue that there is an incompatibility between topic and focus or interrogativity.

4. Discourse connectedness. This section begins to answer how wh-phrases can appear to be topical by redefining both categories. What seems to be topicalization is in fact discourse connected- or DC-movement, and what appears to be optional wh-movement is DC-movement of a wh-phrase. Discourse connectedness, first observed by López (2009) (as [+anaphora]) for clitic right-dislocation in Catalan, has two components (9).
First, the phrase in question must be a discourse anaphor, an anaphor whose antecedent is in a prior sentence in the discourse. Second, the antecedent’s sentence must discourse subordinates the anaphor’s sentence (10).

(9) DISCOURSE CONNECTEDNESS (DC): For antecedent \( x \in \) sentence \( \phi \) and anaphor \( y \in \) sentence \( \psi \), \( y \) is DC iff \( \phi \) discourse subordinates \( \psi \)

(10) DISCOURSE SUBORDINATION: Sentence \( \phi \) discourse subordinates sentence \( \psi \) if \( \psi \) is interpreted as a subpart of the focus space denoted by \( \phi \), but not vice versa.

Discourse subordination was first defined in terms of focus spaces and attention states by Grosz & Sidner (1986) (as ‘dominance’). Subsequently, it has been defined in terms of embedded eventualities (cf. Asher & Lascarides 2003; Asher & Vieu 2005 in Segmented Discourse Representation Theory), or in terms of discourse intentions (cf. Mann & Thompson 1988 in Rhetorical Structure Theory, as ‘nucleus-satellite relations’).

Informally, it involves two sentences, or discourse units, one of which elaborates on the other and leaves it open for future discussion. Why should discourse subordination be relevant to an anaphor? According to the Right-Frontier Constraint (Polanyi 1985; Webber 1988), discourse subordination is one of multiple conditions that render an antecedent accessible for anaphora. Discourse connectedness restricts discourse anaphora to just this one condition, resulting in a stronger, more specific anaphoric relation.

To illustrate, consider the discourse in (11a–b). (11a) contains an antecedent ‘frog’. (11b) has an anaphor, identical to its antecedent. That anaphor can be DC-moved, because the two sentences are in a subordinating discourse relation. One elaborates upon the other. The same anaphoric relation is present in (b’). However, DC-movement is illicit, because the sentence is not in a subordinating relation. Instead, it is interpreted as a separate event.

(11) a. CONTEXT: ‘Look at Thuận cook frog.’
   b. \( \text{Ing-aong nyu ngap bingi ralo.} \)
      \{\text{ʔiŋʔɔŋ} \ \text{ŋu} \ \text{ŋaʔ} \ \text{ŋi} \ \text{lo} \}
      \{\text{frog} \ 3.ANIM \ make \ be.delicious \ very \}
      ‘He makes[cooks] frog very well [Lit: deliciously].’  \( \checkmark \) Subordination(a,b)
   b’. \( \text{Sôn ngap ing-aong hu o.} \)
      \{\text{ʔiŋʔɔŋ} \ \text{ŋu} \ \text{ŋaʔ} \ \text{ŋi} \ \text{o} \}
      \{\text{frog} \ 3.ANIM \ make \ be.delicious \ very \}
      ‘Sôn does not know how to make[cook] frog.’ \( \times \) Subordination(a,b’)

The same holds for wh-phrases. The antecedent in brackets in (12a) defines a set of two pots. Both (12b,b’) have anaphors that refer to that set in the form of wh-phrases. However, only (12b) is in a subordinating discourse relation with (12a), as it is interpreted within the same event. By contrast, (12b’) is interpreted as a separate event, and DC-movement is infelicitous.
a. CONTEXT: ‘Look at my father boil [one pot of fish and one pot of frog].’

b. *Urak ni, gaok hagait ong nan daok ngap nan?*
   ja ni {kɔʔ kɛɪt} oŋ nān tɔʔ nā? {} nān
   now pot what old.man that PROG make that
   ‘Now, what pot is that old man making [working on]?’ √Subordination(a,b)

b’. *Urak ni, ong nan daok mbeng gaok hagait nan?*
   ja ni {#} oŋ nān tɔʔ bāŋ {kɔʔ kɛɪt} nān
   now old.man that PROG eat pot what that
   ‘Now, what pot is that old man eating?’ ×Subordination(a,b’)

Topicality does not directly account for the pattern above. If topic is defined in terms of old information (e.g. Chafe 1976), it is insufficient to distinguish between the (b) and (b’) sentences. Both have identical prior information states (i.e. (a)). Topic is also defined in terms of aboutness, as in the phrase around which a sentence is organized (e.g. Reinhart 1981). Some analyses preclude wh-phrases from being topics altogether, which would not account for the Eastern Cham data.5 Otherwise, both the (b) and (b’) sentences can be construed as being about the set of pots (cf. Casielles-Suarez 2004; 23; López 2009; 27 for other arguments against old information and aboutness topic). Nevertheless, aboutness has some explanatory power: only the (b) examples can be paraphrased with ‘As for X…’, at least in the English glosses (cf. Reinhart 1981). Discourse connectedness provides a concrete way to encode the pattern above, which can be embedded within broader theories of discourse (i.e. Segmented Discourse Representation Theory or Rhetorical Structure Theory).

Encoding anaphoric relations between discourse moves has some precedent in the literature. According to Büring (2003), Constant (2014), and others, contrastive topics require a discourse anaphoric relation within a complex Question Under Discussion (QUD). There must be an antecedent and an anaphor within a subpart, or strategy, to answer a broader QUD. This is comparable to discourse connectedness, as both involve leaving a prior sentence open for further discussion. However, these accounts of CT are more restricted: they require open Questions Under Discussion and an element of contrast. In Eastern Cham DC-movement, contrast is never present, and open QUD’s are not required.6 Other models of discourse have posited less restricted relations between sentences. Onea (2013, 2016) posits that certain phenomena are sensitive to Potential Questions, any question that is compatible with the presuppositions of the prior sentence. Discourse connectedness is more restricted, requiring discourse subordination, though an analysis could be construed within the Potential Question framework, especially following Onea (2016), which integrates Potential Questions with Segmented Discourse Representation Theory.

As detailed above, discourse connectedness is defined in terms of discourse structure, not pure topicality. DC is not necessarily incompatible with wh-phrases. It is widely accepted that wh-phrases, especially discourse-, or D-linked wh-phrases, can have
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5López (2009) also restricts the ability of wh-phrases to be assigned [+anaphora] due to the fact that they cannot be clitic right-dislocated in Catalan.
discourse antecedents in some way (cf. Pesetsky 1987; Comorovski 1996). DC simply requires that a phrase have an antecedent and their respective sentences have a certain type of relation in the discourse. The following section examines these antecedents in more detail.

5. Referential indices. This section examines complex DP’s, such as partitives, and finds that only referential indices are DC-marked. It has been argued that definite DP’s of various kinds contain syntactic instantiations of their domain restrictions. These domain restrictions are generally filled by indices supplied by the context. For example, Patel-Grosz & Grosz (2017) propose the structures in Figure 1 for personal and demonstrative pronouns (cf. also Schwarz 2009). Demonstrative pronouns are distinguished from personal pronouns by an additional DP projection, which merges a referential index from the context set, here, 7, for example.

Figure 1: Pronoun structure, as per Patel-Grosz & Grosz (2017; 7–8))

(a) Personal pronoun

(b) Demonstrative pronoun

With this in mind, it has been argued that overt pronouns or other DP’s can specify the reference of the referential indices. As evidenced by Huang et al. (2009; 298) and Jenks (2018), close appositives such as (13a) in Mandarin Chinese are structurally singular DP’s in which the element on the left overly marks the referential index that binds the definite DP on the right. Eastern Cham has a similar close appositive (13b). Note that the root modal hu is clause-final and has scope over the predicate.

(13) a. wo xihuan [Zhangsan, Lisi na ji-ge guai haizi]_{DP}.
   ‘I like Zhangsan and Lisi those several-clf good children’
   MANDARIN
   (Huang et al. 2009; 299)

b. Hâ da-a Phú saong Hoa, dua urang nan hu.
   ‘You can invite Phú and Hoa, those two people.’

Two additional constructions have similar properties. Partitives are formed in Eastern Cham by moving a noun that originates lower in the DP to a higher position (14a). The noun that moves corresponds with the one that marks the antecedent set in the
discourse, much like the referential index of definites (cf. Enç 1991). Inventory forms are minimally different from partitives in that the moved noun is indefinite (14b). The moved noun again corresponds with the one that marks the antecedent set in the discourse and has been equated with a DP-internal topic (cf. Simpson 2005).

(14) a. Hâ blei pa-aok ni, tajuh abaoh hu.
   
   hi pleado [ʔɔ̆ʔ mango 7 clf]ROOT
   2SG buy mango this 7 CLF ROOT
   ‘You can buy seven of these mangoes.’

b. Hâ blei pa-aok, tajuh abaoh hu.
   
   hi pleado [ʔɔ̆ʔ mango ʔɔ̆ʔ]ROOT
   2SG buy mango 7 CLF ROOT
   ‘You can buy mangoes, seven.’

Each of these constructions represents a singular DP. They can be moved to the subject position of unaccusatives, as evidenced in (15a–b). The moved noun is also a DP, as it can be subextracted from a complex DP to subject position in unaccusatives, stranding the remainder of the DP (15c; cf. Wang 2007 and others on Japanese).

(15) a. Phú saong Hoa, dua urang nan laik trun.
   [pu hɔŋ nj=hwa ʔɔ̆ʔ ni laik trun.
   Phú with FEM=Hoa 2 person that fall down
   ‘Phú and Hoa, those two people fell.’

b. Pa-aok ni, tajuh abaoh laik trun.
   [ʔɔ̆ʔ mango ni laik trun.
   Seven of these mangoes fell down
   ‘Seven of these mangoes fell down.’

These complex DP constructions are relevant to discourse connectedness and wh. First, only the referential index DP can be DC-moved. In (16a), the referential index is subextracted from a partitive. Neither the rest of the partitive cannot be subextracted (16b), nor the whole partitive itself (16c) can be DC-moved. The same pattern obtains with close appositives and inventory forms. This indicates that it is really the referential index, not the whole DP that is marked as DC.

(16) a. Pa-aok ni, kau blei tajuh abaoh.
   [ʔɔ̆ʔ mango ni blei tajuh abaoh.
   ‘Of these mangoes, I bought seven.’

b. *Tajuh abaoh, kau blei pa-aok ni.
   *ʔɔ̆ʔ mango blei pa-aok ni
   INTENDED: ‘Seven, I bought these mangoes.’
c. *Pa-aok ni, ajuh abaoh, kau blei.

*ʔɔ̆ʔni çuh pɔh kāw pļej [ʔɔ̆ʔni çuh pɔh]
mango this 7 CLF 1SG buy

INTENDED: ‘Seven of these mangoes, I bought.’

Second, the referential index DP conversely cannot consist of a wh-phrase. In general, a partitive can contain a wh-phrase, as in (17a). However, the referential index DP cannot (17b). Note that the question is askable when prompted in elicitation, and the gloss in English is grammatical.

(17) a. Hā blei pa-aok ni hadom ki?
   hi pļej [ʔɔ̆ʔni tɔm kiʔ]
   2SG buy mango this how.many kg
   ‘How many kilograms of these mangoes did you buy?’

b. *Hā blei abaoh kayau halei sa ki?
   hi pļej [pɔh zaw hļej tha kiʔ]
   2SG buy fruit which one kg
   INTENDED: ‘Which fruit did you buy one kilogram of?’

These facts can be explained if it is the referential index that is marked as discourse connected, not the whole DP. That is why only the referential index DP can be DC-moved. This also accounts for the incompatibility of wh-phrases and referentiality: wh-phrases can be DC-moved, if they are pied-piped by a DC-marked referential index; however, they cannot supply that referential index on their own.

6. Conclusion. What seems to be optional wh-movement in Eastern Cham is in fact discourse connected-, or DC-movement. This result upholds the Clausal Typing Hypothesis and provides a way to account for movement operations that target both wh-phrases and topics. Both can be DC-moved so long as they are discourse anaphors in a particular discourse structure configuration. Yet, there remains an incompatibility: DC targets referential indices, and wh-phrases cannot supply referential indices themselves. Instead, they can be pied-piped by a DC-marked index.

Many questions remain for future research. First, even though discourse connectedness restricts the contexts DC-movement can occur in, the movement operation remains optional in some sense. Is this true optionality, perhaps susceptible to Optimality Theoretic constraints, or only apparently optional, the result of different derivations that coincidently receive similar interpretations (cf. Müller 2003 on pseudo-optionality)? Second, this paper has only presented a syntactic analysis of DC; how is DC interpreted, and how can it mark sets of alternatives like wh-phrases? Third, how is DC comparable to other information structural notions like D-linking? Finally, how is DC-movement of wh-phrases possible in languages like Eastern Cham, but not in others like Catalan?
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