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1 Introduction
This paper proposes an analysis of the DP extraction restriction in Austronesian languages. The argumentation for the proposal comes mainly from Tagalog, but I also show how the analysis can be extended to other languages as well.

Philippine and Formosan languages display a type of ergative or split-ergative alignment in which the single argument of an intransitive predicate and the internal argument of a transitive predicate are marked with the same nominative (absolutive) case. Transitive and intransitive verbs are morphologically distinguished in the perfective aspect, the infix <um> appearing on the verb when it is intransitive, as in (1a), and the infix <in> occurring on transitive verbs, as exemplified by (1b-d). Tagalog also has two applicative affixes, which are required when pseudoarguments are merged as DPs in the verbal domain. Not being selected by the lexical verb, applied objects require structural licensing and always appear with nominative case. The suffix –an selects a goal or locative argument, and the prefix i- selects a range of other arguments, including instruments, beneficiaries, and transported themes. External arguments in transitive clauses are marked with inherent genitive (ergative) case.

(1) a. D<um>ating ang babae.
<INTR.PRV>arrive NOM woman
‘The woman arrived.’
b. B<in>ili ng babae ang isda.
<TR.PRV>buy GEN woman NOM fish
‘The woman bought the fish.’
c. B<in>ilh-an ng babae ng isda
<TR.PRV>buy-APPL GEN woman GEN fish
ang tindahan=ko.
NOM store=1.SG.GEN
‘The woman bought a/the fish at my store.’
d. I-b<in>ili ng babae ng isda ang lalaki.
APPL-<TR.PRV>buy GEN woman GEN fish NOM man
‘The woman bought the fish for the man.’

These languages are also syntactically ergative in that a DP undergoing dislocation must be the nominative DP in the clause. For example, the direct
An external argument can only be extracted in an intransitive or antipassive clause. An antipassive, as exemplified by (3a), is a semantically transitive but syntactically intransitive clause type. The verb is inflected with intransitive morphology, and nominative case appears on the external argument, while the direct object has inherent (in Tagalog genitive) case. The external argument with nominative case is eligible to undergo extraction, as in (3b), but the genitive object is not, as in (3c).

(3) a. B<um>ili   ang  babae  ng  isda.
    <INTR.PRV>buy NOM woman GEN fish
      ‘The woman bought a fish.’
    b. babae-ng   b<um>ili  ang  isda
       woman-LK  <INTR.PRV>buy GEN fish
      ‘woman who bought a/the fish’
    c. *isda-ng   b<um>ili  ang  babae
       fish-LK  <INTR.PRV>buy NOM woman
      ‘fish that the woman bought’

In this paper, I propose an account of the extraction restriction by correlating movement with the valuation of nominative case. Specifically, I propose that all movement to [Spec, CP] in languages with this restriction is driven by [$u\phi$], and there are no other features such as [$uWH$] driving movement in this type of language. As a consequence, movement of the nominative DP is free, but movement of an internal argument over the external argument is possible only when the external argument is licensed with inherent case. This in effect eliminates competition between the internal and external arguments to value the probe, enabling movement of the internal argument over the subject. It is thus unsurprising that the extraction restriction is frequently found in ergative

---

1 The absolutive (nominative) extraction restriction is widely considered to be a key characteristic of syntactic ergativity (Dixon 1994, Bittner 1994, Manning 1996, Campana 1996, Aldridge 2008), found not only in Austronesian languages but also in Inuit and Mayan languages, as well as the Australian language Dyirbal.
languages, where external arguments in transitive clauses are assigned inherent (ergative) case.

However, this restriction is by no means found only in ergative languages. Though detailed discussion is beyond the scope of the current paper, this analysis is anticipated to apply broadly to languages where extraction of objects is only possible when the subject has inherent case. Hence, it is common in these languages to require relative clauses formed on object position to be nominalized or participial. I (to appear) have proposed that the Austronesian extraction restriction traces its origin to precisely such a requirement in Proto-Austronesian.

2 Previous approaches
The connection between nominative case and Austronesian extraction is by no means new. Primarily on the basis of Austronesian data, Keenan and Comrie (1977) have proposed that relative clauses are formed more easily on nominative arguments than on other grammatical relations. This subject restriction has been adopted by Bell (1983), Kroeger (1993), Manning (1996), and others. Within the Generative tradition, Guilfoyle et al. (1992), Campana (1992), Paul (2000, 2002), and others have invoked locality to force A’-movement to pass through the nominative subject position. Here, I summarize Campana’s (1992) approach based on Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990).

In the vein of Murasugi (1992), Campana (1992) proposes an analysis of Chamorro as a split-ergative language in which ergative case is equated with accusative, while absolutive (nominative) DPs check their case in subject position, though movement to this position is generally covert, taking place at LF. The tree in (4) derives the VSO word order found in Chamorro. Departing from Murasugi’s approach, Campana adds a stipulation that subject position in syntactically ergative languages is an A’-position rather than an A-position. Relativized Minimality then ensures that the nominative DP will be closest to a probe on C if further A’-movement takes place.
In earlier work, I (2004, 2008) have also proposed that syntactically ergative languages have no A-movement, only A’-movement. Like Campana (1992), this approach requires nominative DPs to undergo covert movement, which is driven by EPP features on phase heads C and transitive v (and not on T).

(5) **Syntactic Ergativity Parameter** (Aldridge 2004, 2008)

EPP ((υD)) on phase heads C and transitive v (no EPP on T)

The EPP feature on transitive v draws the nominative object into the outer specifier of this phase, allowing it to be attracted by a probe on C, as in (6a). In an intransitive clause like an antipassive, v does not have an EPP feature, with the result that the external argument is the highest DP in the edge of vP, as in (6b), which allows the external argument to extract, while the internal argument is trapped in VP, as in (6c) ².

(6) a. isda-ng [CP OP [AspP b<in>ili [vP <OP> [vP ng babae ... fish-LK <TR.PRV>buy GEN woman

‘fish that the woman bought’

b. babae-ng [CP OP [AspP b<um>ili [vP <OP> [vP ... ng isda woman-LK <INTR.PRV>buy GEN fish

‘woman who bought a/the fish’

² Rackowski and Richards (2005) make use of a similar approach to locality, but their analysis depends on additional mechanisms which are redundant on my more straightforward approach. I follow the simpler version of these two phase-edge locality-based approaches.
A clear disadvantage of both Campana (1992) and Aldridge (2004, 2008) is that they rely on covert movement of the nominative DP in order to ensure that it occupies the position closest to a higher probe driving movement. In this paper, I propose an alternative, which dispenses with the problem of covert movement.

3 New proposal: Extraction as $\phi$-feature competition

In this section, I propose a revision of my (2004, 2008) analysis in the framework of C-T Inheritance (Chomsky 2008). In this framework, the features responsible for licensing nominative arguments are not inherent to T but rather are inherited by T from C. In particular, C passes $[u\phi]$ to T, which licenses the subject and attracts it to the [Spec, TP] subject position. If C has a feature driving A'-movement like a $[uWH]$ feature, this is retained by C, allowing movement over the subject in [Spec, TP] if the clause contains an XP with a matching [WH] feature, as in cases of object $wh$-movement.

(7) a. What did you buy?

If the subject undergoes $wh$-movement, both probes on C are checked by this DP. I assume with Ouali (2006), Legate (2014), Martinović (2015), and others that inheritance need not take place in this case, since both probes can be checked in a single operation, with the result that the subject moves directly to [Spec, CP].
Interestingly, Legate (2014) applies an analysis of this type to the Austronesian language Acehnese, which exhibits the same extraction restriction as Tagalog. A problem, however, is that such an analysis still allows object movement over the subject if the object has a [WH] feature, as just observed for English. In order to account for strict locality in Achenese, Legate stipulates that C-T Inheritance fails to take place when “C contains nominal A’-features” (2014:84).

This stipulation is reminiscent of my earlier approach that derived locality by forcing nominal arguments to move to phase edges. One goal of the current paper is to dispense with stipulations like these in favor of a simpler account. The analysis I propose here is that languages with the Austronesian-type extraction restriction have only one feature driving movement to [Spec, CP], which is $u\bar{\phi}$.

Since there is only one feature on C driving movement, C-T Inheritance is obviated. A corollary of this proposal is that C-T Inheritance does not take place universally. Rather, it is forced only when necessary. In other words, I take the position that each probe with the EPP property projects its own specifier, but if there is only one such feature, then a single specifier of CP will suffice.

Condition on C-T Inheritance

(9) C-T Inheritance is a consequence of the need to project a second specifier of C/T.

Accounting for the Tagalog facts, I begin with the antipassive, in which the external argument has nominative case and can undergo extraction. This DP enters into an Agree relation with the $\bar{\phi}$-probe on C and values its case feature. If it also checks the EPP property of this probe, it will move to [Spec, CP].

(10) a. babae-ng b<um>ili ng isda  
    woman-LK <INTR.PRIV>buy GEN fish  
    ‘woman who bought a/the fish’

There is an obvious parallel between this proposal and that of Coon et al. (2014), who claim that the extraction restriction is found only in languages in which absolutive case is equated with nominative. The reason for this is that the need to value case forces an object to move out of VP to a position where it is visible to the $u\bar{\phi}$ probe on T. The account of locality, though, does not differ significantly from Aldridge (2004, 2008), in which the EPP feature on transitive $v$ forces object movement to the edge of this phase. The current approach aims to streamline the account of locality by equating the licensing probe with the probe driving movement.
Object movement is not possible in an antipassive, when the external argument needs to value structural case. If the object were to move to the edge of vP and consequently become visible to the φ-probe on C, it would still not be able to value this probe, since the subject has an unvalued case feature. If this feature is not valued, then the derivation will crash. I assume that inherent genitive case is assigned by the lexical verb to the object in an antipassive. But the analysis of extraction is the same if the object checks structural accusative case with v. Note that it is no longer necessary to force or prevent movement to [Spec, vP] in order to ensure locality among DPs in this phase edge, since it is valuing of the φ-probe that determines which DP moves to [Spec, CP].

(11) a. *isda-ng b<um>ili ang babae
    fish-LK <INTR.PRV>buy NOM woman
    ‘fish that the woman bought’

b. CP
   DP_{NOM} C'
   C_{[uφ]} AspP
   V+v+Asp vP
   DP_{[GEN]} v'
   <DP_{[uCASE]}> v'
   <V+v> VP
   <V> DP_{[GEN]}
In order to move an internal argument over the external argument, the competition to value the φ-probe on C must be eliminated. This is accomplished by assigning inherent case to this DP⁴. Recall that object extraction is only possible in transitive (ergative) clauses. With Woolford (1997, 2006), Legate (2002, 2008), Mahajan (1989), and others, I assume that ergative is inherent case assigned by transitive v to its specifier. I also follow Bok-Bennema (1991), Bittner and Hale (1996a, b), Woolford (1997), Ura (2000), Alexiadou (2001), and others that accusative case is unavailable in ergative clauses so the object is dependent on the φ-probe on C to value nominative case. I further assume with Chomsky (2001) for Icelandic and with Legate (2008) for ergative languages that nominative case can be valued on an internal argument in situ in VP when the external argument has inherent case.

(12) a. isda-ng b<in>ili ng babae
    fish-LK <TR.PRV>buy GEN woman
    ‘fish that the woman bought’

b. CP
   DP[NOM] C’
   C[φ] AspP
   V+V+Asp vP
   DP[GEN] v’
   <V+V> VP
   <V> <DP[NOM]>

In contrast to this, the ergative subject is not eligible for extraction in a transitive clause. Since its case feature has already been valued, it is not an active goal for the probe on C. Furthermore, if the external argument were to agree with C, then the case feature of the object would not be valued.

⁴ Polinsky (2016) also draws a connection between the extraction restriction to the licensing of the ergative argument. But Polinsky claims that ergatives in languages with the extraction restriction are PPs and not DPs. One obvious problem with this proposal is that PPs in many ergative languages are able to dislocate quite freely; the extraction asymmetry only obtains between DPs. See Aldridge (2004) for discussion.
To summarize the proposal, the Austronesian DP extraction restriction results from $[u\phi]$ being the only probe driving movement to [Spec, CP]. Only the DP valuing nominative case is able to undergo movement to this position. Consequently, an internal argument cannot move over a nominative external argument. In order to extract a lower DP, the external argument must be given inherent case in order to eliminate competition for $\phi$-feature checking.

This revised analysis is preferable to my (2004, 2008) approach, since it is no longer necessary to stipulate movement of nominative objects to the outer specifier of vP in order to block extraction of the ergative external argument. In the revised approach, it is only the DP with an unvalued case feature which can agree with C, obviating the earlier category based approach to locality.

4 Supporting evidence
This section provides supporting evidence for the proposal that movement to [Spec, CP] is driven exclusively by $[u\phi]$ in languages with the DP extraction restriction.

4.1 Lack of A-movement (as distinct from A’-movement)
Since the probe on C is the only feature driving movement, there is no C-T Inheritance and consequently no A-movement which is distinct from A’-movement. One indication of the lack of A-movement comes from basic word order in Tagalog, Tagalog being a verb-initial language. Word order among arguments follows the thematic hierarchy, and the nominative DP tends to appear in its base position in vP.

(14) a. B<um>ili ang babae ng isda.
<TR.PRV>buy NOM woman GEN fish
‘The woman bought (a) fish.’
b. B<in>ili ng babae ang isda kay Huan.
<TR.PRV>buy GEN woman NOM fish DAT Juan
‘The woman bought the fish from Juan.’
c. B<in>ilh-an ng babae ng isda
<TR.PRV>buy-APPL GEN woman GEN fish
si Huan.
NOM Juan
‘The woman bought a/the fish from Juan.’

This introduces the question of Austronesian languages – especially those that also have the extraction restriction – which do have a fixed position for the nominative DP. Malagasy is a VOS language, the nominative DP surfacing in
clause-final position. However, Pearson (2001, 2005) has argued that this DP does not behave like a subject in [Spec, TP] but rather exhibits the properties of an A’-topic. For example, it must be definite.

**Malagasy** (Pearson 2001:88)

(15) a. Novidin-dRajaona ny boky.
PAST.ACCP.buy-Rajaona DET book
‘Rajaona bought the book.’
b. *Novidin-dRajaona boky.
PAST.ACCP.buy-Rajaona book
‘Rajaona bought a book.’

This DP can also be reconstructed for the purposes of variable binding. The binders in (16) are the external arguments in immediate post-verbal position with inherent (genitive) case. The pronoun contained within the clause-final nominative DP is bound by the genitive agent.

**Malagasy** (Pearson 2005:424)

(16) a. Novangian’ ny mpianatra tsirairay, ny rainy,
PAST.TT.visit DET student each DET father.3
omaly.
yesterday
‘His father, each student visited yesterday.’
b. Norohan’ ny vehivavy rehetra, ny vadiny,
PAST.TT.kiss DET woman all DET spouse.3
‘Their spouses, all the women kissed.’

Similar facts can be found in Standard Indonesian, an SVO language. As Arka and Manning (1998) show, the clause-initial subject can also be reconstructed for the purposes of reflexive binding. The binder is the pronominal agent appearing in immediate preverbal position.

**Indonesian** (Arka & Manning 1998:8)

(17) a. Diri-saya saya serah-kan ke polisi.
selF-1.SG 1.SG surrender-APP to police
‘I surrendered myself to the police.’
b. Diri-nya mesti dia serah-kan ke polisi.
self-3.SG.GEN must 3.SG surrender-APPL to police
‘(S)he must surrender herself/himself to the police.’

In sum, it appears that even the clause-peripheral position for nominative DPs in these languages is not the [Spec, TP] A-position but rather a topic position in the left periphery.
4.2 No wh-feature
The claim that the sole feature driving movement to the clause periphery is \([u\phi]\) also entails that there is no other feature, such as \([uWH]\), which has this function. Indeed, Tagalog does not provide morphological evidence for a wh-feature like that in English (\textit{who}, \textit{what}, \textit{where}, \textit{when}, \textit{why}). On the contrary, Tagalog nominal interrogative words have an incorporated determiner or case marker (Blust 2015; Kaufman, to appear): \textit{si} for nominative personal names, \textit{a} for nominative common nouns, and \textit{ni} for genitive personal names.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item [a.] \textit{sino} ‘who.NOM.PN’ \hfill \textit{si} Maria ‘NOM.PN Maria’
  \item [b.] \textit{ano} ‘what.NOM.CN’ \hfill \textit{a-ng guro} ‘NOM.CN teacher’
  \item [c.] \textit{nino} ‘who.GEN.PN’ \hfill \textit{ni} Maria ‘GEN.PN Maria’
\end{enumerate}

It might be countered that the shared syllable \textit{no} is a wh-feature, but this component is not shared by other interrogative pronouns like locative/dative interrogative words. These interestingly appear to begin with a prepositional element, \textit{ka(y)} marking dative personal names, or \textit{sa} occurring with other goals or locatives.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item [a.] \textit{saan} ‘where’ \hfill \textit{sa} Maynila ‘in/to Manila’
  \item [b.] \textit{kanino} ‘to whom’ \hfill \textit{kay} Maria ‘to Maria’
\end{enumerate}

When adverbial interrogative words are considered, no ‘wh’ morpheme seems to be shared among them or with any other interrogative word in the language.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item [a.] \textit{kailan} ‘when’
  \item [b.] \textit{bakit} ‘why’
  \item [c.] \textit{ilan} ‘how many’
\end{enumerate}

In sum, there is no evidence for an affix or other morphological flag identifying interrogative pronouns as a class. However, the morphological incorporation of a case-marker in the nominal interrogative pronouns is quite suggestive of the connection I am proposing here between movement and case-valuing.

4.3 Lack of superiority effects
Another argument against movement being driven by a wh-feature is the fact that Tagalog DP wh-questions lack superiority effects. As is well known, without contextual support, English does not allow movement of an object wh-phrase over another wh-phrase in subject position. This is accounted for by locality, the \([uWH]\) on C attracting the closest matching [WH], which is found on the subject.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item [a.] Who bought what?
  \item [b.] ??What did who buy?
\end{enumerate}
In Tagalog, either the subject or the object can be extracted in multiple *wh*-questions. Unsurprisingly, given my proposal, what determines which can be extracted is the valuation of nominative case. When the object moves over the subject, as in (22b), the subject must be genitive.

(22) a. Sino ang [CP OP b<um>ili <OP> ng ano]?
   who NOM <INTR.PRV>buy GEN what
   ‘Who bought what?’

b. Ano ang [CP OP b<in>ili nino <OP> ]?
   what NOM <TR.PRV>buy who GEN
   ‘What did who buy?’

Let me also point out that Tagalog *wh*-questions formed on DP *wh*-phrases take the form of clefts. The *wh*-phrase functions as the matrix predicate, while the presupposition takes the form of a headless relative clause in matrix subject position. So there is no direct movement of DP interrogative words in the language, another indication that movement in *wh*-questions is not driven by a *wh*-feature.

4.4 Non-DP movement

To this point, I have considered only the locality constraint on DP movement. In contrast to this, movement of non-DPs is considerably freer. Specifically, they are able to move over a nominative DP within the same clause. Let me point out that there is also a structural difference between DP and non-DP interrogative constructions. In contrast to the DP case in (22), non-DP interrogative words are not cleft predicates. Note the lack of a nominative case marker following the interrogative word. Second position clitics also attach to the interrogative word, while in the cleft, they must remain inside the embedded clause. This strongly suggests that non-DP *wh*-questions are monoclausal, and the interrogative word moves to [Spec, CP].

(23) a. [CP Saan=mo [AspP b<in>ili ang libro]]?
   where=2SG.GEN <TR.PRV>buy NOM book
   ‘Where did you buy the book?’

b. [CP Saan=ka [AspP b<um>ili ng libro]]?
   where=2SG.NOM <INTR.PRV>buy GEN book
   ‘Where did you buy the book?’

c. Ano ti ang [CP OPi b<in>ili=mo <OP> sa Maynila]?
   what NOM <TR.PRV>buy=2SG.GEN in Manila
   ‘What did the woman buy in Manila?’

There are two facts that need to be accounted for in the case of non-DP movement. The first is the apparent violation of locality allowing a non-DP
interrogative phrase to move over a nominative DP. The second is the motivation for movement of non-DPs, since non-DPs are not suitable goals for a \([u\check{}\check{}\check{}]\) probe.

The analysis that I propose is that the EPP and licensing properties of the \([u\check{}\check{}\check{}]\) feature on \(C\) can be satisfied by separate constituents. Specifically, nominative case is valued with the closest DP with an unvalued case feature, while the EPP can be checked by a moving adverb or PP.

The indirect connection between non-DP movement and the \([u\check{}\check{}\check{}]\) feature on \(C\) is supported by the presence of a locality effect in long distance movement. In cases of long distance extraction, movement into a higher clause is blocked when the higher clause has a nominative DP. This is true for both DP (24a) and non-DP (24b) long distance movement. Note that long distance DP-movement also cannot be driven directly by the need to value case, since this DP has already valued case in its originating clause.

(24) a. Ano ang  \[CP OP s<in>abi=mo-ng \]
      \[CP <OP> [AspP b<in>ili=niya <OP> sa Maynila]]?
      \[<TR.PRV>say=2SG.GEN -LK <TR.PRV>buy=3SG.GEN in Manila \]
      ‘What did you say he/she bought in Manila?’

b. Saan=mo  s<in>abi-ng  \[CP <saan> \]
      \[AspP b<um>ili=siya ng libro <saan> ]?
      \[<INTR.PRV>buy=3SG.NOM GEN book \]
      ‘Where did you say he/she bought books?’

c. *Saan=ka  nag-sabi-ng  \[CP <saan> \]
      \[AspP b<um>ili=siya ng libro <saan> ]?
      \[<INTR.PRV>buy=3SG.NOM GEN book \]
      ‘Where did you say he/she bought books?’

If DP and non-DP movement were driven by separate features, then a nominative DP in the higher clause should not block movement from the lower clause in (24c). But the paradigm in (24) is correctly derived if movement to [Spec, CP] is driven only by Agree with \([u\check{}\check{}\check{}]\) and satisfaction of its concomitant EPP property. Specifically, the EPP in the embedded clause is satisfied by the nominative DP in (24a) and the adjunct in (24b). Nominative case in (24b) is valued on the external argument in [Spec, \(vP\)] in the embedded clause. The moving adjunct is also located within this phase and can satisfy the EPP property of the probe and move to the embedded [Spec, CP]. The derivation of (24b) is shown in (25).

As to what happens in the higher clause, I follow Georgopoulos (1991), Chung (1994, 1998), and Rackowski and Richards (2005), who propose that long
distance extraction is dependent on case-licensing of the embedded clause launching the extraction. Put simply, we can say that the CP itself values case with the \( \Phi \)-probe, but it does not satisfy the EPP property, which then allows the element in the specifier of this CP to move to the higher \([\text{Spec, CP}]\).

(25) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{saan} \\
C' \\
C_{[u\Phi]} \\
\text{AspP} \\
V+v+\text{Asp} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP}_{[\text{CASE:GEN}]} \\
< V+v > \\
\text{VP} \\
< V > \\
\text{CP}_{[\text{NOM}]} \\
< \text{saan} > \\
C' \\
C_{[u\Phi]} \\
\text{AspP} \\
V+v+\text{Asp} \\
\text{vP} \\
< \text{saan} > \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{DP}_{[\text{CASE:NOM}]} \\
< V+v > \\
\text{VP}
\end{array}
\]

In contrast to this, when nominative case is valued with an argument in a higher phase, for example the external argument in the ungrammatical (24c), long distance movement is not possible. This is accounted for straightforwardly, assuming that constituents agreeing with one \([u\Phi]\) must be in the same phase, which is not true of the nominative DP in \([\text{Spec, vP}]\) and the CP in VP.

Viewed in this light, long distance movement is a case of subextraction, which suggests that the language should allow other types of subextraction. This prediction is indeed borne out. The only violation of the nominative DP extraction constraint allowed in Tagalog that I am aware of is possessor raising, moving the possessor out of an absolutive internal argument, as documented by Kroeger

5 These authors assume a two-step process of case-valuing and subsequent agreement with that case feature. The single process of case valuation suffices for my purposes.
(1993:32). On my analysis, nominative case is valued on the absolutive object, but it is the possessor which checks the EPP in (26b).

(26) a. P<in>utol ng magsasaka ang sungay <TR.PRV>cut GEN farmer NOM horn ng kalabaw. GEN buffalo
   ‘The farmer cut off the buffalo’s horn.’

b. Ang kalabaw, p<in>utol ng magsasaka
   NOM buffalo < TR.PRV >cut GEN farmer
   ang [DP sungay <kalabaw> ].
   NOM horn <buffalo>
   ‘The buffalo, the farmer cut off (its) horn.’

To summarize this section, I have provided supporting evidence for the proposal that movement to [Spec, CP] is driven only by [uɸ] features and that there is no other feature such as [uWH] driving movement to the left periphery. I have also discussed movement of non-DPs. These do not directly serve as goals for the [uɸ] probe. However, I have offered some evidence that their movement is also dependent on this feature. Specifically, they are able to move only when they are in a local configuration with the nominative argument valuing [uɸ]. The nominative DP values case with this probe, while the moving non-DP checks the EPP.

5 φ-Feature competition in other Austronesian languages
This section shows how the analysis proposed in section 3 for Tagalog can be extended to account for extraction restrictions in other Austronesian languages. I take as examples Standard Indonesian and Chamorro, which are typologically different from Philippine and Formosan languages in interesting and relevant ways.

5.1 Standard Indonesian
In Standard Indonesian, DP extraction is limited to subjects. (27a) shows a transitive declarative clause with SVO word order. The external argument subject can be extracted from an active clause, when the verb carries the meN- prefix, as shown in (27b). The internal argument object cannot be extracted when the verb is prefixed with meN-, as shown in (27c). A DP internal argument can be extracted from a passive, when this DP has subject status, as in (27d).

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?’

c. *Apa yang Ali mem-beli?  
What C Ali ACT-buy  
‘What did Ali buy?’
d. Apa yang di-beli (oleh) Ali?  
What C PASS-buy by Ali  
‘What was bought by Ali?’

The Indonesian facts are easily accommodated by my proposal by assuming that the subject moves to [Spec, CP] after valuing nominative case. An internal argument can only be extracted over an external argument when the latter does not value nominative case.

5.2. Chamorro

In this section, I extend the proposal to the so-called “wh-agreement” languages. “Wh-agreement” analyses have been proposed for the Micronesian languages Palauan (Georgopoulos 1991), Chamorro (Chung 1994, 1998), and Malagasy (Pearson 2001, 2005). In this section, I show how the current proposal accounts for extraction in this type of language without stipulating an operation of case agreement. I take Chamorro as the example language, but the same analysis can be applied in all three of these cases.

Chung (1994, 1998) proposes that A’-extraction in Chamorro is licensed by a process of “wh-agreement” and that various morphosyntactic properties of verbs and clauses in extraction context are the spell out of agreement with the nominative, accusative, or oblique case feature of a moving DP. To begin, realis transitive verbs in declarative clauses show person and number agreement with the external argument. This is encoded as a proclitic or prefix on the verb.

**Chamorro**

(28) a. Ha-atan i taotao mansu i guaga’-na.  
3SG.A-watch the man tame the fish.basket-3SG.GEN  
‘The tame man looked (in) his basket.’ (Chung 1998:21)

b. Hu-li’e’ i lepblo.  
1SG.A-see DET book  

Objects can be extracted directly in realis clauses. Chung (1998) claims that the use of this clause type in object extraction is a type of agreement with the accusative case feature of the moving DP. But this seems unlikely, given that no morphological change can be distinguished between the verb in the extraction context, as opposed to declarative clauses like (28).
(29) a. Hafa un-kakannu’ t ?
    what 2SG.A-eat.PROG
    ‘What are you eating?’ (Chung 1998:239)

b. [i lepblu [Op ni ha-na’i hit si Juan t ]]
    the book COMP 3SG.A-give us DET Juan
    ‘the book that Juan gave us’ (Chung 1998:239)

A simpler account of object extraction in this clause type does, however, present itself in my analysis. There is reason to believe that the proclitics in examples like (28) and (29) are actually ergative, not nominative, agreement clitics. Note that morphological case is not distinguished on the DPs in these examples. However, according to Zobel (2002), these proclitics are diachronically related to genitive pronouns in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian and hence Tagalog. If this is true, then the external argument does not value structural nominative case but rather has inherent ergative case. Consequently, it is the internal argument which values nominative case, checking the [$u\phi$] probe on C, and undergoing movement to [Spec, CP].

Further indication that this approach is correct comes from another type of object extraction context. Internal arguments are also able to move in nominalizations. Chung (1998) claims that this is a second type of “accusative agreement”, but this is again unlikely, since she offers no explanation as to why a language would have multiple exponents of agreement with a single feature. Furthermore, it is difficult to imagine that swapping a nominalization for a finite CP is the reflex of agreement with a single feature on the C head.

Chamorro
(30) a. Hafa k<in>annono’-mu t ?
    what <IN>eat.PROG-1SG.GEN
    ‘What are you eating?’ (Chung 1998:237)

b. [([Op t<in>aitai-mu t ] na lepblu]
    <IN>read-2SG.GEN LK book
    ‘the book that you read’ (Chung 1998:237)

In contrast to this, my analysis accounts for examples like (30) straightforwardly, since the external argument in a nominalization has inherent genitive case, allowing the internal argument to value a structural [$u\phi$] probe and undergo movement. Note that movement of an internal argument over a genitive external argument is precisely what we observe in object extraction in Tagalog. Note further the appearance of the infix <$in$>, which marks perfective aspect in ergative clauses in Tagalog. This infix historically marked perfective aspect on nominalized verbs in Proto-Austronesian (Starosta et al. 1982, Ross 2009, and others).

In cases of external argument extraction, the Chamorro verb takes the infix <$um$>. This infix is also found in Tagalog and other Philippine and Formosan...
languages when external arguments have nominative case or undergo extraction. Chung (1994, 1998) claims that this is “nominative agreement”. But the appearance of <um> can more straightforwardly be accounted for by affording it a similar analysis to its counterparts in the more conservative Austronesian languages of the Philippines and Taiwan. A v which is spelled out as <um> lacks the ability to assign inherent case to its specifier. In Tagalog, this is the intransitive/antipassive v. Consequently, the external argument is dependent on structural licensing from C, with the result that this DP will be the one to value the [uϕ] on C and undergo movement.

Chamorro

(31) a. Hayi f<um>a’gasi t i kareta?
   who <UM>wash the car
   ‘Who washed the car?’
   (Chung 1998:236)

b. [i taotao [Op ni f<um>a’gasi t i kareta-hu]]
   the person C <UM>wash the car-1SG.GEN]
   ‘the man who washed my car’
   (Chung 1998:236)

This section has briefly sketched possible extensions of my proposal to other Austronesian languages with the extraction restriction. One point I wish to emphasize here is that although the languages in question have been assumed to have different alignment types and are certainly not all ergative, the extraction restriction I examine in this paper is not limited to ergative languages. Rather, it is a consequence of competition to value the sole feature, [uϕ], on C which drives movement.

6 Conclusion

This paper has proposed an analysis of strict locality among DPs in Austronesian A’-movement. I proposed that movement to [Spec, CP] in these languages is driven solely by [uϕ]. Locality among DPs is then the consequence of competition to value the [uϕ] probe on C with the result that only the nominative DP will be able to do so; otherwise, its case feature will go unvalued and the derivation will crash.

I also showed that this locality constraint, which is often attributed to syntactic ergativity, is in fact independent of alignment type, per se. Given that movement of an internal argument over an external argument is only possible when the external argument has inherent case and is not a competitor to value the [uϕ] probe, the restriction is commonly found in ergative languages, where external arguments in transitive clauses have inherent case. But the same constraint can be observed in other kinds of languages, for instance accusative languages which require nominalization or passivization in order to extract an internal argument.
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