CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1. Overview

This thesis explores and proposes an analysis of two key features of Austronesian syntax: ergativity and verb-initial word order. Verb-initial word order is a pervasive characteristic of Austronesian languages, found in nearly all Austronesian languages spoken in Taiwan and the Philippines and most of those spoken in the Pacific basin, Indonesia, Malaysia, and other regions. Those Austronesian languages which now have predominantly subject-initial word order are also believed to have evolved from verb-initial languages (Starosta et al. 1982, Cumming 1991, Kikusawa 2002).

Ergativity is manifested to different degrees and in different ways among Austronesian languages. I argue in this thesis that Tagalog and Seediq are both syntactically ergative languages, though representative of different types. Some Austronesian languages, like standard Indonesian, essentially display accusative syntax, while others, like Malagasy, exhibit a split in which the antipassive has been reanalyzed as transitive. However, most Formosan and Western Austronesian and some Oceanic languages, e.g. Tongan, retain the hallmark feature of ergative syntax: the absolutive restriction on A’-extraction.

In this thesis, I direct my analysis to the Philippine language Tagalog and the Atayalic language Seediq, spoken in central Taiwan. These two Austronesian languages are representative of the two types of syntactic ergativity that I propose to be manifested cross-linguistically. They also exhibit two distinct types of verb-initial word order. Tagalog unmarked word order is VSO but it allows some scrambling. Seediq is a strict VOS language, in which the absolutive nominal appears in clause-final position in basic word order. The purpose of this thesis is to develop an analysis to account for the similarities and differences in these two languages within a broader theory of ergativity and verb-initial word
order. It is also hoped that the analysis proposed here will have the potential to be extended to other languages in the Austronesian family, and I make specific reference to Malagasy, Indonesian, and Chamorro, and other languages at appropriate points in this thesis.

2. Theoretical Orientation

The theoretical framework assumed in this thesis is the Minimalist Program, as proposed by Chomsky (2000, 2001a, 2001b). In this theory, developed for accusative languages, internal arguments are merged in VP and the external argument in the specifier of vP. In a transitive clause, the external argument checks case with T and the internal argument with v. This is accomplished under an Agree relation between a probe and goal. Uninterpretable features on a functional head act as a probe which seek a goal with matching features in its e-command domain. DPs are merged with unvalued case features. When Agree is established, the case feature of DP is valued (Chomsky 2001a).

\[
\text{(1)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{TP} & \quad \text{T}_{[u\text{Nom}]} \quad \text{vP} \\
& \quad \text{DP}_{[Nom]} \quad \text{V'} \\
& \quad \text{V}_{[u\text{Acc}]} \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad \text{V} \quad \text{DP}_{[Acc]}
\end{align*}
\]

In accusative languages, nominative case is checked by T, accusative by v. In a great many accusative languages, an EPP feature on T also ensures that the subject be located in the specifier of this functional projection at the time of Spell-Out.
The derivation proceeds phase by phase, with vP and CP defined as phases. Each phase is transferred individually to the phonological and semantic components. In mapping to the phonetic representation, the sister (domain) of the phase head is spelled out (Chomsky 2001b). The head and specifiers, i.e. the edge, of the phase remain accessible until transfer of the next phase. In order to allow movement to take place, a phase head may have an EPP feature, which raises an XP to the phase edge. Successive cyclic movement proceeds through the edge of all phases along the path of movement. For instance, long distance movement of an object may look like the following, where the moved XP originates in the VP of the embedded clause and moves incrementally through the edge of each vP and CP phase on the way to the matrix [Spec, C].

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{CP} \ [\text{XP} \ ... \ [\text{vP} \ [\text{tXP} \ ... \ [\text{CP} \ [\text{tXP} \ ... \ [\text{vP} \ [\text{tXP} \ ... \ [\text{VP} \ ... \ [\text{tXP} \ ... \ ... \ ]]]]]]]]]
\end{align*}
\]

Movement out of a phase is allowed only from the edge. The domain of the phase is inaccessible after construction of the phase.

(4) **Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC)** (Chomsky 2001b:5)

The domain of a phase head is not accessible to operations, but only the edge is.
2.1. Ergativity

Though numerous attempts have been made to equate absolutive with nominative (Marantz 1984, Levin 1983, Murasugi 1992, Bittner and Hale 1996a,b, among many others), the notion of subject cannot be translated directly into ergative systems. In the analysis of ergativity that I develop in this thesis, there is no single grammatical function that corresponds to subject. Rather, the grammatical properties generally associated with nominative subjects tend to be divided between the ergative and absolutive roles in ergative languages. Therefore neither ergative nor absolutive can be said to exhaustively possess the typical properties of subjects.

There are also different types of ergative language. Morphologically ergative languages display ergative case-marking but behave syntactically like accusative languages. Syntactically ergative languages exhibit syntactic characteristics which are different from accusative languages. The most salient of these properties is the restriction that only DPs with absolutive status are able to undergo A’-movement. However, syntactic ergativity can be further divided on the basis of how subject properties are distributed among ergative and absolutive roles. The roles that can be assumed only by a subject which I consider in this thesis are as follows.

(5)a. Antecedent of a reflexive pronoun
b. Imperative or hortative addressee
c. Controlled PRO

In one type of ergative language, external arguments, regardless of whether they have ergative or absolutive status can fulfill all of the roles in (5). I propose that absolutive case-
checking in this type of language is distributed between v and T. In transitive clauses, absolutive case is checked by v. Ergative case is inherent, assigned by v.

\[(6)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{V}+v+T \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP}_{[\text{Erg}]} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{t}_{v+T_{[\mu\text{Abs}]}} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{t}_v \\
\text{DP}_{[\text{Abs}]} \\
\end{array}
\]

T checks absolutive case in intransitive clauses, with the external argument in an unergative or antipassive clause and with the internal argument in an unaccusative. I assume with Chomsky (2001a) that unaccusative and passive vPs are weak phases, allowing T to probe down into VP without violating the Phase Impenetrability Condition.

**Unergative**

\[(7)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{V}+v+T_{[\mu\text{Abs}]} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP}_{[\text{Abs}]} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{t}_{v+v} \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]
I label these v-type ergative languages, on the basis that v checks absolutive case in transitive clauses, while T checks case only in intransitive clauses. This divided case-checking system is intended to account for the observation that transitive absolutes in these languages behave primarily like direct objects and ergative DPs like subjects. It is only in intransitive clauses where absolutes have the properties of subjects. I will show in chapter 2 that this is the appropriate analysis for ergativity in Tagalog and Eskimo languages.

In the other type of syntactically ergative language, (5c) can only be performed by an absolutive. Absolutive case is not available for checking with an overt DP, specifically an internal argument. Consequently, nonfinite clauses must be intransitive. I refer to these as T-type ergative languages, proposing that absolutive case is uniformly checked by T. In T-type ergative languages, absolutes have more subject properties than in the v-type. I take this fact to be a reflex of the role of T in checking absolutive case, a property shared by nominative DPs in accusative languages. Seediq and Mayan languages display T-type ergative syntax.

Case-checking in unaccusative and unergative clauses is the same as in v-type languages.
T also checks absolutive case in transitive clauses in T-type ergative languages. Since the ergative DP is merged in a position closer to T than the absolutive DP, the latter must move to the vP phase edge in order to serve as the goal for the probe on T.
This may appear at first glance to be a stipulation, but I will show in chapter 2 and again in chapter 6 that merging an EPP feature in \(v\) is an important feature of ergative syntax. For instance, it is this ability of \(v\) to host an EPP feature that ensures the absolutive restriction on extraction. In syntactically ergative languages, only the absolutive DP is eligible to undergo A’-movement. To account for this, I propose that \(v\) hosts an EPP feature only when the verb is transitive. This EPP feature attracts the VP-internal absolutive to the vP phase edge, making it the closest DP to C and ensuring that it is the DP which will be able to undergo A’-movement to [Spec, C].

\[
\begin{align*}
(12) \quad & \text{CP} \\
& \text{DP}_{[\text{Abs}]} \quad \text{C'} \\
& \quad \text{C} \quad \text{TP} \\
& \quad \text{V} + v + T \quad \text{vP} \\
& \quad \quad \text{t}_{\text{Abs}} \quad \text{v'} \\
& \quad \quad \text{DP}_{[\text{Erg}]} \quad \text{v'} \\
& \quad \quad \text{t}_{V + v \{EPP\}} \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \text{t}_V \quad \text{t}_{\text{Abs}}
\end{align*}
\]

In an antipassive – which is intransitive in that structural case is not available for an internal argument – \(v\) does not have an EPP feature, so the DP merged in [Spec, \(v\)] is now the closest DP to C. A VP-internal DP cannot be attracted without violating the Phase Impenetrability Condition.
2.2. Verb-initial Word Order

Tagalog and Seediq also have different types of basic word order. Tagalog is a VSO language, while basic word order in Seediq is VOS. The key difference is that in the latter, the absolutive nominal has a fixed position, always appearing in clause-final position, while in the former arguments tend to remain in their base positions. Tagalog VSO word order also allows a certain amount of word order variation, particularly displacement of adjuncts, e.g. fronting of locatives for pragmatic focus. In Seediq, on the other hand, no VP-internal material other than the absolutive DP can appear in clause-initial position.

For Tagalog VSO word order, I adopt a verb-movement analysis similar to McCloskey (1991), Kaplan (1991), and others, in which the verb moves to an aspect projection above vP, while the vP-internal arguments remain in their base positions.
(14)a. K-in-ain ng babae ang manggá.¹

"The woman ate the mango."

b. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{AspP} \\
\text{V+v+T} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{woman} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{t_v+v} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{t_v} \\
\text{mango}
\end{array}
\]

Derivation of Seediq word order is much more complex. Due to morphological feature-checking requirements, Seediq verbs move to an aspectual projection, as in Tagalog. Absolutive-final word order is derived by moving the absolutive to a topic position above TP and then fronting the remnant TP. Since checking of verbal features takes place inside the fronted predicate, I propose that TP-movement is not driven by morphological features but rather is the indirect result of the following PF constraint².

(15) **Stranded DP Constraint**

A DP cannot be spelled out in the leftmost position in a phase edge.

¹ Primary stress is contrastive in Tagalog but most commonly falls on the penultimate syllable. Words with penultimate stress contain no accent marks in the examples used in this thesis. An accent mark is used to indicate stress on a syllable other than the penult. Secondary stress in Tagalog is predictable, occurring on alternating syllables counting rightward from the primary stressed syllable. Stress is not contrastive in Seediq, occurring uniformly on the penultimate syllable. For this reason, I do not indicate stress on Seediq words in this thesis.

² A similar intuition is expressed by Massam (2000, 2001) and Rackowski and Travis (2000), who propose that the EPP feature on T cannot be checked by a DP by must rather be checked by a predicative element.
Topicalization of the absolutive places this DP in the leftmost position in the CP phase edge. If no other XP is subsequently merged to its left within this CP, then (15) will cause the derivation to crash at PF. (15) will not be violated, however, if movement of a non-DP XP takes place after absolutive topicalization. Since TP is the closest XP to C whose movement will satisfy (15), TP-fronting takes place and results in VOS word order.

(15) may appear to be an unmotivated stipulation. However, it is in fact founded on a pervasive pattern of word order and information structure in Austronesian languages. There is a strong tendency for a clause in an Austronesian language to begin with a non-DP phrase which is immediately followed by a DP. In terms of information structure, the clause-initial XP represents new or focused information, while the DP following it is interpreted as definite or topicalized.

(16) Phase Edge Interpretation

If the edge of a phase HP has the form \([_{HP} \quad XP \quad _{[_{HP} \quad DP \quad ... }]_1]\), where X is not D, DP is mapped to the presupposition and XP to focus.

In addition to basic VOS word order in Seediq and Malagasy, I will show that this pattern is also observed in intransitive clauses in Tagalog and the so-called body guard construction in Malagasy. I will also show how (15) and (16) are responsible for the fact that \(wh\)-questions involving DP \(wh\)-phrases in most Austronesian languages have to take the form of clefts and cannot be derived through \(wh\)-movement to clause-initial position.

(17) below shows a sample derivation for a Seediq transitive clause. The absolutive DP is merged in VP. The EPP feature on v attracts this DP to the vP phase edge, where the absolutive checks case with T. The absolutive is further attracted by an EPP feature on C. (15) will cause the derivation to crash at PF if the absolutive is left alone in \([_{Spec, C}]\). But
the derivation converges if TP-fronting moves TP to C’s outer specifier so that the left edge of CP is occupied by a non-DP XP.

Seediq

(17)a. Wada burig-un na Ape ka patis na Pawan.
Past buy-Tr Erg Ape Top book Gen Pawan
“Ape bought Pawan’s book.”

b. CP

In addition to the difference in basic word order, the predicate-fronting proposal also accounts for another important difference between Tagalog and Seediq. In Tagalog, PPs are allowed to undergo focus or \(wh\)-movement, while they are not in Seediq.
Uriagereka (1999) has proposed that a spelled out XP is analogous to a complex word in that it has a label and an internal structure. Like a complex word, the internal structure is not accessible to the syntax. However, the label allows the XP to undergo Agree and be remerged in the structure. Building on this analysis, Nunes and Uriagereka (2000) propose that a moved constituent is spelled out before it is merged in its new location, with the result that the contents of the moved XP will no longer be accessible to the syntax after remerge. Therefore, locatives cannot move to clause-initial position in Seediq, because they are contained inside the fronted TP, which has already been spelled out and its contents are no longer accessible to the syntax. In more traditional terms, movement from TP would violate Huang’s (1982) Condition on Extraction Domain.

3. Grammatical Sketches of the Languages

The two languages I focus on in this thesis are the Philippine language Tagalog and the Formosan language Seediq. Some aspects of subgrouping in Austronesian historical linguistics remain controversial, particularly with regard to the affiliation of Formosan languages. Some linguists (Dyen 1965 and 1991, Tsuchida 1976, Wolff 1991 and 1995)
group Formosan languages together with other western Austronesian languages, including the languages of the Philippines, Indonesian, Malaysia, and Madagascar. The following shows the position of Tsuchida (1976), adapted from Rau (1992).

(19) Austronesian
    /               /
  Hesperonesian   Eastern Austronesian
    /               /
Formosan           Western Austronesian

Tsuchida (1976) further subdivides the Formosan group into Atayalic and other Formosan languages. The following is again adapted from Rau (1992).

(20) Formosan
    /               /
Atayalic          Southern Formosan
    /               /
Seediq           Atayal           Paiwanic         Rukai-Tsouic


Other linguists (Dahl 1973, Blust 1977, Ross 1992 and 1995) view some or all of the Formosan languages as directly descending from proto-Austronesian and not forming a subgroup with other languages. The following shows the view of Blust (1977), adapted from Huang (1993).
This thesis makes no assertion regarding the exact genetic relationship between Tagalog and Seediq. As elucidated by Wolff (1991, 1995), there are numerous similarities between Philippine and Formosan languages syntax and morphosyntax. The purpose of this thesis is to account for the similarities and differences in word order and ergativity between Tagalog and Seediq. The general framework I propose for this comparison is also intended ultimately to be adaptable to other Austronesian languages other than Philippine and Formosan.

3.1. Tagalog

In this subsection, I provide a sketch of the aspects of Tagalog grammar which are analyzed in the main body of this thesis. I focus primarily on case marking, word order, and verbal morphology.

As I argue in chapter 2, Tagalog and Seediq are ergative languages and display an ergative-absolutive case-marking system. The following table shows the Tagalog case-markers for common nouns and proper names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ergative</th>
<th>Absolutive</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Oblique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common noun</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ang</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper name</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>kay</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of ergative and absolutive case marking are shown below. (23a) shows examples of marking on common nouns, (23b) of proper names.
Dative case is found on goals and locatives when they do not have absolutive status.

Oblique case is reserved for themes and patients when they do not have absolutive status, as in an antipassive. Since oblique objects in antipassives are typically indefinite or nonspecific, this case cannot appear with a proper name. When a proper name is the direct object of an antipassive verb, it appears in dative case.
Perf-Intr-see Abs woman Dat Pedro
“The woman saw Pedro.”

As in many ergative languages, genitive case is homophonous with ergative.

(26)a. libro ng babae
book Gen woman
“the woman’s book”
b. libro ni Maria
book Gen Maria
“Maria’s book”

Tagalog basic word order is VSO. The “S” in VSO refers to the semantic subject, typically the external argument. This argument appears in immediate post-verbal position in unmarked word order. Other arguments follow, essentially in accordance with the thematic hierarchy, yielding the typical order shown in (27).

(27) VSO = V-Ag-Th-X

For example, in unmarked word order in a ditransitive clause, the agent appears in immediate post-verbal position, followed by the theme and then the goal. For the goal to precede the theme is somewhat marked and needs contextual support to be felicitous.
It is rarer still for a goal to precede an oblique theme in an antipassive.

It is even more awkward for a DP to intervene between the verb and ergative nominal.
This pattern becomes more acceptable, however, when the object is nonreferential and the context is irrealis.

(31)a. Hindí b-in-igy-án ng coach ng pagkakataón
Neg -Perf-give-App Erg coach Obl chance
     si Rafael.
Abs Rafael
“The coach didn’t give Rafael a chance.”

b. Hindí b-in-igy-án ng pagkakataón ng coach
Neg -Perf-give-App Obl chance Erg coach
     si Rafael.
Abs Rafael
“The coach didn’t give Rafael a chance.”

Absolutives and PPs only rarely appear in this position.

(32)a. Bi-bilh-í n ng babae ang isdá.
Red-buy-Tr Erg woman Abs fish
“The woman will buy the fish.”

b. *Bi-bilh-í n ang isdá ng babae
Red-buy-Tr Abs fish Erg woman
“The woman will buy the fish.”

Tagalog verbs host two types of inflection. One type is related to identifying or licensing the absolutive DP.
Basic Transitive: 
- in

Locative Applicative:  
- an

Benefactive/Instrumental Applicative:  
i-

Intransitive/Antipassive:  
- um-

The theme has absolutive status in a basic transitive clause.

B-in-ilí ng babae ang isdá.  
-Tr.Perf-buy Erg woman Abs fish

“The woman bought the fish.”

A locative or goal is the absolutive when the locative applicative is used.

B-in-ilh-an ng babae ng isdá  
-Tr.Perf-buy-App Erg woman Obl dress  
  ang tindahan=ko.  
  Abs store=1sGen

“The woman bought a/the fish at my store.”

(36) shows an example of a benefactive absolutive with the i- applicative.

I-b-in-ilí ng babae ng isdá si Pedro.  
App-Tr.Perf-buy Erg woman Obl dress Abs Pedro

“The woman bought the fish for Pedro.”

An antipassive example is shown below. The external argument is the absolutive.
Tagalog verbs can express three aspects. Ramos (1971) calls them “completed”, “contemplated”, and “incompleted”. Schachter and Otanes (1972) refer to them as “perfective”, “contemplated”, “imperfective”. Wolff et al. (1991) term these “past”, “future”, and “present” tense. They are expressed by a combination of two morphological processes on the verb. The infixes -um- (attaching to intransitive verbs) and -in- (attaching to transitive verbs, including verbs affixed with applicatives) mark actions as having been initiated. Reduplication indicates that the action has not been completed. Thus, using Schachter and Otanes’ terminology, we have the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Contemplated</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>-in-V</td>
<td>Red-V-in</td>
<td>Red-in-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrans</td>
<td>-um-</td>
<td>Red-V</td>
<td>Red-um-V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(39a) gives an example of an intransitive verb, (39b) a transitive verb.

(39)a. *sayáw* “dance”

*sumayáw* “danced”

*sasayáw* “will dance”

*sumasayáw* “is dancing”
b.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>kain</em></td>
<td>“eat”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kinain</em></td>
<td>“ate”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kakainin</em></td>
<td>“will eat”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kinakain</em></td>
<td>“is eating”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(40) shows examples of infixation and reduplication on verbs carrying an applicative. Reduplication targets the verb root in both cases. The *i*- applicative is never reduplicated.

(40)a.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Absolutive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Hini-hing-án</em></td>
<td>Red.Tr-ask.for-App</td>
<td>Obl money Abs man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ng pera ang lalaki.</em></td>
<td>“The man is being asked for money.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Absolutive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>I-kinu-kuha</em></td>
<td>App-Red.Tr-get</td>
<td>Erg Pedro Obl water Abs Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ni Pedro ng tubig si Maria.</em></td>
<td>“Pedro is getting water for Maria.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to *-um-*, there are two other intransitive/antipassive affixes.

(41)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Absolutive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>mang-</em></td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>single argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mang-</em></td>
<td>antipassive</td>
<td>actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mag-</em></td>
<td>antipassive</td>
<td>actor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aspect paradigm for these two is as follows. *Nag-* and *nang-* are formed historically by the infixation of the perfective *-in-* to *mag-* and *mang-* (Reid 1992).
Perfective  Contemplated  Imperfective

*nag-V*  *mag-Red-V*  *nag-Red-V*

Examples are as follows.

(43)a. Nag-ba-basa ng diyaryo si Maria.

Intr-Red-read Obl newspaper Abs Maria

“Maria is reading a newspaper.”

b. Na-no-noód silá ng sine.

Intr-Red-watch3p.Abs Obl film

“They are watching a film.”

Personal pronouns are distinguished morphologically on the basis of person and case. Ergative and absolutive clitic pronouns are shown below.

(44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Ergative/Genitive</th>
<th>Absolutive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person Sg.</td>
<td><em>ko</em></td>
<td><em>ákó</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Person Pl. (Inclusive)</td>
<td><em>natin</em></td>
<td><em>tayo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Person Pl. (Exclusive)</td>
<td><em>namin</em></td>
<td><em>kamí</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person Sg.</td>
<td><em>mo</em></td>
<td><em>ka</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person Pl.</td>
<td><em>ninyó</em></td>
<td><em>kayó</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person Sg.</td>
<td><em>niyá</em></td>
<td><em>siyá</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person Pl.</td>
<td><em>nilá</em></td>
<td><em>silá</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, there is a portmanteau morph \textit{kita} which represents the combination of 1\textsuperscript{st} person singular ergative \textit{ko} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person singular absolutive \textit{ka}.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(45)a.] Mahá=\textbf{ko} si Maria.
\text{love=1s.Erg Abs Maria}
\text{“I love Maria.”}
\item[b.] Mahá=\textbf{ka} ni Maria.
\text{love=2s.Abs Erg Maria}
\text{“Maria loves you.”}
\item[c.] Mahá=\textbf{kitá}.
\text{love=1sErg.2sAbs}
\text{“I love you.”}
\end{enumerate}

The clitic pronouns appear in second position within the tensed clause.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(46)a.] Pu-puntá=akó sa Maynila.
\text{Red-go=1s.Abs Dat Manila}
\text{“I will go to Manila.”}
\item[b.] Hindí=akó pu-puntá sa Maynila.
\text{Neg=1s.Abs Red-go Dat Manila}
\text{“I will not go to Manila.”}
\item[c.] Sa Maynila=akó pu-puntá.
\text{Dat Manila=1s.Abs Red-go}
\text{“I will go to Manila.”}
\end{enumerate}

Clitics can also climb out of a nonfinite complement clause but not a tensed one.
a. Ta-tawag-an=ko=siyá.
   Red-call-App=1s.Erg=3s.Abs
   “I will call him/her.”

b. Gustó=ko=siyá-ng [PRO tawag-an tsiya]
   want=1s.Erg=3s.Abs-Lk call-App
   “I want to call him/her.”

The bisyllabic absolutive pronouns can appear in preverbal topic position and as a cleft predicate.

a. Siyá ay kaibigan=ko.
   3s.Abs Top friend=1s.Gen
   “He/she is my friend.”

   1s.Inc.Abs Abs Intr-Red-succeed P end
   “We will be the ones to succeed in the end.”

Monosyllabic ka ‘2s.Abs’, however, is replaced by bisyllabic ikáw in these contexts.

(49) Ikáw ay mas matalino kaysá sa akin.
   2s.Abs Top more intelligent than Dat 1s
   “You are more intelligent than I am.”
The dative forms of the pronouns are given below. They appear together with the dative case-marker.

(50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun Form</th>
<th>Dative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(^{st}) Person Sg.</td>
<td>sa akin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(^{st}) Person Pl. (Inclusive)</td>
<td>sa atin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(^{st}) Person Pl. (Exclusive)</td>
<td>sa amin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{nd}) Person Sg.</td>
<td>sa iyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{nd}) Person Pl.</td>
<td>sa inyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{rd}) Person Sg.</td>
<td>sa kanyá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{rd}) Person Pl.</td>
<td>sa kanilá</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dative pronouns are permitted to remain in argument position.

(51) Nag-bigáy=akó ng libro sa kanyá.

Intr.Perf-give=1s.Abs Obl book Dat 3s

“I gave a book to him/her.”

An absolutive clitic would not be tolerated in this position but would have to move to second position.

(52)a. B-in-igy-án=ko=síyá ng libro.

-Tr.Perf-give-App=1s.Erg=3s.Abs Obl book

“I gave him/her a book.”
b. *b-in-igy-án=ko ng libro siyá.
   -Tr.Perf-give-App=1s.Erg Obl book 3s.Abs
   “I gave him/her a book.”

As in a great many Austronesian languages, relativization, wh-question formation, clefting, and topicalization are restricted to absolutes in Tagalog. (53) shows that an absolutive argument can relativize but not an ergative.

(53)a. libro-ng b-in-ilí ni Maria
   book-Lk -Perf-buy Erg Maria
   “book which Maria bought”

b. *tao-ng b-in-ilí ang libro
   person-Lk -Perf-buy Abs book
   “person who bought the book”

(53a) is an example of a post-nominal relative clause. Tagalog also has pre-nominal and internally headed relative clauses. In internally headed relatives, the head nominal appears in immediate post-verbal position.

(54)a. b-in-ilí ni Maria-ng libro (pre-nominal)
   -Perf-buy Erg Maria-Lk book
   “book which Maria bought”

b. b-in-ilí-ng libro ni Maria (internally headed)
   -Tr.Perf-buy-Lk book Erg Maria
   “book which Maria bought”
*Wh*-questions also exhibit the absolutive restriction on extraction, as shown in (55).

(55)a. **Anó** ang b-in-ilí ni Maria?

what Abs -Perf-buy Erg Maria

“What did Maria buy?”

b. *Sino* ang b-in-ilí ang libró?

who Abs -Perf-buy Abs book

“Who bought the book?”

(56) shows the same restriction for clefts. It should be noted that clefts and *wh*-questions are very similar in form. The focused nominal appears in clause-initial position. The rest of the clause appears to its right, preceded by the absolutive case marker. In chapter 6, I argue that *wh*-questions of the type shown in (55a) are clefts and as such are structurally identical to clauses like (56a).

(56)a. **Libró** ang b-in-ilí ni Maria.

book Abs -Perf-buy Erg Maria

“A book is what Maria bought.”

b. *Maria* ang b-in-ilí ang libró

Maria Abs -Perf-buy Abs book

“Maria is the one who bought the book.”

It should be pointed out that the absolutive restriction on extraction applies only to DPs in Tagalog. PPs can be freely dislocated. Clause-initial PPs receive a focus interpretation.
(57a) I-b-in-ìgay ng babae ang kendi sa bata.
App-Perf-give Erg woman Abs candy Dat child
“The woman gave candy to the child.”

b. Sa batá i-b-in-ìgay ng babae ang kendi.
Dat child App-Perf-give Erg woman Abs candy
“The woman gave the candy to the child.”

(58b) shows that it is impossible for a DP to undergo focus movement of the type shown for PPs in (57b).

-Perf-give-App Erg woman Obl candy Abs child
“The woman gave the child candy.”

b. *ng kendi b-in-ìgy-án ng babae ang batá.
Obl candy -Perf-give-App Erg woman Abs child

Before closing this section, I will note that a number of Philippine linguists, including Schachter and Otanes (1972), Wolff et al. (1991), Kroeger (1993), Rackowski (2002), among many others, choose an accusative, rather than ergative, analysis of Tagalog syntax. Given the facts cited above concerning A’-movement, these linguists have identified the clause-type in which the semantic subject also has the syntactic privilege of A’-extraction, i.e. the intransitive/antipassive, as the active and transitive clause type. The clause type in which an internal argument possesses the extraction privilege is taken to be passive. They further gloss the cases accordingly. Absolutive is termed “nominative”. Ergative case is identified as genitive, due to the homophony with the case on possessors in noun phrases. Oblique case, which is also homophones with ergative is likewise called genitive.
(59)a. B-um-ilí ang babae ng isdá.
   -Act.Perf-buy Nom woman Gen fish
   “The woman bought a fish.”
b. B-in-ilí ng babae ang isdá.
   -Pass.Perf-buy Gen woman Nom fish
   “The woman bought the fish.”

It is also common in Philippine linguistics to refer to the system of verbal morphology as a “focus system”, due to the role these affixes play in identifying the absolutive DP. The term “focus” here does not, however, imply any association with pragmatic focus. Under the focus analysis, the affixes I identify as transitive, intransitive, and applicative are labeled as follows.

(60) Patient focus: -in
   Locative focus: -an
   Benefactive/Instrumental focus: i-
   Actor focus: -um-

Examples are given below illustrating the focus glosses. This terminology is relevant to the discussion of traditional analyses of Philippine syntax taken up in chapter 2.

(61)a. B-in-ilí ng babae ang isdá.
   -PF.Perf-buy Gen woman Nom dress
   “The woman bought the fish.”
b. B-in-ilh-án ng babae ng isdá ang tindahan=ko.
   -Perf-buy-LF Gen woman Gen dress Nom store=1s.Gen
   “The woman bought a/the fish at my store.”

c. I-b-in-íng ng babae ng isdá si Pedro.
   BF-Perf-buy Gen woman Obl dress Nom Pedro
   “The woman bought the fish for Pedro.”

d. B-un-ilí ang babae ng isdá.
   -AF.Perf-buy Nom woman Gen fish
   “The woman bought a fish.”

3.2. Seediq

This subsection provides a brief description of Seediq morphology and syntax. Compared to Tagalog, the morphological case-marking system of Seediq is somewhat impoverished. Strictly speaking, there is only one marker for case: ergative/genitive. There are no markers for dative or oblique case. The ergative/genitive marker also does not show a morphological distinction between common nouns and proper names. Absolutives and topicalized ergative DPs, which appear following the predicate, can optionally be preceded by the topic marker ka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(62)</th>
<th>Ergative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples below show an ergative DP in situ preceded by na and a genitive DP with na. The absolutive DP in (63a) appears in clause-final position and is preceded by ka.
(63)a. Wada bube-un na Pihu ka laqi.
   Past hit-Tr Erg Pihu Top child
   “Pihu hit the child.”

b. laqi na Pihu
   child Gen Pihu
   “Pihu’s child”

There are no morphological markers for oblique or dative/locative case. (64) shows examples of direct objects, indirect objects, and locatives in antipassives.

(64)a. Wada beebu laqi ka Pihu.
   Past Intr.hit child Top Pihu
   “Pihu hit a child.”

b. Wada m-ege hulama laqi ka Ape.
   Past Intr-give treat child Top Ape
   “Ape gave a treat to the child.”

c. Wada m-ari patis Taihoku ka Ape.
   Past Intr-buy book Taipei Top Ape
   “Ape bought books in Taipei.”

*Ka is optional but na may not be omitted.

(65) Wada biq-un hulama *(na) Ape (ka) laqi.
   Past give-Tr treat Erg Ape Top child
   “Ape gave the child a treat.”
(66) shows an example of *ka* used to mark an ergative DP which has been topicalized and placed in clause-final position. The topicalized DP is resumed by a clitic pronoun. The order of absolutive and ergative topics is fixed; the ergative topic must follow the absolutive.

(66) \[ \text{Wada=na biq-un hulama (ka) laqi (ka) Ape.} \]

\[ \text{Past=3s.Erg give-Tr treat Top child Top Ape} \]

“As for Ape, she gave the child a treat.”

Seediq basic word order is VOS. In an ergative VOS language, “S” refers to the absolutive nominal, and this nominal occurs in clause-final position in unmarked word order. VOS can be restated in the following way, where “Abs” is “absolutive” and “X” indicates any material in the clause other than the verb and absolutive DP.

(67) \[ \text{VOS = V-X-Abs} \]

As shown in (66) above, an absolutive DP may be followed by a topicalized ergative. However, an absolutive cannot be followed by an oblique object in an antipassive.

(68)a. \[ \text{Wada m-ari hulama laqi ka Ape.} \]

\[ \text{Past Intr-buy treat child Top Ape} \]

“Ape bought the child a treat.”

b. \[ *\text{Wada m-ari ka Ape hulama laqi.} \]

\[ \text{Past Intr-buy Top Ape treat child} \]

“Ape bought the child a treat.”
In a transitive clause, the absolutive must follow an ergative DP which has not been topicalized.

(69)a. Wada burig-un na Ape ka patis.
    Past buy-Tr Erg Ape Top book
    “Ape bought the book.”

    Past buy-Tr Top book Erg Ape
    “Ape bought the book.”

(70) is an example of an applicative construction. As in Tagalog, applied objects always have absolutive status. In Sediq, the applied object absolutive must follow the oblique theme.

(70)a. Wada=na s-tabu huling ka buuts rodux.
    Past=3s.Erg App-feed dog Top bone chicken
    “She fed the chicken bones to a/the dog.”

b. *Wada=na s-tabu ka buuts rodux huling
    Past=3s.Erg App-feed Top bone chicken dog
    “She fed the chicken bones to a/the dog.”

In complex clauses, the matrix absolutive must follow the complement clause.
(71a) Ini suluwa [mbari deheran mukan]
   Neg permit sell land Chinese
   laqi=na   ka tama-bubu.
   child=3s.Gen Top father-mother

“The parents do not permit their children to sell land to Chinese.”

b. *Ini suluwa ka tama-bubu
   Neg permit Top father-mother
   [mbari deheran mukan] laqi=na
   sell land Chinese child=3s.Gen

“The parents do not permit their children to sell land to Chinese.”

(71a) above is an example of an antipassive verb in the matrix clause. (72) shows that absolutes in transitive matrix clauses must also appear clause-finally.

   Pawan-Def Past=3s.Erg permit-Tr buy book Ape

   “Pawan did not allow Ape to buy books.”

b. *Pawan-ni wada=na suluwa-un Ape [mari patis]
   Pawan-Def Past=3s.Erg permit-Tr Ape buy book

   “Pawan did not allow Ape to buy books.”

Seediq verbal morphology is roughly parallel to Tagalog. Seediq exhibits a fairly rich system of transitivity and applicative verbal morphology, parallel to Tagalog, except that -an is no longer productive as a locative/dative applicative and has essentially merged with the basic transitive suffix in its function. For example, while -un is typically found in declarative matrix clauses, -an is more common in nominalized contexts such as relative clauses. The
former locative use of -an is preserved primarily in derived nominals like burig-an “place for buying and selling”, i.e. “market”.

(73) Basic Transitive: -un/-an

Benefactive/Instrumental Applicative: s-

Intransitive/Antipassive: m/-m-

Seediq verbs can also show aspectual distinctions through inflection. These are cognate with Tagalog -in- and reduplication.

(74) Past/Perfective: -n-

Future: RED

Unlike Tagalog, however, Seediq has also developed a system of tense auxiliaries, derived from verbs of motion.

(75) Auxiliary Verb
wada Past “went”
maha Future “will go”
gaga, gisu Present “be located at”

(76) shows a pair of antipassives, one with the perfective infix -n- and the other with the auxiliary wada.
Basic transitives also show this alternation. They can carry the -n- perfective infix or be accompanied by wada. The transitive suffix -un is not overtly realized when the verb is inflected with the perfective marker -n-.

Blust (1998) takes -(i)n- to be a portmanteau morph, indicating both perfective aspect and transitivity ("passive" in his terminology). Wolff (1973), Ross (1995) also reconstruct only -in- for Proto-Austronesian.
Unlike Tagalog, however, the infix does not cooccur\(^4\) with reduplication. Perfective -n- also can appear with transitive and intransitive morphology but does not cooccur with the benefactive applicative.

(78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Trans/Intrans/App</th>
<th>-n-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“see”</td>
<td>quta</td>
<td>qutaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“buy”</td>
<td>bari</td>
<td>mari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“buy”</td>
<td>bari</td>
<td>sbari</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applied verbs must occur with an auxiliary in order to indicate tense or aspect.

(79)a. Wada s-bari hulama na Ape ka laqi.
Past App-buy treat Erg Ape Top child
“Ape bought the child a treat.”

b. *S-n-bari hulama na Ape ka laqi.
App-Perf-buy treat Erg Ape Top child
“Ape bought the child a treat.”

Seediq exhibits a similar asymmetry between aspect expressed by infixation and that expressed by reduplication. Basic transitive verbs can be reduplicated to indicate future.

(80)a. Ani rima kubekui ngu-ngal-un.
even 5 100 Red-get-Tr
“(We) will even get 500 (yuan).”

---

\(^4\) The Tagalog system is considered to be innovative (Reid 1992), while Seediq inflection more closely resembles Proto-Austronesian (Wolff 1973, Ross 1995, and others).
b. Ya ani knuwan qa-qede-un=na ini kulai uri.
Q even when Red-finish-Tr=3s.Erg Neg know also
“I still don’t even know when he will finish.”

However, reduplication does not cooccur with the applicative prefix. Intransitive verbs with -m- also do not reduplicate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Trans/Intrans/App</th>
<th>RED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“go”</td>
<td>(u)sa</td>
<td>saun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“make”</td>
<td>salu</td>
<td>smalu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“give”</td>
<td>bege</td>
<td>sbege</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future is expressed on intransitive verbs with the prefix mu-/um-.

(82)a. M-n-ari qutsuruh chiiga ka Awe-ni.
Intr-Perf-buy fish yesterday Top Awe-Def
“Awe bought a fish yesterday.”

b. Um-bari qutsuruh kusun ka Awe-ni.
Intr.Fut-buy fish tomorrow Top Awe-Def
“Awe will buy a fish tomorrow.”

c. M-n-ahu=ku lukus.
Intr-Perf-wash=1s.Abs clothes
“I washed clothes.”

d. Mu-pahu lukus ka Awe-ni nana.
Intr.Fut-wash clothes Top Awe-Def from.now
“Awe will wash clothes now.”
e. **Um-pahu** lukus ka Awe-ni nana.
   Intr.Fut-wash clothes Top Awe-Def from.now
   “Awe will wash clothes now.”

f. M-n-huma bulebun ka Awe-ni.
   Intr-Perf-plant banana Top Awe-Def
   “Awe planted bananas.”

g. **Um-puhuma** bulebun ka Awe-ni.
   Intr.Fut-plant banana Top Awe-Def
   “Awe will plant bananas.”

If the verb root does not begin with a labial consonant, then a /p/ can be inserted.
Holmer (1996) cites the distinction between *m-* and *mp-* as immediate and distant future.

(83) *smalu* build
    *mu-salu* Intr.Fut(Imm)-build
    *ump-salu* Intr.Fut(Dist)-build

The clitic pronouns in Seediq are given below. Only ergative and absolutive pronouns have clitic forms. Third person absolutive forms are null.
These clitics appear in second position in their originating tensed CP. They attach to verbs, auxiliaries, negators, and Q particles.

The pronominal free forms are given below.

(84)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ergative</th>
<th>Absolutive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person Sg.</td>
<td><em>mu</em></td>
<td><em>ku</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Person Pl. (Inclusive)</td>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Person Pl. (Exclusive)</td>
<td><em>nami/miyan</em></td>
<td><em>nami/miyan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person Sg.</td>
<td><em>su</em></td>
<td><em>su</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person Pl.</td>
<td><em>namu</em></td>
<td><em>namu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person Sg.</td>
<td><em>na</em></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person Pl.</td>
<td><em>daha</em></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(85)a. Tuminun=**ta**, burige=**ta**!

weave=1p.Inc sell=1p.Inc

“Let’s weave stuff and sell (it)!”

b. Wada=**miyan** mukuraqin riong ka tsubeo.

Past=1p.Excl poor verb Top past

“In the past, we were very poor.”

c. Ini=**mu** burig-i kanna.

Neg=1s.Erg buy-Tr.Irr all

“I didn’t buy all of them.”

d. Ya=**ku=daha** pahulisan kndalah bukuei uri.

Q=1s.Abs=3p.Erg laugh behind back also

“Perhaps they will laugh at me behind my back.”

The pronominal free forms are given below.
Free forms are used when the pronoun has oblique status or when it is focused or topicalized.

(87)a. Gaga mu-lawa **isu** ka bubu.
   Pres Intr-call 2s Top mother
   “Mother is calling you.”

b. Bulebun-ni **heya** ka b-n-ari.
   banana-Def 3s Top -Perf-buy
   “These bananas, he/she is the one who bought them.”

Free forms are also used when the pronoun appears in clause-final absolutive position. This pronoun must be resumed by a clitic in second position.

(88)a. M-n-imah **sino** **heya**.
   Intr-Perf-drink wine 3s
   “He drank wine.”
b. Gaga=\textbf{ku}=daha ngal-un ka \textbf{yaku} duri.

Pres=1s.Abs=3p.Erg choose-Tr Top 1s also

“They have chosen me, too.”

Seediq exhibits the same extraction restriction as Tagalog. Only absolutes can undergo A’-movement. (89) shows examples of relativization.

(89)a. \textbf{sapah} s-n-malu na tama

house -Perf-build Erg father

“house which Father built”

b. *\textbf{seediq} s-n-malu ka \textbf{sapah}

person -Perf-build Top house

“person who built the house”

Like Tagalog, Seediq has pre-nominal and internally headed relative clauses, in addition to post-nominal relatives.

(90)a. s-n-malu na tama \textbf{sapah} (pre-nominal)

-Perf-build Erg father house

“house which Father built”

b. s-n-malu \textbf{sapah} na tama (internally headed)

-Perf-build house Erg father

“house which Father built”

(91) shows the absolutive extraction restriction in the case of \textit{wh}-movement. Like Tagalog, \textit{wh}-questions formed on DPs take the form of clefts. The clefted nominal appears
in predicate clause-initial position. The headless relative clause has absolutive status and is preceded by the topic marker.

(91)a. \textbf{Maanu} ka s-n-malu na tama?
\begin{tabular}{llll}
what & Top & -Perf-build & Erg father
\end{tabular}
“What did Father build?”

b. \textit{*Ima} ka s-n-malu ka sapah?
\begin{tabular}{llll}
who & Top & -Perf-build & Top house
\end{tabular}
“What built the house?”

(92) shows clefting examples not involving \textit{wh}-words.

(92)a. \textbf{Sapah} ka s-n-malu na tama.
\begin{tabular}{llll}
house & Top & -Perf-build & Erg father
\end{tabular}
“A house is what Father built.”

b. \textit{*Tama} ka s-n-malu ka sapah.
\begin{tabular}{llll}
father & Top & -Perf-build & Top house
\end{tabular}
“Father is the one who built the house.”

As noted above, Seediq also allows ergative DPs to topicalize, unlike Tagalog. Topics appear in clause-final position and must be resumed by a clitic pronoun inside the clause.

(93)a. \textbf{Wada bube-un} \textit{na Pawan} ka dangi=na.
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
Past & hit-Tr & Erg & Pawan & Top & friend=3s.Gen
\end{tabular}
“Pawan hit his friend.”
b. Wada=na bube-un ka dangi=na ka Pawan-ni.
Past=3s.Erg hit-Tr Top friend=3s.Gen Top Pawan-Def
“Pawan hit his friend.”

But oblique objects are not able to dislocate.

(94)a. M-n-atis patis ka seediq kiya.
-Perf-write book Top person that
“That person wrote a book.”

b. *M-n-atis ka seediq kiya (ka) patis.
Intr-Perf-write Top person that Top book

Indirect objects in antipassives are likewise unable to move.

(98)a. M-n-ari quyuqeya laqi=na ka Ape.
Intr-Perf-buy thing child=3s.Gen Top Ape
“Ape bought her child something.”

Intr-Perf-buy thing Top Ape Top child=3s.Gen

4. Organization of the Thesis

Before ending this chapter, I recapitulate the discussions of the preceding sections by briefly summarizing how each main point will be taken up in the body of the thesis.

In chapter 2, I propose the analysis for absolutive case-checking in Tagalog and Seediq. I begin by arguing that these languages are ergative but belong to two separate types of syntactically ergative language. Next I present the analyses of the two types of
ergativity, labeled v-type and T-type. I also sketch an analysis of Indonesian as an accusative language with remnant ergative syntax. Additionally, I suggest how Malagasy can be analyzed as a split-ergative language which has lost its antipassive construction.

Chapter 3 is devoted to the derivation of VSO word order in Tagalog. I show how this is accomplished by moving the verb to the left of the ergative and absolutive arguments, in parallel fashion to analyses proposed for Celtic and Semitic languages.

Chapter 4 is concerned with VOS word order in Seediq. I propose that the absolutive DP undergoes topicalization to [Spec, C], followed by fronting of the remnant TP. TP fronting to the left of the absolutive is indirectly triggered by the PF filter prohibiting the stranding of a DP in the left edge of CP (the Stranded DP Constraint in (15) above). I also show how this pair of movements feeds the interpretive component, where a clause-initial XP receives a focus reading, while the DP following it is interpreted as a topic (Phase Edge Interpretation in (16) above). TP-fronting also derives a typological distinction between VSO and VOS languages regarding movement of PPs and adjuncts. VSO languages allow wh-movement and focus fronting of PPs and adjuncts to clause-initial position. However, this is not possible in VOS languages like Seediq, which is accounted for by the fact that these XPs are contained inside the fronted TP.

In chapter 5, I extend the predicate-fronting proposal to other Austronesian languages. Tagalog displays evidence of predicate-fronting in intransitive clauses, including antipassives and clauses containing non-verbal predicates. The proposal for Seediq can also account for VOS word order in Malagasy and Niuean, suggesting a foundation upon which a general theory of Austronesian VOS word order may be developed.

The proposals for ergativity and word order are brought together in chapter 6 in order to account for wh-constructions involving DPs. DP wh-movement is constrained by the absolutive restriction on extraction, which I implement by allowing an EPP feature to appear only on transitive v. This ensures that internal argument DPs can move out of vP only
in transitive clauses, i.e. only when they have absolutive status. Otherwise, the external argument in an antipassive or the single argument of an intransitive predicate, which have absolutive status in their respective clause types, will be the DP attracted to [Spec, C]. In chapter 6, I also show how my proposal for Seediq and Tagalog can be adapted for other Austronesian languages, including Chamorro and Malagasy, again suggesting the possibility of a uniform cross-linguistic analysis.

In chapter 6, I also discuss the structure of DP wh-questions, which take the form of pseudo-clefts. I show how this fact need not be stipulated but rather is a consequence of the Stranded DP Constraint, which prohibits spelling out a DP in the extreme left edge of a phase. This filter has the effect of disallowing DP wh-movement, since such movement would result in spelling out the wh-phrase in the left edge of CP. The cleft option is available, however, since it can circumvent this prohibition and also feed the interpretive mapping specified by Phase Edge Interpretation. The wh-phrase will receive the required focus interpretation, since it will be contained inside the matrix predicate which fronts to clause-initial position. The remainder of the clause, which takes the form of a headless relative clause, will be in the absolutive topic position in C’s inner specifier and will be interpreted as the presupposition. The absolutive restriction on extraction is still maintained under the cleft analysis, applying to the movement of a null operator inside the headless relative.
CHAPTER TWO
ERGATIVITY AND CASE-CHECKING

1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to develop an ergative analysis of case-checking in Tagalog and Seediq. I will argue that the split in subject properties observed by Schachter (1976, 1994) for Philippine languages is a common occurrence in syntactically ergative languages and is no basis for claiming that these languages are accusative or constitute their own typological class. I will also show that Seediq and other Formosan languages possess the basic characteristics of syntactically ergative languages.

I propose an analysis of ergativity which departs from earlier Generative approaches. Marantz (1984), Levin (1983), Murasugi (1992), and Bittner and Hale (1996a,b) account for the perceived subject-like behavior of absolutive nominals by equating absolutive with subject case. Bobaljik (1993) and Levin and Massam (1985), on the other hand, focus on the object qualities of absolutive and treat absolutive case as analogous to accusative. In this thesis, I do not fully identify absolutes as subjects or objects. Rather, what defines an absolutive is the distribution of subject and object qualities it exhibits. In this chapter, I argue that there are two types of ergative language, one in which absolutes show a balance of subject and object properties and another in which absolutes are more closely (but not completely) aligned with subjects.

Dixon (1979, 1994) and others have proposed that morphological ergativity languages should be distinguished from syntactically ergative ones. The former display ergative case-marking but behave syntactically like accusative languages. Syntactically ergative languages additionally exhibit syntactic characteristics which are different from accusative languages. This is what Dixon (1979, 1994) refers to as the “syntactic pivot”. The most salient of these properties is the restriction that only DPs with absolutive status are
able to undergo A’-movement. However, I will show in this chapter that syntactic ergativity must be subdivided into two types. Certain properties generally attributed to subjects in accusative languages can be assumed by any external argument in an ergative language regardless of whether this nominal bears ergative or absolutive case. Specifically, I show in this chapter that ergatives as well as antipassive absolutes can antecede reflexives and function as imperative or hortative addressees. In some ergative languages, controlled PRO can appear in the ergative position in a nonfinite clause. However, there are many ergative languages in which controlled PRO cannot appear in the ergative slot, allowing only intransitive (antipassive) clauses in nonfinite contexts.

In order to account for this distinction, I propose that there are two types of syntactically ergative language. The two types are distinguished mainly on the basis of the roles assigned to T and v in structural case-checking. In those languages that allow transitive nonfinite clauses, I propose that absolutive case-checking is distributed between v and T, v checking absolutive case in transitive clauses and T in intransitive clauses. I identify these as “v-type” ergative languages. This is intended to account for the observation that transitive absolutes in these languages behave primarily like direct objects and ergative DPs like subjects. It is only in intransitive clauses where absolutes have the properties of subjects. This divided case-checking system also accounts for the grammaticality of transitive nonfinite clauses. Since absolutive case is checked by v and not T, it is still available for an internal argument even when T is unable to check case, i.e. when it is nonfinite. I will propose that this is the appropriate analysis for ergativity in Tagalog and Eskimo languages.

In the other type of syntactically ergative language, controlled PRO can only appear in absolutive position, meaning that nonfinite clauses must always be intransitive or antipassive. I refer to these as T-type ergative languages, proposing that absolutive case is uniformly checked by T and is therefore unavailable in nonfinite clauses. Seediq and Mayan languages display T-type ergative syntax.
The primary goal of this chapter is to propose a general theory of ergative/absolutive case-checking which accounts for the two types of ergative syntax, using Seediq and Tagalog as prototypes. Additionally, I intend for this analysis to function as a platform for comparison among Austronesian languages, which applies not only to other fully ergative Austronesian languages but also to those which display certain aspects of accusative syntax. I will show how this analysis can be extended to account for split-ergativity in Malagasy and remnants of ergative syntax in otherwise fully accusative Indonesian.

2. Characterization of Ergativity

This section identifies the basic characteristics of ergativity. Using Dixon’s (1979, 1994) proposal as a guide, basic grammatical relations can be divided into transitive subject (A), transitive object (O), and intransitive subject (S). The fundamental distinction between accusative and ergative languages is that in the former, A and S roles share certain properties, distinct from O, while in ergative languages it is S and O which pattern together.

A distinction is generally made between morphological and syntactic ergativity. Morphological ergativity refers specifically to case marking or agreement, whichever identifies grammatical roles in a clause. In an ergative pattern, an intransitive subject is marked the same way as a transitive direct object (absolutive), while a transitive subject (ergative) is indicated differently. The absolutes in the following Dyirbal examples are zero-marked, while the ergative is suffixed with -nggu.
Dyirbal (Dixon 1994:161)

(2)a. yabu banaga-nyu
mother.Abs return-Nonfut

“Mother returned.”

b. nguma yabu-nggu bura-n
father.Abs mother-Erg see-Nonfut

“Mother saw father.”

Absolutive marking in Yup’ik is -(a)q. The ergative DP takes -m.

Yup’ik Eskimo (Payne 1982:77)

(3)a. Pam-aq mayu-llru-u-q.
Pam-Abs climb-Past-Intr-3s

“Pam climbed up.”

b. Yero-m Dena-q tange-llru-a-0.
Yero-Erg Dena-Abs see-Past-Tr-3s/3s

“Yero saw Dena.”

Mam shows agreement for ergative and absolutes DPs on the verb. Absolutive agreement is null, while the ergative is marked overtly.

Mam Mayan (England 1983:182-3)

(4)a. ma 0-kyim xiinaq
Rec 3s.Abs-die man

“The man died.”
b. ma-a7 0-tzaj ky-q’o-7n pwaq q-ee
Rec-Emph 3s.Abs-dir 3p.Erg-give-DS money 1p-RN/Dat

“They gave us the money.”

In syntactically ergative languages, the S/O grouping is extended to certain syntactic operations, roughly those involving A’-dependencies. For example, relative clauses can be formed only on absolutes in Dyirbal. The sole argument of an intransitive verb can be relativized in (5a). In order to relativize a transitive agent, the clause has to antipassivize, as in (5b).

Dyirbal
(5)a. nguma [e₁ banaga-ngu] yabu-nggu bura-n
father.Abs return-Rel.Abs mother-Erg see-Nonfut

“Mother saw father, who was returning.” (Dixon 1994:169)

b. yabu [e₁ bural-nga-ngu nguma-gu] banaga-nyu
mother.Abs see-AP-Rel.Abs father-Dat return-Nonfut

“The mother, who saw father, was returning.” (Dixon 1994:170)

The same is true of Yup’ik Eskimo. (6a) shows a relative clause formed on an intransitive. (6b) is a relativized transitive patient. Relative clauses cannot be formed on transitive agents.

Yup’ik (Payne 1982:87)
(6)a. aya-lria
leave-Intr

“the one who is leaving”
Manning (1996) gives examples from West Greenlandic. In the transitive clauses below, only the absolutive internal argument can be relativized, not the external argument.

West Greenlandic (Manning 1996:84)

(7)a. nanuq Piita-p tuqu-ta-a
    polar.bear.Abs Piita-Erg kill-Tr.Ptcp-3s
    “a polar bear killed by Piita”

b. *angut aallaat tigu-sima-sa-a
    man.Abs gun.Abs take-Perf-Rel.Tr-3s
    “the man who took the gun”

England (1983) shows the same characteristic is also found in Mayan languages. Transitive patients, as in (8b), but not transitive agents, as in (8c), can be extracted in constituent questions. In order to extract a transitive agent, the clause must be antipassivized, as in (8d).

Mam (England 1983:250-1)

(8)a. ma-a7 chi tzaj t-tzyu-7n Cheep kab’ xiinaq
    Rec-Emph 3p.Abs Dir 3s-grab-DS Jose two man
    “Jose grabbed the men.”
Craig (1977) notes that relativization or *wh*-movement of intransitive subjects or transitive objects can take place directly in Jacaltec. Movement of a transitive subject, however, must be accompanied by the antipassive suffix *-ni* on the verb.

*Jacaltec* (Craig 1977:14)

(9)a. mac xul ewi
who came yesterday

“Who came yesterday?”

b. mac xawila
whom you saw

“Whom did you see?”

c. mac xcañ xañ* ni*
who you hit-AP

“Who hit you?”
Absolutives are not, however, the exclusive bearers of syntactic privilege. External arguments, whether in the ergative or absolutive role, still retain certain properties of subjects. For example, ergative DPs can antecede reflexives.

W. Greenlandic (Manning 1996:126)

    Junna-Erg Kaali.Abs self-Mod tell-Ind-Tr-3s
    “Junna, told Kaali about himself.”

Quiche Mayan (Larsen & Norman 1979:349)

(11) x-0-u-kamsa-j r-iib’ lee achih
    Compl-3s.Abs-3s.Erg-kill-Suff 3s-self the man
    “The man killed himself.”

External arguments, either with ergative or absolutive status, function as imperative or hortative addressees.

Yup’ik (Payne 1982:90)

(12)a. Ner-ci-u!
    eat-2p-3s
    “You all eat it!”

b. Inar-ci!
    lie.down-2p
    “You all lie down!”
As in accusative languages, controlled PRO typically appears in the position of the external argument. In Eskimo languages, this is the ergative slot in a transitive clause and the absolutive in an intransitive.

W. Greenlandic (Manning 1996:124)

(13)a. Miiqqat [PRO Juuna ikiu-ssa-ltu-gu]
   children.Abs [(Erg) Juuna.Abs help-Fut-Inf-3s]
   niriursui-pp-u-t.
   promise-Ind-Intr-3p
   “The children promised to help Juuna.”

   children.Abs (Abs) dance-Fut-Inf-4p promise-Ind-Intr-3p
   “The children promised to dance.”

To summarize the characteristics of syntactic ergativity, A’-extraction is the privilege of absolutives. But other subject properties, including the ability to antecede reflexive pronouns, serve as imperative addressees, and function as controlled PRO, are possessed by external arguments, both absolute and ergative.

3. The Philippine Ergativity Debate

Ergativity in Philippine languages has long been a controversial issue. Many ergative analyses have been proposed (De Guzman 1988, Gerdts 1988, Payne 1982, Aldridge 1998, and others) for one or more of these languages, though others (Schacter & Otanes 1972, Bell 1983, Wolff et al. 1991, Kroeger 1993, Rackowski 2002, among others) assume Philippine languages to be accusative or to belong to another typological class (Schachter 1976, Shibatani 1988, and others). There are two key issues involved in the
debate. One concerns establishing the transitive status of non-actor focus clauses. The second, perhaps more important, involves showing that Tagalog has an antipassive construction.

3.1. Transitive Status of Ergative Clauses

Early structuralist and subsequent Philippine linguists (Bloomfield 1917, Schachter and Otanes 1972, Wolff et al. 1991, among others), observed that there are two morphological cases assigned to agents and themes, generally termed “nominative” and “genitive”.

**Tagalog**

(14)a. B-um-ilí ang babae ng isdá.

-Act.Perf-buy Nom woman Gen fish

“The woman bought a fish.”

b. B-in-ilí ng babae ang asdá.

-Pass.Perf-buy Gen woman Nom fish

“The woman bought the fish.”

Bearing with this terminology, the nominative-marked nominal has certain syntactic privileges not available to the genitive nominal. For instance, the nominative DP can undergo relativization, while the genitive DP cannot.

**Tagalog**

(15)a. tao-ng b-um-ilí ng isdá

person-Lk -Act.Perf-buy Gen fish

“person who bought a fish”
b. *isda-ŋ b-um-ilí si María
   fish-Lk -Act.Perf-buy Nom María
   “fish that Maria bought”

c. isda-ŋ b-in-ilí ni María
   fish-Lk -Pass.Perf-buy Gen María
   “fish that Maria bought”

d. *tao-ŋ b-in-ilí ang isdá
   person-Lk -Pass.Perf-buy Nom fish
   “person who bought a fish”

These linguists assumed that the nominal with this privilege must have subject status in the clause. Thus, clauses where external arguments appear in the case which they gloss as “nominative” are taken to be active. These verbs appear with the -um- infix. Clauses in which internal arguments have this status are taken to be passive. These verbs are affixed with -in- in realis mood, -in- in irrealis.

This view has led to the assumption that Philippine languages are accusative, exhibiting the case-marking pattern shown below, where transitive agents and intransitive subjects are marked in a way which is distinct from transitive objects.

Tagalog

(16)a. B-um-ilí ang babae ng isdá.
   -Act.Perf-buy Nom woman Gen fish
   “The woman bought a fish.”

b. D-um-atíng ang babae.
   -Act.Perf-arrive Nom woman
   “The woman arrived.”
Bell (1983) attempts to substantiate her claim that the Philippine language Cebuano is accusative by invoking Keenan and Comrie’s (1977) accessibility hierarchy for relativization. In a survey of about fifty languages, Keenan and Comrie conclude that languages generally have constraints on which grammatical relations can undergo relativization. Their conclusion is that if direct objects in a given language can relativize, then so can subjects. Likewise, if a language allows relativization of genitives, then it also permits obliques, indirect objects, direct objects, and subjects to relativize. Finally, if only one nominal in a language can relativize, then that nominal is the subject.

\[(17) \quad \text{SU} > \text{DO} > \text{IO} > \text{OBL} > \text{GEN} > \text{OCOMP}\]

Based on this hierarchy, Bell (1983) concludes that the one grammatical relation in Cebuano which can relativize must be a subject and therefore that Cebuano must be an accusative language.

In spite of this tradition of assuming Philippine languages to be accusative, there is abundant counter-evidence against this claim. In addition to determining grammatical functions and their properties, the ergative/accusative debate also depends on identifying the basic transitive clause type in these languages. The accusative analysis makes the assumption that clauses with a nominative agent are active, while clauses with a nominative internal argument are passive. However, numerous scholars have pointed out the fact that “passive” clauses in Austronesian languages do not have the characteristics typically associated with passive clauses in accusative languages. For example, “passive” clauses occur with equal or greater frequency than “active”. Shibatani (1988:96) reports 48% for Cebuano. Cooreman et al. (1984:17) show 76% for Tagalog. Brainard (1994:383) indicates 63% for Karao. Shibatani (1988:95) contrasts this with 18% for Japanese and English.
Another fact distinguishing Austronesian -in marked clauses from passive is the fact that agents in non-actor focus constructions are almost never dropped. Cooreman (1982:360-1) reports that over 75% of semantically transitive clauses in a Chamorro discourse belong to what she calls an “ergative” type. The agent is encoded for all of these, at least by means of verb agreement. Cooreman et al. (1984:18) reports omission of agents in only 24% of -in-type Tagalog clauses. Himmelmann (1999) also reports that actors typically appear overtly in -in-type Tagalog clauses. Shibatani (1988:93) again contrasts this with the situation in accusative languages: 70 to 90 percent of English and Japanese passives are agentless.

Schachter (1976) adds to the controversy by demonstrating that the “passive” agent has certain properties expected of a subject. For example, Schachter points out that an agent can bind a reflexive lower in the clause, as shown in (18a), while a lower argument cannot bind the agent, as shown in (18b).

**Tagalog (Schachter 1976:503)**

(18)a. In-iisip=nilá ang kanilá-ng sarili.

PF-think.about =3p.Gen Nom their-Lk self

“They think about themselves.”

b. *In-iisip=silá ng kanilá-ng sarili.

PF-think.about =3p.Nom Gen their-Lk self

Controlled PRO in a nonfinite clause also must appear in the agent position.
Tagalog (Schachter 1976:504)

(19)a. Nag-atubilí=siyá-ng [PRO h-um-irám ng pera sa bangkó]
AF-hesitated=3s.Nom-Lk -AF-borrow Obl money P bank
“He hesitated to borrow money from a/the bank.”

b. Nag-atubilí=siyá-ng [PRO hiram-i n ang pera sa bangkó]
AF-hesitated=3s.Nom-Lk borrow-PF Nom money P bank
“He hesitated to borrow the money from a/the bank.”

These agents also function as imperative addressees.

Tagalog (Schachter 1976:506)

(20)a. Bigy-án=mo=siya ng kapé.
Give-LF=2s.Gen=3s.Nom Obl coffee
“Give him the coffee.”

b. I-bigáy=mo sa kaniyá ang kapé.
PF-give=2s.Gen P him Nom coffee
“Give him the coffee.”

Schachter also points out that verbs in another Philippine language Kapampangan show agreement with both the nominative DP and a non-actor focus agent, indicating their status as final terms.

Kapampangan (Schachter 1976:501-2)

(21)a. Menakit=ya ng anak ing lalaki.
AF.saw=3s.Nom Obl child Nom man
“The man saw a child/some children.”
b. Ikit=na=la ning lalaki ding anak.

PF.saw=3s.Gen=3s.Nom Gen man Nom child

“A/The man saw the children.”

Schachter (1976, 1994) concludes that Philippine languages are different from more commonly-known languages in that there is no single grammatical category corresponding to subject. Rather, properties generally attributed to subjects are divided between the external argument and the absolutive nominal ("actor" and "topic" in his terminology).

Payne (1982), on the other hand, points out that this split in subject properties is also found in a language generally accepted as syntactically ergative, Yup’ik Eskimo. Payne cites the fact that ergative agents function as imperative addressees and appear in the position of controlled gaps. Payne also notes that relativization in Yup’ik functions on an absolutive pivot, as in Tagalog and most other syntactically ergative languages, as I have discussed in section 2.

This discussion leads to the conclusion that non-actor focus clauses are actually active, as I will assume for the duration of this thesis. Given that -in/-in-marked clauses can be considered to be a basic transitive clause type, Tagalog appears to follow an ergative pattern. Case marking on the transitive theme matches that on the intransitive subject and this is distinct from the marking on the transitive agent.

Tagalog (Payne 1982:77)

(22)a. B-in-ilí ng babae ang baró.

-Tr.Perf-buy Erg woman Abs dress

“The woman bought the dress.”
Taking the perspective that Tagalog is an ergative language, the extraction asymmetry mentioned at the beginning of this section also comes as no surprise. Given the conclusion above that non-actor focus is active and transitive, the theme in (23) has absolutive status and so can be relativized in (23a) while the ergative agent in (23b) cannot. In order to extract the agent, the clause must be antipassivized, as in (23c).

Tagalog

(23)a. is dá-ng b-in-ilí ni Maria
fish-Lk -Tr.Perf-buy Erg Maria
“the fish that Maria bought”

b. *tao-ng b-in-ilí ang is dá
person-Lk -Tr.Perf-buy Abs fish
“the person who bought a fish”

c. tao-ng b-um-ilí ng is dá
person-Lk -Intr.Perf-buy Obl fish
“the person who bought a fish”

As we have seen, Bell (1983) used the A’-extraction restriction in Cebuano to argue that this language is accusative by invoking Keenan and Comrie’s (1977) Accessibility Hierarchy for relativization. However, Keenan and Comrie also point out the fact that relativization in the ergative language Dyirbal is limited to absolutives and propose to accommodate this potential counterexample by identifying the absolutive as the subject in
this language. This concession to syntactic ergativity on the part of Keenan and Comrie in effect nullifies Bell’s (1983) argument for an accusative analysis of Cebuano, as the revision to the relativization hierarchy leads to the new generalization that if only one grammatical relation in a language can relativize, this relation is a subject or an absolutive. One additional point should be mentioned, and that is the fact that nine of the eleven languages (aside from Dyirbal) that Keenan and Comrie cite as allowing only one grammatical function to relativize are Austronesian. I will not attempt to debate the relative degrees of ergative and accusative syntax of each of these languages. I will suggest, though, that this characteristic, which is pervasive throughout Formosan and Western Austronesian languages, can be given an empirically and typologically satisfying account if considered to derive from a common source. In section 8, I will show how even standard Indonesian, which has largely evolved into an accusative language but still retains the (absolutive) extraction restriction, can be analyzed in the framework I propose for syntactic ergativity with minimal parametric variation.

3.2. Antipassive

The discussion in the previous section has shown that verbs marked with -in should be considered active and not passive. However, this fact alone is not sufficient to prove that Tagalog is an ergative language. Tagalog could, in fact, have two basic transitive clause types, one following an ergative pattern and one an accusative pattern, as has been proposed by Maclachlan (1996). In order to show conclusively that Tagalog is a canonical ergative language, it is necessary to demonstrate that -um- verbs, as in (24a), are intransitive and therefore that Tagalog has an antipassive construction, which is a far more controversial topic than the active status of -in- verbs.
3.2.1. Questions Regarding Antipassive in Tagalog

Some linguists who accept the transitive status of ergative clauses hesitate to analyze Tagalog as a fully ergative language, claiming that Tagalog does not have true antipassives. Kroeger (1993), for instance, shows that an actor focus theme can control a gap in a participial clause. Either the thief or the police can be interpreted as entering the bank.

Tagalog (Kroeger 1993:47)

(25) Nanghuli ng magnanakaw, ang polí.jsj

AV.Perf.catch Gen thief Nom police

[nang PRO; pumapasok sa bangkó]

Adv AV.Imperf.enter Dat bank

“The police caught a/the thief when entering the bank.”

Maclachlan (1996) points out that the actor focus clause text frequency rate (24% cited by Cooreman et al. 1984; 38% by McFarland 1984) is not as low as corresponding rates for passives in most accusative languages and should not be taken as evidence that actor focus is less basic than non-actor focus. Citing early acquisition data, Maclachlan reports that although non-actor focus is generally acquired before actor focus, the
discrepancy is not as great as that between acquisition of active and passive by children learning accusative languages. She thus concludes that both are equally basic and transitive and on this basis analyzes Tagalog as a split ergative language with ergative syntax manifested in non-actor focus and accusative in actor focus.

3.2.2. Cross-linguistic Characteristics of Antipassive

From the preceding discussion, it is clear that part of the objection to an ergative analysis of Philippine languages stems from the perception that these languages lack an antipassive construction. This perception may, at least in part, also be the result of a misunderstanding of the nature of antipassive clauses. Kroeger’s and Maclachlan’s arguments are both founded on the assumption that antipassive is the mirror image of passive. If passive involves the demotion of the agent then antipassive must likewise force the direct object into adjunct status.

In this section and in section 7.4, where I present my structural analysis of antipassive, I argue that these assumptions are unfounded and unnecessary. Though antipassive objects tend crosslinguistically to be indefinite and are marked with oblique case, this is no reason to conclude that they are not arguments. In this subsection, I summarize the general characteristics of antipassives.

As is often noted in the literature, direct objects in antipassive constructions tend to be indefinite or nonspecific. (26) is a South Baffin Eskimo example. -si- is a marker of antipassivization or reflexivity.

South Baffin Eskimo (Kalmar 1979:124)

(26)a. Joosi quqiq-si-y-up-0 tuttu-mik
    Joosi.Abs shoot-si-Ptcp-Monop-3 caribou-Mod

“Joosi shot a caribou.”
b. Joosi-up quqi-kkaniq-t-a-nga tuttu
   Joosi-Erg shoot-again-Ptcp-Polyp-3/3 caribou.Abs
   “Joosi shot the same caribou again.”

Antipassive objects are also typically less affected by the action of the verb than in transitive constructions, as in the case of the following examples from Chuckchee.

Chuckchee (Palmer 1994:182)

(27)a. etleg-e keyng-en penre-nen
    father-Erg bear-Abs attack-3s.3s.Aor
    “Father attacked the bear.”

b. etleg-en penre-tko-g’e kayng-ete
    father-Abs attack-AP-3s.Aor bear-Dat
    “Father ran at the bear.”

Antipassive objects can also have a partitive interpretation in some languages, such as Eskimo.

Eskimo (Palmer 1994:183-4)

(28)a. ama-p niqi niri-vaa
    woman-Erg meat.Abs eat-Ind
    “The woman ate the meat.”

b. ama niqi-mik niri-NNiq-puq
    woman.Abs meat-Instr eat-AP-Ind
    “The woman ate some of the meat.”
Aspect is sometimes involved in antipassive constructions. Typically, there is a sense that the action is less complete. In West Greenlandic, Chukchee, and Chamorro, antipassive constructions can have a hatibual or iterative interpretation, as in the following from West Greenlandic.

\begin{verbatim}
West Greenlandic (Cooreman 1994:57)
(29)a. inuit tuqup-pai
    people.Abs kill-Tr.Ind.3s.Erg.3p
    “He killed the people.”

b. inun-nik tuqut-si-vuq
    people.Instr kill-AP-Intr.Ind.3s.Abs
    “He killed people.”
\end{verbatim}

The preceding discussion has shown that antipassive objects tend cross-linguistically to be indefinite, nonspecific, or less affected by the action of the verb. In the next subsection, I show that actor focus clauses containing objects in Tagalog can also be characterized as antipassives.

3.2.3. Antipassive in Tagalog

The defining characteristic of Tagalog antipasses is that the object tends overwhelmingly to be nonspecific. The discussion that follows examines the information structure of antipassive clauses found in a text.\(^5\) There are 65 antipassive clauses in the 93 pages that comprise this text. The direct object is nonspecific in all of them.

The most numerous cases (50 examples) are of the following type, where the oblique object is indefinite and nonspecific.

\(^5\) Data are taken from \textit{Ngayong Mahal na Kita}.\n
   Pot.Perf-Intr-get Obl scholarship Abs friend
   “(Her) friend was able to get a scholarship.”

b. Hindí=ító nag-karoon ng injury.
   Neg=3s.Abs Intr.Perf-have Obl injury
   “He didn’t have an injury.”

c. H-um-ugot ng hiningá si Gilbert.
   -Intr.Perf-draw Obl breath Abs Gilbert
   “Gilbert drew a breath.”

d. Hindí=ító nag-hintáy ng katugunán.
   Neg=3s.Abs Intr.Perf-wait Obl answer
   “He didn’t wait for an answer.”

The other examples might be understood as definite. However, they are clearly not specific. The definiteness in these cases is not discoursally determined. In (31), for instance, *bola* “ball” could be considered to be definite, but not because it has been introduced in the preceding discourse.

a. Mag-bu-buslo ng bola si Gilbert.
   Intr-Red-shoot Obl ball Abs Gilbert
   “Gilbert will shoot the ball.”

b. Nagmamadalì ng l-um-abás ng silá.d.
   quickly -Intr.Perf-leave Obl room
   “(She) quickly left the room.”
Rather, the definiteness in these examples is due to pragmatic inference. For example, (31a) is uttered in the context of a basketball game. The object receives its definite interpretation from the fact that a basketball game always involves a ball (though not a specific ball). This type of definiteness has been as analyzed as bridging by Asher and Lascarides (1998) and need not be assumed to involve specificity.

The association between nonspecificity and antipassive is made clearer by the contrast with existential constructions. As argued by Flegg (2004), existential constructions involve indefinite, specific DPs and are used to introduce referents into the discourse. The antipassive in (32a) can only be used when the object is nonspecific. The existential in (32b) is used with an indefinite specific object.

(32)a. Nag-ha-hanáp=ako ng libro
    Intr-Red-look.for=1s.Abs Obl book
tungkól sa mga giraffë.
    about Dat Pl giraffë

    “I’m looking for a(ny) book about giraffes.”
b. Mayroón=akó-ng hina-hanaó na libró
exist=1s.Abs-Lk Red.Tr-look.for Lk book
tungkól sa mga giraffé.
about Dat Pl giraffé

“There’s a book about giraffes that I’m looking for.”

The difference in specificity is highlighted by the fact that (32b), but not (32a), can be followed by (33), which describes a specific book.

(33) Mayroón litrato sa loób.
exist picture in inside

“It has pictures inside.”

Antipassives and existentials contrast further with transitive clauses. The absolutive in the following example can only be interpreted as definite.

(34) Hina-hanáp=ko ang libró
Red.Tr-look.for=1s.Erg Abs book
tungkól sa mga giraffé.
about Dat Pl giraffé

“I’m looking for the/*a book about giraffes.” (Flegg 2004)
To return to the text that yielded 65 examples of antipassive, a rough count of transitive clauses with an internal argument DP absolutive reveals 488 examples. In terms of percentages, no more than 12 percent of the clauses containing both an external and internal argument DPs are antipassives, contradicting Maclachlan’s (1996) claim that the antipassive is a basic clause type in Tagalog. As for information structure, in contrast to the nonspecific obliques in antipassives, the absolutive in all of the 488 transitive examples is definite and specific. For instance, the absolutive is very often realized as a pronoun or proper name.

   Tr.Perf-imitate=3s.Abs Erg Gilbert.
   “Gilbert imitated her.”

b. Na-salubong=ko si Gemma.
   Pot.Perf-meet=1s.Erg Abs Gemma
   “I ran into Gemma.”

There are also some examples which superficially resemble the antipassive bridging examples. *Bola* ‘ball’ in (36b) obtains its definiteness through pragmatic inference. The discourse preceding this passage describes Rod’s dribbling and waiting for his teammates to get into position so he can pass to one of them. Dribbling and passing require a ball; hence *bola* is definite.

(36)a. Má-mata-án ni Rod si Allan
    Pot-see-App Erg Rod Abs Allan

---

6 This count does not include transitive complex clauses in which the complement CP is in absolutive position.
na sa biglaáng pagpihit

C Dat sudden turn

patungo sa ilalim ng goal=nilá ay
toward Dat under Gen goal=3s.Gen Top

na-ka-walá sa bumabantáy rito.

Pot.Perf-Intr-free from guard 3s.Dat

“Rod spotted Allan, who, by turning suddenly toward (the space) under their goal, became free of the player guarding him.”

b. Sing-bilí̱s ng kidlát

as-fast as lightning

i-p-in-ukól ni Rod ang bola rito.

App-Tr.Perf-throw Erg Rod Abs ball 3s.Dat

“As fast as lightening, Rod threw the ball to him.”

However, unlike in the case of the bridging example, the ball in (36b) refers to the specific ball being used in the game. First, it is clear from (36) that bola is the focus of the reader’s attention. Rod has been carrying the ball and waiting for his chance to make a play with it. (36a) describes the opportunity, and (36b) tells the reader what Rod did with the ball. Secondly, in the passage following (36), bola has become the topic of the discourse. It therefore has to have specific reference.

(37)a. Pero na-basa ni Gilbert ang intensyon=nitó kayá

but Pot.Perf-read Erg Gilbert Abs intention=3s.Gen so

sing-bilí̱s din ng kidlát ay

as-fast also as lightning Top
For the sake of comparison, let me mention the context in which the bridging example (31a) is uttered. The discourse is focused on the action of shooting and not the ball itself. Nor is the ball mentioned again in the following discourse.

(38) “Shoot! Shoot!” tilí ni Gemma
scream Erg Gemma
sa tuwíng aakto-ng
at every action-Lk
mag-bu-buslo ng bola si Gilbert.
Intr-Red.Fut-shoot Obl ball Abs Gilbert

“‘Shoot! Shoot!’ screamed Gemma at every time it appeared that Gilbert was about to shoot the ball.”

To summarize this discussion, antipassive direct objects in Tagalog tend overwhelmingly to be nonspecific. All of the 65 antipassive sentences examined above contained nonspecific objects and therefore pattern with antipassives in other languages. In
section 7.4, I present my analysis of antipassive. At that time, I will argue against the view that antipassive derivation involves demotion of the direct object to adjunct status. I will also return to the control facts observed by Kroeger (1993) and show how this fact is accounted for in the analysis I propose.

4. Ergativity in Formosan Languages

I present evidence in this section for an ergative analysis of Seediq. I first show that non-actor focus clauses in Seediq are active and transitive. I also show that semantically transitive actor focus has the characteristics of antipassive. Seediq also exhibits the absolutive restriction on A’-extraction.

The primary arguments in favor of Tagalog ergativity also apply to Seediq. First is case marking. The intransitive subject in (39a) is marked the same way as the transitive object in (39b) and different from the transitive subject in (39b).

Seediq

(39)a. Wada kudurjak ka qedin=na.
  Past flee Top wife=3s.Gen
  “His wife ran away.”

b. Wada bube-un na Pihu ka dangi=na.
  Past hit-Tr Erg Pihu Top friend=3s.Gen
  “Pihu hit his friend.”

Pronominal clitics provide evidence that clauses like (40) are transitive and not passive. Both the ergative and absolutive arguments appear in clitic form in the transitive (non-actor focus) clauses in (40).
Seediq

(40)a. Wada=\textbf{ku}\textbf{=na} bube-un.
Past=1s.Abs=3s.Erg hit-Tr
“He/she hit me.”

\begin{itemize}
  \item b. Wada=\textbf{ku}=na s-bari hulama.
  \begin{itemize}
    \item Past=1s.Abs=3s.Erg App-buy treat
    \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}
  “He/she bought me a treat.”

However, only absolutive clitics appear in actor focus (antipassive) clauses. This indicates that antipassives are syntactically intransitive.

Seediq

(41)a. Wada=\textbf{ku} beebu Pihu.
Past=1s.Abs hit.Intr Pihu
“I hit Pihu.”

\begin{itemize}
  \item b. Wada=\textbf{ku} m-ari hulama laqi.
  \begin{itemize}
    \item Past=1s.Abs Intr-buy treat child
    \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}
  “I bought a treat for the child.”

As in Tagalog, direct objects in actor focus constructions tend to be indefinite or nonspecific. The following pairs illustrate that an indefinite object mentioned for the first time in the discourse appears naturally in an antipassive, as in (42a) and (43a). But the second mention of this NP requires it to be in the absolutive role in a transitive clause. (42b) is an example of a theme in a basic transitive. In (43b), the object in question is an instrument in an applicative construction.
Seediq

(42)a. M-n-ari qutsuruh chiiga Ape.
Intr-Perf-buy fish yesterday Ape
“Ape bought a fish yesterday.”
b. Wada=na puray-un ka qutsuruh ka Ape.
Past=3s.Erg cook-Tr Top fish Top Ape
“Ape cooked the fish.”

(43)a. M-n-oda m-ari qushia mutaso Hori ka Awe-ni.
Intr-Perf-go Intr-buy water clean Puli Top Awe-Def
“Awe went to buy clean water in Puli.”
b. Wada=na s-pahu lukus ka qushia mutaso.
Past=3s.Erg App-wash clothes Top water clean
“She washed clothes with the clean water.”

Absolutive DPs in Seediq can be null when they are definite, as in the following narrative about harvesting plums. The underscored places indicate the missing arguments. These are all internal arguments and have absolutive status in their respective clauses. Note that objects can be dropped only in transitive clauses, when they have absolutive status, and not in antipassives.

Seediq

(44)a. Mehedu pu-tuting kandalah bubu=na ka hei=na,
after Caus-fall from tree=3s.Gen Top fruit=Def

7 Many of the sentences in this narrative contain a nonfinite embedded clause, which is intransitive. Nonfinite clauses in Seediq are obligatorily intransitive, because PRO can only appear in absolutive position. Pro-drop in these examples is licensed by morphology on the matrix verbs; intransitive morphology on the embedded verbs is irrelevant. I propose an analysis of Seediq complex clauses and licensing of long distance movement in chapter 6.
“After knocking the fruit out of their trees, then next you gather up the fruit. And then you put (them) in sacks. And then you shake (them) up in a machine. Then after the good plums without twigs are put into sacks, you take (them) home and load (them) onto a car and then take (them) to sell to a Chinese.”

Ergative agents in Seediq also have certain subject properties. They can control a gap in a complement clause.

Seediq

go-Tr=3s.Erg mount Top top wheel water

“She went to climb up on the waterwheel.”
know-Tr=1s.Erg read Top newspaper
“I knew how to read the newspaper.”

An ergative agent can also be an imperative or hortative addressee.

**Seediq**

(46)a. Ha-e=ta p-hyu proj
    go-Hort=1p.Erg Caus-stand
    “Let’s go stand (them) up!”

b. Burig-e=ta proj
    sell-Hort=1p.Erg
    “Let’s sell (them)!”

Seediq also exhibits the absolutive restriction on A’-extraction, as shown in the following relativization examples. The theme is relativized in the transitive clause in (47a) and the agent in the antipassive in (47b).

**Seediq**

(47)a. laqi, [e₁ b-n-bee-an na Pihu]
    child -Perf-hit-Tr Erg Pihu
    “the child hit by Pihu”

b. laqi, [e₁ b-n-eebu Pihu]
    child Intr-Perf-hit Pihu
    “the child who hit Pihu”
Building on work by Gibson and Starosta (1986), Huang (1994) offers an ergative analysis of Atayal, another Atayalic language closely related to Seediq. She first cites higher text frequencies of non-actor focus clauses (52 out of 82) as opposed to 30 semantically transitive actor focus clauses. Huang takes this as evidence that non-actor focus is the basic transitive clause type. She then points out that Atayal exhibits an ergative case marking pattern. The transitive agent in (48a) and intransitive subject in (48b) appear in different case forms. The theme in (48c), however, has the same form as the subject in (48b).

Atayal (Huang 1994:133-4)

(48)a. musa’-maku’ pma-n hiya’
   Asp-1s.Gen wash-PF 3s.Nom
   “I am going to wash him.”

b. m-wah-saku’ kira
   AF-come-1s.Nom later
   “I will come later.”

c. p-in-cbaq-an-saku’ na’ Tali’ hira’
   -Past-teach-PF-1s.Nom Gen Tali yesterday
   “Tali taught me yesterday.”

Huang also notes that in the alternation between actor and non-actor focus forms, the latter exhibits greater transitivity. The theme in the patient focus clause in (49b) is more greatly affected by the action than in (49a).
Atayal (Huang 1994:131)

(49)a. m-in-qbaq-saku’ ke’ na’ tayan
   -AF-Past-learn-1sNom word Gen Atayal
   “I learned Atayal (I may still be learning it, and may still not know how to speak the language.)”

b. q-in-baq-an-maku’ ke’ na’ tayan
   -Past-learn-PF-1sGen word Gen Atayal
   “I learned Atayal (I learned it and now, as a result, I know how to use it.)”

Liao (2002) also proposes that Kavalan, spoken in the eastern coastal region of Taiwan, is an ergative language. She bases this claim on the identification of verbs suffixed with -an (parallel in function to the transitive marker -un in Seediq) as transitive and m-(-um-) (monadic and antipassive) verbs as intransitive. “The theme NP in a dyadic m-clause usually has an indefinite or nonindividuated interpretation, while the theme NP in a dyadic -an clause usually has a definite or individuated interpretation.” (Liao 2002:155)

Kavalan (Liao 2002:145-6)

(50)a. smangi tu bawa
   make Obl boat
   “They made a boat.”

b. tumangaw tu zemian
   bring Obl salt
   “They brought some salt.”

c. inebana=ti na hetay a rawang
close.3p.Erg=Perf Erg soldier Abs city
   “The soldiers closed the city (gate).”
d. taktakana ya taqan na repaw na bayblan
   cut.down.3p.Erg Abs pillar Gen house Gen old.woman
   “They cut down the pillar(s) of the old woman’s house.”

After establishing the basic transitive and intransitive clause types in Kavalan, Liao then shows that these exhibit an ergative case-marking pattern.

Kavalan (Liao 2002:145-6)

(51)a. m-zaki tu razing a repaw=ku
   Intr-close Obl sea Abs house=1s.Gen
   “My house is close to the sea.”

b. inebana=ti na hetay a rawang
   close.3p.Erg=Perf Erg soldier Abs city
   “The soldiers closed the city (gate).”

The preceding discussion has argued for the transitive status of non-actor focus clauses and subject properties of ergative agents. I have also established that actor focus clauses have intransitive properties. In addition, I have shown that the absolutive extraction restriction holds in Seediq. Therefore, Seediq passes the basic diagnostic tests for syntactic ergativity.

This, however, is not necessarily the accepted view of Seediq syntax. Chang (1997) proposes a split-ergative analysis of Seediq and Kavalan. Both actor focus and non-actor focus are claimed to be transitive. Chang proposes a three-way case array: ergative, nominative, and accusative. Ergative case appears on non-actor focus external arguments. Evidence for the existence of this case is the subject properties, like those summarized above, assumed by these nominals, for instance the ergative clitic pronouns.
Chang claims that absolutes are subjects and marked with nominative case. This assumption is supported only by Keenan and Comrie’s (1977) relativization hierarchy. Chang’s evidence against antipassive and in support of his claim that actor focus objects take accusative case is the fact that these objects can control PRO.

Although the data I have presented in this section support the existence of ergative case, Chang’s claims for the subjecthood of absolutes and transitivity of antipassive are less convincing. I have shown in sections 2 and 3.1 that the relativization privilege is a property of absolutes and cannot be claimed as a diagnostic for subjecthood. As for the control facts, as mentioned in 3.2, I do not consider this a problem for an antipassive analysis. I present my analysis of antipassive and control by antipassive objects in section 7.4.

5. Ergativity in Malagasy

As is the case for other Austronesian languages, the first task in deciding the status of Malagasy in the ergativity debate is determining the basic transitive clause type. Paul and Travis (2003) list several ways in which non-actor focus clauses should be analyzed as transitive. In particular, external arguments exhibit subject properties and do not seem to
behave like obliques in passive constructions. For example, as in Tagalog, these DPs can control gaps in complement clauses.

Malagasy (Paul & Travis 2003)

(54) Kasain-dRasoa [PRO hosasana ny zaza]
    intend.TT Gen.Rasoa Fut.TT.wash Det child

“This Rasoa intends to wash the child.”

This DP can bind a reflexive and serve as an imperative addressee.

Malagasy (Paul & Travis 2003)

(55)a. Hajain’ny vehivavy, ny tenany.

“The woman respects herself.”

b. Sasao ny lamba!
    TT.wash Det cloth

“Wash the clothes!”

Another characteristic of syntactic ergativity exhibited by Malagasy is the absolutive restriction on extraction. The actor can be relativized from the actor topic clause below. In order to relativize the theme, the verb must have theme topic morphology.

---

8 TT stands for “theme topic” and corresponds to patient focus in traditional terminology and basic transitive in the current analysis. Likewise, AT indicates “actor topic”.
Malagasy (Keenan 1976:265)

(56)a. Manasa ny lamba ny zazavavy.
   AT.wash Det clothes Det girl
   “The girl is washing the clothes.”

b. ny zazavavy (izay) manasa ny lamba
   Det girl that AT.wash Det clothes
   “the girl that is washing the clothes”

c. *ny lamba (izay) manasa ny zazavavy
   Det clothes that AT.wash Det girl
   “the clothes that the girl is washing”

d. ny lamba (izay) sasan’ny zazavavy
   Det clothes that TT.wash.Det girl
   “the clothes that are washed by the girl”

However, Paul and Travis also note that Malagasy does not have a canonical antipassive construction. For instance, the object in an actor topic clause can be definite or can take wide scope over the external argument.

Malagasy (Paul & Travis 2003)

(57)a. Nanapaka ity hazo ity tamin’ny antsy i Sahondra.
   Past.AT.cut this tree this Past.P.Gen.Det knife Sahondra
   “Sahondra cut this tree with the knife.”

b. Namaky ny boky roa ny mpianatra tsirairay.
   Past.AT.read Det book two Det student each
   “Each student read two books.”

⇒ OBL ‘two’ > ABS ‘each’
In contrast to this, Tagalog antipassive obliques always take narrow scope with respect to the absolutive external argument.

Tagalog

(58) Nag-basa ang [lahát ng batá] ng [marami-ng libro]
-Perf.Intr-read Abs all Gen child Obl many-Lk book
“All the children read many books.”
⇒ ABS ‘all’ > OBL ‘many’

Rackowski and Travis (2000) claim that definite objects in actor topic (antipassive) clauses optionally raise out of VP to an accusative checking position. These definite objects then appear to the right of adverbs they would otherwise precede.

Malagasy (Rackowski & Travis 2000:125)

(59)a. Tsy manasa foana ny lamba mihitsy Rakoto.
Neg Pres.AT.wash always Det clothes at.all Rakoto
“Rakoto does not always wash the clothes at all.”
b. Tsy manasa intsony mihitsy ny lamba Rakoto.
Neg Pres.AT.wash nolonger at.all Det clothes Rakoto
“Rakoto does not wash the clothes at all anymore.”

Rackowski and Travis develop a predicate-fronting analysis of VOS word order in Malagasy. Predicate XPs are attracted by the adverbs which select them. Mihitsy ‘at all’ is merged above AgrOP. Foana ‘always’ is merged under AgrOP and selects VP. The
object, when definite, can move to [Spec, AgrO] and not be contained in the fronted predicate, thereby dislocating to a position to the right of the verb and adverbs.

(60) \[
\begin{array}{c}
mihitsyP \\
foanaP \\
\text{mihitsy} \\
\text{AgrOP} \\
\text{NP}_{\text{Obj}} \\
\text{AgrO} \\
t_{\text{foanaP}} \\
\end{array}
\]

Paul (1999) reports another type of object shift in Malagasy. An instrument in an actor topic clause can be promoted to direct object status. The instrument in (61a) appears in a PP. In (61b) the preposition has been lost and the instrument appears in direct object position as a DP.

Malagasy (Paul 1999:272)

(61)a. Nandidy ny hena tamin’ny antsy Rasoa.
“Rasoa cut the meat with the knife.”

b. Nandidy antsy ny hena Rasoa.
Past.AT.cut knife Det meat Rasoa
“Rasoa cut the meat with the knife.”

Like Rackowski and Travis, Paul also posits an object position inside VP for derived objects like this in [Spec, Asp]. The DP in this position is assigned accusative case.
In Tagalog, constructions analogous to Malagasy object shift involve applicatives. Interestingly, applied arguments in Tagalog always have absolutive status. (63a) is a basic transitive clause, in which the theme is the absolutive. (63b) is the version with a benefactive applicative. The benefactive now has absolutive status.

Tagalog

  -Tr.Perf-buy=1s.Erg Abs book for Dat Maria
  “I bought the book for Maria.”

b. I-b-in-ilí =ko ng libró si Maria.
  App-Tr.Perf-buy=1s.Erg Obl book Abs Maria
  “I bought Maria a book.”

It is possible to package a ditransitive clause in an antipassive. However, as (64b) shows, the antipassive verb cannot host an applicative. This indicates that Tagalog
antipassives, in contrast to Malagasy, do not have a structural case feature for an internal argument.

**Tagalog**

(64)a. **B-um-ilí=akó ng libro para kay Maria.**
   -Intr.Perf-buy=1s.Abs Obl book for Dat Maria
   “I bought a book for Maria.”

b. **I-b-um-ilí=akó ng libro si Maria.**
   App-Intr.Perf-buy=1s.Abs Obl book Abs Maria
   “I bought Maria a book.”

In the analysis I present in section 7, I will suggest that Malagasy is losing (or has already lost) its antipassive construction. Though non-actor topic clauses retain ergative features, actor topic clauses display characteristics of accusativity. In formal terms, I suggest that this means that accusative case is available for checking with an internal argument in an actor topic clause and that Malagasy no longer has an antipassive construction.

**6. Indonesian**

Of the languages examined so far in this thesis, Indonesian exhibits the highest degree of accusative syntax. Morphologically, Indonesian verbs are inflected as active *meng-* or passive *di-*. Unmarked word order in Indonesian declarative clauses is SVO. Subjects move to preverbal position to check nominative case. (65a) and (65b) show examples of an active agent and a passive goal in a ditransitive.
Like other accusative languages with applicative constructions, applicative morphology can appear on both active and passive verbs. In the active clause in (66a), the applied object remains in the VP, while the external argument is licensed as the subject. In the passive clause in (66b), the applied object raises to subject position to check nominative case. The ability to take an applicative affix is solid evidence that active verbs are transitive, since there must be a structural case available to check with the applied object. Recall from the previous section that antipassive verbs in Tagalog cannot host applicatives, indicating that no structural case is available for an internal argument in these constructions.

Pronouns freely occur in object position of active verbs in Indonesian, indicating that these constructions do not pattern with antipassives in terms of information structure.
Evidence that the passive is intransitive comes in part from the fact that they occur freely without an agent.

As noted in section 3.1, it is very rare for non-actor focus agents to be dropped in Tagalog. As pointed out by Verhaar (1988), however, Indonesian passives can also function as transitive clauses. For instance, passives\(^9\) are frequently used in imperative constructions, indicating that the agent is not demoted or merely implicit in the structure.

---

\(^9\) The \textit{di-} passive prefix does not appear on the verb in (61), because \textit{di-} is only used when the agent is third person. In an imperative, the agent is always second person.
Hopper (1983) analyzes Malay passives with verb-initial word order as ergative clauses, which are active and display a high degree of transitivity. In the following Indonesian examples, there is no demotion of the grammatical status of the agent. In (70), the agent in the passive matrix clause functions as controller of the PRO subject of the adverbial clause.

(70)  [Sambil PRO memangang buku itu]

while Act.hold register that
di-pandang-nya penjaga itu dengan hati-hati.
Pass-regard-3s.Gen guard that with care

“While holding the (visitors’) register, he regarded the guard carefully.”

(“Jakarta”)

In (71), passive clauses are used in succession in narrative discourse. It is clear that these are active and transitive, especially given the fact that the agent refers to topic of the discourse.

(71)a. *Di-tepuk-tepuk-nya* debu yang melekat di celana-nya,
Pass-slap-3s.Gen dust Rel stuck on trousers-3s.Gen
"He slapped at the dust stuck to his trousers..."

b. lantas *di-ambil-nya* slepi dari saku-nya.
then Pass-take-3s.Gen cigarette.case from bag-3s.Gen
"...then took a cigarette case out of his bag."

c. *Di-tawar-kan-nya* rokok
Pass-offer-App-3s.Gen cigarette
"He offered out a cigarette under the tip of the guard's nose."

Indonesian also has the A’-extraction restriction: only the subject is eligible to move. In an active clause, only the external argument subject can be extracted. Not even the applied object is eligible.

(72)a. Siapa yang mem-beri Nuri buku-nya?
   who C Act-give Nuri book-Def
   “Who gave Nuri the book?”

b. *Apa yang Ali mem-beri Nuri?
   what C Ali Act-give Nuri
   “What did Ali give Nuri?”

c. *Apa yang Ali mem-beri-kan kepada Nuri?
   what C Ali Act-give-App to Nuri
   “What did Ali give to Nuri?”

   Internal arguments can only be extracted from passive clauses. The applied object will be extracted in the case of a passive applicative construction.

(73)a. Siapa yang di-beri buku-nya?
   who Comp Pass-give book-Def
   “Who was given the book?”
To summarize, though Indonesian is a accusative language with an active/passive dichotomy, there are still remnants of ergative syntax. These are specifically the extraction restriction and subject properties of the passive agent. In section 8, I will propose an analysis of nominative and accusative case-checking that also accounts for the ergative aspects of Indonesian syntax.

7. Variation in Ergativity

It is well-known that ergativity is a diverse phenomenon and cannot be characterized under a unitary definition. Syntactically ergative languages are distinguished from accusative languages by the absolutive restriction on A’-extraction and the fact that canonical subject properties cannot be exhaustively associated with either the ergative or absolutive nominal. However, there is significant variation in how these subject properties are distributed in different ergative languages. In this section, I propose that syntactically ergative languages are divided into two types: one in which control and binding relations are dictated by argument structure; and another in which these relations are more sensitive to absolutive case.
For the first type of ergative language, I argue principally that the case system is best captured by allowing absolutive case to be checked by different functional heads (contra Bobaljik 1993, Murasugi 1992, and others), depending on the nature of the verb. I refer to this as the v-type ergative language. Absolutive case is checked by either T or v, depending on the transitivity of the clause. Intransitive absolutes check case with T, while transitive absolutes check their case with v. There are several consequences of this proposal. First, it presupposes that absolutes should not always be equated with subjects. Intransitive absolutes should be identified as subjects, while absolutes in transitive clauses behave more like direct objects. This leads to the second consequence, which is that absolutive case-checking – unlike nominative – is not necessarily contingent on the finiteness of the clause. In other words, PRO in nonfinite clauses can appear in either ergative or absolutive external argument position, and in transitive clauses absolutive case will still be available for checking with an internal argument.

In the second type of ergative language, T-type, absolutive case is always checked by T. The principal difference with v-type languages is that nonfinite clauses in T-type languages must be intransitive, and PRO can only occur in absolutive position, which means also that no overt absolutive DP can appear in a tenseless clause.

---

10 The proposal presented in this thesis that absolutive case can be checked by different functional heads has evolved from work of mine beginning with Aldridge (1998). See also Legate (2003) for a similar analysis of Warlpiri.
7.1. Case-checking in v-Type Ergative Languages

In Tagalog, absolutive case is checked by either v or T, depending on the transitivity of the clause. In transitive clauses, when the verb carries the simple transitive suffix \(-in\) or one of the applicatives \(-an\) or \(i\)\(^{11}\), it is v which checks absolutive case with an internal argument. Ergative case is inherent, assigned by v to the external argument merged in its specifier. In an intransitive clause, when the verb carries one of the intransitive affixes (\(-um\)- and the portmanteau morphs containing \(-um\): mag-, mang-, maka-, maki-, etc.), it is T which checks absolutive case with the external argument or the sole DP argument inside VP.

Tagalog is a VSO language. This word order is derived by moving the verb to T. Transitive and intransitive morphology carry a probe which values absolutive case on a DP in its c-command domain, as per Chomsky (2001a and 2001b). The basic transitive \(-in/-in\)-affix is merged in v; intransitive affixes, e.g. \(-um\)-, are merged in T. The probe then searches its domain to find a goal to agree with. I assume, with Chomsky (2000:122) that the probe must agree with the closest goal that it c-commands. Thus, in an intransitive clause, agreement takes place between T and the highest argument in the clause, the external argument in an antipassive or unergative clause.

Tagalog

(74)a. B-um-il í ang babae ng isdá.
   -Intr.Perf-buy Abs woman Obl fish
   “The woman bought a fish.”

\(^{11}\) \(-in\) is realized overtly only in the future and nonfinite forms of basic transitive verbs. Perfective and progressive forms of all transitive verbs are infixed with \(-in\).
In an unaccusative, this will be the internal argument. Following Chomsky (2001a), I assume that vP is a weak phase, allowing T to probe down into VP without violating the Phase Impenetrability Condition.

**Tagalog**

(75)a. Na-hulog ang bató sa hukay.

Perf.Intr-fall Abs rock P hole

“The rock fell into a hole.”

Since the internal argument is in the c-command domain of v, it is conceivable that it is v which is responsible for checking case in unaccusatives. However, I reject this possibility. Preliminary support for this decision is suggested by Burzio’s Generalization, first proposed by Burzio (1986) and adapted below to more recent theoretical assumptions.
Burzio’s Generalization

v checks structural case iff it introduces an external argument.

Unaccusative verbs have no external argument. Therefore, v should be unable to check structural case.

In a transitive clause, agreement takes place between the transitive morphology on v and the highest VP-internal argument. The verb subsequently moves to T. (77) shows a simple transitive, with agreement taking place between v and the theme.

Tagalog

(77)a. B-in-ilí ng babae ang isdá.
   -Tr.Perf-buy Erg woman Abs fish

“The woman bought the fish.”

b. 

```
TP
   V-in-T
      vP
         DP_{Erg}
            v'
                tV-in-[aAbs]
                      VP
                            tV
                                DP_{Abs}
```

Examples with applicatives are illustrated below. The applicative i- in Tagalog selects a benefactive or instrumental DP as the absolutive.
Following Marantz (1993) and Pylkkänen (2002), I assume that the applicative heads a phrase ApplP and selects the applied DP as its argument. ApplP is merged directly below vP. A direct consequence of this is that the applied argument will always be the closest available goal for the probe on v and will always have absolutive status in the clause. This is a welcome consequence, as it accounts for the well-known direct object properties of applied arguments (Marantz 1984, Baker 1988, Marantz 1993, and others).

The applicative -an\textsuperscript{12} licenses a locative or goal argument as absolutive. This applicative is also merged as the head of ApplP and selects the applied argument which will check absolutive case with v.

\textsuperscript{12} The prefix \textit{i}- and suffix \textit{-an} are both merged in Appl and attached to the verb via head movement. Following the theory of Distributed Morphology (Marantz 1988, Halle & Marantz 1993, Noyer 1992, and others), I assume that the relative ordering of the morphemes is determined by their subcategorization features, i.e. the fact that they are prefixes or suffixes, at the level of morphological structure, the interface between syntax and PF.
This analysis captures the fact that external arguments in these languages behave like subjects, regardless of whether they have ergative or absolutive status. Since arguments remain in their base positions, the external argument is always in a position to c-command into VP and bind an internal argument reflexive. The same is true of West Greenlandic Eskimo languages are also v-type ergative languages.

*Tagalog*

(81)a. P-in-igil ng lalaki ang sarili=niyá.
   -Tr.Perf-control Erg man Abs self=3s.Gen
   “The man controlled himself.”

b. Nag-pigil siyá sa sarili=niyá.
   Intr.Perf-control 3s.Abs Dat self=3s.Gen
   “He controlled himself.”
West Greenlandic (Manning 1996:136)

(82)  \textbf{Junna-p}  Kaali  inmi-nik  uqaluttuup-p-a-a.
Junna-Erg  Kaali.Abs  self-Mod  tell-Ind-Tr-3s

“Junna told Kaali about himself.”

The fact that external arguments, either ergative or absolutive, function as imperative and hortative addressees can also be explained by their occupying the highest A-position in the clause.

Tagalog

(83)a. Bigy-án\textsubscript{mo}=siyá ng kapé.
give-App=2s.Erg=3s.Abs Obl coffee

“Give him the coffee.”

b. K-um-ain=na=tayo.
-Intr.Perf-eat=now=1p.Abs

“Let’s eat now!”

Yup’ik (Payne 1982:90)

(84)a. Ner-ci-u!
eat-2p-3s

“You all eat it!”

b. Inar-ci!
lie.down-2p

“You all lie down!”
The most salient characteristic exhibited by v-type, but not T-type, ergative languages is the possibility of transitive nonfinite clauses. This is because absolutive case is checked by v in transitive clauses and is therefore still available if when T is nonfinite.

Tagalog

(85)a. Nag-ba-balak si Maria-ng Intr.Perf-Red-plan Abs Maria-Lk
[PRO tulung-an si Pedro]
(Erg) help-App Abs Pedro

“Maria is planning to help Pedro.”

b. Gustó ni Maria-ng [PRO b-um-ilí ng libro]
want Erg Maria-Lk (Abs) -Intr.Perf-buy Obl book

“Maria wants to buy a book.”

W. Greenlandic (Manning 1996:124)

niriursui-pp-u-t.
promise-Ind-Intr-3p

“The children promised to help Juuna.”

children.Abs (Abs) dance-Fut-Inf-4p promise-Ind-Intr-3p

“The children promised to dance.”
Malagasy ergative clauses (non-actor focus) also should be analyzed in the v-type model, since transitive clauses and absolutive case-checking are allowed in nonfinite contexts.

Malagasy (Paul and Travis 2003)

(87) Kasain-dRasoa [PRO hosasana ny zaza]
intend.Tr.Erg.Rasoa Fut.Tr.wash Det child

“Rasoa intends to wash the child.”

Where Malagasy differs from Tagalog is in the antipassive construction, which I will discuss in section 7.4.

In addition to the availability of absolutive case in nonfinite clauses, Tagalog also provides direct evidence for dividing structural case-checking capability between T and v. As noted by Schachter and Otanes (1972), Kroeger (1993), Schachter (1994), Maclachlan and Nakamura (1997), and others, Tagalog intransitive predicates optionally show agreement with a plural absolutive. In the antipassive in (88), -si- registers agreement with the plural absolutive in (88a) but cannot agree with the oblique in (88b). (88c) shows that (88b) is grammatical without the plural marker.

Tagalog (Schachter & Otanes 1972)

(88)a. Nag-si-basa ang mga batá ng liham.
Intr.Perf-Pl-read Abs Pl child Obl letter

“The children read a letter.”

b. *Nag-si-basa ang batá ng mga liham.
Intr.Perf-Pl-read Abs child Obl Pl letter

“The child read some letters.”
c. Nag-basa ang batá ng mga liham.
Intr.Perf-read Abs child Obl Pl letter
“The child read some letters.”

Unaccusatives can also show this agreement. Adjectives register this agreement with reduplication, as in (89a). (89b) shows that reduplication is ungrammatical with a singular absolutive. (89b) becomes grammatical by removing the reduplication, as shown in (89c).

Tagalog (Kroeger 1993:24)

(89)a. Ma-ta-talino ang mga batá-ng Intsík.
Stat-Pl-smart Abs Pl child-Lk Chinese
“The Chinese children are bright.”

b. *Ma-ta-talino si Armand.
Stat-Pl-smart Abs Armand

“Armand is bright.”

c. Ma-talino si Armand.
Stat-smart Abs Armand

“Armand is smart.”

What is crucial for the purposes of illustration here is that this agreement is never used with transitive absolutes. (90a) and (90b) show, respectively, that plural ergative and absolutive DPs can occur in a transitive clause with no agreement marker.
Tagalog

(90)a. B-in-asa ng mga batá ang liham.
- Tr.Perf-read Erg Pl child Abs letter
“The children read the letter.”

b. B-in-asa ng batá ang mga liham.
- Tr.Perf-read Erg child Abs Pl letter
“The child read the letters.”

However, -si- cannot be used to agree with either the plural ergative or the plural absolutive.

(91)a. *Si-ni-basa ng mga batá ang liham.
- Pl-Tr.Perf-read Erg Pl child Abs letter
“The children read the letter.”

b. *Si-ni-basa ng batá ang mga liham.
- Pl-Tr.Perf-read Erg child Abs Pl letter
“The child read the letters.”

To my knowledge, no formal account has ever been proposed of the fact that agreement takes place only in intransitive clauses. The analysis of absolutive case-checking I have spelled out in this section can account for this straightforwardly. Plural agreement is spelled out on T, when this functional head checks case, and therefore does not appear in transitive clauses, when case is checked by v.

To return to case-checking in transitive clauses, in the case-checking analysis I have presented in this section, due to the locality constraint on Agree, absolutive case in transitive clauses is always checked with the internal argument closest to v. But there is also empirical
evidence that internal argument absolutes do indeed immediately follow the external argument in surface order. Tagalog has fairly free word order, so the base order can be obscured. But the Indonesian language Toba Batak provides clearer indication of the position for absolutive DPs. (92) shows two ditransitive clauses. In (92a) the theme is the absolutive and immediately follows the agent. (92b) is the dative shifted version of (92a), where the goal has absolutive status and appears in the position to the immediate right of the agent.

Toba Batak (Schachter 1984:137-8)

(92a. Dilean si Torus biang i tu si Ria.
-AT.give PN Torus dog the to Pn Ria
“Torus gave the dog to Ria.”

b. Dilean si Torus si Ria i biang i.
-AT.give PN Torus PN Ria dog the
“Torus gave Ria the dog.”

Classical Malay is also interesting in this regard, as it has two distinct positions for absolutive (or nominative) case. Cumming (1991) reports that in classical Malay active clauses, the agent subjects typically appeared in clause-initial position, but internal arguments with subject (or absolutive) status tended to follow the verb and the agent, appearing in the same position as the Batak absolutes in (92).
Classical Malay (Cumming 1991:36-40)

(93)a. **Maka Indraputra m-akan buah delima itu.**

then Indraputra Act-eat fruit pomegranate that

“Indraputra ate the pomegranate.”

(18\textsuperscript{th} C: *Hikayat Indraputra*)

b. **Maka di-pegang perdana menteri tangan Indraputra.**

then Pass-hold prime minister hand Indraputra

“The prime minister held **Indraputra’s hand.**”

(18\textsuperscript{th} C: *Hikayat Indraputra*)

Travis (1991) cites a similar situation for the Philippine language Kalagan, where absolutes also appear in the third position in the clause, immediately following the external argument.

To summarize the main proposal for case-checking in \(v\)-type ergative languages, absolutive case is checked by \(v\) with an internal argument in transitive clauses. In intransitive clauses, absolutive case is checked by \(T\). To compare this with case-checking in an accusative language, where subjects check case with \(T\) and objects with \(v\), in \(v\)-type ergative languages, transitive absolutes are treated like direct objects and ergatives like subjects, while intransitive absolutes are predicted to behave more like subjects. This clustering of subject properties in the external argument accounts for the subject properties observed in sections 2 and 3 for ergative and intransitive absolutive DPs.

7.2. Case-checking in T-Type Ergative Languages

In contrast to \(v\)-type languages, in \(T\)-type ergative languages, absolutive case is always checked by \(T\). The main consequence of this is that more subject properties are attributed to absolutive DPs. Principally, controlled PRO can only appear in absolutive...
position, which means that nonfinite clauses are all intransitive. Seediq and the Mayan languages belong to this type of ergative language.

As in v-type languages, T checks absolutive Case in intransitive clauses. In antipassives and unergatives, this will be with the external argument. The intransitive prefix \textit{m-}, like Tagalog \textit{-um-}, is merged in T and values absolutive case on the closest DP in its c-command domain, in this case the external argument in [Spec, v]. Seediq word order is VOS, derived through a combination of verb-movement and remnant predicate-fronting. I develop this analysis in chapter 4 and will not take it up here.

\textbf{Seediq}

(94)a. Wada m-ari patis ka Awe.
Past Intr-buy book Top Awe
“Awe bought a book.”

b. \[
\text{TP} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{m-}_{\text{[uAbs]}} V + V \rightarrow vP \\
\text{DP}_{\text{[Abs]}} \rightarrow v' \\
\text{t}_{V+v} \rightarrow VP
\]

In an unaccusative, absolutive case is checked with the internal argument. As with Tagalog, vP is a weak phase, so T can probe into VP.
Before discussing case-checking in transitive clauses, it is important to introduce another key feature of the analysis of syntactic ergativity I am developing in this thesis. When transitive morphology is merged in v, it is accompanied by an EPP feature. This is true for both T-type and v-type ergative languages. In T-type languages, this EPP feature is necessary for attracting the absolutive DP to a position above the ergative so that it can check case with T. Its primary motivation, however, is the absolutive restriction on A’-extraction, which is a characteristic of both types of syntactically ergative language. The EPP feature on transitive v ensures that the absolutive DP moves to the vP phase edge so that it can be further attracted to [Spec, C]. The extraction restriction is the focus of chapter 6. Additional motivation for this EPP feature for both v-type and T-type languages is given in section 7.3. Here, I limit the discussion to case-checking.

In a transitive clause, the transitive suffix -un is merged in v. v also has an EPP feature, which forces the internal argument to raise to the outer specifier of v, where it checks case with T. This is the crucial difference with v-type languages. In both languages, transitive v carries an EPP feature, but only in v-type languages does v check case.
Seediq

(96)a. Wada bube-un na Pihu ka dangi=na.
Past hit-Tr Erg Pihu Top friend=3s.Gen
“Pihu hit his friend.”

b. $\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{T}_{[u/Abs]} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP}_{[Abs]} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{DP}_{[Erg]} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{V}_{[EPP]} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{t}_{Abs}
\end{array}$

In an applicative construction, the applied argument is again merged in [Spec, Appl]. It is then attracted by $v$’s EPP feature and checks case with $T$.

Seediq

(97)a. Wada s-bari hulama na Ape ka laqi.
Past App-buy treat Erg Ape Abs child
“Ape bought the child a treat.”
The main empirical difference between v-type and T-type ergative languages is that the latter do not allow transitive nonfinite clauses. Since absolutive Case is always checked by T, it is not available for checking in a nonfinite clause. Hence, PRO will always appear in the absolutive position and overt absolutive DPs will not appear in the clause.

Seediq

Intr-Perf-go Intr-buy book Taipei Top Ape
“Ape goes to buy books in Taipei.”

b. M-osa=nami [PRO ts-um-uaq qushia]
Intr-go=1p -Intr-pour water
“We went to water (the plums).”

The matrix clause may be transitive.
Seediq

    go-Tr -Intr-pour water Top plum that

“(We) went to water the plums.”

b. Uxe=ku beyo yah-an [PRO m-angan]
    not=1s.Abs long come-Tr Intr-take
    tumuninun=mu da.
    weaver=1s.Gen Emph

“Before long, my weaver will come to take me.” (“I will die soon.”)

However, the embedded clause cannot be transitivized, since absolutive case is not available to check in a nonfinite clause.

Seediq

(100)a. *M-n-osa [PRO burig-un taihoku (ka) patis]
    Intr-Perf-go buy-Tr Taipei Top book
    ka Ape.
    Top Ape

“Ape goes to buy books in Taipei.”

    come-Tr take-Tr=1s.Abs weaver=1s.Gen Emph

“Before long, my weaver will come to take me.” (“I will die soon.”)

The same is true for Mayan languages. PRO must be in the absolutive position. Overt absolutive DPs are prohibited from appearing in nonfinite clauses.
Jacaltec (Craig 1977:320)

(101)a. choche naj [PRO caNalw-oj]
  like he (Abs) dance-Irr
  “He likes to dance.”

b. *ch-in to [PRO col-o’ **hach**]
  Asp-1s.Abs go (Erg) help-Fut 2s.Abs
  “I go to help you.”

Dyirbal also shows evidence of being a Τ-type ergative language. According to Dixon (1994), the controlled gap in a purpose clause can only occur in the absolutive position.

Dyirbal (Dixon 1994:168)

(102)a. nguma banaga-n’u [yabu-nggu bura-li]
  father.Abs return-Nonfut mother-Erg see-Purp
  “Father returned in order for mother to see him.”

b. nguma banaga-n’u [bural-nga-ygu yabu-gu]
  father.Abs return-Nonfut see-AP-Purp mother-Dat
  “Father returned in order to see mother.”

Since the ergative DP remains in situ in argument position, however, it still potentially has some subject properties as well. Recall from section 2 that Mayan ergative DPs can antecede a reflexive pronoun.
(103) x-0-u-kamsa-\textit{j} \textit{r-iib	extprime} \textit{lee} \textit{achih}
Compl-3s.Abs-3s.Erg-kill-Suff 3s-self the man
“The man killed himself.”

Seediq ergatives are unable to bind reflexives, but this is a consequence of VOS word order derivation, which moves the absolutive nominal and other VP-internal material out of the external argument’s c-command domain. This analysis is presented in chapter 4.

Seediq ergative DPs are, however, able to serve as hortative addressees.

Seediq
(104)a. Ha-e=\textit{ta} p-heyu pro\textsubscript{j}
go-Hort=1p.Erg Caus-stand
“Let’s go stand (them\textsubscript{j}) up!”

b. Burig-e=\textit{ta} pro\textsubscript{j}
sell-Hort=1p.Erg
“Let’s sell (them\textsubscript{j})!”

This subsection has presented the analysis of case-checking in T-type ergative languages. The primary distinction between \textit{v}-type and T-type languages is that T has the sole ability to check absolutive case in the latter. Empirically, this analysis accounts for the greater number of subject properties of absolutes in T-type languages, in particular the fact that controlled PRO must occupy the absolutive slot in these but not in \textit{v}-type languages.

7.3. EPP on \textit{v}

In the preceding subsection, I proposed that an EPP feature on \textit{v} attracts an absolutive DP to the \textit{vP} phase edge in transitive clauses in both \textit{v}-Type and T-type ergative
languages. This EPP feature is necessary in T-type languages for raising an internal argument absolutive above the ergative DP so that it can undergo an Agree relation with T for case-checking. The regulation of EPP features on v also derives the absolutive restriction on A’-extraction, which is discussed in chapter 6. Additionally, this feature plays a role in deriving Seediq VOS word order by moving the absolutive out of VP before remnant predicate fronting. I develop the analysis of Seediq word order in chapter 4. In this subsection, I provide motivation for this EPP feature from VSO word order languages as well as from v-type languages.

As I propose in chapter 4, internal argument absolutes in Seediq move to the vP phase edge, attracted by the EPP feature on v, and then move further to a topic position above TP. These movement are followed by remnant TP fronting in order to derive VOS word order. However, there are other Austronesian languages whose word order gives more direct evidence for absolutive movement to the outer specifier of v. (105) shows an absolutive theme that has moved to a position between the verb and ergative agent in Northern Paiwan.

Northern Paiwan (Chang 2000:97-8)

(105)a. t-in-ekoL a zua vava ni palang
- Tr.Perf-drink Abs that wine Erg Palang
“Palang drank that wine.”

b. na-t-em-ekeL ti palang ta vava
Perf-Intr-drink Abs Palang Obl wine
“Palang drank wine.”
Paiwan also exhibits the control pattern of T-type languages, indicating that all absolutes must be able to check case with T. (106b) shows that an overt absolute DP cannot appear in a nonfinite clause.

Northern Paiwan

(106)a. Kilingaw [a PRO v-en-eli ti palang tua sunat]
   try C (Abs) -Intr-buy Abs Palang Obl book
   “Palang tries to buy a book.”

b. *Kilingaw-in [a PRO veli-in ni palang a sunat]
   try-Tr C (Erg) buy-Tr Erg Palang Abs book
   “Palang tries to buy the book.”

Topping (1973) reports a similar word order alternation in focus constructions in Chamorro. Basic word order in Chamorro is VSO. When an external argument is focused, it moves to clause-initial position.
Chamorro

(107)a. Ha-li’i’ si Juan i patgun lahi.
3s-see Juan the child male

“Juan saw the boy.” (Chung 1998:22)

b. Si Juan lumi’e’ i palao’an.
Juan saw the woman

“Juan is the one who saw the woman.” (Topping 1973:244)

However, an internal argument moves to a position between the verb and the agent when it is focused.

Chamorro (Topping 1973:245)

(108) Lini’e’ i palao’an ni lahi.
saw the woman man

“It was the woman that the man saw.”

Otsuka (2002) analyzes VSO and VOS word alternation in Tongan. Basic word order is VSO, with the ergative DP preceding the absolutive DP. In VOS word order, the absolutive DP moves to the left of the ergative DP. The absolutive DP receives a focus reading.

Tongan (Otsuka 2002)

Past choose Erg Sione Abs Pila

“Sione chose Pila.”
b. Na’e fili ‘a Pila e’ Sione.
Past choose Abs Pila Erg Sione
“Sione chose Pila.”

I propose that in v-Type ergative languages like Tagalog, transitive v also carries an EPP feature, meaning that internal argument absolutes must move out of VP. There is robust evidence that this is the case. As shown in section 3.2, Tagalog absolutes always receive a presuppositional interpretation, either definite or generic. According to Diesing’s (1992) Mapping Hypothesis, these DPs would have to be outside VP at LF in order to escape existential closure.

Tagalog
(110) B-in-ilí ni Maria ang libro.
-Tr.Perf-buy Erg Maria Abs book
“Maria bought the/*a book.”

Quantifier scope facts also lead to the same conclusion. The following examples indicate that absolutes take scope over other nominals in the clause, indicating that they must be in a higher position at LF than the ergative in (111a) and oblique object in (111b). Since in the surface word order the absolute follows the ergative nominal in (111a), this example makes it particularly clear that the absolute must move in order to take scope over the ergative.
Semantic properties such as these have long been observed by Philippine linguists. Schachter (1976) calls Tagalog absolutes “topics” and points out that these nominals are always definite and referential. Richards (2000) demonstrates that Tagalog absolutes have many of the same characteristics as topics in Icelandic and proposes an analysis in which the absolute nominal moves obligatorily to an A’ topic position.

As I mentioned before, the presence of an EPP feature on transitive v will also figure prominently in accounting for the absolute extraction restriction to be developed in chapter 6. Specifically, only the absolute can undergo movement to [Spec, C]. To block attraction of the ergative DP, the absolute must be located in the outer specifier of v, a position closer to C than the external argument’s base position.

Clearly, however, attraction of the absolute by v in declarative clauses must be covert in Tagalog. Various analyses (Nunes 1999, Pesetsky 2000, and many others) have been proposed recently account for the effects of covert movement in a theory which no longer allows counter-cyclic displacement. This is done by forcing movement in overt syntax and later spelling out the tail of the chain as opposed to the head. I propose for Tagalog that v’s EPP feature always attracts a DP to its outer specifier. This accounts for the
presuppositional or quantificational interpretations at LF. For the purposes of Spell-Out, however, only the tail of the chain will end up being pronounced.

On the other hand, when the absolutive checks a feature with C, this movement must be overt. I adopt a proposal by Richards (2001) which posits that movement that would otherwise be covert can become overt in the case that further movement takes place. Specifically, in the case of Tagalog, the head of a chain residing in the outer specifier of v will not be spelled out; the tail of that chain will. But if the head of the chain proceeds further to [Spec, C], then it will be the head of the chain that is be pronounced.

So far in this section, I have proposed case-checking mechanisms for two types of syntactically ergative language. I have also shown how the two mechanisms account for the relative distributions of subject properties in these two types of language. In v-Type languages, in which v checks absolutive case in transitive clauses, ergative DPs display the full array of subject properties. Ergative nominals in T-Type languages, on the other hand, have fewer subject properties. Specifically, controlled PRO can only appear in an absolutive slot and never in a position that would be occupied by an ergative DP in a finite clause. Thus far, however, I have had little to say about object properties. Although in many ergative languages, anaphors can appear in absolutive position, bound by the ergative DP, and absolutive case can be available in nonfinite clauses in v-Type ergative languages, internal argument absolutes in ergative languages do not pattern entirely with direct objects in accusative languages. First, they always receive a presuppositional, often topic-like, interpretation. Secondly, they are subject to the absolutive restriction on A’-extraction. These facts are accounted for by the EPP feature which is carried by transitive v and serves to distinguish absolutes from direct objects in accusative languages, which are not typically required to raise out of VP.
7.4. Analysis of Antipassive

As proposed in section 7.1, transitive $v$ checks absolutive case with an internal argument in $v$-Type ergative languages. Transitive $v$ also has an EPP feature, which forces these objects to raise out of the VP into the outer specifier of $v$.

Antipassive objects, on the other hand, do not check absolutive case, since $v$ is not transitive and therefore cannot check structural case. VP-internal DPs in antipassives receive inherent case, which is realized as a type of oblique case, $ng$ in Tagalog. These objects also never raise out of VP, since an intransitive $v$ will never have an EPP feature\textsuperscript{13}.

\textsuperscript{13} Basilico (2003) and Bobaljik and Branigan (2003) have also recently proposed that direct objects in antipassives remain in their base positions inside VP.
This is a welcome consequence for the Mapping Hypothesis of Diesing (1992), since nonspecific objects will not QR at LF but instead will undergo existential closure. The fact that antipassive verbs are sometimes less telic than transitive verbs and objects are sometimes interpreted as less affected by the action of the verb, as discussed in section 3.2, is also consistent with Borer’s (1994) proposal that telic interpretation of events is associated with raising of objects to the specifier of a functional projection above VP.

Quantifier scope facts provide further confirmation. As I showed in section 7.3, absolutive QPs take wide scope over ergatives, while antipassive obliques must scope under the external argument.\[14\]

Tagalog

(114)a. B-in-asa ng [lahát ng batá] ang [marami-ng libró]
   -Tr.Perf-read Erg all Gen child Abs many-Lk book
   “All the children read many books.”
   ⇒ ABS ‘many’ > ERG ‘all’

b. Nag-basa ang [lahát ng batá] ng [marami-ng libró]
   -Intr.Perf-read Abs all Gen child Obl many-Lk book
   “All the children read many books.”
   ⇒ ABS ‘all’ > OBL ‘many’

The analysis of antipassive proposed here also eliminates the criticisms cited in section 3.2.1 against analyzing Tagalog \(-um\)- verbs as antipassive. The structure proposed for antipassive clauses in (113) predicts there to be semantic/interpretive differences between oblique and absolutive direct objects. However, it does not presuppose a fundamental

\[14\] Similar facts are cited for other ergative languages by Bittner (1991) and Basilico (2003).
distinction at the level of argument structure. In other words, obliques and absolutes alike are merged in argument position in VP and receive theta roles from the verb.

In section 3.2.1, I noted objections to the antipassive analysis of Tagalog 
clauses by Philippine linguists such as Kroeger (1993), who assumes that an antipassive oblique must be syntactically inert in the way that a passive agent is in accusative languages. Under this view, antipassive involves demotion of the direct object from absolutive to oblique in the same way that passive involves demotion of the agent. Given the distribution of subject and object properties of absolutes examined in section 7, however, this assumption needs to be reworked.

I have shown in this chapter that internal argument absolutes, particularly in v-Type languages like Tagalog, check case with v and behave more like objects than subjects with respect to relations involving binding and control. Their special status as absolutes is founded on their interpretive properties and their ability to undergo A’-movement. These two properties are accounted for by their movement to the vP phase edge, licensed by the EPP feature carried by transitive v. They have no other “subject”-like properties. Therefore, if the parallel between passive and antipassive is to be maintained at all, antipassive cannot be said to involve demotion of the object from a higher grammatical function. Rather, antipassive can be better characterized by the lack of promotion. This can be achieved formally by the removal of the EPP feature from v, as I have proposed in (113).

Conversely, antipassive also does not involve promotion of the external argument. The ergative DP in a transitive clause becomes an absolute in an antipassive clause. However, since ergative DPs function as the subject of a transitive clause, as shown in section 2, then the change to absolutive status in an antipassive involves only the acquisition of the ability to undergo A’-movement. This is again accounted for by the lack of an EPP feature on v, which forces the internal argument oblique to remain in VP so that the external
argument is the only DP in the vP phase edge and hence the only DP which can be attracted by a feature on C.

What this boils down to is a characterization of antipassive as semantically transitive but syntactically intransitive. In other words, two or more theta roles are assigned in vP, but no structural case is available for an internal argument. It should also be pointed out that lack of structural case for an internal argument is not typically accepted as a diagnostic for adjunct status of that argument. Suppression of accusative case is frequently observed in specificity alternations, like those shown below for Turkish. The nonspecific object must be adjacent to the verb, as in (115a). If the object is scrambled and receives a specific interpretation, as in (115b), it must be marked with accusative case. Runner (1993) proposes that the dislocated accusative-marked object moves out of VP to [Spec, AgrO].

Turkish (Runner 1993:23)

(115)a. Ben dun aksam cok guzel bir biftek yedim
   I yesterday evening very nice a steak ate
   “Yesterday evening, I ate a very nice steak.”

b. Ben bifteg-i dun aksam yedim
   I steak-Acc yesterday evening ate
   “I ate the steak yesterday evening.”

Ritter and Rosen (2000) propose a similar analysis of the accusative/partitive alternation in Finnish.
Finnish (Ritter and Rosen 2000:205)

(116)a. Ammu-i-n  karhu-n.
    shoot-Past-1s  bear-Acc
    “I shot a/the bear.”

b. Ammu-i-n  karhu-a.
    shoot-Past-1s  bear-Part
    “I shot at a/the bear.”

Building on work by Tenny (1987), Van Voorst (1988), Borer (1994) and others on the role of direct objects in delimitation of events, Ritter and Rosen (2000) propose that when the verb is delimited and the object is specific, the object raises to an functional projection above VP to check accusative case and receive an event role.

(117) FP
    DP_{Obj}  F’
    F  VP
    DP_{Subj}  V’
    V  t_{obj}

Otherwise, it remains in VP, where in Finnish it receives inherent partitive case.
This proposal is strikingly similar to the one I have laid out for antipassives. Oblique objects remain in their base positions and receive inherent case rather than moving to the vP phase edge. Note that the interpretive similarities are also captured by this analysis: antipassive obliques tend to be indefinite, nonspecific, or less affected by the action of the verb, as discussed in section 3.2.

In addition to the clarification above concerning the nature of antipassive, there is further reason to reject Kroeger’s (1993) claim that Tagalog -um- clauses are transitive and not antipassive. As pointed out in section 3.2, Kroeger shows that an object in a Tagalog antipassive can control a gap in a participial clause. For this reason, he claims that this object must then be a term (or argument) and not an oblique, which he assumes to be an adjunct.

Tagalog (Kroeger 1993:47)

(119) Nanghuli ng magnanakaw ang polí sj
AV.Perf.catch Gen thief Nom police
[nang PROuj pumapasok sa bangkó]
Adv AV.Imperf.enter Dat bank

“The police caught a/the thief when entering the bank.”
Kroeger’s distinction between terms and obliques is based on the fact that the latter can undergo focus movement, while the former cannot. (120b) shows that a PP in an antipassive can be fronted for focus, while the direct object in (120c) cannot.

**Tagalog**

(120)a. Mag-bi-bigáy=akó ng bulaklá Kay María.
   Intr-Red-give=1s.Abs Obl flower to María
   “I will give flowers to María.”

b. Kay María=ako mag-bi-bigáy ng bulaklá.
   to María=1s.Abs Intr-Red-give Obl flower
   “I will give flowers to María.”

c. *Ng bulaklá=akó mag-bi-bigáy kay María.
   Obl flower=1s.Abs Intr-Red-give to María
   “I will give flowers to María.”

This distinction breaks down, however, in light of the fact that PPs can be controllers, as in the following. (121a) shows control into a complement clause and (121b) control into an adjunct clause.

**Tagalog**

(121)a. Nag-utos ang nanay sa [anák=niyá],-ng
   Intr.Perf-order Abs mother P child=3s.Gen-Lk
   [PRO, mag-bantáy ng bahay]
   Intr-watch Obl house
   “The mother ordered her child to watch the house.”
b. Na-ka-tingí n si Mariaí sa [kaibigan=niyá]í
Perf-Intr-see Abs Maria P friend=3s.Gen

[nang PROí p-um-apasok sa bangkó] C -Intr.Perf-enter to bank

“Maria saw her friend entering the bank.”

Kroeger’s distinction is actually not between adjuncts and arguments but rather one of category: the difference between a PP and a DP. Assuming that an EPP feature is realized as a strong [D] feature, movement of a DP out of VP requires this feature on v. This feature is absent in antipassives, hence the inability of oblique DPs to undergo focus fronting. Movement of PPs, however, is regulated by other mechanisms. In chapters 3 and 4, I show that PP fronting is constrained by phrase structure, i.e. whether or not the PP is contained inside an island. In Tagalog, it is not and can therefore move freely to clause-initial position.

As to the question of how it is that oblique objects can be controllers, under my analysis of ergativity, this is not at all surprising. What distinguishes antipassive from transitive clauses in a v-type language like Tagalog is whether v checks absolutive case and has an EPP feature. In both clause types, however, the verb still has an internal theta role to assign. In other words, the object in both clause types is merged in argument position inside VP and is therefore in a position to c-command inside a complement clause.
To summarize the analysis of antipassive, antipassive verbs are considered semantically transitive: an internal argument theta role is assigned to a VP-internal element. However, antipassive verbs are syntactically intransitive: no structural case is available for a VP-internal DP. Also no EPP feature appears on v, which means that the oblique object will not raise to the vP phase edge.

Before closing this subsection, I briefly sketch an analysis of antipassive for languages like Malagasy, in which this construction has been reanalyzed as active and transitive. In these languages, “antipassive” morphology on the verb allows v to check accusative case with an internal argument.
The result is a type of split ergativity. Non-actor focus in Malagasy remains transitive and ergative, while actor focus also has the characteristics of both semantic and syntactic transitivity with respect to case-checking, as analyzed by Paul and Travis (2003).

The absolutive restriction on A’-extraction is observed in all clause types in Malagasy. The direct object can be extracted only when it has absolutive status and not in an antipassive.

Malagasy (Pearson 2001:129)

(124)a. ny akoho
   Det chicken
   [novonoin’ny mpambo tamin’ny ants]
   Past.TT.kill.Det farmer Past.with.Det knife
   “the chicken which the farmer killed with the knife”

b. *ny akoho [namono tamin’ny ants ny mpambo]
   Det chicken Past.AT.kill Past.with.Det knife Det farmer
   “the chicken which the farmer killed with the knife”

This is also accounted for in my analysis. Just as in Tagalog, antipassive v does not have an EPP feature, so even though the object checks accusative case, it will not be able to move out of VP.
To summarize this subsection, I have proposed an analysis of antipassive as semantically transitive but syntactically intransitive. The difference between antipassive and syntactically transitive clauses is the lack of structural case for an internal argument and the lack of an EPP feature on v. This accounts for the nonpresuppositional interpretation of the oblique object and also this DP’s inability to undergo A’-movement. In other respects, the oblique object is still treated as an argument of the verb.

This analysis, which treats the oblique object as an argument and not as an adjunct, has the additional advantage of being readily adaptable to cross-linguistic variation in antipassive constructions. This analysis is particularly well-suited for accounting for the reanalysis of antipassive to transitive, which has taken place in Malagasy. This is a reasonable path of historical change, given the distribution of subject properties in ergative languages. As I have pointed out repeatedly in this chapter, subject functions are divided between the ergative and absolutive nominal in transitive clauses, particularly in v-type ergative languages, which is the type of ergativity displayed by Malagasy transitive clauses. In antipassives in v-type languages, however, subject properties are concentrated in the absolutive. The absolutive in an antipassive is the external argument, i.e. the highest argument in the clause, and can therefore c-command all other DPs. As the absolutive, it is also the only nominal eligible to undergo A’-movement. Antipassive clauses, then, bear striking similarity to transitive clauses in accusative languages, i.e. the external argument has the subject role. The change from antipassive to transitive, therefore, requires only the single step of adding a structural case feature to v. This step is also a reasonable one, since v already has the ability to check case in transitive clauses in v-type languages. The change simply allows a structural case feature also to be merged with antipassive v.
8. Indonesian as Accusative with Remnant Ergative Syntax

As discussed in section 6, Indonesian is fundamentally an accusative language, but it retains some aspects of ergative syntax, e.g. subject properties of the ergative DP (or passive agent) and the A’-extraction restriction. I propose that Indonesian case-checking follows an accusative pattern. Nominative is checked by T and accusative by v. Subjects also move overtly to [Spec, T].

(125) Indonesian Case-checking

T = Nominative
v = Accusative

In section 7.2, I proposed that transitive verbal morphology in syntactically ergative languages is merged in v and carries an EPP feature which attracts the absolutive DP to v’s outer specifier. The appearance or absence of the same EPP feature can be shown to regulate movement of DPs in Indonesian. In this language, it is passive v which carries the EPP feature. An additional EPP feature on T derives the SVO word order of Indonesian.

(126) EPP in Indonesian

v = Passive
T = Active and Passive

In the derivation of an active clause, the active prefix meN-, historically cognate with the antipassive *maN-, is merged in T, just as antipassive -um- and -m- are in Tagalog and Seediq, respectively. MeN- carries an EPP feature, which attracts the external argument to [Spec, T]. v checks accusative case with the highest VP-internal DP. But no DP can raise out of VP, since there is no EPP feature on v.
In a passive, the passive prefix *di-* is merged in v with an EPP feature, just as transitive morphology is merged in v with an EPP feature in Tagalog and Seediq. This EPP feature attracts the closest internal argument to v’s outer specifier. Being in the closest position to T, this DP is further attracted to subject position by T’s EPP feature. Following Chomsky (2001a), I assume that operations are strictly cyclic and the notion of equidistance has been dispensed with. Therefore, it is the higher of the vP specifiers that is attracted by T’s EPP feature.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{15}\) In order to account for subject raising over an object in [Spec, v] in the case of A’-movement, Chomsky (2001a) proposes that the Minimal Link Condition is not evaluated until the next higher phase level, in this case CP. At that point in the derivation, a DP with phonological content that intervenes between the moved subject and its trace in [Spec, v] will violate the MLC. If, on the other hand, the intervening material is a trace, i.e. is devoid of phonological content, then the MLC is not violated.
The fact that the agent is merged in [Spec, v] (not as an adjunct) and receives the agent theta role directly from the predicate accounts for the fact that it can function as an imperative addressee.

(129) Kerja-kan hitungan itu! (“Ia Masih Kecil”)

solve-App problem that

“Solve those problems!”

In an active clause with an applicative, applied objects check accusative case with v. v has no EPP feature, so it is the external argument that will be attracted to [Spec, T].


“Ali bought Nuri a book.”
In passive applicative constructions, \( v \) has an EPP feature. The applied object will be the one to move to [Spec, T].


“Nuri was bought a book by Ali.”
To summarize, *di*- forces movement of an internal argument, and *-kan* allows an applied object to be in a position to check accusative case. Indonesian is similar to T-type ergative languages in that nominative case is checked by T, in both active and passive clauses (corresponding, respectively, to intransitive and transitive in an ergative language). The two main difference between Indonesian and ergative languages is the ability of v to check structural (accusative) case in active clauses.

9. Comparison with Other Frameworks

The fundamental concept underlying the approach taken to ergativity in this thesis is that the properties traditionally attributed to subjects in accusative languages are distributed between the ergative and absolutive roles in ergative languages. This distribution and the parametric variation exhibited among different types of ergative language are accounted for by positing that either v or T checks absolutive case or only T checks absolutive case. The latter, T-type ergative language, will attribute more subject properties to the absolutive than
the v-type, since in the latter absolutive case is checked exclusively by T, analogous to nominative case in accusative languages.

9.1. Absolutive as Nominative

The proposal developed in this thesis represents a marked departure from standard formal analyses of ergativity, most of which equate absolutive case with nominative, assuming that this nominal functions as the subject of the clause. One early analysis is that proposed by Marantz (1981, 1984) and developed by Levin (1983), where the agent and theme theta role assignment are switched. Agent is assigned directly by the verb, while theme is assigned by the predicate as a whole, the opposite of what happens in an accusative language.

(132)a. Accusative Language

agent roles: assigned by predicates
theme/patient roles: assigned by verbs

b. Ergative Language

agent roles: assigned by verbs
theme/patient roles: assigned by predicates

Johns (1992) takes a similar approach, the primary difference being that the verb is nominalized, a claim motivated in part by the similarity between ergative and genitive case marking. Like Marantz, Johns claims that theme theta roles cannot be assigned directly by verbs. Agents, on the other hand, are base-generated within the XP containing the nominalized verb.
Inuktitut (Johns 1992:61)

(133)a. anguti-up nanuq jaki-a-0
  man-Erg bear.Abs stab-Pass-Ptcp-3s/3s
  “The man stabbed the bear.”

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AgrP}_V (=\text{IP}) \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{Agr}_v, \\
\text{bear} \quad \text{AgrP}_N \quad \text{Agr}_v \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{Agr}_N, \\
\text{man} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{Agr}_N \\
\end{array}
\]

Murasugi (1992) proposes for verb-initial ergative languages that the ergative nominal moves overtly into [Spec, Tr], while the absolutive nominal moves covertly into [Spec, T]. This proposal has been adapted for Tagalog by Maclachlan & Nakamura (1997) and Maclachlan (1996).

(134) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{DP}_{[\text{Abs}]} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{TrP} \\
\text{DP}_{[\text{Erg}]} \quad \text{Tr} \\
\text{Tr'} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\end{array}
\]
To account for ergative languages like Dyirbal and Inuit, Bittner & Hale (1996a, 1996b) propose that the absolutive nominal moves overtly into [Spec, IP]. The ergative subject is not based-generated internal to the VP but is rather considered a “distinguished adjunct” (p. 9) in order to undergo predication (Williams 1980) with the VP.

Evidence for absolutive raising comes in part from scope facts. Inuit absolutes take wide scope over negation.

**Inuit** (Bittner & Hale 1996b:568)

today Juuna-Erg student one talk.to-not-Ind-3s.3s

“There is one student that Juuna did not talk to today.”

Interestingly, Bittner & Hale (1996a) also includes an analysis of Malagasy based on Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis (1992) and characterize this language as having a three-way split...
case system. Therefore, the mono-transitive in (137a) is analyzed as in (137b), with ergative and nominative (absolutive).

Malagasy (Bittner & Hale 1996a:55)

(137)a. No-sasa-n Rasoa ny lamba.
Asp-wash-Erg Rasoa the clothes
“Rasoa washed the clothes.”

b. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Rasoa}_{\text{ERG}} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{\textit{clothes}}_{\text{NC}} \\
\text{\textit{wash}} \\
\end{array}
\]

The ditransitive clause in (138a), however, is analyzed as in (138b), where ergative, nominative, and accusative are all assigned. What is glossed as “D” is an applicative licensing advancement of the instrument to subject status.

Malagasy (Bittner & Hale 1996a:56)

(138)a. N-an-asa-n Rasoa ny lamba ny savony.
Asp-D-wash-Erg Rasoa the clothes the soap
“Rasoa washed the clothes with the soap.”
Though Bittner and Hale give evidence showing the subject status of the ergative nominal, such as imperatives and control constructions, they do not offer an explanation of their assumption that accusative case is also assigned.

Ura (2000) proposes the “Theta-Position Checking parameter” ($\theta$PC parameter) in order to allow an ergative agent to check its Case feature at the time it is merged into its $\theta$eta position. Then it is attracted to [Spec, T] to check T’s strong EPP feature. The agent must be attracted first and not the object, in accordance with the MLC. The agent cannot check T’s Case feature, since it already has inherent case. The object then must move to the outer specifier of T to check T’s strong case feature.

(139) $[[TP \ OBJ] [[TP \ SUBJ_T \ \ [vp \ t_k \ \ v \ [vp \ v_\ t_j \ ]]]]]$

The parameter distinguishing morphological from syntactic ergativity is that in the former T’s case feature is weak. Hence, the external argument checks inherent case and is
attracted to [Spec, T] by T’s EPP feature. The object checks absolutive case but remains in its base position. This parameter is intended to account for the lack of subject properties assumed by the absolutive in morphologically ergative languages.

(140) \[ \text{TP} \, \text{SUBJ}_K \, T \, [v_P \, t_K \, v \, [v_P \, V \, OBJ]] \]

In addition to case marking, Ura’s system can account for certain subject properties of the ergative and absolutive nominals. Since the ergative nominal is the one to check the EPP feature of T, it is the only one that can bind a subject-oriented reflexive.

Similar in its structural output to Ura (2000) is a recent proposal by Bobaljik and Branigan (2003), which claims that v cannot check case in ergative languages; both the ergative and absolutive DPs must check case with T. Following Richards (2001), Bobaljik and Branigan propose that the closest DP, i.e. the external argument, is attracted first and the then internal argument is tucked in under it. The result is that both DPs reside in a specifier of T, similar to Ura.

(141)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{Subj} \\
\text{Obj} \\
T \\
v_P \\
t_{Subj} \\
v \\
VP \\
V \\
t_{Obj}
\end{array}
\]

Manning (1996) proposes an LFG approach in order to account for the split in subject properties by stipulating that certain relations or operations are sensitive to argument
structure and others to grammatical structure. Accusative languages map directly from argument to grammatical structure, i.e. logical subjects become grammatical subjects.

(142) \[ \text{gr-structure} \quad \text{a-structure} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>a-subject (agent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ergative languages, however, use inverse mapping.

(143) \[ \text{gr-structure} \quad \text{a-structure} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>a-subject (agent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To account for the split in subject properties, Manning proposes that certain relationships like binding are established by the a-subject, while others are the privilege of the grammatical subject, like relativization.

9.2. Problems with the Abs=Nom Approach

The common feature of the analyses introduced in the previous subsection is the assumption that the absolutive nominal should be treated as a subject. The analysis I develop in this paper, on the other hand, claims that aside from the A’-movement privilege, absolutives do not necessarily have the properties of subjects. VP-internal absolutives in transitive clauses have certain object-like properties.

Subject properties of the ergative nominal like reflexive binding do not pose a problem for structural analyses sketched above, since at some level of representation, the ergative DP c-commands the absolutive.
**W. Greenlandic** (Manning 1996:126)

(144) Junna-p Kaali inmi-nik uqaluttuup-p-a-a.

Junna-Erg Kaali.Abs self-Mod tell-Ind-Tr-3s

“Jonna, told Kaali about himself.”

**Quiche Mayan** (Larsen & Norman 1979:349)

(145) x-0-u-kamsa-j r-iib’ lee achih

Compl.3s.Abs-3s.Erg-kill-Suff 3s-self the man

“The man killed himself.”

There is a problem, however, concerning controlled PRO in ergative position. Since the highest case-checking position in the clause is reserved for absolutive, it is predicted that PRO can only appear in the absolutive slot.

**W. Greenlandic** (Manning 1996:124)

(146) Miiqqat [PRO Juuna ikiu-ssa-llu-gu]

children.Abs [(Erg) Juuna.Abs help-Fut-Inf-3sg]

niriursui-pp-u-t.

promise-Ind-Intr-3p

“The children promised to help Juuna.”

Murasugi claims that the embedded clause in (146) is inflected and that PRO is in fact *pro*. 
Evidence for this is not convincing, however. Bobaljik (1993), Bittner and Hale (1996a), and Manning (1996) treat -llu- as an infinitive marker and note that embedded verbs like in (148) do not register agreement with the ergative DP. In a finite clause, this agreement would be present.

W. Greenlandic (Manning 1996:109)

(148) Niisi-p  erni-ni  asa-vaa.

Niisi-Erg  son-4s  love-Ind.3s.3s

“Niisi loves his son.”

Murasugi’s analysis would also does not work for Tagalog, since the embedded verb is clearly tenseless.

Tagalog

(149) Nag-ba-balak si  Maria-ng

Intr-Red-plan Abs  Maria-Lk
The tense/aspect paradigm for *tulungan* ‘help’ is as follows, using the terminology of Ramos (1971). Aspect is indicated by infixation, reduplication, or a combination of the two. Verbs lacking this inflection can only appear in nonfinite clauses.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline
\text{Completed} & \text{tinulungan} \\
\hline
\text{Incompleted} & \text{tinutulungan} \\
\hline
\text{Contemplated} & \text{tutulungan} \\
\hline
\text{Infinitive} & \text{tulungan} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

More crucially, Murasugi’s analysis cannot account for the fact that absolutive case is still available for checking in the nonfinite clause. This is also a problem for Ura (2000) and Bittner and Hale (1996a, 1996b). Ura’s analysis can account for PRO appearing in the ergative slot, since the ergative DP moves to [Spec, T]. However, the availability of absolutive case still goes unexplained, since this case is also checked by T.

To summarize the analyses which equate absolutive with nominative case, they are best suited to accounting for T-type ergative languages, where absolutive case is always checked by T. But they cannot account for all aspects of v-Type languages, in particular the availability of absolutive case in nonfinite contexts.

### 9.3. Absolutive as Accusative

Levin & Massam (1985), Bobaljik (1993), and Laka (1993) propose analyses of morphological ergativity. Since morphologically ergative languages exhibit syntactic behavior
of accusative languages, ergative and absolutive case-checking is proposed to take place in a manner analogous to accusative languages. In transitive clauses, ergative case is essentially equated with nominative and accusative with absolutive. Bobaljik (1993) proposes the following structure and case-checking mechanism. The external argument checks ergative case in [Spec, Agr1], while the internal argument checks its case in the lower [Spec, Agr2].

(151)

This proposal accounts for the subject properties of the ergative nominal, as Bobaljik (1993) argues, citing data from Inuit on ergative reflexive binding and controlled PRO. For example, in the following Inuktitut reflexive possessive construction, the ergative binds the possessor in the absolutive DP.

**Inuktitut** (Bobaljik 1993)

(152) Piita-up **anaana-ni** nagligi-jaa.

Piita-Erg mother-Poss.3s/Refl/Abs love-3s/3s

“Piita loves his mother.”
However, the fact that controlled PRO can never appear in the ergative position in T-type languages like Seediq, Dyirbal, and Mayan languages goes unexplained. Again, the absolutive = accusative analysis suffers from the same problem as the absolutive = nominative approach: it can only account for one type of ergative language, when it is clear that two types exist, i.e. v-type and T-type.

9.4. “Split Absolutive”

Legate (2003) proposes an analysis of Warlpiri case-checking which is strikingly similar to my analysis of v-type ergativity. Absolutive case on the subject is structural nominative, licensed by T. Absolutive case on an object is structural accusative, licensed by v and morphologically realized as default unmarked absolutive case. In a transitive clause, accusative case is checked by v with the internal argument. Ergative is inherent case assigned by v to the external argument. The external argument raises to [Spec, T] to check T’s EPP feature.

(153)  
TP  
  
DP_{Erg}  
  T  
  vP  
  t_{Erg}  
  v  
  VP  
  V  
  DP_{Abs}  

In an intransitive clause, for example an antipassive, accusative and inherent ergative case are unavailable. The external argument is attracted by T’s EPP feature and is nominative case-licensed by T.
This analysis is nearly identical to my proposal for v-type ergative languages and can account for the basic characteristics of these languages. However, it is unable to account for T-type ergativity. Specifically, it would not be able to block transitive nonfinite clauses and would predict that absolutive case should be available regardless of the finiteness of T. Therefore, this analysis, too, is unable to account for the parametric variation that exists among ergative languages.

10. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have proposed case-checking systems for two types of syntactically ergative languages. In v-Type ergative languages like Tagalog, v checks absolutive case in transitive clauses and T in intransitive clauses. The main consequence of this analysis is that external arguments and single arguments of intransitive verbs function as subjects, while transitive absolutes behave more like objects. In contrast to this, in T-type ergative languages like Seediq, absolutive case is always checked by T. Absolutes in these languages have more subject properties than in v-Type languages, including the fact that PRO can only appear in absolutive position.

In addition to case-checking, I have also proposed that transitive v host an EPP feature, which forces the absolutive DP to raise out of VP to the vP phase edge. This accounts for specificity requirements and scope facts exhibited by absolutes. The ability of v to carry an EPP feature also plays a central role in the account of the absolutive restriction on extraction which I propose in chapter 6.
The proposal presented in this chapter accounts not only for ergativity in Austronesian languages but is a general theory of case-checking in syntactically ergative languages cross-linguistically, as I have indicated at appropriate points throughout this chapter. In addition, I have also shown how the proposal can be extended, with minimal modification, to other Austronesian languages which exhibit varying degrees of ergative syntax. Specifically, I have shown how this theory can accommodate the reanalysis of antipassive to accusative in Malagasy and the remnants of ergative syntax in the Indonesian passive. The proposals for the different Austronesian languages are summarized below.

**Tagalog (v-Type ergative)**

(155) Absolutive case: Transitive v

Intransitive T

EPP: Transitive v

**Seediq (T-Type ergative)**

(156) Absolutive case: Transitive and intransitive T

EPP: Transitive v

**Malagasy (Split-ergative)**

(157) Absolutive case: Transitive (ergative) v

Intransitive T

Antipassive T

Accusative case: Antipassive v

EPP: Transitive (ergative) v
Indonesian (Accusative)

(158) Nominative case: T
Accusative case: v
EPP: Passive v
CHAPTER THREE

VERB-MOVEMENT IN TAGALOG

1. Introduction

In this and the next two chapters, I present analyses of Tagalog and Seediq word order. Tagalog is a VSO language, while Seediq has VOS word order. The primary surface distinction is that in the latter, the absolutive must appear in clause-final position. Another difference between the two is that Tagalog permits dislocation of PPs to clause-initial position, while Seediq does not. In order to account for these differences, I propose a verb-movement analysis for Tagalog and a predicate-fronting analysis for Seediq. In the latter, the absolutive nominal moves to a position above TP and then the remnant predicate fronts to its left. This derives absolutive-final word order. It also accounts for the lack of PP movement, since all clause-internal material is contained inside the fronted predicate, which has already been spelled out. In Tagalog, on the other hand, the absolutive typically remains in its base position and need not move overtly in declarative clauses. I propose that verb-initial word order is derived through verb-movement to a functional projection above vP. The lack of XP predicate-fronting also accounts for the ability of PPs to dislocate, since they are not contained in an island.

Chapter 4 develops the predicate-fronting analysis for Seediq. In this chapter, I present the verb-movement analysis of VSO word order in Tagalog. I first introduce some of the principal proposals for VSO word order in other languages, focusing on verb-movement analyses. Building on that foundation, I propose for Tagalog that the verb raises to an aspectual projection above vP, while the ergative and absolutive DPs remain in their base positions inside vP.
2. Tagalog as a VSO Language

In this chapter, I develop the analysis of word order derivation in Tagalog. As shown in chapter 1, Tagalog has VSO basic word order. The verb typically appears in clause-initial position, its arguments following in the order of the thematic hierarchy: agent/experiencer, theme/patient, locative, etc. Their is no fixed position for absolutive DPs. They appear in their base positions in unmarked word order.

(1)a. B-um-ilí ang babae ng isdá kay Huan.
   -Intr.Perf-buy Abs woman Obl fish Dat Juan
   “The woman bought a fish from Juan.”

b. B-in-ilí ng babae ang isdá kay Huan.
   -Tr.Perf-buy Erg woman Abs fish Dat Juan
   “The woman bought the fish from Juan.”

c. B-in-ilh-án ng babae ng isdá si Huan.
   -Tr.Perf-buy-App Erg woman Obl fish Abs Juan
   “The woman bought the fish from Juan.”

These facts notwithstanding, it has been claimed in the literature that Tagalog is a VOS language. In this section I present that analysis and subsequently argue against this approach.

2.1. A VOS Analysis of Tagalog

Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis (1992) (referred to below as “GHT”) propose a structural account of three types of word order found in Austronesian languages. GHT propose that VOS order should be derived in the following way, using Malagasy as an example. (2) gives an “actor topic” clause, where the agent is the topic (“absolutive” under an ergative analysis of this language) and appears in clause-final position.
Malagasy (Guilfoyle, Hung, & Travis 1992)

(2) M-an-sasa ny lamba amin’ny savony ny zazavavy.
AT-wash the clothes with the soap the girl
“The girl washes the clothes with the soap.”

(3) shows a “theme topic” clause, where the theme is in clause-final topic position.

Malagasy (Guilfoyle, Hung, & Travis 1992)

(3) Sasa-na ny zazavavy amin’ny savony ny lamba.
wash-TT the girl with the soap the clothes
“The clothes are washed with the soap by the girl.”

Because of this topic-final word order, GHT proposes that the topic always moves into clause-final position in order to receive case. The following shows the structure for (2), with an agent topic.

(4) 
```
  IP
    I’
      girl
        I
          wash
          VP
            t_j
              clothes
```
Patient subjects also move into clause-final position.
Tagalog is characterized as a language with alternating VOS/VSO word order. GHT offer the analysis in (6) and (7). As seen above, agent absolutes in Tagalog appear in immediate post-verbal position, while non-agent absolutes appear further to the right. GHT generate verb-initial word order by moving the verb to the left of VP. Agent absolutes, which appear to the immediate right of the verb, can get case in situ in [Spec, VP] and need not move out of this position for case. This is an instance of VSO word order.

Tagalog

(6)a. B-um-ilí ang babae ng libro.
   - Intr.Perf-buy Abs woman Obl book
   “The woman bought a book.”

b. 

(5) 

IP 

I’ clothes 

I 

| 

wash 

| 
girl 

| t_i  

| 

book
In contrast to this, patient absolutes, which appear further to the right than agents in surface word order, are claimed to move into a clause-final [Spec, IP] to receive case, resulting in VOS word order.

Tagalog

   -Tr.Perf-buy Erg woman Abs book
   “The woman bought the book.”

b. 

Indonesian is a language with SVO word order. To account for the difference between Malagasy and Tagalog, on the one hand, and Indonesian, on the other, GHT propose that the subject position in Indonesian is located on the left and not the right. The agent subject moves into clause-initial [Spec, IP] in an active clause.

Indonesian

   Ali Act-buy book
   “Ali buys a book.”
In the passive clause in (9), it is the patient which moves into [Spec, IP].

Indonesian

book that Pass-buy Ali
“That book was bought by Ali.”

b. IP
   book_j I’
       buy_i VP
           t_j V’
               ti book

2.2. Problems with the VOS Approach

As introduced in the previous section, Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis (1992) classify Tagalog as primarily a VOS language and propose that non-agent absolutes (“subjects” under their analysis) move rightward to [Spec, IP] in order to receive nominative case. It is true that arguments in a Tagalog clause do not always appear in their base positions and can be found in clause-final position. However, this is by no means obligatory. Furthermore,
GHT make several false predictions regarding c-command relations between the absolutive and other arguments in the clause.

As pointed out by GHT, the absolutive in an antipassive can remain in its base position immediately following the verb or can be displaced to the end of the clause. Under the GHT account, the absolutive in (10a) would receive case in its base position, while in (10b) it can raise to [Spec, IP] for case.

Tagalog
(10)a. K-um-ain si Maria ng mangga.
   -Intr.Perf-eat Abs Maria Obl mango
   “Maria ate a mango.”

b. K-um-ain ng mangga si Maria.
   -Intr.Perf-eat Obl mango Abs Maria
   “Maria ate a mango.”

In ditransitives, the following two orders are possible between the absolutive theme and dative goal.

Tagalog
   -Tr.Perf-buy Erg woman Abs fish Dat Juan
   “The woman bought the fish from Juan.”

b. B-in-ilí ng babae kay Huan ang isdá.
   -Tr.Perf-buy Erg woman Dat Juan Abs fish
   “The woman bought the fish from Juan.”
The GHT approach predicts that the absolutive-final order in (11b) is the default. However, they propose no analysis for the alternative orders.

(12)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{I'} \quad \text{fish}_j \\
\text{buy}_i \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{woman} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{t}_i \\
\text{t}_j \\
\text{PP}
\end{array}
\]

A more serious problem for GHT is the fact that absolutive reflexives and variables can be bound by ergatives. GHT would predict that (13a) is ungrammatical, since the absolutive reflexive should c-command the ergative antecedent.

Tagalog

(13)a. P-in-igil ng lalaki ang sarili=niyá.  
- Tr.Perf-control Erg man Abs self=3s.Gen  
“The man controlled himself.”

b.  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{I'} \quad \text{self}_j \\
\text{I} \\
\text{control}_i \\
\text{man}_j \\
\text{t}_i \\
\text{t}_j \\
\end{array}
\]

GHT also predict that the ungrammatical (14a) should be acceptable, since the antecedent c-commands the reflexive.
A further complication for GHT is word order in complex clauses. In a complex clause, the matrix absolutive must precede the complement clause, as exemplified in (15a). (15b), where the matrix absolutive appears in clause-final position, after the complement clause, is ungrammatical.
Again, as GHT stipulate that the matrix absolutive appear in final position in the matrix clause (since it must move to [Spec, IP] in order to receive case) it is predicted that the ungrammatical (15b) should be acceptable.

(16)

Another potential problem for GHT is posed by weak crossover effects. Weak crossover is observed in the transitive clause in (17a), when the internal argument operator is moved over the external argument containing the variable. If the operator is the external argument, then no weak crossover is observed, as in (17b).

Tagalog

(17)a. sino-i\_i\_ang yina-yapós ng nanay niyá.
   who Abs Red.Tr-hug Erg mother 3s.Gen
   “Who is his mother hugging?”

b. sino\_i\_ang yuma-yapós sa aná\_ki niyá.
   who Abs Red.Intr-hug Dat child 3s.Gen
   “Who is hugging his/her child?”
The GHT analysis is not able to account for the weak crossover effect in (17a), since the operator would first undergo A-movement to [Spec, IP] before proceeding to [Spec, CP].

\[(18)\]

```
   IP
  / \    
 I'  Op_j
     /
    I
   /
  hug
```

This section has shown that GHT’s VOS analysis can account neither for Tagalog word order nor for hierarchical relationships among the arguments. In section 4, I propose an analysis of Tagalog as a VSO language whose word order is derived through verb-movement, similar to traditional analyses of VSO order in Celtic and Semitic languages.

3. Previous Approaches to VSO Word Order

This section sketches previous proposals for deriving VSO word order. Most of these proposals involve movement of the verb to the left of the subject. Some require additional NP or DP movement to a checking position below the final landing site of the verb. The key issues I focus on here are what movements are involved and what the motivations are for these movements. Specifically, the questions that need to be addressed are: 1) whether (and to what position) there is movement of the subject; 2) the landing site of verb-movement; and 3) motivation for these movements.
3.1. Early Verb-Movement Approaches

Beginning with Emonds (1980) and Sproat (1985), numerous proposals have been set forth to derive VSO word order in Celtic languages from underlying SVO. The common mechanism employed is movement of the verb to the left of the subject. This approach has also been adapted for Semitic languages. Prior to general acceptance of the VP-internal subject hypothesis (Kuroda 1988, Koopman and Sportiche 1991, and others), there was some question as to where the subject should be base-generated and how the verb comes to be positioned to its left. Early analyses like Chung and McCloskey (1987) and McCloskey (1990) place the subject and VP in a small clause and then move the verb to Infl.

(19)

```
    IP
     /\  
    /   \ 
  Infl+V  SC
     \   / 
      \ / 
     Subj VP
        /   
       t_v Obj
```

A similar approach (McCloskey 1991, McCloskey 1996a) exploits the VP-internal subject hypothesis, positing that the subject remains in VP, while the verb moves to Infl.

(20)

```
    IP
     /\  
    /   \ 
  Infl+V  VP
     \   / 
      \ / 
     Subj V'
        /   
       t_v Obj
```
To account for why the subject need not move to the IP specifier position, McCloskey proposes that Infl governs and assigns case rightward, with the result that the subject can be case-marked in situ.

One important premise of the verb raising analysis is that VSO order is derived from underlying SVO. Emonds (1980) cites Greenberg’s (1963) observation that VSO languages have SVO as an alternate word order. Sproat (1985) gives evidence from Welsh showing that nonfinite embedded clauses have SVO word order.

**Welsh Sproat (1985:205)**

(21)a. **Gwelodd** Sion ddraig.
  saw-3s.Past dragon

  “John saw a dragon.”

b. **Gwnaeth** Sion weld ddraig.
  did-3s.Past see dragon

  “John saw a dragon.”

c. [s\_cyn i Sion laddu draig] y
  before to kill dragon Ptcl
  mae rhaid iddo brynu llaeth i’r gath.
  is necessary to-him buy milk for-the cat

  “Before John kills a dragon, he has to buy milk for the cat.”

Sproat argues that finite Infl assigns case rightward to the subject in VSO languages. Infl must be morphologically supported, i.e. morphologically spelled out on the verb or an auxiliary. Hence, a finite verb must move into Infl or an auxiliary must appear in this position for the subject position to be case-marked, thereby deriving VSO word order in finite clauses such as (21a) and (21b). In contrast, nonfinite Infl is not a case-assigner and
therefore does not require movement of the verb to this position, which accounts for SVO word order in nonfinite clauses such as (21c).

Another argument offered by Sproat for underlying SVO word order comes from VP clefting. A constituent may appear in clause-initial position and be followed by a particle *a* or *y*.

\[\text{Welsh} \quad \text{Sproat (1985:177)} \]

(22)a. Rhoddodd y dyn y ffon i’r ci.
gave.3s.Past the man the stick to.the dog

“The man gave the stick to the dog.”

b. [Y ffon] a roddodd y dyn i’r ci.
the stick Ptcl gave.3s.Past the man to.the dog

“It was the stick that the man gave to the dog.”

Only one constituent may be clefted.

\[\text{Welsh} \quad \text{Sproat (1985:178)} \]

(23) *[Y ffon] [i’r ci] a roddodd y dyn.
the stick to-the dog Ptcl gave.3s.Past the man

“It was the stick to the dog that gave the man.”

The key point here is that a VP can be clefted, which indicates that the verb and its complement together form a single constituent.
Welsh (Sproat 1985:178)

(24)a. Y mae’r dyn [wedi gweld y ci]
    Ptcl is.3s.Prog.the man Perf.Ptcl see(VN) the dog
    “The man has seen the dog.”

b. [Wedi gweld y ci] y mae’r dyn.
    Perf.Ptcl see(VN) the dog Part is.3s.Pres.the man
    “It’s having seen the dog that the man is.”

Another prediction made by the structures in (19) and (20) is that the subject and VP together form a constituent separate from Infl. McCloskey (1991) gives evidence for this in Irish. First is Right Node Raising, in which the subject and object together appear in the postposed position.

Irish (McCloskey 1991:265)

(25) Nior thug, no is beag ma thug, [an pobal
    Neg gave or almost.didn’t.give the community
    aon aird ar an bhean bhocht]
    any attention on the woman poor
    “The community paid no attention, or almost no attention, to the poor woman.”

Another argument comes from ellipsis. Answers to yes/no questions are given by the verb alone, elliding the subject together with any VP-internal material.
The same type of ellipsis is also observed in coordinate structures.

(27) Duirt me go gceannoinn e agus cheannaigh.
said I C buy(Cond:1s) it and bought

“I said that I would buy it and I did.”

3.2. Subject Raising

The analyses discussed in the previous subsection assume that the EPP is inactive in verb-initial languages and so the subject remains in its base position. More recently, a variety of proposals have been made concerning the position of the subject and the role of the EPP. These are summarized below.

3.2.1. Subject Raising below V

In some recent Minimalist approaches (McCloskey 1996b, 1997, 1998; Bobaljik and Carnie 1996; Noonan 1995), evidence has been presented that DPs in Celtic languages, particularly Irish, do have to raise out of VP for the purpose of case-checking. For instance, subjects appear to the left of sentential adverbs.
Chuala Roise go minic roimhe an t-amhran sin.

“Roise had often heard that song before.”

Bobaljik and Carnie (1996) note that objects must precede verbs in nonfinite clauses, which shows that objects as well as subjects vacate the VP under certain conditions.

Ba mhaith liom [(e) an teach aL thogail]

“I would like him to build the house.”

Exploiting the articulated phrase structure of early Minimalist theory, Bobaljik and Carnie (1996) derive VSO word order by positing that the N features of AgrS are weak while those of T are strong. The result is that the subject will raise to [Spec, T] (but no higher), while the verb raises to AgrS.
McCloskey (1998) also posits functional projections above VP for the subject and object DPs to move to, but he places these below T. T is the landing site for verb-movement. The EPP feature of T is inactive for Irish, which ensures that the subject never raises to the left of the verb.
3.2.2. Subject Agreement above V

The question of the EPP is treated differently in verb-initial analyses of Semitic languages. Mohammad (1988), Kaplan (1991), Ouhalla (1994), Shlonsky (1997), Doron (2000), and others have proposed verb-raising analyses for Semitic languages. Mohammad (1988) and Kaplan (1991) propose V-to-I analyses of VSO word order in Arabic and other languages. For example, Kaplan (1991) posits that nominative case is assigned to the subject by Infl in a manner analogous to ECM.

A null expletive is generated in [Spec, IP] to account for the fact that in many Semitic and Celtic languages verbs do not agree with post-verbal subjects. The expletive registers default agreement on the verb.

Arabic (Mohammad 1988:251)

(33)a. jaa?a l-walad-u w-al-bent-u
    came.3sm the-boy-Nom and-the-girl-Nom

    “The boy and the girl came.”
b.  ḍal-waład-u  ᵚ-w-al-bent-u  jaaʔa
the-boy-Nom  and-the-girl-Nom  came.3dm
“The boy and the girl came.”

To accommodate languages like Berber and Biblical Hebrew, where verbs do agree with post-verbal subjects, Kaplan proposes that Agr is realized on Pr instead of Infl so that agreement can take place between the verb and subject in [Spec, PrP].

Ouhalla (1994) proposes a verb-movement analysis of Arabic word order. Based on morphological evidence like that in (34a), where subject agreement appears closer to the verb stem than tense, Ouhalla claims that AgrS is located below T in Arabic phrase structure.

**Arabic** (Ouhalla 1994:45)

(34)a.  ᵛ-ya-zuuru  l-ʔawlaad-u  xaal-a-hum
will-3s-visit  the-boys-Nom  uncle-Acc-their
“The boys will visit their uncle.”

b.  

```
TP  
|--- AgrSP
  |--- VP
    |--- Subj
    |--- V'
```

The verb raises to T to check tense and agreement features. Arabic is a language in which pre-verbal subjects agree with the verb, but post-verbal subjects do not.

**Arabic** (Ouhalla 1994:43)
Ouhalla proposes that pre-verbal subjects in Arabic move to [Spec, T]. Post-verbal subjects, on the other hand, remain in [Spec, VP], while an expletive pro is merged in [Spec, AgrS], which registers default agreement on the verb passing through AgrS. At LF, the expletive is replaced by the subject DP. For languages which show agreement with post-verbal subjects, these subjects move to [Spec, AgrS].

In addition to verbal morphology, Ouhalla (1994) also cites double object constructions in Arabic as evidence for verb-movement. The indirect object can move over the direct object into [Spec, AgrO]. The verb appears to the left of the two objects, indicating that the verb must move to a position higher than AgrOP.

**Arabic** (Ouhalla 1994:55)

(36)a. ?a’tay-tu l-kitaab-a li-l-taalib-i
    gave-1s the-book-Acc to-the-student-Gen
    “I gave the book to the student.”

b. ?a’tay-tu [AgrOP l-taalib-a [VP l-kitaab-a t_v t_iO ]]
    gave-1s the-student-Acc the-book-Acc
    “I gave the student the book.”
A similar analysis is developed by Aoun, Benmamoun, and Sportiche (1994) for dialects of Arabic which show agreement with post-verbal subjects. The subject is moved to [Spec, IP], where agreement takes place with the verb. The verb then raises further to a functional projection above IP.

Verb raising analyses have also been developed for Hebrew. Shlonsky (1997) proposes a verb-movement analysis for Hebrew and Arabic. The examples in (38) show that adverbial adjuncts and floated quantifiers can appear between the verb and direct object in Modern Hebrew, indicating that the verb has raised out of the VP. The verb raises from VP to T in order to check tense and aspect features.

Hebrew (Shlonsky 1997:8-9)

(38)a. ha-yladim katvu etmol [VP t_V mixtav ]
   the children wrote yesterday letter
   “The children wrote a letter yesterday.”

(38)b. ha-yladim katvu kulam [VP t_V mixtav ]
   the children wrote all letter
   “The children all wrote a letter.”
Doron (2000) further shows that VP ellipsis strands the verb in Hebrew, as McCloskey showed for Irish above.

Hebrew (Doron 2000:82)

(39) ?im mishehu yedaber ?al abodato
if someone will.speak about work.his

gam dani yedaber [vp e ]
also Dani will.speak

“If someone will speak about his work, Dani will too.”

Biblical Hebrew is a predominantly VSO language in which verbs agree with post-verbal subjects. Doron proposes that the verb moves to T, where it can agree with the post-verbal subject through c-command, in the sense of Chomsky (2000). T does not have an EPP feature, ensuring that the subject will remain to the right of the verb.

(40) TP
    /\  
   /   \ 
 V+T   VP
     /\   /\ 
    /   /   
   Subj V’   t_v
         /\  /\  
        /   /   
       TV   Obj

3.2.3. EPP and Verbal Agreement

Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) have a different approach to verb-initial word order and the EPP. Their claim is that verb-initial order results when the verb can check the EPP feature on AgrS. Specifically, the [D] features of subject agreement registered on the verb can check the [D] feature on AgrS.
Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (A & A below) examine verb-initial word order in languages like Greek and Spanish.

**Greek (A & A:495)**

(41)a. efige o Petros.
left Peter
“Peter left.”
b. epekse o Petros.
played Peter
“Peter played.”
c. ektise i Maria to spiti
built Mary house
“Mary build the house.”

A & A note that alternating SVO/VSO word order occurs in null subject languages and attempt to correlate this with pronominal agreement morphology on the verb. They propose that the Greek agreement affixes in (42) are [+D] nominal elements with the same status as personal pronouns in languages like English.

**Greek (A & A:517)**

(42) agapo ‘I love.’
agapame ‘We love.’
agapas ‘You love.’
agapate ‘You love.’
agapa ‘He loves.’
agapane ‘They love.’
A & A claim that EPP is always checked by verbal agreement morphology in these languages and never by a phrasal subject. They claim that preverbal subjects in SVO word order are actually in an A’-position. Evidence for this claim comes from the fact that subjects are not located in a spec-head relation with the verb. Adverbs and even adverbial clauses can intervene between the two.

Greek (A & A:503)

(43) Epidi o Petros an erthi i Maria tha figi.

because Peter if comes Mary Fut leave

“Because if Mary comes, Peter will leave.”

3.2.4. Covert Movement

In the previous chapter, I introduced Murasugi’s (1992) approach to case-checking in ergative languages. Her system is particularly useful in accounting for VSO ergative languages. Murasugi proposes a Nested Path approach to case-checking in ergative languages. She posits the following parameter to account for the difference between ergative and accusative systems.

(44) Ergative Parameter (Murasugi 1992:24)

In an accusative language, the case features of T are strong.

In an ergative language, the case features of Tr are strong.

The result of this is that the highest nominal available for case-checking, the one residing in [Spec, VP], will be attracted overtly to [Spec, TP] in accusative languages and [Spec, TrP] in ergative languages. The verb has strong transitivity and tense features,
requiring it to move to T. In an ergative language, the case features of T are weak, so the internal argument will not move to [Spec, TP] until LF. This derives VSO (verb-ergative-absolutive) word order.


\[(45)a. \text{ma } 0\text{-jaw } t\text{-tx’ee7ma-n_v Cheep}_{\text{NP}} [V_{\text{P}}, t_{\text{NP}}, t_{\text{V}}, \text{tzee7 }]
\]

Rec 3s.Abs-Dir 3s.Erg-cut-DS Jose tree

“Jose cut the tree.”

b.

```
TP
  \[\text{DP}_{\text{Abs}}\]
  T’
  \[\text{V} \text{TrP}\]
  \[\text{DP}_{\text{Erg}}\]
  \[\text{Tr’}\]
  Tr
  \[\text{VP}\]
  \[t_{\text{Erg}}\]
  \[t_{\text{V}}\]
  \[t_{\text{Abs}}\]
```


To summarize all of the above approaches to VSO word order, most of them, particularly those proposed for Celtic and Semitic languages involve verb-movement to a position to the left of the subject. The EPP feature of T (or Infl) is either inactive or satisfied by other means than raising the subject, i.e. by insertion of an expletive or by verb-movement.
4. Verb-movement in Tagalog

The discussion of the previous section has shown that the key issues involved in VSO word order generation are movement of the verb and position of the subject. In this section, I propose that Tagalog VSO word order is derived by moving the verb to an aspectual projection above vP. As for the position of the absolutive, there is an EPP feature on v in transitive clauses which raises the absolutive DP to its outer specifier. However, in Tagalog this DP is spelled out in its base position inside VP, as proposed in chapter 2. In chapter 5, I will consider and argue against a possible alternate derivation of Tagalog VSO order through remnant VP-movement.

In chapter 2, I proposed that absolutive case in v-Type languages is checked by either v or T, depending on the transitivity of the clause. In this section, I refine this notion for Tagalog. In chapter 1, I showed that aspect in Tagalog is expressed by infixation and reduplication on the verb. The infix -in- marks perfective aspect, as in (46a). Reduplication in (46b) signals that the action has not yet been initiated. The combination of infixation and reduplication indicates imperfective, continuing aspect, as in (46c).

- Tr.Perf-eat Erg woman Abs mango
“The woman ate the mango.”

b. Ká-kain-in ng babae ang manggá.
- Red-eat-Tr Erg woman Abs mango
“The woman will eat the mango.”

c. Kina-kain ng babae ang manggá.
Red.Tr-eat Erg woman Abs mango
“The woman is eating the mango.”
What is important for the discussion at hand is that negation always precedes the inflected verb in Tagalog.

(47) Hindí k-in-ain ni Maria ang isdá.
   Neg -Tr.Perf-eat Erg Maria Abs fish
   “Maria didn’t eat the fish.”

   -Tr.Perf-eat Neg Erg Maria Abs fish
   “Maria didn’t eat the fish.”

Rather than follow Ouhalla (1990) in parametrizing the relative order of NegP and TP, I assume instead that negation is universally located below tense. This assertion will become particularly relevant when I examine aspect and negation in Seediq in the next chapter. In Seediq, tense auxiliaries precede negation. The difference between Seediq and Tagalog is related to the development of the analytic forms in the former, while the latter retains more conservative inflectional forms.

Because of the relative ordering between the verb and negation, I propose that the verb in Tagalog does not raise as high as T but rather targets an aspectual projection between negation and vP. As proposed in chapter 2, transitive morphology carrying an absolutive case feature and an EPP feature is merged in v. The absolutive DP raises covertly to the outer specifier of v. Asp and v have strong [V] features, inducing verb-movement to Asp.
The case-checking mechanism for intransitive clauses requires slight modification from the proposal of chapter 2. Since Asp, and not T, is the highest verbal projection in Tagalog phrase structure, I propose that intransitive morphology is merged in Asp, rather than in T. The absolutive case feature merged with this morpheme checks case with the highest DP in the tree, as proposed in chapter 2. (49) shows the structure of an antipassive.
5. Evidence for the Verb-movement Analysis

The analysis proposed in the preceding section asserts that VSO word order in Tagalog is generated by moving the verb to an aspectual projection above vP. Structural case is checked by Asp or v under Agree. Arguments are spelled out in their base positions. In this section, I present structural evidence for this proposal.

5.1. Surface Positions of External and Internal Arguments

Since word order in Tagalog is generated by moving the verb out of vP and stranding its arguments in their base positions, the external argument should be in a position to c-command the internal arguments. This is indeed the case. As shown in section 2.2, an ergative nominal in Tagalog can antecede an absolutive reflexive, but an agent reflexive cannot be anteceded by another nominal, even when the intended antecedent is the absolutive.

\begin{align*}
(50) \text{a.} & \quad \text{P-in-igil} \quad \text{ng} \quad \text{lalaki} \quad \text{ang} \quad \text{sarili=niyá}. \\
& \quad \text{-Tr.Perf-control} \quad \text{Erg} \quad \text{man} \quad \text{Abs} \quad \text{self=3s.Gen} \\
& \quad \text{“The man controlled himself.”} \\
\text{b.} & \quad *\text{P-in-igil} \quad \text{ng} \quad \text{sarili=niyá} \quad \text{ang} \quad \text{lalaki} \\
& \quad \text{-Tr.Perf-control} \quad \text{Erg} \quad \text{self=3s.Gen} \quad \text{Abs} \quad \text{man}
\end{align*}

In section 2.2, I cited this fact as a problem for the GHT analysis of Tagalog, which forces the absolutive to move to a position c-commanding the ergative DP. Reflexive binding facts are not a problem for the analysis I propose, because the ergative DP is located higher in the structure than the absolutive and therefore can bind it.
The proposal is further supported by the fact that agents, both absolutives and ergatives, can bind variables.

(51)a. Nag-ma-maháľ ang bawat batá
    Intr.Perf-Red-love Abs each child
    sa kani-kaniyá-ng aso.
    Dat 3s.Dist-Lk dog
    “Each child loves his/her own dog.”

b. Mina-maháľ ng bawat batá ang kani-kaniyá-ng aso.
    Red.Tr-love Erg each child Abs 3s.Dist-Lk dog
    “Each child loves his/her own dog.”

The other problems faced by the GHT analysis are easily accommodated in this analysis. Since the absolutive DP does not have to move to clause-final position, it will not follow a complement clause.

(52)a. Na-himok=ko si Pedro
    Perf-persuade=1s.Erg Abs Pedro
    [na bilh-í n yung libró]
    C buy-Tr that.Abs book
    ‘I persuaded Pedro to buy that book.’

b. *Na-himok=ko [na bilh-í n yung libró]
    Perf-persuade=1s.Erg C buy-Tr that.Abs book
    si Pedro.
    Abs Pedro
The correct analysis is also provided for weak crossover effects. (53a) is predicted not to allow binding of the variable by the operator, since the operator will be A’-moved over the variable directly from its base position.

(53)a. Sino\textsubscript{ij} ang yina-yapós ng nanay niyá.,
who Abs Red.Tr.Perf-hug Erg mother 3s.Gen

“Who is his mother hugging?”

b. *CP

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Op} \\
\downarrow \\
C' \\
\downarrow \\
\text{AspP} \\
\downarrow \\
hug \\
\Downarrow \\
\text{vP} \\
\Downarrow \\
\text{v'} \\
\Downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\Downarrow \\
t_v \text{t} \\
\Downarrow \\
t_{\text{Op}} \\
\end{array}
\]

In contrast, (54) should not exhibit weak crossover effects, since the operator originates in external argument position, above the intended variable.

(54)a. Sino\textsubscript{i} ang yuma-yapós sa anak niyá.,
who Abs Red.Intr-hug Dat child 3s.Gen

“Who is hugging his/her child?”

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Op} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{C'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{AspP} \\
\downarrow \\
hug \\
\downarrow \\
\text{vP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{v'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
t_v \text{t} \\
\Downarrow \\
t_{\text{Op}} \\
\end{array}
\]
Licensing of negative polarity items additionally indicates that ergative and absolutive nominals do not move to a position above negation prior to Spell-Out. Negative polarity items take the form of a *wh*-word followed by the adverbial particle *man* ‘even if/also’, e.g. *anuman* ‘anything’ (*ano* ‘what’ + *man*), *sinuman* ‘anyone’ (*sino* ‘who’ + *man*). These function as NPIs in the context of negation but not in positive contexts, indicating that they are licensed as NPI only when c-commanded by a negator.

(55a) **Walá-ng anumán sa kwarto.**  
not.exist-Lk anything P room  
“There is nothing in the room.”

b. **Mayroón-g anumán sa kwarto.**  
exist-Lk anything P room  
“*There is anything in the room.”

NPI is licit in negative existential constructions when the NPI is the complement of the existential verb or when it is in the absolutive possessor position.
(56)a. Walá-ng anumán-g b-in-ilí ang babae.
   Neg-Lk anything-Lk -Perf-buy Abs woman
   “The woman didn’t buy anything.”

b. Walá-ng b-in-ilí-ng libro ang sínuman.
   Neg-Lk -Perf-buy-Lk book Abs anyone
   “No one bought books.”

The same is true in non-stative, agentive clauses. The NPI can appear in the VP as an oblique or absolutive.

(57)a. Hindí siyá t-um-anggáp ng anumán-g mungkahí.
   Neg 3s.Abs -Intr.Perf-accept Obl any-Lk proposal
   “He/she didn’t accept any proposal.”

b. Hindí niyá t-in-anggáp ang anumán-g mungkahí.
   Neg 3s.Erg -Tr.Perf-accept Abs any-Lk proposal
   “He/she didn’t accept any proposal.”

An NPI can also appear in external argument position, as ergative or absolutive.

(58)a. Hindí t-um-anggáp ang sínuman ng mungkahí -niyá.
   Neg -Intr.Perf-accept Abs anyone Obl proposal-3s.Gen
   “No one accepted his/her proposal.”

b. Hindí t-in-anggáp ng sínuman ang mungkahí -niyá.
   Neg -Tr.Perf-accept Erg anyone Abs proposal-3s.Gen
   “No one accepted his/her proposal.”
The NPI examples above show that both ergative and absolutive DPs are located in a position c-commanded by negation in declarative clauses.

5.2. VP-internal Hierarchy

As proposed in chapter 2, ApplP is merged above VP in applicative constructions. This results in an underlying word order where the applied object precedes the theme, which is merged inside VP.

(59)                AspP
                   V+v+Asp     vP
                   DP[Erg]     v'
                   tV+v[ν/Abs] ApplP
                   DP[Abs]     Appl'   Appl   VP

Rackowski (2002) cites evidence from variable binding to support this underlying structure. In the antipassive in (60), the theme\textsuperscript{16} precedes the benefactive PP and can bind the pronominal variable\textsuperscript{17} inside the PP. This is expected, since the PP will be merged after the theme in an antipassive.

(60)a. Nag-bantáy=ako sa bawat batá,

\textsuperscript{16} The theme direct object here is marked with dative case and not oblique \textit{ng} case. This is because only nonspecific DPs can appear with \textit{ng}, not quantificational ones, as is the case here.

\textsuperscript{17} Not all speakers accept a bound variable reading with \textit{kanya}. But those that do accept this sentence with the bound variable interpretation.
Intr.Perf-watch=1s.Abs      Dat   each   child
                       para   sa   kanya-ng   magulang.
                       for   Dat   3s.Gen.-Lk   parent

“I watched each child for his parent.”

b. 

The locative applicative version of this sentence will yield the same word order, but
the quantifier will be inside the absolutive. The bound variable interpretation is possible, as
expected, because the applied DP is merged above the PP.

(61)a.  B-in-antáy-an=ko  ang   bawat,   batá
      -Tr.Perf-watch-App=1s.Erg   Abs   each   child
              para  sa   kanyá-ng   magulang.
              for  Dat  3s.Gen-Lk   parent

“I watched each child for his parent.”
The crucial example is (62), where the oblique theme precedes the applied object. Rackowski claims that the bound variable interpretation is not available because the theme originates in a lower position and cannot bind a variable from its scrambled position.

(62)a. *I-p-in-ag-bantáy=ko ng bawat, batá
    App-Tr.Perf-watch=1s.Erg Obl each child
    ang kanyá,-ng magulang.
    Abs 3s.Gen-Lk parent

    “I watched each child for his parent.”
Hence, scrambling of oblique DPs has the characteristics of A’-movement. This may come as a surprise, given that vP-internal scrambling in other languages often has A-properties. For example, it is well-known (Hoji 1985, Tada 1993, Oka 1996, Takano 1996, McGinnis 1999, and others) that movement of a direct object over an indirect object in Japanese can establish a new binding relation. For example, Takano (1997) shows the preceding quantified phrase can bind the following variable in (63a). If the quantified DP is in object position, as in (63b), the bound variable interpretation is not possible. However, if the object QP is scrambled to the left of the indirect object containing the variable, then the bound reading becomes available, as in (63c).

Japanese (Takano 1997, based on Hoji 1985)

(63)a. Mary-ga [subete-no gakusei]-ni Mary-Nom all-Gen student-Dat
McGinnis (1999) accounts for facts like these by proposing that A-scrambling is feature-driven movement. If this proposal is on the right track, then we expect an asymmetry between scrambling involving feature-checking and scrambling that does not involve feature-checking. Recall from chapter 2 that oblique objects do not check case with v. Nor are they attracted by an EPP feature on v. Therefore, they do not check any features with v. Absolutive DPs, on the other hand, check both the case and EPP features of v. Interestingly, absolutive movement to the outer specifier of vP does seem to have A properties. The quantified DP in absolutive position can bind the variable in ergative position.
Recall from chapter 2 that the absolutive DP moves to the outer specifier of vP to check v’s EPP feature (though the movement will be covert and the DP spelled out in its base position).

This section has shown that applied arguments are merged in a position structurally higher than oblique themes. Word order in which the oblique precedes the applied absolutive is derived through scrambling.

### 5.3. Configurationality

Kroeger (1993) argues that Tagalog has a flat phrase structure, i.e. that it lacks a VP constituent. The bulk of his evidence comes from pronominal coreference possibilities. Kroeger claims that the constraint at work is (66).
Rule of Pronominal Non-coreference (Kroeger 1993:115)

A (non-reflexive) pronoun must not take as its antecedent a phrase which neither precedes nor c-commands it.

Kroeger claims that this constraint both explains the following coreference patterns and shows that Tagalog has a flat structure. Hence, (67a) is grammatical because the pronoun is preceded and c-commanded by its antecedent and (67b) because the antecedent precedes the pronoun.

(67)a. Nag-ma-mahál si Juan, sa arák=níyá,
AV-Red-love Nom Juan Dat child=his
“Juan, loves his child,”

b. Nag-ma-mahál ang nanay ni Juan, sa kanyá,
AV-Red-love Nom mother Gen Juan Dat him
“Juan’s mother loves him,” (Kroeger 1993:117)

Likewise, the following are claimed to be ungrammatical because the pronoun is neither preceded nor c-commanded by the intended antecedent.

(68)a. *Mina-mahál=siyá, ng nanay ni Juan,
-Red.OV-love=3s.Nom Gen mother Gen Juan
“He is loved by Juan’s mother.”

b. *Nag-ma-mahál =[sa kanyá,] ang nanay ni Juan.
AV-Red-love=Dat him Nom mother Gen Juan
“Juan’s mother loves him,” (Kroeger 1993:117)
Given the constraint in (66), Kroeger then claims that the possibility of coreference in (69) shows that Tagalog has a flat phrase structure. Since the antecedent does not precede the pronoun, it must c-command it.

(69) Nag-ma-mahál ang nanay=niyá, kay Juan.
   AV-Red-love Nom mother=his Dat Juan
   “His mother loves Juan.”  (Kroeger 1993:117)

However, there is a critical flaw in this reasoning. The contrast between (68b) and (69) does not necessarily indicate that the antecedent c-commands the pronoun in (69). The inability to establish coreference in (68) can also be accounted for by Principle C of the Binding Theory.

(70) Principle C
    An R-expression must always be free.

Assuming, following Kayne (1994) that leftward material is not c-commanded by any terminal nodes to the right, in (67a) and (67b), where the antecedent precedes the pronoun, it is not c-commanded by it. This is also true of (69), where though the pronoun precedes the antecedent, it is contained within an NP and does not c-command the antecedent. In the ungrammatical examples in (68), the pronoun is encliticized to the verb and clearly precedes, hence c-commands, the antecedent.

Elsewhere, Kroeger does offer one example which seemingly mandates the precedence clause of (66).
(71) *Mina-mahál ang anák=niyá, ng nanay ni Juan.
Red.OV-love Nom child=his Gen mother Gen Juan
“His child is loved by Juan’s mother.” (Kroeger 1993:115)

However, this does not demonstrate that Tagalog phrase structure is nonconfigurational. (71) is simply another example illustrating that movement of the absolutive DP to the outer specifier of vP has A properties and can change binding relations, as discussed in section 5.2. Observe the following contrast. When the antecedent is contained in the absolutive phrase, fronting allows the possibility of coreference.

(72)a. *Mina-mahál ng nanay=niyá, ang anák ni Juan.
Red.Tr-love Erg mother=3s.Gen Abs child Gen Juan
“His mother loves Juan’s child.”

b. Mina-mahál ang anák ni Juan ng nanay=niyá.
Red.Tr-love Abs child Gen Juan Erg mother=3s.Gen
“Juan’s child, his mother loves.”

Recall from section 5.1 that Tagalog displays other characteristics of a configurational language. An ergative antecedent can bind an absolutive reflexive, but not vice-versa. If c-command in a flat structure were the only criterion, there should be no difference between the two.

(73)a. P-in-igil ng lalaki ang sarili=niyá.
- Tr.Perf-control Erg man Abs self=3s.Gen
“The man controlled himself.”
- Tr.Perf-control Erg self=3s.Gen Abs man

Precedence is also irrelevant, since in (74b) the pronoun precedes the antecedent.

(74)a. Nag-pigil ang lalaki sa sarili=niya.  
Intr.Perf-control Abs man Dat self=3s.Gen
“The man controlled himself.”

b. Nag-pigil sa sarili=niya ang lalaki.  
Intr.Perf-control Dat self=3s.Gen Abs man
“The man controlled himself.”

Another problem for Kroeger’s constraint is the fact that it cannot prevent Binding Principle B violations.

(75) Principle B
A pronoun must be free in its governing category.

The non-reflexive pronoun in (76b) cannot take “Juan” as its antecedent, in accordance with Principle B but contra Kroeger’s principle (66).

(76)a. Nag-ma-mahál si Juan sa sarili=niyá.  
Intr-Red-love Abs Juan Dat self=3s.Gen
“Juan loves himself.”
b. *Nag-ma-mahál si Juan sa kanyáì.

Intr-Red-love Abs Juan Dat him

“Juan loves him.”

6. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have proposed an analysis of VSO word order in Tagalog in which the verb moves to an aspect projection between vP and negation, while the ergative and absolutive DPs remain in their base positions. In this chapter, I have concentrated on demonstrating the landing site of verb-movement and the surface positions of the nominals. In chapter 4, I will contrast the Tagalog verb-movement derivation with the XP predicate-fronting analysis I propose for Seediq VOS word order. I will show how the verb-movement derivation for Tagalog allows PPs to move to clause-initial position, while this is prevented in Seediq, since PPs are contained inside the fronted XP. In chapter 5, I will also return once more to the VSO derivation and argue further in favor of the verb-movement analysis I have proposed and against an alternative remnant VP-movement derivation.
CHAPTER FOUR
PREDICATE-FRONTING IN SEEDIQ

1. Introduction

Seediq and Tagalog are both syntactically ergative languages. Seediq is a T-type language, while Tagalog is v-Type. However, the most striking syntactic differences between the two languages are the result of word order derivation. In chapter 3, I presented a verb-movement analysis of VSO word order in Tagalog. In contrast, Seediq has basic VOS word order. In this chapter, I present an analysis of VOS word order based on both verb-movement and predicate-fronting. First, I propose that, like in Tagalog, the Seediq verb moves to an aspectual projection above vP. Then, unlike in Tagalog, the absolutive nominal moves to a topic position above TP. Following this, the remnant TP moves to the left of the absolutive.

The two proposals for VSO and VOS word order generation account for not only differences in basic word order but also dislocation possibilities. Specifically, VSO Tagalog allows fronting of VP-internal PPs, while Seediq does not. This can be attributed to a new formulation of the CED, based on Nunes and Uriagareka (1999). Dislocated XPs, like a fronted VP or TP are spelled out before being moved, so their contents are no longer available to the computational system.

2. Seediq Verb-movement

As discussed in the previous chapter, the key issues involved in verb-initial word order generation are motivating movement of the predicate and licensing the subject (or absolutive). As in Tagalog, v and Asp have strong [V] features which attract the verb. I show in this section that the verb in Seediq must move out of vP to the head of AspP.
Recall from chapter 3 that aspect is expressed in Tagalog by infixation and reduplication on the verb. Recall also that Tagalog verbs follow negation in surface word order. I accounted for this word order by positing that the verb moves to an aspectual projection above v but below Neg and T.

Tagalog

(1a) Hindi kina-kain ni Maria ang isda.

Neg Red.Tr-eat Erg Maria Abs fish

“Maria isn’t eating the fish.”

I showed in chapter 1 that Seediq verbs can also reduplicate or be infixed to indicate aspect, as shown in (2a) and (2b). However, infixation and reduplication cannot take place simultaneously on a given Seediq verb, as is possible in Tagalog. In order to indicate imperfective in Seediq, an auxiliary must be used, as shown in (2c).

(2a) m-n-ege

Intr-Perf-give

“gave”
b. **b-bege**
   Red-give
   “will give”

c. **gaga m-ege**
   Pres Intr-give
   “be giving”

The synthetic forms for the perfective and contemplative may also be substituted by analytic forms. (3) shows that perfective can be expressed either by the infix or with the auxiliary.

(3)a. M-n-ari patis ka Awe.
   Intr-Perf-buy book Top Awe
   “Awe bought a book.”

b. Wada m-ari patis ka Awe.
   Past Intr-buy book Top Awe
   “Awe bought a book.”

Note, however, that when the negator *ini* appears, only the auxiliary can be used.

(4)a. **Wada ini** ekan ido ka Pawan.
   Past Neg eat rice Top Pawan
   “Pawan did not eat rice.”

b. *Ini m-n-ekan ido ka Pawan.
   Neg Intr-Perf-eat rice Top Pawan
   “Pawan did not eat rice.”
This indicates that perfective aspect is associated with a position higher than negation, i.e. with T. When the verb carries the infix, as in (3a), it must move to T.

\[(5) \quad \text{TP} \]

\[\text{mnari} \quad \text{vP} \]

\[\text{DP}_{Ag} \quad \text{v'} \]

\[t_{V+v} \quad \text{VP} \]

\[t_v \quad \text{DP}_{Th} \]

When Neg is projected, as in (4), verb-movement will be blocked, so a tense auxiliary must be merged in T.

\[(6) \quad \text{TP} \]

\[\text{wada} \quad \text{NegP} \]

\[\text{ini} \quad \text{vP} \]

\[\text{DP}_{Ag} \quad \text{v'} \]

\[\text{ekan} \quad \text{VP} \]

Another characteristic of verbal morphology in the context of negation is that the intransitive affix \(m\)- must be dropped.
In chapter 2, I proposed that Seediq intransitive verbal morphology is merged in T. Since this morpheme is realized as an affix on the verb, the verb must move to T so the two can be merged at morphological structure. The fact that intransitive morphology cannot co-occur with negation is readily accounted for under my proposal, since verb-movement is blocked by the intervening negative head.

Further evidence for the relationship between T and m- comes from conjoined gerunds like the following. The antipassive stems imah ‘drink’ and ekan ‘eat’ do not carry the intransitive affix m-. I suggest that this is because T is absent, which is supported by the fact that the agent pronouns have inherent ergative case rather than absolutive case, which would have to be checked by T.

(8)a. Gaga rudan [vP imah=na sino] dahaka [vP ekan=na tumaku]
    Pres old drink=3s.Erg wine Conj eat=3s.Erg tobacco
    “(He) has grown old drinking wine and smoking cigarettes.”
Although negation prevents intransitive morphology from appearing on the verb stem, it does not block transitive morphology. This is expected under the current analysis, since transitive morphology is merged in v and not T\textsuperscript{18}.

(9)a. Wada=na inī burig-i kanna patis.
Past=3s.Erg Neg buy-Tr.Irr all book
“He/she did not buy all the books.”

b. The next question to consider is whether aspect is always associated with T or whether there is another aspect projection between TP and vP, as in Tagalog. There is evidence for such a projection in Seediq. Although infixation and reduplication cannot be

\textsuperscript{18} In the context of negation, the irrealis transitive suffix -i must be used instead of the realis -un.
combined in Seediq, present tense and incompletive aspect can occur together, present being expressed by the combination of an auxiliary and reduplication.

(10)a. Gaga=nami bu-bulieq sapah.
   Pres=1p Red.Intr-fix house
   “We are going to fix the house.”

b. Laqi=na gisu mu-maha purading mu-uyas patis.
   child=3s.Gen Pres Red.Intr-go begin Intr-study book
   “Her child is about to go begin studying (in school).”

This contrasts with simple present tense, using only the auxiliary.

(11) Gisu/gaga m-ekanqutsuruh saya Awe-ni.
   Pres Intr-eat fish now Awe-Def
   “Awe is eating a fish now.”

The addition of reduplication adds the sense that the action has not yet begun. In (10a), the speaker is discussing plans for home improvements that have not yet been implemented. In (10b), the child has just reached the age when he will start school, but has not yet begun attending classes. This indicates that in addition to merging the tense auxiliary in T, the verb in (10a) and (10b) must also move to a lower aspectual projection.
Further evidence for verb-movement out of vP comes from adverb placement.

(13) M-imah riong sino ka Awi.
Intr-drink much wine Top Awi
“Awi drinks a lot of wine.”

This adverb follows the verb even when the negator ini appears in the clause and the verb does not move as high as T.

(14) Ini=ku usa riong.
Neg=1s.Abs go much
“I don’t go often.”

This suggests that the verb moves from VP to v and then to aspect, regardless of whether it proceeds further to T.
Positing verb-movement in Seediq also allows internally headed relative clauses to receive a parallel account in this language and in Tagalog. The head of the relative clause must be the absolutive of the clause, which is attracted to the vP phase edge by the EPP feature on v. As introduced in chapter 1, relative clauses in Tagalog and Seediq can be post-nominal, pre-nominal, or internally headed. In an internally headed relative clause, the head nominal appears between the verb and the ergative DP.

(16)a. s-n-malu sapah na tama (Seediq)
   -Perf-build house Erg father
   “house which Father built”

b. b-in-ilí-ng libro ni Maria (Tagalog)
   -Tr.Perf-buy-Lk book Erg Maria
   “book which Maria bought”

This word order can be accounted for by assuming, with this analysis, that the absolutive DP moves to the outer specifier of v, and the verb to Asp.
This section has shown that Seediq verbs, as in Tagalog, must undergo head movement to an aspectual projection above vP.

3. TP-fronting in Seediq

This section presents the derivation of VOS word order in Seediq. As a VOS language, the absolutive nominal appears in clause-final position. I propose that in VOS languages like Seediq, C has an EPP feature, forcing topicalization of the absolutive and placing this DP in the CP phase edge. Remnant TP-fronting then takes place in order to derive VOS word order. The question at this point is what triggers this fronting. In chapter 3, I showed that T has been argued for a great many verb-initial languages not to have an EPP feature\(^{19}\), which ensures that DPs do not appear to the left of the verb in basic word order. As an extension of this basic claim, I will suggest that the following PF constraint underlies Austronesian VOS word order.

(18) \textit{Stranded DP Constraint}

A DP cannot be spelled out in the leftmost position in a phase edge.

\(^{19}\) In chapter 5, I will introduce proposals along these lines put forth by Massam (2000, 2001) and Rackowski and Travis (2000).
This constraint is parametrized to apply to CP or vP or both in a given language. In Seediq, the constraint is active for both types of phase. With regard to CP, this constraint will be violated if a DP is moved to [Spec, C] and no other (non-DP) material is subsequently merged to its left. In this section, I argue that the absolutive DP undergoes topicalization and moves to [Spec, C]. Following this, the remnant TP fronts to C’s outer specifier, deriving VOS word order. The motivation for the second movement is indirect. If no movement takes place, (18) will force the derivation to crash at PF. If TP or another XP inside TP moves to C’s outer specifier, (18) will be satisfied. However, economy considerations also come into play. Since TP is the closest XP to C, this is the XP which is attracted.

TP-fronting actually can be observed as a general process of VOS word order derivation in Austronesian languages. Obligatory TP-fronting (because of obligatory topicalization of the absolutive) is found in VOS languages like Seediq and Malagasy. Optional TP-fronting (triggered by optional absolutive topicalization) is found in otherwise VSO languages like Tagalog. I present my analysis of Seediq in this chapter. I discuss Tagalog and Malagasy in chapter 5.

The next question which needs to be addressed is why a constraint like (18) should exist at all. I propose that this is ultimately because of how an Austronesian sentence is interpreted. The majority of Austronesian languages have verb-initial word order, and the leftmost portion of the predicate tends to be interpreted as new information or focus, while material further to the right is interpreted as old information or as being topicalized. I formalize this generalization as the following LF mapping procedure.

(19) Phase Edge Interpretation

If the edge of a phase HP has the form [[HP XP [[f DP ... ]]], where X is not D, DP is mapped to the presupposition and XP to focus.
In this way, I propose that VOS word order is derived through remnant predicate-fronting, but this movement is not driven by morphological feature-checking, contra Pearson (2001) and others. In the previous section, I showed that verbal head-movement is required independently, so it is unlikely that predicate-fronting is induced by the need to check morphological features on the verb. I will show below how information structure interacts with VOS word order in Seediq. I will also show that predicate-fronting is indeed triggered by the presence of a DP in a phase edge and not by morphological features. Evidence for this comes from VP-fronting inside vP, which does not always take place in Seediq but rather is contingent on the ergative DP being spelled out in its base position in [Spec, v]. In chapter 5, I will show further that (18) is at work in Tagalog and Malagasy as well. Tagalog provides particularly good evidence for (18), since TP-fronting takes place only when the absolutive is topicalized. Finally, I will show in chapter 6 how (18) and (19) derive the fact that wh-questions formed on DPs in a great many Austronesian languages must have the structure of a cleft and cannot be derived through wh-movement to clause-initial position.

At this point, I will show the process of how VOS word order is derived in Seediq. In the transitive clause shown in (20), the absolutive DP is merged in VP. The EPP feature on v attracts this DP to the vP phase edge, where the absolutive checks case with T. Next, an EPP feature on C forces the absolutive to move to its specifier. Remnant TP-fronting takes place subsequently, and the Stranded DP Constraint is satisfied.

(20)a. Wada burig-un na Ape ka patis na Pawan.
Past buy-Tr Erg Ape Top book Gen Pawan
“Ape bought Pawan’s book.”
In an intransitive clause like an antipassive, the external argument absolutive is merged in [Spec, v] and checks case with T. This DP is then attracted to [Spec, C], and the remnant TP is again moved to its left.

(21)a. Wada m-ari patis ka Ape.
    Past Intr-buy book Top Ape
    “Ape bought a book.”
4. Evidence

The proposal presented in the previous section has essentially two components: movement of the absolutive and TP-fronting. In this section, I provide evidence for these two operations. First I show that the absolutive moves out of TP. Then I argue for phrasal dislocation of the predicate. I also relate these movements to information structure, specifically that new or focused information appears in the predicate, while the absolutive is always presupposed.

4.1. Position of the Absolutive

In Seediq, only absolutes can antecede reflexives, indicating that no other DP in the clause c-commands the absolutive. Therefore, the agent absolutive in the antipassive in (22) can bind the benefactive reflexive. But the ergative in the applicative construction in (23) cannot bind the absolutive benefactive.
Seediq

(22)a. Wada=nak m-ari rulu ka Ape.
   Past=Refl Intr-buy car Top Ape
   “Ape bought herself a car.”

b. CP
   DP
   TP
   …Refl…

(23)a. *Wada=nak s-bari rulu na Ape.
   Past=Refl.Abs App-buy car Erg Ape

b. *CP
   Refl
   TP
   …DP_Erg…

NPI can appear as antipassive obliques, as in (24a). But they cannot occur in absolutive position, as in the transitive clause in (24b), indicating that the absolutive position is not c-commanded by negation.

Seediq

(24)a. Wada ini bari ani mumaanu ka Ape.
   Past Neg buy any thing Top Ape
   “Ape didn’t buy anything.”

b. *Ini burig-i na Ape ka ani mumaanu.
   Neg buy-Tr.Irr Erg Ape Top any thing
   “Ape didn’t buy anything.”
Recall from chapter 3 that NPI can occur in absolutive position in Tagalog. Consistent with the different word order analyses I propose for Seediq and Tagalog, the absolutive DP in the latter does not move overtly out of vP but remains in argument position and is therefore c-commanded by negation.

Tagalog

   Neg 3s.Erg -Tr.Perf-accept Abs any-Lk proposal
   “He/she didn’t accept any proposal.”

b. Hindí t-um-anggáp ang sínuman ng mungkahí-niyá.
   Neg -Intr.Perf-accept Abs anyone Obl proposal-3s.Gen
   “Noone accepted his/her proposal.”

Coordination also provides evidence that absolutes move out of TP. The fact that the verbs in the conjuncts in (26a) carry the intransitive prefix provides strong evidence that the XPs being conjoined are TPs and not smaller constituents. This is because the intransitive prefix is merged in T, as I have shown in section 2.

Seediq

(26)a. [M-usa Purishia] [m-ari sama] ka Ape.
   Intr-go Puli Intr.buy vegetable Top Ape
   “Ape went to Puli and bought vegetables.”
b. [S-bari=na hulama] ma
   App-buy=3s.Erg treat and
   App-make=3s.Erg clothes also Top child-3s.Gen

“She buys a treat for and also makes clothes for her child.”

The structure before predicate-fronting is as in (27). When predicate-fronting takes place, it will target the entire &P, since this is the closest XP to C. As a result, both of the TP conjuncts will precede the absolutive DP, as in (26).

```
(27) CP
    /_\  
   /   \  
  DP_{Abs} &P
   \   /  
    TP  &’
         & \  
            TP
```

4.2. Resumptive Pronouns

I have proposed that the absolutive DP moves to [Spec, C], which I assume to be an A’-position, where it will be interpreted as a topic. Evidence for this is provided by pronominal doubling, which bears striking resemblance to clitic left dislocation in Romance languages. In (28a) and (28b), the absolutive yaku is resumed by clitics right-adjacent to the verb\(^{20}\).

\(^{20}\) Recall from chapter 1 that third-person singular absolutive is null.
(28)a. Gaga=ku=daha ngal-un ka yaku duri.
   Pres=1s.Abs=3p choose-Tr Top 1s also
   “They have chosen me, too.”

b. M-usa=ku mu-huma kyuuri=na ka yaku.
   Intr-go=1s.Abs Intr-plant cucumber=3s.Gen Top 1s
   “I went to plant his cucumbers.”

Chang (1997) claims that the pronouns in (28) are agreement affixes and not pronouns. There is counter-evidence to this claim, however. First, in terms of placement, these pronouns behave as second position clitics and not affixes. They attach to the first phonological word in a tensed clause. This is the main verb in (29a), a tense auxiliary in (29b), negation in (29c), and a question particle in (29d).

(29)a. Tuminun=ta, burige=ta!
   weave=1p.Inc sell=1p.Inc
   “Let’s weave stuff and sell (it)!”

b. Wada=miyan mukuraqin riong ka tsubeo.
   Past=1p.Excl poor verb Top past
   “In the past, we were very poor.”

c. Ini=mu burigi kanna.
   Neg=1s.Erg buy all
   “I didn’t buy all of them.”

d. Ya=ku=daha pahulisan kndalah bukuei uri.
   Q=1s.Abs=3p laugh behind back also
   “Perhaps they will laugh at me behind my back.”
Clitic pronouns also do not occur with a DP in argument position. Full NP absolutives always move to the C domain, as per the analysis in section 2. But ergative DPs do not. When a full NP occurs in the ergative position, in [Spec, v], it is not resumed by a pronoun.

(30) Wada burig-un na Ape ka patis na Pawan.
Past buy-Tr Erg Ape Top book Gen Pawan
“Ape bought Pawan’s book.”

If the ergative DP is topicalized, however, it must be resumed by a pronoun.

(31) Wada=na biq-un hulama laqi ka Awe.
Past=3s.Erg give-Tr treat child Top Awe
“Awe gave the child a treat.”

4.3. Information Structure

The VOS word order derivation I have proposed claims that the movement of the absolutive DP and remnant TP to the C domain is related to information structure. In this subsection, I provide evidence to support this assertion. In a typical declarative Seediq clause, new or focused information tends to appear first in the clause, inside the predicate, with definite material coming last, generally in the form of the absolutive DP.

Non-absolutive internal arguments in immediate post-verbal position tend to be indefinite, or non-specific. The oblique object in immediate post-verbal position is generally indefinite, while the absolutive DP must be definite or specific. In (32a), it is mentioned that the family ate chicken, which implies that there were chicken bones. (32b) describes what
was done with those bones. In this case, *buuts rodux* “chicken bones” is old information and *huling* “dog” is new information.

(32)a. Bubiyan chiida wada m-ekan **rodux**
   evening then Past Intr-eat chicken
   ka tnsapahna Ape.
   Top family Gen Ape
   “In the evening, Ape’s family ate chicken.”

b. Wada=na kudal-un **huling** ka **buuts rodux**.
   Past=3s.Erg feed-Tr dog Top bone chicken
   “She fed the bones to the dog.”

To illustrate that it is not the case that *kudalun* “feed” must take a theme absolutive, in (33b), where the goal *huling* “dog” is old information, this becomes the absolutive.

(33)a. Gaga mu-ure **huling** t-m-bug-an na Ape.
   Pres Intr-hungry dog -Perf-care.for-Tr Erg Ape
   “The dog that Ape takes care of is hungry.”

b. Kiyaka wada=na kudal-un **buuts huling**.
   so Past=3s.Erg feed-Tr bone dog
   “So she fed the dog bones.”

Similarly, (34a) introduces *qushia mutaso* “clean water”, where it is immediately after the verb, before the locative NP and the agent absolutive. In (34b), where it represents old information, it is the absolutive, while the NP representing new information *lukus* “clothes” has oblique status.
(34)a.  M-n-oda  m-ari  qushia mutaso  Hori  ka  Ape.
       Intr-Perf-go  Intr-buy  water  clean  Puli  Top  Ape

       “Ape went to Puli to buy clean water.”

b.  Wada=na  s-pahu  lukus  ka  qushia mutaso.
       Past=3s.Erg  App-wash  clothes  Top  water  clean

       “She washed clothes with the clean water.”

In contrast to this, XPs which cannot be topicalized are not permitted to appear in absolutive position in Seediq. For instance, *wh*-words cannot occur in absolutive position. This is true not only for Seediq but also for Malagasy, another VOS Austronesian language.

**Seediq** (Chang 1997:146)

(35)a.  Ima  (ka)  s-m-ebut  laqi.
       who  Top  -Intr-hit  child

       “Who hits a child?”

b.  *S-m-ebut  laqi  ka  ima?
       -Intr-hit  child  Top  who

       “Who hits a child?”

**Malagasy** (Sabel 2003:11)

(36)a.  Inona  no  novidin-dRabe?
       what  Foc  Past.TT.buy-Rabe

       “What did Rabe buy?”
b. *Novidin-dRabe(ny) inona?

Past.TT.buy-Rabe Det what

“What did Rabe buy?”

Note that wh-phrases occur naturally in clause-initial position. In chapter 6, I argue for a cleft analysis of wh-questions. Under this analysis, the wh-phrase is part of the matrix predicate, again consistent with the claim that focused material is contained within the predicate. The remainder of the clause in the cleft construction is contained in a headless relative clause in matrix absolutive position. This is also consistent with the fact that the headless relative portion of a cleft represents the presupposition of the utterance. In order to derive the word order, the matrix predicate undergoes predicate fronting to C’s outer specifier.

Another related asymmetry is that observed between strong and weakly quantified DPs. Strongly quantified DPs tend to be given absolutive status.
Interestingly, weakly quantified DPs cannot appear in absolutive position. If they appear in situ in the clause, they must have oblique status, e.g. as the object of an antipassive verb.

(39)a. Wada m-ari egu nashi ka Awe-ni.
    Past Intr-buy many pear Top Awe-Def
    “Awe bought a lot of pears.”

b. *Wada=na burig-un egu nashi ka Awe-ni.
    Past=3s.Erg buy-Tr many pear Top Awe-Def

Alternatively, they can appear in clause-initial position, functioning as the predicate of a cleft.

(40)a. Egu ka b-n-ari=na nashi ka Awe-ni.
    many Top -Perf-buy=3s.Erg pear Top Awe-Def
    “Awe bought a lot of pears.”

b. Hobaru (ka) laqi gaga teheyak ngaguts.
    many Top child Pres play outside
    “There are many children playing outside.”

c. Egu ka wada puq-un laqi ka budo kiya de.
    many Top Past eat-Tr child Top grape that Asp
    “The kids ate many of the grapes.”
Building on work by Milsark (1974), Diesing (1992) proposes that strong quantifiers, but not necessarily weak quantifiers, presuppose the existence of the entities they are applied to. This dichotomy is captured easily in the current analysis. Strongly quantified DPs move into topic position, where they will be mapped onto the presupposition, while weakly quantified DPs are contained inside the predicate and are mapped to the focused – or nonpresupposed – part of the clause.

Tagalog provides an interesting contrast here. Unlike the VOS languages, it is possible for \(wh\)-words to appear in absolutive position. This fact is also consistent with the word order derivation I have proposed for Tagalog, since the absolutive DP is not forced to move to a topic position. Inherently focused material is therefore not prohibited from appearing in absolutive position.

Tagalog

(41)a. P-um-untá sa Maynila sino?
   -Intr.Perf-go to Manila who.Abs
   “Who went to Manila?”

b. B-in-ilí ni Maria ang anó?
   -Tr.Perf-buy Erg Maria Abs what
   “What did Maria buy?”

The preceding discussion has argued for movement of the absolutive DP and for the information structure I proposed in (19) above. Specifically, the absolutive DP in Seediq moves out of TP to a topic position. The remnant TP, which then fronts to its left, is interpreted as focused or new information. In the next subsection, I give structural evidence for dislocation of the predicate XP.
4.4. CED Effects

As Seediq is a syntactically ergative language, a DP $wh$-phrase in this language undergoes $wh$-movement only when it has absolutive status. (42) shows $wh$-movement of the applied object in an applicative construction. The derivation of $wh$-questions like this will be treated in detail in chapter 6.

Seediq

(42) Ima$_i$ ka wada s-bari hulama na Ape?
who Abs Past App-buy treat Erg Ape

“Who did Ape buy a treat for?”

Non-absolutive nominals, however, cannot appear in clause-initial position. (43) shows this for the direct object in an antipassive.

Seediq

(43)a. Wada m-ari maanu ka Ape?
Past Intr-buy what Top Ape

“What did Ape buy?”

b. *Maanu wada m-ari ka Ape?
what Past Intr-buy Top Ape

“What did Ape buy?”

This is also true for Tagalog.
However, there is an interesting difference between Seediq and Tagalog. PPs and adjuncts are free to move into pre-verbal position in Tagalog.

This is also true of non-\textit{wh} PPs. They can undergo focus movement to clause-initial position in Tagalog. (46a) shows a locative PP in situ, to the right of the verb. (46b) shows the PP scrambled to clause-initial position.
Tagalog

(46)a. Pu-puntá=ákó sa Maynila.
   Red-go=1s.Abs Dat Manila
   “I will go to Manila.”

b. [Sa Maynila]=ákó [T₁ pu-puntá₁]
   [Dat Manila]=1s.Abs Red-go
   “I will go to Manila.”

Dative arguments can also be dislocated in this way.

Tagalog

(47)a. Nag-bigáy=ákó ng libro kay Maria.
   Perf.Intr-give=1s.Abs Obl book Dat Maria
   “I gave a book to Maria.”

b. [Kay Maria]=ákó nag-bigáy ng libro.
   Dat Maria=1s.Abs Intr.Perf-give Obl book
   “I gave a book to Maria.”

c. I-p-in-akilala=ko si Juan kay Maria.
   App-Perf-introduce=1s.Erg Abs Juan Dat Maria
   “I introduced Juan to Maria.”

d. [Kay Maria]=ko I-p-inakilala si Juan.
   Dat Maria=1s.Erg App-Perf-introduce Abs Juan
   “I introduced Juan to Maria.”
Following Stroik (1996), I assume that locatives are merged inside VP; when they appear in clause-initial position, this is the result of movement. In Seediq, on the other hand, locatives cannot be fronted.

**Seediq**

(48)a. M-n-ari inu patis Ape?
   Intr-Perf-buy where book Ape
   “Where did Ape buy books?”

b. *Inu, m-n-ari ti patis Ape?
   where Intr-Perf-buy book Ape

I argue here that the difference is the result of word order derivation. As a VSO language, Tagalog word order is derived by moving the verb to Asp. As I have shown in chapter 3, Tagalog is not a VOS language; its word order is not typically derived through XP predicate-fronting. A VP-internal PP can then be attracted to the vP phase edge and further undergo wh-movement.

---

21 However, I show in chapter 5 that predicate-fronting can and often does take place in intransitive clauses in Tagalog and is related to topicalization of the absolutive.
In contrast to this, Seediq word order is VOS. After the absolutive DP moves to [Spec, C], the remnant TP is also moved into C’s outer specifier, to the left of the absolutive. Assuming with Nunes and Uriagareka (1999) that moved XPs are spelled out before they are dislocated, the \( wh \)-word inside the fronted predicate will be trapped inside the fronted TP and inaccessible to further syntactic operations. In pre-Minimalist terms, movement of the \( wh \)-phrase would invoke a violation of Huang’s (1982) Condition on Extraction Domain (CED).
4.5. CED Effects in Other VOS Formosan Languages

The same correlation observed in section 4.4 between basic word order and adjunct fronting can be found in other Formosan languages. Paiwan is a VSO language, like Tagalog. The absolutive DP can, but need not, appear in clause-final position.

**Southern Paiwan**

(51)a. P-in-avai-an ni ama ta tsakit a kakedian.
   -Perf-give-Tr Erg father Obl knife Abs child
   “Father gave the child a knife.”

b. P-in-avai-an ni ama a kakedian ta tsakit.
   -Perf-give-Tr Erg father Abs child Obl knife
   “Father gave the child a knife.”
c. Sini-pavai  a  tsakit  na  kakedian  tjay  ama.
App.Perf-give  Abs  knife  Erg  child  Obl  father
“The child gave Father the knife.”

Bunun is another VSO language.

Bunun

(52)a. ‘is-anat mas  tina’  ‘uvaz-a’  pandian.
App-cook  Erg  mother  child-that  soup
“Mother cooks soup for that child.”    (Zeitoun 2000a:80)

b. ma-ludah  tina’-a’  ‘uvaz-tia’.
Intr-hit  mother-that  child-that
“That mother hits that child.”    (Zeitoun 2000a:66)

In contrast to this, Tsou has VOS word order. The absolutive always appears in clause-final position.

Tsou

(53)a. i-si  fii to  emi to  ino  ‘o  amo.
Aux-3sErg  give  Obl  wine  Erg  mother  Abs  father
“Father was given some wine by mother.”

b. i-si  mU’a  to  bUvnU  to  mamespinNi
Aux-3sErg  plant  Obl  flowers  Erg  woman
   si  papai.
   Abs  field
   “This field is where the woman planted some flowers.”
Now observe the placement of adjuncts. VSO Paiwan and Bunun allow fronting of locatives.

**Southern Paiwan**

(54)a. **Inu** na-suman tapau ti ama?
   where  Intr.Perf.-build house Abs father
   “Where did the father build a house?”

b. A okama suman tapau i **daruk**.
   Abs father build house P mountain
   “The father builds a house in the mountains.”

c. **I** **daruk** suman tapau a okama.
   P mountain build house Abs father
   “In the mountains, the father builds a house.”

**Bunun (Zeitoun 2000a:94)**

(55)  (*I*)’isa ‘uvaz-a’ dau’ tatangis?
   Pres.where child Q cry
   “Where is the child crying?”

VOS Tsou, on the other hand does not. Locative *wh*-words must follow the verb.

**Tsou**

(56)a. mi-ko oengiti **nenu**?
   Intr-2s.Abs sleep where
   “Where did you sleep?”
   (Huang et al. 1999:670)
b. te-ko uh nenu?
Fut-2s go where
“Where are you going?” (Zeitoun 2000b:124)

This cross-linguistic comparison substantiates the correlation between VOS word order and predicate-fronting. Predicate-fronting creates an island to extraction, so adjuncts cannot move to clause-initial position.

5. VP-movement

The vP phase edge is also subject to the Stranded DP Constraint in Seediq, meaning that VP-fronting also takes place in this language. I proposed in the previous section that predicate-fronting is not triggered by feature-checking but rather must take place when a DP is spelled out in the left edge of a phase. VP-fronting in Seediq provides even clearer evidence for this correlation than TP-fronting. I will show below that VP-fronting must take place in precisely those cases when a DP, typically the ergative nominal, is spelled out in the edge of vP but otherwise does not take place.

Recall that in an antipassive, the verb and auxiliaries appear at the left edge of the clause, followed by VP-internal arguments and adjuncts and finally the external argument absolutive.

(57) Wada m-ari [vP t_{Abs} hulama t_y laqi] ka Ape.
Past Intr-buy treat child Top Ape
“Ape bought the child a treat.”

In a mono-transitive clause with a full NP ergative nominal, the ergative DP immediately follows the verb, while the internal argument absolutive appears clause-finally.
An interesting pattern emerges in the case of applicative constructions with full NP ergatives in situ. The oblique object appears between the verb and the ergative DP.

This can be accounted for under the analysis proposed in the previous section. If the ergative DP were spelled out in the left edge of vP, the Stranded DP Constraint would be violated. This can be circumvented if the sister XP of v, i.e. ApplP in (60), moves to v’s outer specifier. The absolutive nominal is also attracted to the vP phase edge by v’s EPP feature and subsequently moves to the topic position above TP, as proposed in section 3.
As proposed in section 2, the verb must also move to Asp and will not be contained inside the fronted VP. Even in cases of VP-fronting, verb-movement must take place independently. This is substantiated by the fact that a VP adverb intervenes between the verb and the oblique object inside the fronted VP. This shows once again that predicate-fronting is not triggered by a morphological feature like [V].

(61)a. S-bari  **riong** hulama na ape ka laqi.
    App-buy  much  treat  Erg  Ape  Top  child

   “Ape often buys the child a treat.”

b. 

Since the verb moves independently, we must consider what evidence there is for VP-movement, as opposed to simply displacement of the object. One argument against moving the object comes from the fact that the oblique object which appears between the verb and ergative DP receives an existential, nonspecific interpretation.
(62)a. Wada s-bari **hulama** na Ape ka laqi.
Past App-buy treat Erg Ape Top child
“Ape bought the child a/*the treat.”

b. Wada puq-un **atak** na Ape ka qutsuruh-ni.
Past eat-Tr chopsticks Erg Ape Top fish-Def
“Ape ate the fish with (*the) chopsticks.”

Diesing (1992) and others have shown that shifted objects in Germanic languages must receive presuppositional interpretations. If, however, the object remains inside VP, as I propose above, they can undergo Existential Closure and receive a nonspecific interpretation.

Fronting within vP in some ways provides more direct evidence for the analysis I have proposed than TP-fronting does. In Seediq, topicalization of the absolutive and subsequent fronting of the remnant predicate are obligatory in the process of generating basic word order. In addition to this fact, given the connection with interpretation, one possible approach could be to stipulate that the DP and TP carry topic and focus features, respectively, which need to be checked by C. Such an approach, however, would not be able to account for VP-fronting. VP-fronting is not observed in every clause. It only takes place when a DP appears in the vP phase edge. In the discussion below, I motivate the proposal that VP-fronting is correlated with spelling out of a DP in [Spec, v].

In addition to the transitive contexts like the applicative construction examined in (59) above, VP-fronting can also take place in intransitive clauses, so long as [Spec, v] contains a DP. Causative constructions are one such case. In the causative in (63), neither the embedded direct object nor the complement clause can be stranded to the right of the causee.
This can be accounted for by assuming that the causee is merged and spelled out in a specifier of the lower vP. The inner-most VP then fronts to the left edge of the second vP.

As I have suggested above, VP-fronting is not triggered by morphological feature-checking but rather is a last resort operation which is necessary to satisfy the Stranded DP
Constraint. This means, indirectly, that VP-fronting (and TP-fronting also, for that matter) only takes place when a DP would otherwise be spelled out in the left edge of a phase. One context that makes this clear is adjunct \textit{wh}-constructions. As I showed in section 4.4, adjunct \textit{wh}-phrases cannot move to clause-initial position, because they are trapped inside the fronted TP. However, they also do not remain in their base positions. In basic word order, goals and locatives follow the theme.

(65)a. Pawan wada m-ege sapah \textbf{Awi-ni}.
   Pawan Past Intr-give house Awi-Def
   “Pawan gave a house to Awi.”

b. M-n-ari sapah \textbf{Purishia} ka Pihu.
   Intr-Perf-buy house Puli Top Pihu
   “Pihu bought a house in Puli.”

When these elements appear as \textit{wh}-phrases, however, they move to the left of the theme.

(66) M-n-ari \textbf{inu} patis Ape?
   Intr-Perf-buy where book Ape
   “Where did Ape buy books?”

I propose that \textit{wh}-in situ is licensed when it is bound by an operator in [Spec, C]. But the \textit{wh}-element must itself be in the edge of the next lowest phase, i.e. vP. I will show additional evidence for this proposal when I discuss embedded clauses containing \textit{wh}-phrases.
The above examples all show intransitive clauses. Adjunct *wh*-phrases can appear in transitive clauses as well.

(68)a. \( \text{B-n-ari}=\text{na} \quad \text{inu} \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{patis-ni} \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{Awi-ni}? \)
   -Tr.Perf-buy=3s.Erg where Top book-Def Top Awi
   “Where did Awi buy the book?”

b. \( \text{Wada}=\text{na} \quad \text{burig-un} \quad \text{inu} \quad \text{patis-ni} \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{Awi} \)?
   Past=3s.Erg buy-Tr where book-Def Top Awi
   “Where did Awi buy the book?”

However, they cannot cooccur with an ergative DP which appears in its base position in [Spec, v].

(69)a. \( \text{*Wada} \quad \text{burig-un} \quad \text{inu} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{Awi} \quad \text{patis-ni}? \)
   Past buy-Tr where Erg Awi book-Def
   “Where did Awi buy the book?”
I suggest that this fact shows that the presence of the ergative DP in [Spec, v] is responsible for VP-fronting. According to the Stranded DP Constraint, the presence of the ergative DP in [Spec, v] indirectly forces the VP to move to its left. However, since the wh-phrase is contained inside VP, it will not be able to move independently to [Spec, v], as per the proposal in (67), and will therefore not be accessible to binding from the operator in [Spec, C].

VP-fronting is therefore incompatible with the presence of an adjunct wh-phrase inside VP. (69) shows that adjunct wh-phrases cannot cooccur with an ergative DP in situ. This fact can be accounted for by the current analysis under the assumption that VP-fronting must take place when the ergative DP is spelled out in [Spec, v]. (69) therefore provides indirect evidence for the Stranded DP Constraint.

Similar evidence is provided by embedded clauses containing wh-phrases. In an object control construction, the controller, which is the indirect object of the matrix clause,
precedes the complement clause. However, when the embedded CP contains a wh-word, the complement clause appears to the left of the controller.

   -Intr-allow  child  Intr-buy  car  Top  father
   “The father allowed the child to buy a car.”

   -Intr-allow  Intr-buy  what  child  Top  father
   “What did the father allow the child to buy?”

Note that the matrix verb in (71a) and (71b) is intransitive. These are both antipassives. The external argument checks absolutive case with T and is topicalized to [Spec, C]. This means that there will be no DP in the vP phase edge at Spell-Out. By hypothesis, VP-fronting should not be required. I argue here that (71b) shows that VP-fronting does not take place. This is because movement of the entire VP would not account for the relative positions of the CP and the controller. Assuming that the controller is merged higher than the CP so that it c-commands PRO inside the complement clause, then [vP DP V CP] should be the base order. The verb moves to v and then to Asp, as argued in section 2. If VP-movement were to take place next, then the order DP-CP between the internal arguments should be maintained. However, this is not the order seen in (71b).
The word order in (71b) is accounted for, however, if VP-fronting does not take place but rather just the CP moves to the vP phase edge. In the preceding discussion, I proposed that an adjunct wh-phrase moves to [Spec, v] so that it can be bound by an operator in [Spec, C]. To account for (71b), I propose that it is the containing CP which moves to [Spec, v], pied-piping the wh-phrase with it. The wh-phrase is still accessible to binding, since it is located in the specifier, i.e. phase edge, of the complement CP. Only the embedded TP, which is the domain of the CP phase, will be spelled out when this movement takes place. Again, VP-fronting cannot be allowed. If the entire matrix VP were to move to [Spec, v], then the CP would be contained in its domain and therefore no longer accessible to binding from the operator.

22 K. A. Jayaseelan (personal communication) claims that this type of pied piping also takes place in Malayalam. An embedded clause containing a focused element moves to a clause-medial focus position in the matrix clause.
Therefore, I conclude that that VP-fronting does not take place in an antipassive like (71b), in which the external argument has absolutive status and has moved to [Spec, C] and will not be spelled out in [Spec, v]. I now show that VP-fronting cannot take place if movement is required from inside a complement clause. (74a) shows a transitive matrix clauses whose absolutive originates in the embedded clause. (74b) and (74c) show long distance wh-constructions, with the gap in the embedded clause. The ergative DP appears as a pronoun in (74a). As shown in section 4.2, pronouns are clitics and will move out of vP prior to Spell-Out. This means that they will not trigger a violation of the Stranded DP Constraint. In (74b) and (74c), the ergative nominal has been topicalized and resumed by a pronoun.

(74)a. Ha-an=nami  [CP  ts-m-uaq  quishia t ]  ka  ritsah kiya.
      go-Tr=1p.Erg -Intr-pour water Top plum Dem
      “We went to water those plums.”
b. Maanu  gaga=na  hdieq-un
   what      Pres=3s.Erg  allow-Tr
   [CP      m-ari   ]  laqi   ka  tama.
   Intr-buy  child  Top  father

   “What does the father allow the child to buy?”

   what      go-Tr=3s.Erg  Intr-get  Ape

   “What did Ape go to get?”

(75) shows that a full NP ergative cannot appear in its base position. Note that
whether CP-fronting takes place is irrelevant.

(75)a. *Ha-an  [CP      m-angan   t    ]  na  Ape  ka  laqi.
   go-Tr  Intr-get  Erg  Ape  Top  child

   “Ape is going to get her child.”

   go-Tr  Erg  Ape  Intr-get  Top  child

   “Ape is going to get her child.”

I argue here that the ungrammaticality of (75a) and (75b) is the result of VP-fronting.
If VP-movement were to take place, the contents of VP would be spelled out prior to this
movement. This means that movement from within the VP would not be possible. If we
assume the Stranded DP Constraint, the presence of the ergative DP in [Spec, v] forces
movement of the VP. The ungrammaticality of (75a) and (75b) can therefore be accounted
for as an island violation.
This shows that the ergative DP will never be spelled out in argument position in a transitive complex clause. In chapter 6, I develop an analysis of long distance extraction in which movement takes place from the specifier of a complement CP that has absolutive status. Notice that the embedded clause has moved to the left of the controller in (74b). I propose that the CP moves to the vP phase edge and checks absolutive case. The DP in its specifier can then be attracted by the EPP feature on C.

(77)a. Maanu gaga=na hdieq-un
    what Pres=3s.Erg allow-Tr
    [CP m-ari t] laqi ka tama.
    Intr-buy child Top father

    “What does the father allow the child to buy?”
b. The Stranded DP Constraint also accounts for an interesting asymmetry between Tagalog and Seediq internally headed relative clauses. Recall from chapter 1 that the head nominal appears immediately following the verb in an internally headed relative clause.

\[
\text{AspP} \\
\text{hmeidaq} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{tama} \\
\text{t}_{v+v} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{laqi} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{tv} \\
\text{CP}
\]

(78) shows examples of theme head nominals. An external argument can function as internal head of a relative clause in Tagalog, but not in Seediq, as shown in (79b). The external argument may, however, head a pre-nominal relative clause, as shown in (79c).
(79)a. nag-bigáy na tao ng kendi sa batá (Tagalog)
Intr.Perf-give Lk person Obl candy to child
“person who gave candy to the child”
b. *m-n-atís seedaq patis-ni (Seediq)
Intr-Perf-write person book-Def
“person who wrote the book”
c. m-n-atís patis-ni seedaq kiya (Seediq)
Intr-Perf-write book-Def person that
“person who wrote the book”

The Tagalog example can be accounted for with the analysis proposed for internally headed relative clauses in section 2. The head nominal appears in its base position in [Spec, v] and the verb moves to Asp. VP-internal material remains to the left of the head nominal.

(80)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AspP} \\
\downarrow \text{nagbigay} \\
\downarrow \\
\downarrow \text{tao} \\
\downarrow \text{tV} \\
\downarrow \text{kendi} \\
\downarrow \text{tV} \\
\downarrow \text{bata}
\end{array}
\]

In Seediq, on the other hand, this derivation would not be possible. The VP cannot be stranded after the external argument.
This can be accounted for with the Stranded DP Constraint. VP-fronting must take place in (79b), because the head nominal is spelled out in a specifier of v, which should trigger VP-fronting and not allow VP-internal material to be stranded to the right of the absolutive.

At this point, I will offer one final piece of evidence that VP-fronting does not take place when no DPs are spelled out in the vP phase edge. In an antipassive, a quantifier can be stranded in the base position of the external argument. The quantifiers in (82) are construed with the external argument absolutive and not with the internal argument that they immediately precede.

\[(82)\]

\(a.\) M-n-ari * ruma * patis ka seedaq.

\(b.\) Wada m-ari * hari * kanna * patis ka seedaq.

“Some people bought books.”

“Almost everybody bought books.”
This be accounted for with the following structure. The quantifier is stranded in [Spec, v]. Since the absolutive DP has moved to the topic position, VP-fronting is not triggered and the direct object remains to the right of the quantifier.

(83) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AspP} \\
V+v+\text{Asp} & \text{vP} \\
\text{QP} & v' \\
...t_{\text{Abs}}... & t_{v+v} \\
& t_v \\
& \text{VP} \\
& \text{DP}
\end{array}
\]

This section has shown that VP-fronting is induced precisely when a DP is spelled out in a specifier of vP and does not take place when no DP is spelled out there. This point argues strongly for the analysis I have proposed in which predicate-fronting is not motivated by morphological features but rather is a last resort operation necessary to ensure that a DP is not spelled out in initial position in a phase edge.

(84) **Stranded DP Constraint**

A DP cannot be spelled out in the leftmost position in a phase edge.

6. **Comparison with the Rightward Subject Analysis**

In chapter 3, I introduced the Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis (1992) proposal for word order variation in Austronesian languages. GHT propose that the typological distinction between SVO Austronesian languages like Indonesian and verb-initial languages like Malagasy and Tagalog can be reduced to the position of the subject, i.e. whether [Spec, IP]
is located to the left or to the right of the head Infl. For Indonesian, this position is leftward, as in other SVO and SOV languages.

**Indonesian**


Ali Act-read book the

“Ali read the book.”

b. 

```
  IP
    \   / 
   Subj I'  
     \ /   /
    V+I   VP
       \   /   
        tv   Obj
```

In the verb-initial languages, the subject position is on the right.

(86) 

```
  IP
    \   / 
   I'   Subj
     \ /   /
    V+I   VP
       \   /     
        tv   t_{Subj}
```

In chapter 3, I showed how this proposal makes incorrect predictions for Tagalog. In the case of Seediq, the clause-final position of the absolutive can be accounted for with this structure. However, there are other aspects of Seediq word order which are not compatible with this structure. In this section, I introduce two analyses of Seediq word order based on the GHT account and then argue against this approach.
Holmer (1996) and Chang (1997) propose analyses of Seediq VOS word order based on rightward movement of the absolutive to clause-final position. In Holmer (1996), the absolutive (“subject” for Holmer) moves into clause-final position in order to check thematic agreement. The nominal in [Spec, AgrP], according to Holmer, must agree with the “focus” morphology on the verb. Hence, only an actor can appear in this position when the verb is in “actor focus”, only a patient when the verb is in “patient focus”, and so on. Movement to [Spec, AgrP] is not associated with case, which can be assigned inside the VP, for instance to the agent.

Seediq

(87)a. Wada burig-un na pawan ka patis.
   Past   buy-Tr   Erg  Pawan Top  book
   ‘Pawan bought the book.’

b.   TP
     /   \
    /     \
   T     AgrP
         /   \__________
        /     Past  \\
       /       Agr  \book
      /         /   \__________
     /         /     Agr  \VP
    /     \buy  /   \t
   /      \ti  /   \tj

Chang (1997) also proposes that absolutes must move overtly from within VP to a rightward [Spec, IP] subject position. On their way to [Spec, IP], subjects first stop in [Spec, VoiceP], where they check “thematic agreement”. This agreement proposal will be examined in detail in chapter 6.
Seediq

(88)a. M-n-imah sino ka Pawan.
Intr-Perf-drink wine Top Pawan

“Pawan drank wine.”

b. ![Tree Diagram]

Both of the above proposals can derive VOS word order. However, as I have shown in the preceding sections of this chapter, there is more to Seediq word order than the clause-final position of the absolutive. For instance, I showed that the asymmetry between Tagalog and Seediq in terms of locative extraction can be reduced to the difference in word order generation.

Seediq

(89)a. [TP M-n-ari inu patis] Ape?
Intr-Perf-buy where book Ape

“Where did Ape buy books?”

b. *Inu [TP m-n-ari ti patis] Ape?
where Intr-Perf-buy book Ape
Under the predicate-fronting analysis, predicate-internal material is contained inside the fronted TP, which has already been spelled out and become unavailable to the computational system and is therefore an island to extraction. The rightward movement analysis, on the other hand offers no obvious account of this fact. As I will discuss in chapter 6, “thematic agreement” can be employed to regulate the movement of arguments but should be irrelevant in the case of adjuncts.

Chang (1997) and GHT also cannot account for the VP-fronting word order in Seediq.

Seediq

(90) Wada s-bari *hulama* na ape ka laqi.
Past App-buy treat Erg Ape Top child
“Ape bought the child a treat.”

In order to ensure that the oblique object precedes the ergative DP, GHT would have to stipulate a rightward VP specifier, which is precisely the choice made by Holmer (1996), as shown in (87) above. Interestingly, this word order is not attested in all VOS Austronesian languages, e.g. Malagasy, where the ergative DP must immediately follow the verb.

Malagasy (Paul 1999:265)

(91) Anasan-dRakoto *lovia* telo ny savony.
CT.wash-Gen.Rakoto dishes three Det soay
“The soap is used by Rakoto to wash three dishes.”
The difference between Seediq and Malagasy is accounted for under my proposal by parametrizing the Stranded DP Constraint for vP in Seediq but not Malagasy.

As for distinguishing SVO from VOS word order among Austronesian language, my proposal can also account for this in a straightforward way. As claimed by GHT, Indonesian has SVO basic word order.

**Indonesian**

Ali Act-buy book

“Ali bought a book.”

book-Def Pass-buy Ali

“This book was bought by Ali.”

As I proposed in chapter 2, Indonesian T has an EPP feature, which requires to subject to raise to its specifier.

**Indonesian**

(91)a. Ali mem-beli buku.
Ali Act-give book

“Ali bought a book.”
6. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that Seediq word order is derived through a combination of verb-movement and predicate-fronting. The verb undergoes head movement to check aspectual features with Asp, located above vP. VOS word order is derived by moving the absolutive nominal to a topic position and then fronting the remnant TP to its left. I have shown that predicate-fronting is not triggered by morphological features but is related to building a comment-topic information structure for the clause. When the absolutive DP is topicalized, the predicate is moved to its left and is interpreted as the focused part of the clause.

In the next chapter, I will show that Malagasy also provides evidence for this approach to VOS word order generation, both in terms of word order and also in terms of information structure. I will also extend this analysis to account for alternating VSO/VOS word order in Tagalog antipassives. Chapter 6 will show how the predicate-fronting participates in the derivation of cleft structures in wh-question formation.
CHAPTER FIVE

PREDICATE-FRONTING IN OTHER AUSTRONESIAN LANGUAGES

1. Introduction

In chapters 3 and 4, I presented analyses of verb-initial word order in Tagalog and Seediq. For Tagalog VSO word order, I proposed that the verb moves to an aspect projection above vP, while all other vP-internal material remain in their base positions. I proposed a predicate-fronting account of Seediq VOS word order. In this chapter, I extend this predicate-fronting analysis to other Austronesian languages, focusing on Tagalog intransitive clauses and other languages for which predicate-fronting analyses have been proposed in the literature, specifically Malagasy and Niuean.

2. TP-fronting in Tagalog

I show in this section that although Tagalog basic word order is VSO, TP-fronting is also observed in Tagalog in intransitive clauses. This process is obligatory in non-verbal clauses and optional in verbal clauses, e.g. antipassives. The reason for this distinction is the availability of verb-movement. As proposed in chapter 3, basic word order in Tagalog is derived through verb-movement. Thus, VSO word order is always an option in verbal clauses. In non-verbal clauses, however, as I will demonstrate in section 2.2, head-movement does not take place, so TP-fronting is the only way to derive predicate-initial word order.

2.1. VOS Word Order in Tagalog Antipassives

Tagalog antipassives exhibit fairly free word order. In particular, an oblique object may follow or precede the absolutive agent.
It is rare, however, for a PP or oblique direct object to intervene between the verb and ergative nominal.

The question to be addressed at this point is how the word order in (1b) is derived. There are two possibilities: scrambling of the VP-internal XP or fronting of the predicate containing the object. I argue here for the latter option. First, it is unlikely that the position of the object in (1b) is the result of scrambling. First, as discussed at length in chapter 2, antipassive objects are typically interpreted as nonspecific. Movement of the object in (1b) to move to the vP phase edge should force a specific interpretation, since it will have moved out of the domain of existential closure, assuming this is VP, as per Diesing’s (1992) proposal.
The comparative awkwardness of (2b) also argues against a movement analysis. It is not immediately apparent what constraint could explain why movement in (1b) is so much more acceptable than in (2b).

Another reason to reject the movement analysis is that if an oblique DP in an antipassive could be attracted to a position to the left of the external argument, i.e. the vP phase edge, this DP could then also be attracted by a feature on C and undergo \textit{wh}-movement. However, as I have pointed out in chapter 2, this would result in ungrammaticality. In a syntactically ergative language, only a DP with absolutive status can be extracted from the clause. As (4c) shows, the oblique object in an antipassive is ineligible.

(4)a. \textit{Anó} ang \textit{b-in-asa} ni Maria?
    \textit{what Abs Tr.Perf-read Erg} Maria
    “What did Maria read?”

b. \textit{Sino} ang \textit{b-um-asa} ng libro?
    \textit{who Abs Intr.Perf-read Obl} book
    “Who read the book?”
In chapter 2, I proposed that \( v \) has an EPP feature only when the verb is transitive. Antipassive clauses are syntactically intransitive. In the account of antipassive I developed in chapter 2, \( v \) does not have an EPP feature and the internal argument DP is not able to raise out of VP, accounting not only for the A’-extraction restriction but also for the nonspecific interpretation of this nominal.

These facts make an object shift or scrambling analysis untenable. Recall from chapter 3 that rightward movement of the absolutive, along the lines of Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis (1992), is also not a possible derivation. However, a predicate-fronting account does achieve the desired results. As proposed for Seediq VOS word order in chapter 4, the absolutive moves to [Spec, C]. Then the remnant TP containing the verb and VP-internal material fronts to the left of the absolutive.
As I have shown in chapter 3, Tagalog basic word order is VSO, derived through verb-movement. Predicate-fronting does not typically take place. However, this derivation easily accounts for instances of VOS word order in Tagalog. This fact provides indirect support for my analysis of predicate-fronting, based on the Stranded DP Constraint.

(7) **Stranded DP Constraint**

A DP cannot be spelled out in the leftmost position in a phase edge.

In other words, predicate-fronting takes place in Tagalog only when the absolutive nominal moves out of its base position. Therefore, this provides evidence that predicate-fronting is not driven by morphological feature-checking but is rather a consequence of DP-movement to the C domain.
2.2. Non-verbal Predicates

Word order in Tagalog clauses with nominal predicates are also best accounted for by TP-fronting. In (8) the absolutive follows the entire predicate.

(8) Miyembro ng Sizzlers si Gilbert.
member Gen Sizzlers Abs Gilbert

“Gilbert is a member of the Sizzlers.”

This order is easily accounted for in the TP-fronting analysis. The absolutive checks case with T and then moves to [Spec, C] before the TP is spelled out and adjoined to the left of CP.

(9) CP
   /   \
  CP   CP
     /   \
    Gilbert C’
      /   \
     C_{[EPP]} TP
        /   \
       T vP
         /   \
        t_{Gilbert} v NP
            /   \
           v NP
              /   \
             miyembro sizzlers

One argument in favor of the predicate movement analysis is the alternate word order shown in (10). The complement of the predicate NP can be stranded to the right of the absolutive. This indicates that the predicate followed the absolutive at some point in the
derivation and reached its clause-initial position through dislocation. This word order is also easily accounted for by the predicate-fronting analysis. The possessive PP can be stranded and then the remnant TP fronted to clause-initial position.

(10) Miyembro si Gilbert ng Sizzlers.

“Gilbert is a member of the Sizzlers.”

c.

An alternative analysis of (8) and (10) could be developed along the lines of Carnie (1995). Both would be analyzed as head-movement. The predicate NP is treated as an N⁰ and not a phrase.

(11) T’
One argument Carnie gives for such a derivation in Irish is that \textit{w/h}-movement cannot take place from inside the fronted predicate, even with a resumptive pronoun\textsuperscript{23}. Carnie argues that this is because the predicate functions as a complex word.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(12)a.] \begin{align*}
    \text{Is } & \quad [\text{NP } \text{amhrán}_t] \quad [\text{CP } \text{a}^L \text{ bhualfídh} \\
    \text{be } & \quad \text{song} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{play.Fut} \\
    \text{an } & \quad \text{piobaire}_t ]] \quad (\acute{e}) \quad \text{“Yellow Submarine”}. \\
    \text{the } & \quad \text{piper} \quad \text{Agr}
  \end{align*}
  \text{““Yellow Submarine’ is a song which the bagpiper is going to play.”}

  \item[(12)b.] \begin{align*}
    \text{Cén } & \quad \text{piobaire}_t \quad \text{is } \quad [\text{NP } \text{amhrán}_t \\
    \text{which } & \quad \text{piper} \quad \text{be } \quad \text{song} \\
    \text{[CP } & \quad \text{a}^L \quad \text{bhualfídh } \quad \text{sé}_j t_i ]] \quad (\acute{e}) \quad \text{“Yellow Submarine”}. \\
    \text{C} & \quad \text{play.Fut} \quad \text{he} \quad \text{Agr}
  \end{align*}
  \text{“Which bagpiper is ‘Yellow Submarine’ a song which he/t is going to play?”}
\end{itemize}

However, there is additional evidence for the phrasal movement analysis I propose. An adjectival modifier can move together with the head nominal and strand the PP complement.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(13)a.] \begin{align*}
    \text{Importante-ng } & \quad \text{miyembro} \quad \text{ng } \text{Sizzlers} \quad \text{si} \quad \text{Gilbert.} \\
    \text{important-Lk} & \quad \text{member} \quad \text{Gen} \quad \text{Sizzlers Abs} \quad \text{Gilbert}
  \end{align*}
  \text{“Gilbert is an important member of the Sizzlers.”}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{23} McCloskey (1979) and (1990) shows that subjacency and ECP violations are allowed in Irish if a resumptive pronoun is left in the extraction site.
b. **Importante-ng miyembro** si Gilbert *ng Sizzlers.

Important-Lk member Abs Gilbert Gen Sizzlers

“Gilbert is an important member of the Sizzlers.”

Under Carnie’s analysis, it would be difficult to account for why just the head nominal and the modifier are reanalyzed as an $N^0$, which together do not even form a constituent.

\[(14) \text{CP} \]

\[
\text{Gilbert} \quad \text{C'}
\]

\[
\text{C}_{[EPP]} \quad \text{TP}
\]

\[
\text{vP} \quad \text{v'}
\]

\[
\text{t}_{\text{Gilbert}} \quad \text{v'}
\]

\[
\text{v} \quad \text{NP}
\]

\[
\text{importante} \quad \text{N'}
\]

\[
\text{miyembro} \quad \text{sizzlers}
\]

However, this is easily accounted for under the TP-fronting account. The possessive is again moved out of TP, followed by topicalization and predicate-fronting.
Doherty (1997) proposes a predicate-fronting analysis of nominal predicates in Irish, arguing against Carnie’s $X^0$-movement approach. One argument concerns the fact that the predicate is not an anaphoric island.

(16) Sin thall Dónall.

that over.there Dónall

Is [cara leis,] mo dhearthaír.

Cop friend with.him my brother

“That’s Dónall over there. My brother is a friend of his.”

Doherty proposes that the copula is located in C, and the nominal predicate moves to [Spec, T].
Another fact about Tagalog that Carnie would have difficulty accounting for is that clitics are able to move out of a nominal predicate.

(18) Hindî=ko=iyón problema.
Neg=1s.Gen=that.Abs problem
“That’s not my problem.”

Clitic movement is not, however, permitted from inside an absolutive DP.

(19)a. Hindî=iyón ang problêma=ko.
Neg=that.Abs Abs problem=1s.Gen
“That’s not what my problem is.”

b. *Hindî=ko=iyón ang problema.
Neg=1s.Gen=that.Abs Abs problem
“That’s not what my problem is.”

I assume that DP is a strong phase, not permitting movement from it. However, a predicate nominal is not, so the clitic would be able to move. It would be difficult to account for this movement if the NP had been reanalyzed as N$^0$. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(17) \quad CP \\
\quad \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ Cop \quad TP \\
\quad \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ XP \quad T' \\
\quad \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ T \quad SC \\
\quad \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ Subj \quad t_{XP}
\end{array}
\]
The lack of *wh*-movement also does not necessarily argue for Carnie’s analysis. Under the predicate-fronting proposal, the *wh*-phrase in (12b) would be contained inside the fronted TP, which is an island to extraction, as I have argued in chapter 4.

### 2.3. Head-final Relative Clauses

Word order in Tagalog head-final relative clauses also provides evidence that the Stranded DP Constraint is active for CP in this language. In chapter 1, I showed that Tagalog has head-initial, head-final, and internally headed relative clauses. (21a) and (21b) show examples of the first two varieties.

(21)a. **libró**-ng b-in-ilí ni Maria

book-Lk -Tr.Perf-buy Erg Maria

“the book Maria bought”

b. b-in-ilí ni Maria-ng **libró**

-Tr.Perf-buy Erg Maria-Lk book

“the book Maria bought”
Aldridge (2003) and (2004) proposes a movement analysis based on Kayne (1994) to account for both of these orders. In (21a), the head nominal moves to [Spec, C]. To derive the order in (21b), the remnant TP is moved to [Spec, D].

Evidence for the movement analysis comes principally from head-final relatives involving stranding of clause-internal material. In Tagalog head-final relatives, a PP is allowed to follow the head nominal.

The stranded word order in (23) can be accounted for straightforwardly under Kayne’s (1994) [D CP] analysis. The PP first scrambles to clause-initial position. Then the relative head moves up to [Spec, CP]. Finally, the remnant TP fronts to [Spec, DP].
This analysis predicts that stranding in relative clauses should be possible when dislocation of the stranded XP is allowed and impossible otherwise. This prediction is indeed borne out. As I have mentioned in chapter 2, A’-movement in Tagalog is highly constrained, as it is in a great number of Austronesian and other ergative languages. Only absolutes are eligible to undergo relativization, topicalization, clefting, and wh-question formation. Hence, a relative clause formed on the theme of a transitive clause in (25a) is grammatical, but (25b), formed on the agent of the same transitive clause is not.

(25)a. libro\textsuperscript{-ing} b-in-\textsuperscript{il} ni Maria
    book-Lk -Tr.Perf-buy Erg Maria
    “book which Maria bought”

b. *tao\textsuperscript{-ing} b-in-\textsuperscript{il} ang libro
   person-Lk -Tr.Perf-buy Abs book
   “person who bought the book”

Aside from this restriction, PPs are allowed to move to preverbal position in Tagalog, as we have seen in chapter 4.
   App-Perf-give  Erg  woman  Abs  candy  Dat  child
“The woman gave candy to the child.”

b.  Sa  batá  i-b-in-iğáy  ng  babae  ang  kendi.
Dat  child  App-Perf-give  Erg  woman  Abs  candy
“The woman gave the candy to the child.”

Other non-absolutive arguments, in contrast, are not able to dislocate in this way. In
the ditransitive in (27a), the goal is licensed as absolutive of the clause by the applicative affix
on the verb. The theme is demoted to oblique status. This non-absolutive theme cannot be
scrambled, as shown in (27b).

   -Perf-give-App  Erg  woman  Obl  candy  Abs  child
“The woman gave the child candy.”

b.  *Ng  kendi  b-in-iğ-án  ng  babae  ang  batá.
   Obl  candy  -Perf-give-App  Erg  woman  Abs  child

The same pattern can be observed in stranding in relative clauses. As seen above,
only the absolutive can be the head NP. But a PP can also be stranded to the right of the
head. This is not possible for an oblique object. The ungrammaticality can be explained by
the inability of the oblique object to scramble before remnant TP-fronting. This
straightforwardly accounts for the contrast between (28a) and (28b).
(28)a. i-b-in-igáy ng babae-ng *kendi sa batá
   App-Perf-give Erg woman-Lk candy Dat child
   “candy which the woman gave to the child”

b. ?*b-in-igy-án ng babae-ng batá ng kendi
   -Perf-give-App Erg woman-Lk child Obl candy
   “child to whom the woman gave candy”

Interestingly, head-initial relative clauses formed on goal absolutes with oblique objects in situ are perfectly grammatical. The head initial version of (28b) is shown in (29), where the oblique object appears in situ inside the clause. This is completely consistent with the analysis proposed in (22). The relative head moves to [Spec, CP], but no other dislocation need take place. Therefore, the oblique nominal can remain in its base position.

(29) batá-ng [b-in-igy-án ng babae ng kendi]
    child-Lk -Perf-give-App Erg woman Obl candy
    “child to whom the woman gave candy”

The traditional base-generated adjunct analysis (Chomsky 1977, Safir 1986, among many others) of relative clause formation would have difficulty accounting for the cases of stranding observed above. Under the adjunct analysis, the clause is adjoined to the right of the head NP in head-initial relative clauses and to the left of the NP in head-final relative clauses. The head NP does not move from within the clause but is coindexed with an operator that is base-generated in the gap and then moves to [Spec, CP] of the clause.
Theoretically, the adjunct analysis is less attractive than the movement analysis, since it requires positing two separate base structures, one with the clause adjoined on the right and one with the clause adjoined on the left. On the empirical side, the adjunct analysis would also incorrectly derive head-final relatvies with stranding: the head nominal would be predicted to appear in final position, after the PP.

(31)a. i-b-in-īgay ng babae-ng kendi sa batá
    App-Perf-give Erg woman-Lk candy Dat child
    “candy the woman gave to the child”

b. *NP
   CP candy
   Op TP
   tOp … PP

At this point, I would like to revise the analysis presented in (22) and (24) and show how the movement derivation of Tagalog head-final relative clauses is predicted by the Stranded DP Constraint. If a demonstrative is added to the relative clause, it appears quite naturally in initial position in a DP containing either a head-initial and head-final relative.
(32)a. itó-ng libro ng b-in-ilí ni Maria
   this-Lk book-Lk -Tr.Perf-buy Erg Maria
   “this book which Maria bought”

b. itó-ng b-in-ilí ni Maria-ng libro
   this-Lk -Tr.Perf-buy Erg Maria-Lk book
   “this book which Maria bought”

If TP-fronting were to target [Spec, D], as proposed in (22) and (24), then the demonstrative would be expected to follow the clause.

(33)  
   DP
   /\   /
   TP  D’
   /\   /
   ito CP
      /
     book
t

However, this is ungrammatical.

(34)   *b-in-ilí ni Maria-ng itó-ng libro
       -Tr.Perf-buy Erg Maria-Lk this-Lk book
      “this book which Maria bought”

On the other hand the correct position of the demonstrative is obtained if TP-fronting targets CP and not DP. This derivation is also consistent with the Stranded DP Constraint. The head nominal is raised to [Spec, C] in the relative clause. The remnant clause then fronts to the left edge of this CP, appearing to the right of the demonstrative in surface order.
This section has shown how the TP-fronting analysis accounts for three different constructions in Tagalog. Alternating VSO/VOS word order in antipassives is of particular interest with regard to the analysis I am proposing for predicate-fronting. This word order alternation is optional and therefore difficult to account for in terms of feature-checking. The optionality is accounted for naturally under my proposal, however. Since predicate-fronting takes place when the absolutive DP moves to [Spec, C], VOS word order in Tagalog antipassives can be seen as the result of topicalization of the absolutive and not related to morphological needs of the predicate.

3. Predicate-fronting in Malagasy

Rackowski (1998), Rackowski and Travis (2000), and Pearson (2001) have proposed predicate-fronting analyses of Malagasy VOS word order. In this section, I summarize their proposals and then adapt my analysis to accommodate the relevant facts in Malagasy.
3.1. Previous Analyses

Rackowski (1998) and Rackowski and Travis (2000) develop a TP-fronting analysis of Malagasy word order. They note that the order of postverbal adverbs is the opposite of that Cinque’s (1999) universal adverbial hierarchy.

(36)a. Cinque’s hierarchy

1 2 3 4 5 6
(speech act) > Generally > Neg > Already > Still > (at-all) >
7 8 9 10
Anymore > Always > Completely > Well

b. Malagasy order

2 3 4 5 (3)
Na(dia) Tsy Efa Mbol Tsy
Generally > Neg > Already > Still > Neg > Verb >
10 9 8 7 6 1
Tsara Tanteraka Foana Intsony Mihitsy Aza Ve
Well > Completely > Always > Anymore > At-all > Though > Speech Act

This order can be accounted for and Cinque’s hierarchy maintained by positing the universal adverb order as the underlying one.
Malagasy surface order can then be derived through successive operations of XP fronting to the specifiers of the phrases headed by adverbs.

TP is also fronted to the left of speech act adverbs.
Pearson (1998 & 2001) proposes another predicate-fronting account of Malagasy. Pearson makes the claim that the clause-final nominal is a topic and not a subject (or absolutive). It is merged with an interpretable [op] feature, associated with the scope-taking property of topics and assigned in the numeration to a specific DP. This [op] feature is then attracted by the uninterpretable [op] feature of Piv. (Pearson 2001:96) The topic DP then raises to [Spec, Piv], where case agreement determines the voice morphology on the verb.

**Malagasy** (Pearson 2001:172)

(40)a. Nohanin-ny gidro ny voankazo.
Past.AccP.eat-Det lemur Det fruit

“The lemur ate the fruit.”
Later in the derivation, the topic DP moves again to [Spec, Top], which has [D] and [op] features. Predicate-initial word order is derived by fronting the remainder of the clause to the outer specifier of Top.

Pearson argues that the predicate-fronting analysis can account for the peculiar trait of Malagasy word order that question particles appear between the topic and predicate. Pearson claims that ve heads ForceP and is an enclitic which attracts an XP host to its specifier. According to Pearson’s analysis, this will be the closest specifier, which is PivP, residing in the outer specifier of Top. The result is that the predicate will precede ve, while the topic follows it.
Malagasy (Pearson 2001:218)

(42)a. Namaky boky ve ny mpianatra?
Past.NomPread book Q Det student

“Was the student reading book?”

b. FrcP
   Frc’
   PivP
   ve
   TopP
   tPivP
   top
   student
   top

Predicate-fronting is motivated by a strong feature that must be checked by Piv in Top. Pearson claims that these DP and predicate movements are parallel to movements involved in deriving V2 order in Germanic languages. He cites a number of parallels between Malagasy topics and topics in V2 constructions. First, both must be definite, shown for Malagasy in (43a) and (43b), and for Icelandic in (43c) and (43d).

Icelandic (Pearson 2001:88)

(43)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.”
c. **Bokina** keypti Jon.
   book.the bought John
   “John bought the book.”

d. ??**Bok** keypti Jon.
   book bought John
   “John bought a book.”

This position is also subject to topic-drop in both languages, while non-topic positions are not.

**Malagasy** (Pearson 2001:91)

(44)a. Vangian’-i Naivo izy.
   DatP.visit-Det Naivo 3s
   “Him, Naivo is visiting.”

b. Vangian’-i Naivo __.
   DatP.visit-Det Naivo
   “(Him), Naivo is visiting.”

c. Vangiany i Tenda
   DatP.visit-3s Det Tenda
   “Tenda, he is visiting.”

d. *Vangiana __ i Tenda
   DatP.visit Det Tenda
   “Tenda, (he) is visiting.”

The same is true of topics in Icelandic.
Icelandic (Pearson 2001:90)

(45)a. Ihn hab’ ich schon gesehen.
   him have I already seen
   “Him, I already saw.”

b. __ hab’ ich schon gesehen.
   have I already seen
   “(Him), I already saw.”

c. *Ihn hab’ __ schon gesehen.
   him have __ already seen
   “Him, (I) already saw.”

On this basis, Pearson claims that V2 topics and Malagasy topics move to the same position in the C domain. As for predicate-fronting, though this is realized as verbal head-movement in Germanic languages, Pearson proposes phrasal predicate-fronting for Malagasy. He offers the following parameter, based on the realization of tense-aspect morphology.

(46)a. In languages with suffixal tense-aspect morphology, T-to-C movement, if overt, will involve X0-movement.

b. In languages with prefixal (proclitic) tense-aspect morphology, T-to-C movement, if overt, will involve XP-movement. (Pearson 2001:207)

3.2. Questions for the V2 Analysis

The fundamental aspects of the predicate-fronting analysis I have been advocating are very similar to Pearson’s (2001) account of Malagasy. Essentially, VOS word order is derived by moving the absolutive DP to a topic position and then fronting the remnant clause.
to its left. I am skeptical, however, of certain particulars of Pearson’s analysis. Some, such as case agreement and the need for a PivP will be addressed in chapter 6. In this subsection, I discuss the comparison with Germanic V2.

On the one hand, the analysis I am pursuing in this thesis does highlight an obvious similarity between Austronesian and Germanic syntax: predicate movement is triggered by topicalization. I have proposed that a DP cannot be spelled out alone in a phase edge but can be preceded by a non-DP XP.

(47) **Stranded DP Constraint**

A DP cannot be spelled out in the leftmost position in a phase edge.

On the other hand, a parallel analysis of predicate-fronting and V2 glosses over an important difference between Austronesian predicate-fronting and Germanic V2. As Pearson points out, in Austronesian languages, the topic position must be filled by a DP, while the topic can be of different categories in Germanic languages: a DP in (48a), adverb in (48b), PP in (48c).

**German (Pearson 2001:193)**

(48)a. Hans veröffentlichte heuer in Deutschland ein Buch.

Hans published this.year in Germany a book

“Hans published a book this year in Germany.”

b. Heuer veröffentlichte Hans this.year published Hans in Deutschland ein Buch.

in Germany a book

“Hans published a book this year in Germany.”
c. In Deutschland veröffentlichte Hans heuer ein Buch.

“Hans published a book this year in Germany.”

There is also reason to doubt the association between predicate-fronting and morphological features of T. Predicate-fronting occurs also in non-verbal clauses. In the Seediq examples below, the absolutes must all appear in clause-final position in unmarked word order. Yet these nominal, adjectival, and adverbial predicates do not carry any tense or aspect inflection.

Seediq

(49)a. Piya tama baro?
how many father above
“How many gods are there?”

b. Kingan bale tama baro.
one only father above
“There is only one god.”

c. Sosuawai=nanak tama na Takun duri ka ruseno kiya.
cousin=1s.gen father Gen Takun also Top man that
“That guy is also a cousin of Takun’s father himself.”

d. Nakahara sapah=mu.
Nakahara home=1s.Gen
“My home is Nakahara.”
f. Bubaro muhin=na.
   long nose=3s.Gen
   “She has a long nose.”

f. Qaluh hari hei na mukutina.
   black almost body Gen Bunun
   “Bunun people are almost completely black-skinned.”

In Malagasy, clause-initial position can also be filled by an adverb or PP, stranding the rest of the TP after the topic. This configuration has been dubbed the “bodyguard” construction by Keenan (1976), who identifies the condition that a fronted non-DP may be accompanied by the absolutive.

Malagasy

(50)a. Omaly Rasoa no [nijinja vary]
   yesterday Rasoa Foc Past.AT.harvest rice
   “It was yesterday that Rasoa harvested rice.”

b. Amin’ity savony ity Rasoa no [manasa lamba]
   with.this soap this Rasoa Cleft AT.wash clothes
   “With this soap Rasoa washed the clothes.”

The generalization seems to be, then, that topic position in Austronesian is restricted to DPs but the pre-topic position can be filled by elements of different categories. In the case of Germanic V2, we see the inverse situation: the topic position is not restricted in terms of category, but the predicate position is limited to finite verbs.

---

24 Keenan glosses the particle *no* as a cleft marker, while Paul glosses it as a focus marker. Paul analyzes the structure as a cleft, so I assume *no* marks the boundary between the cleft predicate and headless relative subject.
There is also evidence that different landing sites are involved. In Germanic languages, V2 is prohibited in the presence of a complementizer.

**Dutch** (Diesing 2003)

(51)a. Gisteren *heeft* Herbert dat boek gekocht.
yesterday has Herbert that book bought

“Yesterday Herbert bought that book.”

b. *dat* Herbert gisterendat boek gekocht *heeft*.
that Herbert yesterday that book bought has

“…that Herbert bought that book yesterday.”

However, predicate-fronting is not blocked by a complementizer in Malagasy. The absolutive in (52) follows the predicate in the embedded clause headed by the complementizer *fa*.

**Malagasy** (Pearson 2001:113)

(52) Mihevitra Rakoto
AT.think Rakato

[fa namangy ny dadany ny mpianatra]
that Past.AT.visit Det father-3Gen Det student

“Rakoto thinks that the student visited his father.”

Another way in which the parallel between Austronesian VOS and Germanic V2 breaks down is in information structure. Initial position in Germanic languages is not reserved for topics but can also be filled by focused elements, e.g. *wh*-phrases.
**German** (Fanselow 2003:37)

(53)a. den Fritz hat sie eingeladen
the.Acc Fritz has she invited

“It is Fritz who she has invited.”

b. wen hat sie eingeladen
who has she invited

“Who has she invited?”

In Austronesian, on the other hand, the topic must always be definite or generic. As seen in chapter 4, *wh*-phrases can never occur in absolutive position in Seediq.

**Seediq**

(54)a. Ima ka wada m-ekanbulebun-ni?
who Top Past Intr-eat banana-Def

“Who ate this banana?”

b. *Wada m-ekanbulebun-ni ka ima?*
Past Intr-eat banana-Def Top who

“Who ate this banana?”

In contrast, the initial XP is typically interpreted as new information or can be focused. Hence, *wh*-phrases naturally occur in this position, as in (54a). (55) shows that new information is introduced into the discourse in the predicate and appears in topic position on second mention.
Seediq

(55)a. M-n-oda m-ari \textbf{qushia mutaso} Hori ka Ape.
Intr-Perf-go Intr-buy water clean Puli Top Ape
“Ape went to Puli to buy clean water.”

b. Wada=na s-pahu \textit{lukus} ka \textbf{qushia mutaso}.
Perf=3s.Erg App-wash clothes Top water clean
“She washed clothes with the clean water.”

In chapter 4, I proposed the following LF mapping rule to account for this generalization.

(56) Phase Edge Interpretation
If the edge of a phase HP has the form [\text{HP XP [H’ DP ... ]}], where X is not D, the DP is mapped to the presupposition and XP to focus.

For the reasons cited above, the parallel between VOS and V2 seems unwarranted. In the next subsection, I propose an alternative analysis of Malagasy based on my approach to predicate-fronting.

3.3. Proposal for Malagasy
Malagasy word order can be accounted for essentially in the same way as Seediq. The absolutive DP is attracted by C’s EPP feature. Then the remnant TP is spelled out and fronted to the left of the absolutive.
Bear in mind that one key aspect of my proposal is that the CP phase edge is occupied by a DP on the right and a non-DP on the left. This pattern is exhibited in Malagasy in at least two other constructions besides basic VOS word order. One of them is multiple *wh*-fronting. When this happens, an adjunct and an argument *wh*-phrase are fronted together. One interesting fact is that the adjunct must precede the argument.

Malagasy (Sabel 2003)

(58)a. *Aiza iza no mividy ny vary?*

where who Foc Pres.AT.buy the rice

“Where does who buy the rice?”

b. *Iza aiza no mividy ny vary?*

who where Foc Pres.AT.buy the rice

“Where does who buy the rice?”

Note also that two DP *wh*-words cannot be fronted, again consistent with the current analysis in which a non-DP must precede the DP topic position.
(59)a. *Iza inona no mividy?
   Who what Foc Pres.AT.buy
   “What does who buy?”

b. *Inona iza no mividy?
   What who Foc Pres.AT.buy
   “What does who buy?”

Additionally, Paul (2000) notes that the DP *wh*-phrase must be D-linked, in the sense of Pesetsky (1987). A sentence like (58a) is only felicitous when there is “a context-specified set of people, known to both the speaker and hearer, that restricts the range of possible answers.” (Paul 2000:201)

The derivation proceeds as follows. The DP *wh*-phrase moves to [Spec, C] and checks the EPP feature on this functional head. The derivation would crash at PF if this DP were left alone in the CP phase edge. But this crash is avoided if another XP is moved to the left of the DP. Fronting the entire TP could accomplish this. But I suggest in this case that since there is a PP with a *wh*-feature that needs to be checked, it is this PP which is moved. In terms of the interpretation, according to the Phase Edge Interpretation principle, the PP will be mapped to the focus and be interpreted as a true *wh*-operator, while the DP *wh*-phrase, is mapped to the presupposition and receives a D-linked interpretation.
My analysis also can derive the “bodyguard” construction, introduced in the preceding subsection. This word order can be derived if we assume that the non-DP element attracted to the outer specifier of C can be just the PP. The particle \textit{no} is in the C position.

\textbf{Malagasy (Keenan 1976:269)}

\begin{verbatim}
(61)a. Amin'ity savony ity Rasoa [no manasa lamba].

with.this soap this Rasoa Cl\textsuperscript{25} AT.wash clothes

“With this soap Rasoa washed the clothes.”
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{25}Keenan glosses the particle \textit{no} as a cleft marker, while Paul glosses it as a focus marker. Paul analyzes the structure as a cleft, so I assume \textit{no} marks the boundary between the cleft predicate and headless relative subject.
As for the interpretation, the DP still is interpreted as topic and not as part of the focus, as argued by Paul (2000). This is substantiated by the fact that the presupposition behind the adjunct can be negated but not the topic.

**Malagasy** (Paul 2000:195)

(62)a. Omaly Rasoa no nijinja vary.
    yesterday Rasoa Foc Past.AT.harvest rice
    “It was yesterday that Rasoa harvested rice.”

b. Tsia, afak’omaly izy no nijinja vary.
   no free’yesterday 3.Nom Foc Past.AT.harvest rice
   “No, it was the day before yesterday that she harvested rice.”

c. #Tsia, omaly Rakoto no nijinja vary.
   no yesterday Rakoto Foc Past.AT.harvest rice
   “No, it was yesterday that Rakoto harvested rice.”

Additionally, Paul argues extensively that the adjunct in clause-initial position receives a focus interpretation, while the absolutive remains a topic. The fact that the question particle *ve* intervenes between the focused XP and the bodyguard in a question indicates that the clause-initial XP is located in a focus position.
Paul (2000) analyzes the bodyguard construction as a cleft. The focused XP is contained in the matrix predicate, while the topic is contained inside the subject DP.

This analysis does not, however, account for the fact that the topic can precede the predicate only when another non-DP appears in clause-initial position. The basic requirement that a DP topic must be preceded by a non-DP element is precisely what is predicted by my proposal. The position of the particle no is also accounted for, as it occupies the C head position.

Both Paul (2000) and Pearson (2001) analyze focus constructions with no as involving a cleft structure. Paul argues convincingly for this analysis in the case of focused DPs. I will present my own cleft analysis of DP focus (in particular DP wh-questions) in chapter 6. However, Paul does not extend her argument to the case of adjunct focus. The presence of the particle no also does not necessarily constitute an argument for the cleft
analysis, since no does not otherwise introduce a headless relative clause. Headless relatives in other contexts are headed by izay. There is no reason a priori, then, to assume that every construction containing no is a cleft.

Malagasy (Paul 2000:174)

(65) Hahazo karama be [izay miasa mafy]
Fut.AT.get salary big Rel AT.work hard
“Whoever works hard will make lots of money.”

To summarize the TP-fronting account of Malagasy word order, it is almost identical to that I have proposed for Seediq. The one difference is that Malagasy allows movement of smaller XPs, which accounts for multiple wh-fronting and the bodyguard construction.

4. Predicate-fronting in Niuean

Massam (2000) and (2001) proposes a VP-fronting analysis of verb-initial word order in Niuean. The landing site of VP-movement is [Spec, I]. Massam claims that the predicate XP satisfies the EPP feature of Infl, and DP movement can never target this position.

4.1. VP-fronting in Niuean

Massam (2000) and (2001) has developed a VP-fronting analysis to derive verb-initial word order in Niuean and account for the word order variation in examples like the following. (66a) shows a transitive clause with VSO word order. The external argument follows the verb and has ergative case. The direct object appears next with absolutive case.
(66b) is the intransitive version. The direct object appears as a bare NP immediately following the verb. The external argument follows with absolutive case.

(66)a. Takafaga tumau ni e ia e tau ika.
   hunt always Emph Erg he Abs Pl fish
   ‘He is always fishing.’ (Massam 2001:157; Seiter 1980:183a)

b. Tagafaga ika tumau ni a ia.
   hunt fish always Emph Abs he
   ‘He is always fishing.’ (Massam 2001:157; Seiter 1980:184a)

Massam proposes a VP-fronting analysis of both clauses. In the transitive case, the direct object moves from VP to a case-checking position to check the strong D feature associated with absolutive case. The external argument is merged in [Spec, v], where it checks ergative case in situ. The remnant VP is then attracted to [Spec, IP] to check a predicate feature on Infl. Massam proposes that this movement is analogous to movement of the subject in SVO languages to satisfy the EPP and that VP-fronting verb-initial languages allow only predicative XPs and not DPs to appear in this position.

(67)
In the intransitive case, the verb merges with an NP, not a DP. The NP cannot check the D feature on Abs, so it remains inside the VP and fronts to [Spec, IP] together with the verb. The external argument is then merged in [Spec, Abs].

(68) 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{VP} \\
V & \text{NP} & I' & \text{vP} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP}_{\text{Abs}} \\
\text{t}_{\text{VP}} \\
\end{array}
\]

Massam argues in favor of a VP-movement analysis and against a noun-incorporation analysis based on examples like the following, where the NP inside VP can be modified. Thus, (69) could not be analyzed as an instance of head N-movement in the style of Baker (1988).

(69) Ne holoholo [kapiniu kiva] fakaeneena a Sione.
Past wash dish dirty slowly Abs Sione

“Sione is washing dirty dishes slowly.” (Massam 2000:106)

As in the case of Malagasy, Niuean raised predicates also appear to the left of particles, such as question markers.

(70) [Manako manu] nakai a koe?
like animal Q Abs you

“Do you like animals?” (Massam 2001:180)
4.2. Alternative Analysis for Niuean

The main substantive differences between my proposal and Massam’s analysis are the size of the fronted predicate and its landing site. Massam’s VP-fronting targets IP (or TP). In my proposal, TP moves to the outer specifier of CP. My analysis ensures that vP and the functional projections in the inflectional domain like aspect and negation maintain the order: tense, negation, verb.

Seediq

(71)  \[TP \quad Wada \quad ini \quad bari \quad hulama \quad laqi] \quad ka \quad Ape.  
Past  Neg  buy  treat  child  Top  Ape 

“Ape didn’t buy a treat for the child.”

Niuean exhibits the same word order pattern.

Niuean (Massam 2000:101)

(72)  To \quad nākai \quad liu \quad feleveia \quad foki \quad a \quad taua.  
Fut  not  again  meet  also  Abs  we 

“We will never again meet.”

One question to be addressed concerning Niuean, then, is how to account for this order of functional projections in an analysis of VP-fronting which targets [Spec, IP]. If the following is accepted as the basic clause structure, then the verb should precede tense and negation.
Massam (2000) avoids this problem with the claim that tense markers in Niuean are located in C and that tense and the complementizer are morphologically merged. She cites as evidence the fact that tense markers are in complementary distribution with the factive (he) and subjunctive (ke) markers.

Niuean (Massam 2000:100)
(74)a. Gagao foki ʻi a au
   Sick also Emph Abs I
   he hifo a Maka ki tahi.
   C go.down Abs Maka to sea
   “I’m also sick of Maka going down to the sea.”

b. Ne foa e lautolu e valavao
   Past clear Erg they Abs bushland
   ke tā aki e falepola.
   Sbjn build Instr Abs house
   “They cleared the bushland to build a thatch house.”
Massam (2000:104) proposes the following clause structure, in which C and T form a portmanteau element, to account for these facts.

(75) \[ \text{CTP CT } [\text{NegP Neg } [\text{IP Infl } [\text{VP Subj V Obj } ]]]] \]

However, Niuean clause structure can be made consistent with Seediq, Malagasy, and other Austronesian languages by adopting the predicate-fronting analysis I have been developing in this thesis. The Stranded DP Constraint would be active for CP. The absolutive DP would move to the C domain and the remnant TP would front to its left.

(76) CP
Concrete evidence in favor of this alternative comes from placement of oblique \(wh\)-
words. Massam (2002) shows that obliques can appear in immediate post-verbal position
when they are \([wh]\) but are disallowed otherwise.

\textbf{Niuean} (Massam 2002)

(77)a. Totou \textbf{he} \textit{mena fe:} \textit{e} Mele \textit{e} pepa?
Read Loc thing which Erg Mele Abs paper
“Where did Mary read the book?”

b. *Totou \textbf{he} \textit{peito} \textit{e} Mele \textit{e} pepa?
Read Loc kitchen Erg Mele Abs paper
“Mary read the book in the kitchen”

If VP-fronting were obligatory in order to check Infl’s EPP feature, then it is unclear
what would block (77b). VP-internal material should be pied-piped with the verb to \([\text{Spec, IP}]\) if it is not attracted to a case-checking position.

(78)
\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (cp) {CP}
  \node (op) [below left of=cp] {Op\textsubscript{1}}
  \node (tp) [below of=cp] {TP}
  \node (vp) [below of=op] {V+v+T \ wP}
  \node (vp) [below of=op] {\ldots \text{XP}_{\text{LOC}} \ldots}
  \node (vp) [below of=op] {VP}
  \node (vps) [below of=vp] {\text{DP}_{[\text{Erg}]} \ t_{V+v} \ \text{VP}}
  \node (vps) [below of=vp] {\text{DP}_{[\text{Abs}]} \ t_{V} \ t_{VP}}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}
On the other hand, my predicate-fronting analysis allows a different account for the grammatical (77a) and ensures that VP-fronting does not take place in the ungrammatical (77b). In (77a), the wh-phrase moves to the vP phase edge and is bound by an external operator, just as argued in chapter 4 for Seediq oblique wh-phrases. The Stranded DP Constraint is active only for CP in Niuean and not for vP. Therefore, VP-fronting is not triggered by the presence of the ergative DP in [Spec, v].

Later in the derivation, the absolutive DP will raise to [Spec, C] and TP will front to its left. Pursuing an approach of this sort thus solves the problems noted above and makes it possible to include Niuean in a more general analysis of verb-initial word order in Austronesian languages.

5. VP-movement in Tagalog?

In chapter 3, I proposed that VSO word order in Tagalog is derived through verb-movement, following numerous other proposal for VSO word order in Celtic and Semitic languages. In this section, I will consider a possible alternative. Koopman and Szabolcsi
(2000) (referred to as K & S below) argue that what traditionally has been analyzed as verb-movement is in fact remnant VP-movement. They argue against an earlier verb-movement analysis of the inverted word order found in Hungarian sentences like the following. Their claim rests crucially on the position of verbal modifiers like *szeé ‘apart’. Pure head-movement would strand the modifier to the right of the complex verb, but it must precede the verb that selects it.

Hungarian (K & S)

(80) Nem akartam [szeé szedni] kezdeni a rádiót.

not wanted-1s apart take-Inf begin-Inf the radio-Acc

“I did not want to begin to take apart the radio.”

To illustrate the K & S proposal, I will show the derivation for part of the sentence, “begin to take apart the radio.” The verbal modifier and PP are merged in the lowermost VP. The first movement extracts the PP and places it in the specifier of VP+, the projection dedicated to complex verb formation.

(81) VP+
    PP       VP
    |        |
apart    take   tPP  radio

The direct object then moves to a licensing position (LP) for case.
Next, the infinitival feature is merged, projecting InfP and InfP+. VP+ moves to InfP+ to pick up the infinitival morphology (-ni).

In the next step, InfP+ moves to CP to let the selecting auxiliary “begin” know that its complement is infinitival. Before this is done, the direct object must be removed to a stacking position (LP²).

(84)a. LP²(dp)
Following this, the auxiliary “begin” is merged, after pushing the object to the stacking position $LP^3$.

In order for “begin” to form a complex predicate, a $VP^+$ must be merged, which will attract the embedded $InfP^+$. 

VP+ must move to InfP+ to pick up the infinitival morphology, after pushing the object to LP^4.

Finally, LP is pushed up again and InfP+ moves to CP to check the infinitival nature of the clause.
The question I will consider now is whether this proposal can be adapted to account for the typological facts treated in this thesis: syntactic ergativity (in particular the absolutive restriction on extraction) and differences between VSO and VOS word order. One of the most salient features observable in the K & S proposal is the need for licensing projections (LPs) in order to strand arguments from the fronted predicate phrase. Presumably, these LPs play a key role in VSO derivation but would be omitted in the case of VOS. To see how this works, consider the Tagalog VSO antipassive in (89). In the simplest model derivation, the object would be ejected from VP and the remnant VP would then move to the aspect projection to check its aspectual features.

**Tagalog**

(89)a. Nag-ba-basa si Maria ng diyaryo.
   
   Intr-Red-read Abs Maria Obl newspaper
   
   “Maria is reading a newspaper.”

b. LP(dp)

```
     VP
   /   /
  DP  t_{DP}
  /   /
diyaryo V
```
This derivation can obtain the word order in (89). It should be pointed out, however, that the theory of multiple spell out would need to be abandoned. In order to allow the verb to check its aspectual features, the contents of VP cannot be spelled out before fronting.

In the case of Seediq VOS, the oblique object would not be stranded but would front together with the verb.

Seediq

(90)a. M-n-ari hulama ka Ape.
Intr-Perf-buy treat Top Ape

“Ape bought a treat.”
The distinction, then, between VSO and VOS word order can be captured by a parameter which allows vP-internal LPs in the former but not in the latter. However, this creates a problem when accounting for syntactic ergativity. When an internal argument has absolutive status in Seediq, it must appear in clause-final position. Therefore, it would have to be stranded, requiring that Seediq have vP-internal LPs.

**Seediq**

(91a) B-n-ari na Ape ka patis.

- Tr.Perf-buy Erg Ape Top book

“Ape bought the book.”

b. AspP

```
  VP
 / \                 / \    
Asp'  Asp            vP
  \ /                 \ /    
 mnari hulama Ape     v'
   \ /                 \ /  
    v                  tVP
```

```
  VP
 / \                 / \    
Asp'  Asp            vP
  \ /                 \ /    
 bnari tDP Ape       v'
    \ /                 \ /  
     v  LP(dp)         tVP
      |                  
      DP               
      \                
      tVP
      /                
     patis
```
The parameter can still be salvaged, however, if Seediq LPs are limited to absolutive-case checking positions. But there is still a problem when it comes to A’-extraction. As observed in chapter 2, only absolutes are eligible to undergo A’-movement in syntactically ergative languages like Seediq and Tagalog. This means that the absolute objects in (92) can be \textit{wh}-extracted.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(92)a.] \textbf{Anó} ang \textit{b-in}-asa ni Maria? \hspace{1cm} \text{(Tagalog)}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
  what & Abs & -Tr.Perf-read & Erg Maria \\
\end{tabular}

\text{``What did Maria read?''} \\
\item[(92)b.] \textbf{Maanu} ka wada burig-un na Ape? \hspace{1cm} \text{(Seediq)}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
  what & Top & Past & buy-Tr & Erg Ape \\
\end{tabular}

\text{``What did Ape buy?''}
\end{itemize}

But the antipassive obliques are not permitted to front.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(93)a.] \textbf{*Anó} ang \textit{b-um}-asa si Maria? \hspace{1cm} \text{(Tagalog)}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
  what & Abs & -Intr.Perf-read & Abs Maria \\
\end{tabular}

\text{``What did Maria read?''} \\
\item[(93)b.] \textbf{*Maanu} ka wada \textit{m}-ari Ape? \hspace{1cm} \text{(Seediq)}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
  what & Top & Perf & Intr-buy & Ape \\
\end{tabular}

\text{``What did Ape buy?''}
\end{itemize}

If both transitive and antipassive vPs are required to have LPs, it is not clear how \textit{wh}-movement would be allowed in the former but not in the latter.
On the other hand, in the Multiple Spell-Out analysis that I am developing in this thesis, the typological similarities and differences between Seediq and Tagalog are accounted for straightforwardly. As proposed in chapter 3, VSO word order is the result of verb-movement. VOS word order is derived through predicate-fronting. The similar behavior observed in Seediq and Tagalog in terms of the absolutive restriction on extraction is also accounted for in Phase Theory. As proposed in chapter 2 (to be developed further in chapter 6), v has an EPP feature in transitive clause to draw the internal argument absolutive DP to its outer specifier. This DP will then be attracted to [Spec, C], since it is closest.
A DP left inside vP, which has not been attracted to the vP phase edge, like an antipassive oblique object, cannot move to [Spec, C], since this would violate the Phase Impenetrability Condition.

This account is not available to K & S, since multiple spell out is not compatible with their analysis. I conclude, then, that the analysis developed in this thesis has greater
applicability in accounting for the syntax of Austronesian languages, since it is able to derive
the typological generalizations that characterize the word order as well as ergative syntax in
Austronesian languages.

6. Conclusion

This chapter has shown how my predicate-fronting analysis can be applied to Tagalog, Malagasy, and Niuean. The key generalizations embodied in this analysis are that
the fact that a DP in a phase edge must be preceded by a non-DP XP and that these are
interpreted as topic and focus, respectively. I do not claim that this provides an exhaustive
accounting of Austronesian word order. But I hope to have uncovered a general pattern and
pointed out a direction for a more complete typological analysis. I summarize below the
analysis for each of the languages I have examined.

(97)a. **Seediq**

Stranded DP Constraint active for CP and vP

Obligatory EPP feature on C (obligatory topicalization of the absolutive)

b. **Malagasy**

Stranded DP Constraint active for CP

Obligatory EPP feature on C (obligatory topicalization of the absolutive)

c. **Niuean**

Stranded DP Constraint active for CP

Obligatory EPP feature on C (obligatory topicalization of the absolutive)

d. **Tagalog**
Stranded DP Constraint active for CP

Optional EPP feature on C (optional topicalization of the absolutive)

Though Tagalog exhibits limited instances of predicate-fronting, I still maintain my claim that basic word order is generated through verb-movement. I have shown in this chapter that a VP-fronting analysis along the lines of Koopman and Szabolcsi (2000) does not provide an adequate account of Tagalog syntax.
CHAPTER SIX
ABSOLUTIVE RESTRICTION ON EXTRACTION

1. Introduction

Thus far in this thesis I have proposed analyses of ergative/absolutive case-checking and verb-initial word order derivation in Tagalog and Seediq. In this chapter, I turn to the problem of A’-dependencies in these languages. Ergative syntax and word order both play a role in determining possibilities for A’-movement in these languages. As observed in the previous chapter, movement of non-DPs is constrained by phrase structure. In VSO Tagalog, PPs and adjuncts are able to undergo wh-movement and focus fronting to clause-initial position. In Seediq, however, where VOS word order is derived by TP-fronting, PPs and adjuncts are spelled out inside the fronted clause and therefore cannot move to clause-initial position.

A’-movement of DPs, on the other hand, is subject to the absolutive restriction on extraction, first introduced in chapter 2. Seediq and Tagalog both exhibit this restriction. (1) shows that a theme in a transitive clause can undergo wh-movement.

(1a. Maanu  ka  wada  burig-un  na  Ape?  (Seediq)
what  Top  Past  buy-Tr  Erg  Ape
“What did Ape buy?”

b. Anó  ang  bina-basa  ni  Maria?  (Tagalog)
what  Abs  Red.Tr-read  Erg  Maria
“What is Maria reading?”

The external argument, which has ergative case, cannot move out of a transitive clause.
In order to extract the agent, the clause must be antipassivized.

This chapter examines DP A’-movement in greater detail. I extend the analysis of ergativity developed in chapter 2 to account for DP extraction restrictions. As proposed in chapter 2, an EPP feature appears on v only when the verb is transitive. This allows internal argument DPs to move out of VP only in transitive clauses, i.e. only when these DPs have absolutive status. This chapter develops this proposal in detail. I also take up the structural characteristics of wh-movement in Tagalog and Seediq. Wh-questions formed on DPs in these languages take the form of pseudo-clefts. I will show how this fact is predicted by the predicate-fronting analysis developed in chapters 4 and 5.
2. **Structure of Wh-questions**

As discussed in the previous chapter, A’-dependencies involving non-DPs are derived through *wh*-movement. In Tagalog, PP *wh*-words move to clause-initial position.

Tagalog

(4)a. Saán=ka b-um-ilí ng libró?
where=2s.Abs -Intr.Perf-buy Obl book
“Where did you buy books?”

b. Kailán=siyá pu-puntá sa Maynila?
when=3s.Abs Red-go Dat Manila
“When will he/she go to Manila?”

In Seediq, on the other hand, locative *wh*-words remain inside the clause. In the previous chapter, I proposed that this is because basic word order in this language is derived through TP-fronting. Following Nunes and Uriagareka (1999), I assume that dislocated XPs are spelled out at the time of movement. Therefore, TP-internal material, like locative phrases, is no longer accessible to the computational system and therefore cannot be moved from TP once predicate-fronting has occurred.

Seediq

(5)a. M-n-ari inu patis Ape?
Intr-Perf-buy where book Ape
“Where did Ape buy books?”

b. *Inu m-n-ari patis Ape?
where Intr-Perf-buy book Ape
On the other hand, Tagalog and Seediq both exhibit the absolutive restriction on extraction in cases of A’-dependencies involving DPs. This is a common characteristic of syntactically ergative languages, as I noted in chapter 2. In section 3 of this chapter I present my analysis of this restriction, which is based on limiting v’s ability to carry an EPP feature, thereby restricting the movement of internal argument DPs. In this section, I examine the structural properties of DP wh-questions in Tagalog and Seediq. I take the commonly held (c.f. Georgopoulos 1991, Paul 2000, Pearson 2001, Aldridge 2002, and others) position that wh-questions formed on DPs in a great number of Austronesian languages have the structure of pseudo-clefts. This section argues for this position and proposes a structure for these clefts. In addition to this, I show how this is a consequence of the Stranded DP Constraint and Phase Edge Interpretation principle proposed in chapter 4.

To begin the discussion of clefting and DP wh-questions, I first point out the basic resemblance between wh-questions and pseudo-clefts in Seediq and Tagalog. (6a) and (6b) are generally considered to be clefts in Seediq and Tagalog. They take the form generally attributed to pseudo-clefts, in which a predicate nominal, shown in italics, forms the matrix predicate, while the subject consists of a free relative, indicated by brackets (Akmajian 1970, Chomsky 1977, Williams 1983, Knowles 1986, Boskovic 1997, and others). Seediq and Tagalog, as is the case with most Austronesian languages, do not have a copula; the predicate nominal alone functions as the predicate. The subject relative clause is preceded by an absolutive case marker, given in bold.

(6)a.  
Bulebun ka [b-n-ari na Ape]  
banana Top -Perf-buy Erg Ape  
“A banana is what Ape bought.”
b. *Isdá ang [b-in-ilí ni Maria] (Tagalog)
   fish Abs -Tr.Perf-buy Erg Maria
   “A fish is what Maria bought.”

Evidence that the constituent following the absolutive case marker is a headless relative clause is given below, where *bnari na ape* (“what Ape bought”) and *binili ni Maria* (“what Maria bought”) are used as nominals in argument position.

(7)a. Malu uqun ka b-n-ari na Ape. (Seediq)
good eat Top -Perf-buy Erg Ape
   “What Ape bought tastes good.”

b. Hindí=ko gustó ang b-in-ilí ni Maria. (Tagalog)
   Neg=1s.Erg like Abs -Tr.Perf-buy Erg Maria
   “I don’t like what Maria bought.”

In terms of pragmatic import, the relative clause part of a pseudo-cleft typically conveys given information, while the predicate nominal provides new and focused information (Prince 1978, Bromser 1984, Kamio 1991, Collins 1991, Fitchner 1993). This is also the case with (7) above. For these to be felicitous, it should be understood by the hearer that Ape bought something in (7a), and Maria bought something in (7b). The predicate nominals *bulebun* (“banana”) and *isda* (“fish”) supply the missing information as to what it was that was bought.

The surface appearance of *wh*-questions is identical to the pseudo-clefts in (7). The nominals *maanu* and *ano* appear in initial position, followed by absolutive case markers and the same headless relatives as above.
In the discussion which follows, I present structural arguments in favor of the cleft analysis of (8a) and (8b). I begin by showing that these constructions are bi-clausal. My analysis takes as its starting point the structure proposed by Boskovic (1997) for specificational pseudo-clefts. The headless relative functions as the topic and the wh-word forms the predicate. Consistent with the word order derivation I have proposed in chapter 4 for Seediq basic VOS order and in chapter 5 for Tagalog nominal predicates, the topic DP checks absolutive case with T and then moves to [Spec, C]. Subsequently, the remnant TP is spelled out and fronted to its left.
One indication that the $wh$-word does not originate inside the relative clause comes from the distribution of pronominal clitics. Both examples below are from Seediq, since Tagalog does not have clitic doubling. Ergative and absolutive nominals are resumed by pronouns when topicalized in Seediq. (10a) shows an ergative topic $tama$ ("father") in clause-final position, following the absolutive DP. Topics can also appear in clause-initial position, as is the case in (10b), where the absolutive DP has been fronted and is resumed by the clitic $ku$. Since $ka$ only occurs with fronted predicates, clause-initial topics are followed by the topic marker $ge$.

**Seediq**

(10a) $Wada=na$ s-bari hulama laqi=na ka tama.

Past=3s.Erg App-buy treat child=3s.Gen Top father

“The father bought his child a treat.”
b. Yaku ge wada=\textbf{ku} s-bari hulama na bubu.

1s Top Past=1s.Abs App-buy treat Erg mother

“As for me, Mom bought me a treat.”

A clefted nominal, however, is not resumed by a pronoun inside the clause. There is no \textit{ku} (“I”) clitic inside the clause to refer to the \textit{yaku} in initial position.

\textbf{Seediq}

(11)a. \textbf{Yaku} ka wada=na s-bari hulama.

1s Top Past=3s.Erg App-buy treat

“She bought ME a treat.”

b. *Yaku ka wada=\textbf{ku}=na s-bari hulama.

1s Top Past=1s.Abs=3s.Erg App-buy treat

“She bought ME a treat.”

This is what we expect if (11a) has the structure in (12), where the focused constituent is merged outside the relative clause. The constituent which moves to topic position is the null operator. If an agreement clitic is present in the structure, it is third-person singular, which is null in Seediq.

\textbf{Seediq}

(12) \textbf{Yaku} ka \textit{\textbf{[CP Op}}_{\text{TP}} \textit{wada=na s-bari hulama} \textit{t_{i}} \textit{]}]

1s Top Past=3s.Erg App-buy treat

“She bought ME a treat.”
Rizzi (1997:286) suggests a potential alternative analysis. Rizzi points out that Italian clitic left dislocation occurs in topicalization but not in focus constructions.

(13)a. Il tuo libro, lo ho letto.
   “Your book, I have read it.”

b. IL TUO LIBRO ho letto (, non il suo).
   Your book I read (, not his).”

Rizzi proposes that focus movement, as opposed to topicalization, creates a quantificational A’-binding relation. The focused constituent must bind a variable, and clitic pronouns cannot function as variables.

However, Rizzi’s proposal does not contradict the argument I have presented for the biclausal status of focus constructions in Seediq. In non-cleft constructions involving contrastive focus, clitic doubling is still observed. In (14a), *yaku* “I” is being contrasted with *ruseno kiya* “that man” in (14b). However, (14a) takes the form of a declarative clause and not a cleft. *Yaku* is resumed by the pronoun *ku*, but the focus interpretation is still allowed. This indicates that the lack of clitic doubling in (11a) is not due to focus movement but rather to the biclausal structure of the cleft construction.

Seediq

(14)a. Ashi=ku usa d-m-ayo kupahun=na ka yaku.
   must=1s.Abs go -Intr-help work=3s.Gen Top 1s
   “I had to go help with his work...”
b. Ruseno kiya ka p-heyu dahaka tama=na.
man that Top Caus-stand with father=3s.Gen
“(while) that man propped up (the trees) with my husband (lit. ‘his (my son’s) father’).”

Another indication that clefts are biclausal is the location of clitics. Pronominal clitics attach to the first prosodic word within CP in both Seediq and Tagalog. In (15a), Yo is the Seediq interrogative particle, and the 2nd person clitic su attaches to it. In (15b), the Tagalog 2nd person pronoun ka attaches to the wh-word kailan (“when”).

(15)a. Yo=**su** kula-un seedaq m-n-huma bulebun-ni?

Q=2s.Erg know-Tr person Intr-Perf-plant banana-this

“Do you know the person who planted these bananas?” (Seediq)

b. Kailán=**ka** p-um-untá sa Maynila?

when=2s.Abs -Intr.Perf-go P Maynila

“When did you go to Maynila?” (Tagalog)

I assume that interrogative particles and fronted (non-DP) wh-words are associated with the C domain. Clitics, then, should be able to raise as high as this position.

(16)a. \[\text{CP} \quad [\text{C:} \quad \text{Yo=}\textbf{su} \quad [\text{TP} \quad \text{kula-un} \quad t_i \quad [\text{DP} \quad \text{seedaq} \quad [...]]]] \]

Q=2s.Erg know-Tr person

“Do you know the person who…?” (Seediq)
b. \([_{CP} \text{Kailán}=\text{ka}_i \ {_{TP} \text{p-un-untá} \ t_i \ \text{sa} \ \text{Maynila}}]\)
   \(\text{when}=2s.\text{Abs} \ -\text{Intr.Perf-go} \ \text{Dat} \ \text{Maynila}\)

   “When did you go to Maynila?”

In a cleft, however, the clitic has to stay below the nominal predicate and absolutive marker which follows it. In (17a), the \(3^{rd}\) person Seediq ergative clitic attaches to the tense auxiliary, and in (17b) the Tagalog the \(2^{nd}\) person ergative clitic attaches to the verb.

(17)a. \(\text{Ima} \ \text{ka} \ \text{wada}=\text{na} \ \text{s-bari} \ \text{hulama}\)?

   “Who did she buy a treat (for)?”

b. \(\text{Anó} \ \text{ang} \ \text{gina-gawá}=\text{mo}\)?

   “What are you doing?”

These clitics cannot move up to attach to the \(w/h\)-word or the absolutive case marker.

(18)a. \(*\text{Ima}=\text{na} \ \text{ka} \ \text{wada} \ \text{s-bari} \ \text{hulama}\)?

   “Who did she buy a treat (for)?”

b. \(*\text{Ima} \ \text{ka}=\text{na} \ \text{wada} \ \text{s-bari} \ \text{hulama}\)?

   “What are you doing?”

c. \(*\text{Anó}=\text{mo} \ \text{ang} \ \text{gina-gawá}\)?

   “What are you doing?”
d. *Anó ang=mo gina-gawá?  
what Abs=2s.Erg Red.Tr-do

If (17a) and (17b) were mono-clausal, the clitics should be able to move as high as the *wh*-words, given the structures below, where the *wh*-words have moved to [Spec, C].

(19)a. *[CP Ima=na₃ [c' ka [TP wada s-bari hulama t₃]]]
who=3s.Erg Top Past. App-buy treat

“Who did she buy a treat (for)?”  
(Seediq)

b. *[CP Anó=mo₂ [c' ang [TP gina-gawá t₃]]]
what=2s.Erg Abs Red.Tr-do

“What are you doing?”  
(Tagalog)

Clearly, this mono-clausal structure does not explain the positions of the clitics in (17). However, the bi-clausal cleft analysis given above does account for this. The *wh*-words are not contained in the CP where the clitics originate. Therefore, the highest position available to the clitic in this clause is the auxiliary *wada* in (17a), as shown in (20a), and the verb *ginagawa* in (17b), as shown in (20b). The operators in [Spec, C] are phonetically null and so cannot host clitics.

(20)a. Ima₃ ka [CP Op₃ [TP wada=na s-bari hulama t₃]]
who Top Past=3s.Erg App-buy treat

“Who did she buy a treat (for)?”  
(Seediq)

b. Anó₃ ang [CP Op₃ [TP gina-gawá=mo t₃]]
what Abs Red.Tr-do=2s.Erg

“What are you doing?”  
(Tagalog)
Clitic placement provides a very clear contrast between clefted *wh*-questions and the non-DP questions formed through *wh*-movement. The clitic attaches to the *wh*-word in the latter, indicating that the *wh*-word in this case is located within the originating clause.

**Tagalog**

(21) Saán=ka b-um-ílí ng libro?
where=2s.Abs -Intr.Perf-buy Obl book

“Where did you buy books?”

The preceding discussion has given evidence that *wh*-questions in Seediq and Tagalog are biclausal, as is expected of pseudo-clefts. Next I will show that the *wh*-word forms part of the predicate, specifically the fronted remnant TP. Zeitoun (2000b) reports that a copula can precede the *wh*-word in a pseudo-cleft in Tsou.

**Tsou** (Zeitoun 2000b:122)

(22)a. (zou) cuma na i-ko hioa?
be what Abs Tr-2s.Erg do

“What are you doing?”

b. zou sia na suu?
be who Abs 2s.Abs

“Who are you?”

A *wh*-phrase\(^{26}\) in Seediq can be accompanied by a tense auxiliary.

---

\(^{26}\) A *wh*-phrase in the scope of the question particle *ya* is interpreted as an indefinite quantifier.
Seediq

(23)a. Ya ani maha knhenu [burig-un patis na Ape]  
Q even Fut how many buy-Tr book Erg Ape

“Ape will buy some books.” (lit. “There will be some books that Ape buys.”)

b. Ya wada piya [ka seediq m-n-ari patis]  
Q Past how much Top person Intr-Perf-buy book

“Some people bought books.” (lit. “There were some people who bought books.”)

In particular, note in (23b) that, while the wh-word follows a tense marker, the verb inside the headless relative also carries its own aspect inflection. Past tense and perfective aspect marking never co-occur in a single tensed clause in Seediq. This clearly indicates the biclausal status of (23b) and also the fact that the tense marker should be construed with the wh-word and not with the main verb inside the relative clause.

Seediq

(24)a. Wada m-ari patis Ape.  
Past Intr-buy book Ape

“Ape bought a book.”

b. M-n-ari patis Ape.  
Intr-Perf-buy book Ape

“Ape bought a book.”

c. *Wada m-n-aripatis Ape.  
Past Intr-Perf-buy book Ape

“Ape bought a book.”

Paul (2000) shows that the focused part of a cleft can be negated in Malagasy.
Malagasy (Paul 2000:170)

(25)  **Tsy** Rasoa no nanoroka an-dRakoto.
  Neg Rasoa Foc Past.AT.kiss Acc-Rakoto

“It’s not Rasoa who kissed Rakoto.”

The same is true for Tagalog.

Tagalog

(26)  **Hindí** si Maria ang p-um-untá sa Maynila.
  Neg Abs Maria Abs -Intr.Perf-go to Manila

“It wasn’t Maria who went to Manila.”

The facts in (22) - (26) are accounted for by the structure proposed in (9b), since the copula, tense auxiliary, and negator will be contained inside the fronted TP with the focused constituent.

(27)  \[
\begin{align*}
\text{TP} & \quad \text{NegP} \\
\text{Neg} & \quad \text{vP} \\
\text{tCP} & \quad \text{v'} \\
\text{DP}_{wh} &
\end{align*}
\]

Tagalog has a verbal form for locative predicates. A verbalizing prefix *na-* is added to forms referring to location, e.g. the demonstrative pronoun *dito* ‘here’, the preposition *sa* ‘to’, or the *wh*-word *saan* ‘where’ when these are used as predicates.

(28)a.  Ná-rito\(^{27}\)=silá.
    be-here=3p.Abs
   “They are here.”

    b.  Na-sa Maynila  si  Maria.
    be-at Manila  Abs  Maria
   “Maria is in Manila.”

     c.  Na-sáán  si  Pedro?
    be-where  Abs  Pedro
   “Where is Pedro?”

PPs cannot form predicates on their own.

**Tagalog**

(29)a.*Dito=silá.
    here=3p.Abs
   “They are here.”

    b.  *Sa  Maynila  si  Maria.
    at  Manila  Abs  Maria
   “Maria is in Manila.”

\(^{27}\) /d/ becomes /r/ in intervocalic position.
c. *Saán si Pedro?

where Abs Pedro

“Where is Pedro?”

This clearly indicates that a larger constituent than PP appears to the left of the absolutive in (28). I postulate that the verbalizer *na- heads vP and selects the PP predicate as its complement.

(30)

In the preceding discussion, I have presented evidence that the focused element in the cleft structure forms part of the predicate. Now I will defend the assertion that the headless relative is merged in subject position and not as the predicate. This proposal stands in contrast to Williams’ (1983) analysis of English specificational pseudo-clefts in which he claims that the relative clause forms the predicate and the counterweight the subject. Evidence for the subject status of the counterweight comes from its ability to undergo raising and subject-auxiliary inversion.
(31)a. [Important to himself] is what John is.
b. Is [important to himself] what John is?

There is reason to believe, however, that in Austronesian pseudo-clefts, the relative clause functions as the absolutive argument and not the predicate. First, this CP appears with an absolutive case marker.

Tagalog

(32) Anó [DP ang [CP gina-gawá=mo]]?
What Abs Red.Tr-do=2s.Erg
“What are you doing?”

Additional evidence comes from the fact that the clause can undergo topicalization to clause-initial position. (33a) shows the clefted version and (33b) the topic construction.

Tagalog

(33)a. Si Maria [ang [ b-um-ilí ng bahay sa Maynila]]
Abs María Abs -Perf.Intr-buy Obl house in Maynila
“Maria is the one who bought a house in Manila.”
b. [Ang [ b-um-ilí ng bahay sa Maynila]] ay
Abs -Perf.Intr-buy Obl house in Maynila Top
si María.
Abs María
“The one who bought a house in Manila is Maria.”
Note that only absolutive DPs can undergo topicalization in Tagalog. Predicates cannot.

(34)a. B-um-ilí si Maria ng bahay sa Maynila.
     -Perf.Intr-buy Abs Maria Obl house in Maynila
     “Maria bought a house in Manila.”

b. Si Maria ay b-um-ilí ng bahay sa Maynila.
     Abs Maria Top -Perf.Intr-buy Obl house in Manila
     “As for Maria, she bought a house in Maynila.”

c. *B-um-ilí ng bahay sa Maynila ay si Maria.
     -Perf.Intr-buy Obl house in Manila Top Abs Maria

At this point, I consider the question of why DP wh-questions must take the form of clefts in many Austronesian languages. In her analysis of VP-fronting in Niuean, Massam (2000, 2001, and 2002) has proposed that in predicate-fronting languages, T has a [Pred] feature and not an EPP feature. This ensures that these languages have verb-initial word order and that DPs never appear in clause-initial position. Consequently, there can be no DP wh-movement to [Spec, C]. As evidence, Massam (2002:11a) notes that bare DP wh-words cannot appear in clause-initial position but must be preceded by a predicate particle.

Niuean (Massam 2002)

(35) Ko hai ne lalaga e kato e:?
     Pred who C weave Abs basket this
     “Who wove this basket?”
Massam proposes the following structure, in which *ko* and the *wh*-word form the predicate and are merged in [Spec, IP].

\[
(36) \quad \text{IP} \\
\quad \text{Pred} \quad \text{I'} \\
\quad \text{ko Wh} \quad \text{Particles} \\
\quad \text{DP} \\
\quad \text{CP} \\
\quad \text{0} \quad \text{Op}_1 \ldots t_i
\]

Though this analysis accounts for many aspects of Niuean syntax, Massam’s proposal is somewhat extreme when applied to other Austronesian languages. In Tagalog, for instance, it cannot be the case that the predicate must appear in initial position in the clause, since focused PPs can precede the main verb.

**Tagalog**

(37)  
\text{Sa Maynila bi-bilí si Maria ng bahay.} \\
in Manila Red-buy Abs Maria Obl house

“Maria will buy a house in Manila.”

If the PP were moved to the [Spec, IP] focus position, then there would be no landing site for VP-fronting, and the placement of the verb to the left of the absolutive would not be accounted for.
The analysis of VOS word order that I put forth in chapters 4 and 5 provides a different answer to the question of why clefting takes place in Austronesian *wh*-questions. As discussed at length in chapters 4 and 5, C in VOS languages has an EPP feature forcing the absolutive DP to move to its specifier. Topicalization of the absolutive also takes place in Tagalog in clauses with non-verbal predicates. The remnant clause then fronts to C’s outer specifier.

**Seediq**

(39)a. *Wada burig-un na Ape ka patis na Pawan.*  
Past buy-Tr Erg Ape Top book Gen Pawan  
“Ape bought Pawan’s book.”
As I have argued in chapters 4 and 5, predicate-fronting is an indirect consequence of the Stranded DP Constraint, which prohibits spelling out a DP in the left edge of a phase.

(40) **Stranded DP Constraint**

A DP cannot be spelled out in the leftmost position in a phase edge.

At LF, the Phase Edge Interpretive rule applies.

(41) **Phase Edge Interpretation**

If the edge of a phase HP has the form \[ \text{[\text{[HP} XP [\text{[H'} DP ... ]]} \text{]}, \] where X is not D, DP is mapped to the presupposition and XP to focus.
The DP in the CP phase edge will then be interpreted as the topic and the TP as the focus of the clause.

(42) \[
\text{CP} \\
\text{TP} \quad \text{C'} (\text{focus}) \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{C'} (\text{topic}) \\
\quad t_{\text{TP}}
\]

If, on the other hand, a \textit{wh}-phrase were merged as the absolutive argument, this DP would be attracted to [Spec, C]. With [Spec, C] filled, the TP would then have to be fronted. Since the first XP in the C domain receives a focus interpretation, it would be TP that is interpreted as the focus, and the \textit{wh}-phrase would be interpreted as the topic, yielding an anomalous interpretation.

(43) \[
\text{CP} \\
\text{TP} \quad \text{C'} (\text{focus}) \\
\quad \text{DP}_{\text{wh}} \quad \text{C'} (\text{topic}) \\
\quad t_{\text{TP}}
\]

However, if DP \textit{wh}-questions are formed as pseudo-cLEFTS, the headless relative checks absolutive case and moves to topic position. The focused constituent is then contained inside the fronted TP where it receives the intended interpretation.
In this way, my predicate-fronting analysis derives the cleft structure of DP *wh*-questions and also naturally accounts for the fact that DP *wh*-movement is not available in these languages. Recall that PP *wh*-movement is available in VSO languages like Tagalog. The *wh*-phrase moves independently to [Spec, C].

**Tagalog**

(45)a. *Saan* ka b-um-ili ng libro *ti* ?

where 2sAbs -Intr.Perf-buy Obl book

“Where did you buy books?”
3. Account of the Absolutive Extraction Restriction

The foundation for the analysis of the absolutive extraction restriction is the proposal introduced in chapter 2 that DP-movement from VP is constrained by the appearance of an EPP feature on v. When the verb is transitive, v has an EPP feature, and the absolutive DP is attracted to the phase edge and can undergo further movement to [Spec, C]. In intransitive clauses, v does not have an EPP feature. This means that in an antipassive, the internal argument oblique will not be able to undergo A'-movement.

3.1. Local Movement

As discussed in chapter 2, in syntactically ergative languages, only absolutive DPs are able to undergo A'-movement. This subsection examines absolutive extraction in mono-
clausal constructions in Tagalog and Seediq. As proposed in the chapter 2, transitive morphology is merged in v and is responsible for checking absolutive case with an internal argument. Transitive v also carries an EPP feature, which attracts an internal argument to its outer specifier\(^{28}\).

Once in this position at the vP phase edge, this DP can be further attracted to [Spec, C]. As in the case of topicalization, I assume operator movement also to be triggered by an EPP feature on C. Recall from the previous section that DP \(w\)-questions are pseudo-clefts. I assume that the DP which moves is a null operator.

(46)a. **Anó ang b-in-asa ni Maria?** (Tagalog)

what Abs -Tr.Perf-read Erg Maria

“What did Maria read?”

b. **Maanu ka wada burig-un na Ape?** (Seediq)

what Top Past buy-Tr Erg Ape

“What did Ape buy?”

---

\(^{28}\) I assume that movement (internal merge) of the internal argument takes place after external merge of the external argument and targets v’s outer specifier. The order of merge operations is based on the intuition that selectional features on a given head are satisfied before other types of features. In other words, arguments are merged in vP before features like v’s EPP feature are checked. I also assume that “tucking in”, in the sense of Richards (2001), does not apply, so movement of the internal argument targets v’s outer (and not inner) specifier.
In an intransitive clause, v will not check absolutive case and will not have an EPP feature. The result is that an internal argument cannot be attracted to the vP phase edge. The external argument, on the other hand, which is merged in the specifier of v and therefore located in the vP phase edge in its base position, can be attracted to [Spec, C].

(47)a. **Sino** ang b-[**um**]-asa ng libró? (Tagalog)
   who Abs -Intr.Perf-read Obl book
   “Who read the book?”

b. **Ima** ka wada m-[**ari**] patis-ní? (Seediq)
   who Top Past Intr-buy book-Def
   “Who bought this book?”
In an applicative construction, the applied DP, which is selected by the applicative morpheme and merged in [Spec, Appl] is attracted by the EPP feature on v.

(48)a. **Sino** ang i-b-in-ilí =mo ng kape? (Tagalog)
who Abs App-Tr.Perf-buy=2s.Erg Obl coffee

“Who did you buy coffee for?”

b. **Ima** ka wada=na s-bari hulama? (Seediq)
who Top Past=3s.Erg App-buy treat

“Who did she buy a treat?”
Without an EPP feature on v, an internal argument DP will not be able to raise to [Spec, C]. This is because only material in the vP phase edge can be attracted by the probe on C; material inside VP is no longer available to the computational system. If an internal argument in an antipassive were to raise directly from inside VP to [Spec, C], the Phase Impenetrability Condition would be violated. This accounts for the ungrammaticality of sentences like (49).

(49)a. *Anó ang b-um-asa si Maria?  (Tagalog)
   “What did Maria read?”

b. *Maanu ka wada m-ari Ape?  (Seediq)
   “What did Ape buy?”
The ergative nominal in a transitive clause also cannot be extracted. C has an EPP feature, which attracts a DP. In a transitive clause, the closest DP will be the internal argument absolutive, residing in the outer specifier of v. The external argument will not be attracted, because doing so would violate Attract Closest.

(50)a. *Sino ang b-in-asa ang libró? (Tagalog)
    who Abs -Tr.Perf-read Abs book
    “Who read the book?”

b. *Ima ka wada burig-un patis-ní? (Seediq)
    who Top Past buy-Tr book-Def
    “Who bought this book?”
In the case of unaccusatives, no EPP feature appears on v, since the clause is intransitive. However, as I have noted before, I follow Chomsky (2000, 2001a, 2001b) in assuming that unaccusative vP is not a strong phase. The internal argument is therefore able to check case with T and also be attracted by a probe on C and undergo wh-movement.

(51)a. Sino ang d-um-atîng?
   who Abs -Intr.Perf-arrive
   “Who arrived?”

b. *CP
   Op C’
   C[EPP] TP
   V+v+T vP
   DP[Abs] v’
     tOp v’
     tV+v[EPP] VP
       tV tAbs

   In the case of unaccusatives, no EPP feature appears on v, since the clause is intransitive. However, as I have noted before, I follow Chomsky (2000, 2001a, 2001b) in assuming that unaccusative vP is not a strong phase. The internal argument is therefore able to check case with T and also be attracted by a probe on C and undergo wh-movement.
The reliance of this analysis on Attract Closest is reminiscent of proposals such as Campana (1992). Campana assumes a Murasugi-style approach to absolutive/ergative case-checking in which the ergative DP checks case with AgrO and the absolutive with AgrS. However, Campana adds the stipulation that, while the ergative DP moves into the specifier of AgrO and therefore resides in an A-position, the absolutive DP adjoins to AgrSP, creating an A'-chain. The absolutive extraction restriction is then accounted for in terms of relativized minimality: wh-movement cannot take place from a position lower in the clause than AgrS, because the absolutive DP would be a closer A’-binding for the trace of this nominal.

The account I am proposing, however, has the advantage of not needing to stipulate the A/A’ status of checking positions. In addition, Campana’s account also suffers from the disadvantage of Murasugi’s (1992) approach in not being able to account for v-Type ergative languages, as I have discussed in chapter 2.
3.2. Long Distance Movement

As observed in the previous subsection, only the absolutive can undergo A'-movement in its clause of origin. In cases of long distance wh-movement, the dislocated DP will not be the absolutive in higher clauses along its path. Rather, movement is from complement CPs that have absolutive status. The CP checks absolutive case with v, and an operator in [Spec, C] will be attracted by the EPP feature on the higher v. In (53), the embedded clause is intransitive to allow extraction of the agent. The matrix v is transitive, checking absolutive case with CP and carrying an EPP feature that attracts the embedded operator to its outer specifier.

Tagalog
(53)a. Sino ang [CP s-in-abi ni Maria-ng who Abs -Perf.Tr-say Erg Maria-Lk
[CP t b-um-ilí ng libro]?
Intr.Perf-buy Obl book

“Who did Maria say bought the book?”

b. 

\[
\text{TP}
\]

\[
\text{say} \quad \text{vP}
\]

\[
\text{Op} \quad \text{Maria}
\]

\[
\text{tV+V+EPP} \quad \text{VP}
\]

\[
\text{tV} \quad \text{CP}
\]

\[
\text{toP} \quad \text{C’}
\]

\[
\text{toP bought the book}
\]
Long distance movement is not possible when the matrix clause is intransitive. This is because the matrix v has no EPP feature to attract an embedded operator.

**Tagalog**

(54a) *Sino ang nag-sabi si Maria-ng*

who Abs -Perf.Intr-say Abs Maria-Lk

\[ [\text{CP} \ t \ b-\text{um-}i\text{lī} \ ng \ librō)]? \]

Intr.Perf-buy Obl book

“Who did Maria say bought the book?”

b. CP

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Op} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{Op}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{say} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{VP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Maria} \\
\text{t}_v \rightarrow v \\
\text{t}_v \rightarrow v \\
\text{CP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
t_{\text{op}} \\
C'
\end{array}
\]

\[
t_{\text{op}} \text{ bought the book}
\]

(53) and (54) are examples of finite complement CPs. Nonfinite complement clauses exhibit the same pattern in Tagalog. The matrix clause must be transitive in order to allow extraction from the embedded clause.
Tagalog

(55)a. Sino ang bina-balak ni Maria-ng [CP bisitah-in t ]?
who Abs Red.Tr-plan Erg Maria-Lk visit-Tr

“Who is Maria planning to visit?”

b. *Sino ang nag-balak si Maria-ng [CP bisitah-in t ]?
who Abs Intr-Red-plan Abs Maria-Lk visit-Tr

“Who is Maria planning to visit?”

Note that movement within the embedded clause adheres to the absolutive restriction on extraction. Transitive morphology on the matrix verb is not sufficient to allow long distance extraction. The internal argument cannot be extracted from an embedded antipassive, when the embedded clause is finite, as in (56a), or nonfinite, as in (56b).

(56)a. *Anó ang s-in-abi ni Maria-ng
what Abs -Tr.Perf-say Erg Maria-Lk
[CP b-um-ili si Pedro t ]?
-Intr-buy Abs Pedro

“What did Maria say that Pedro bought?”

b. *Sino ang bina-balak ni Maria-ng [CP b-um-isita t ]?
who Abs Red.Tr-plan Erg Maria-Lk -Intr-visit

“Who is Maria planning to visit?”

This is not, however, the case in Seediq. Recall that as a T-type ergative language, Seediq does not allow transitive nonfinite clauses. This is because absolutive case is always checked by T, and when T is nonfinite, absolutive case is not available to check with a DP that needs to check case. Therefore nonfinite clauses are always intransitive; only the
external argument PRO can appear in absolutive position. However, extraction of an embedded internal argument is permitted, if the matrix clause is transitive.

Seediq

(57)a. H-m-eidaq [CP m-ari maanu] laqi ka tama?
   -Intr-allow Intr-buy what child Top father
   “What did the father allow the child to buy?”

b. Maanu gaga=na hdieq-un
   what Pres=3s.Erg allow-Tr
   [CP m-ari t ] laqi ka tama?
   Intr-buy child Top father
   “What does the father allow the child to buy?”

I propose that nonfinite T selects a vP which is a weak phase. As a weak phase, this vP cannot have an EPP feature. It will also not be sent to Spell-Out until after the embedded C and its specifiers are merged. This will allow VP-internal material to be attracted directly by the embedded C.
From the embedded [Spec, C], the *wh*-word can be attracted further by the EPP feature on a transitive matrix v and undergo *wh*-movement to the matrix [Spec, C].

There is one final issue to be settled regarding long-distance movement. As discussed in the previous section, PPs can undergo focus movement in Tagalog, regardless of whether the verb is transitive or intransitive.
Tagalog

(60)a. Saán b-um-ilí si Pedro ng libró?
where -Intr.Perf-buy Abs Pedro Obl book
“Where did Pedro buy books?”

b. Saán b-in-ilí ni Pedro ang libró?
where -Tr.Perf-buy Erg Pedro Abs book
“Where did Pedro buy the book?”

In cases of long-distance extraction, just as in the case of DP extraction, the matrix clause must be transitive.

(61)a. Saán s-in-abi ni Maria-ng
where -Tr.Perf-say Erg Maria-Lk

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[\text{CP} & b\text{-um-ilí si Pedro ng libró } t ] \\
\text{Intr-buy} & \text{Abs Pedro Obl book}
\end{array}
\]

“Where did Maria say Pedro bought books?”

b. *Saán nag-sabi si Maria-ng
where Intr.Perf-say Abs Maria-Lk

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[\text{CP} & b\text{-um-ilí si Pedro ng libró } t ] \\
\text{Intr-buy} & \text{Abs Pedro Obl book}
\end{array}
\]

“Where did Maria say Pedro bought books?”

The constraint at work here cannot be whether matrix v has an EPP feature, since EPP features attract DPs and not PPs. The key factor in this case is rather the fact that long distance movement must take place from a CP that has absolutive status. I will adopt a
suggestion from Rackowski and Richards (2003), citing a proposal by Ceplova (2001) that XPs that do not undergo Agree with a phase head are islands to extraction.

(62) **Ceplova’s Generalization**

Only those CPs/DPs which Agree with a phase head on independent grounds can be extracted from.

In the transitive (61a), the matrix v checks case with the embedded CP under an Agree relation but not in (61b). Therefore movement from the CP in (61a) is allowed by (62) but not from the CP in (61b).

(63)  

```
(63)            TP
               \     /  
               vP  \    /  
               PP  \  /   
               María \//    
               tV\(v\)\[a\Abs\]  \  /  
               VP  \//   /
               tV   \\   /  
               CP\[Abs\]  /\  /
               tPP  /\  /
                   \//  /
                    C'

Pedro bought the book tPP
```

4. Agreement Accounts of the Absolutive Extraction Restriction

In the preceding section, I proposed an account of the absolutive restriction on A’-extraction in Seediq and Tagalog. This account is based on my analysis of these languages as ergative. However, this is not a commonly-held view, especially among Generative

---

29 This proposal captures some of the empirical facts accounted for by the CED and is a possible Minimalist replacement for this condition regarding these cases.
linguists. In this section, I will introduce a more widely accepted approach to the extraction restriction, which is based on agreement.

4.1. Thematic Agreement

One agreement approach to the absolutive restriction on extraction posits a checking relationship between morphology on the verb and the thematic role of the moved DP (Schachter and Otanes 1972, Holmer 1996, Chang 1997 and others). For example, in his analysis of Seediq and Kavalan, Chang (1997) views Austronesian languages as having a “voice” system, where various verbal affixes have the function of promoting nominals with different thematic roles to the status of subject³⁰ of the clause. Hence, antipassive is viewed as “actor voice”, since the actor is the “subject”, and basic transitive clauses are viewed as “patient voice”, since the patient or theme is the privileged nominal in this case.

As for clause structure, Chang chooses an approach similar to that of Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis (1992) and proposes that subjects must move overtly from within VP to the rightward [Spec, IP] position. To account for extraction facts, Chang additionally proposes that, on their way to [Spec, IP], subjects first stop in [Spec, VoiceP], where they check “thematic agreement”. This ensures that only the nominals identified as subjects by the verbal morphology can move above VP. In the Seediq example in (64a), the actor has been extracted from an actor voice clause, which derives a grammatical sentence. The actor voice prefix _m_- on the verb correctly agrees with the agent thematic role of the _wh_-word. In (64b), the patient cannot be extracted, because its thematic role does not agree with the actor voice feature on the verb.

³⁰“Subject” refers to the nominal identified as “absolutive” in the current paper.
Seediq (Chang 1997:175)

(64)a. **Ima** ka **m-n-imah** sino?

who Nom AV-Perf-drink wine

“Who drank wine?”

b. *Maanu** ka **m-n-imah** ka Pawan?

what Nom AV-Perf-drink Nom Pawan

“What did Pawan drink?”

c. This approach can also account for the fact that adjuncts like *inu* “where” cannot be

fronted in Seediq, since the locative wh-word does not agree with the actor voice prefix *m-*

on the verb.

(65) *Inu** **m-n-aripatis** Ape?

where Intr-Perf-buy book Ape

“Where did Ape buy books?”
Clear and straightforward though this analysis is, it is overly simplistic and cannot account for a number of facts. For example, an approach based on this type of agreement encounters problems when accounting for the lack of one-to-one correspondence between “voice” affixes and theta roles. In Tagalog, for instance, there are circumstances when a patient or theme absolutive can be licensed by either basic transitive verbal morphology (“patient voice” under Chang’s analysis) or by a locative applicative (“locative voice” according to Chang). The use of the applicative indicates that the theme is less affected by the action of the verb, but we would not expect a change in the thematic role of this argument.

Tagalog

   -Tr.Perf-eat=1s.Erg Abs fish
   “I ate the fish.”
   -Tr.Perf-eat-App=1s.Erg Abs fish
   “I ate some of the fish.”

Seediq, too, does not exhibit a one-to-one correspondence between verbal affixes and thematic roles. In order to extract the theme in (67), the verb must be transitivize, indicated by the suffix -un. This if of course what we expect under Chang’s analysis, since -un agrees with a patient or theme theta-role.
Seediq

(67) Maanu ka wada mah-un na Pawan?
what Top Past drink-Tr Erg Pawan
“What did Pawan drink?”

In the case of verbs expressing transfer of possession, however, the basic transitive suffix is often used to license the goal.

Seediq

(68) Wada=na biq-un sapah ka Awi.
Past=3s.Erg give-Tr house Top Awi
“He/she gave Awi a house.”

The theme becomes the absolutive when the verb takes the applicative s-.

Seediq

(69) Maanu ka wada=na s-bege Awi?
what Top Past=3s.Erg App-give Awi
“What did he/she give to Awi?”

Therefore, a different agreement pattern would need to be stipulated for different types of verbs. -un identifies a theme for most transitive verbs, but a goal with verbs of motion or transfer of possession. This undermines the intuition that these verbal affixes express an intrinsic agreement relationship involving theta-roles.

It is also possible for a single affix to cross-reference different theta roles, as pointed out by Rackowski (2002:107) for Tagalog. In (70a), -um- appears on an antipassive,
where the agent has absolutive case. In (70b), -um- occurs on an unaccusative verb with a theme argument.

**Tagalog**

(70)a. K-um-ain=akó
- Intr.Perf-eat=1s.Abs
  fish
  “I ate a fish.”

b. B-um-agsák ang bató.
- Intr.Perf-fall Abs stone
  “The stone fell.”

More problems arise in cases of long distance movement. In (71), the embedded agent is wh-moved to the matrix [Spec, C]. Chang would be able to account for agreement within the embedded clause, where -um- cross-references the agent. However, the agreement pattern breaks down in matrix clause, where the verb must be transitive, but the wh-word retains its agent theta role.

**Tagalog**

(71) Sino ang [CP s-in-abi ni Maria-ng
  who Abs -Tr.Perf-say Erg Maria-Lk
  [CP t b-um-ilí ng libró]]?
  - Intr.Perf-buy Obl book
  “Who did Maria say bought the book?”

Seediq complex clauses, which Chang does not include in his analysis, present even more problems. As shown in chapter 4, nonfinite clauses are always intransitive, i.e. the verb
takes \textit{m-/um} morphology, which Chang takes to be agreement with an external argument. However, as I shown in the previous section, extraction of internal arguments from nonfinite embedded clauses is permitted, so long as the matrix verb is transitive.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Seediq}
\end{center}

\textbf{(72) Maanu} gaga-na hdieq-\textbf{un} \\
what Pres-3s.Erg allow-Tr \\
\begin{tabular}{c}
\text{[CP m-ari \textit{t} ]} \\
\text{Intr-buy child Top father}
\end{tabular} \\
\text{“What does the father allow the child to buy?”}

Additionally, Chang (1997) proposes no account for differences between languages like Seediq and other Austronesian languages with respect to whether adjuncts are allowed to front. Thematic agreement should rule out the Tagalog examples below where locatives have been extracted from “actor voice” clauses.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Tagalog}
\end{center}

\textbf{(73)a. Saán=ka b-\textbf{um}-ilí ng libró?} \\
where=2s.Abs -Intr.Perf-buy Obl book \\
\text{“Where did you buy books?”}

\textbf{b. Sa Maynila=akó b-\textbf{um}-ilí ng libro.} \\
in Manila=1s.Abs -Intr.Perf-buy Obl book \\
\text{“I bought books in Manila.”}

As I pointed out in chapter 4, VSO Formosan languages also allow fronting of locatives.
Southern Paiwan

(74)a. Inu na-suman tapau ti ama?
where Intr.Perf-build house Abs father
“Where did the father build a house?”

b. Iza tama-su ma-tashi’i lumak-su? (Bunun)
where father-2s.Gen Intr-build house-2s.Gen
“Where did your father build your house?”

The thematic agreement account fails, therefore, on two counts. There is no one-to-one correspondence between verbal morphology and the theta role of the absolutive. Also, this analysis does not offer an explanation for the cross-linguistic variation in locative wh-questions.

4.2. Case Agreement

Georgopoulous (1991), Chung (1994), Chung (1998), Pearson (2001), and Rackowski (2002) propose that wh-movement in a variety of Austronesian languages is intermediated by agreement between the verb and the case of the absolutive DP.

4.2.1. Case Agreement Account of Chamorro

Chung (1994, 1998) proposes a wh-agreement account of A’-extraction in Chamorro. Like Tagalog and Seediq, Chamorro verbs display a range of inflection variation when wh-movement takes place. Chung claims that these affixes register agreement for the nominative, objective, or oblique case of the moved DP.
Unlike Seediq and Tagalog, this special morphology is not visible in Chamorro declarative clauses. Realis transitive verbs in declarative clauses show agreement for number and person with the subject.

(75)a. Ha-atan i taotao mansu i guaga’-na.
   Agr[3s]-watch the man tame the fish.basket-Agr[3sPoss]
   “The tame man looked (in) his basket.” (Chung 1998:21)
b. Ma-fa’gasi i lalahi i kannai-niha.
   Agr[3p]-wash the men the hand-Agr[3p.Poss]
   “The men washed their hands.” (Chung 1998:36)

When wh-movement has occurred, however, the verb shows different types of inflection. Chung claims that -um- on a realis and transitive verb is the realization of nominative case agreement.

(76)a. Hayi f-um-a’gasi t i kareta?
   who WH[Nom]-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 WH[Nom]-wash the car-Agr[1s.Poss]
   “the man who washed my car” (Chung 1998:236)

Agreement for accusative case appears as -in- on a transitive verb.
(77)a. Hafa k-in-annono’-mu t ?
what -WH[Obj]-eat.Prog-Agr[2s]
“What are you eating?” (Chung 1998:237)
b. [Op t-in-aaitai-mu t ] na lepblu
-WH[Obj]-read-Agr[2s] Lk book
“the book that you read” (Chung 1998:237)

Alternatively, -in- may be omitted and subject agreement retained on the verb. Un- and ha- register agreement with the subjects of their respective clauses and not with the wh-words.

(78)a. Hafa un-kakannu’ t ?
what WH[Obj].Agr[2s]-eat.Prog
“What are you eating?” (Chung 1998:239)
b. [i lepblu [Op ni ha-na’i hit si Juan t ]] the book Comp WH[Obj]Agr[3s]-give us Det Juan
“the book that Juan gave us” (Chung 1998:239)

The verb must be nominalized when the extracted nominal is an oblique.

(79)a. Hafa para fa’gase-mmu ni kareta t ?
“What are you going to wash the car with?” (Chung 1998:236)
“the woman they wanted” (Chung 1998:238)
Chung (1998:257) proposes the following rule for wh-agreement in Chamorro.

(80) **Wh-Agreement**

$I^0$ and an $\lambda$-bar-bound trace that is free within $I^0$’s minimal m-command domain must have compatible values for [Case].

In the case of long distance wh-movement, the verb in the originating clause agrees with the case feature of the wh-word, while verbs in higher clauses agree with the case of the complement clause from which the extraction has occurred.

(81)a. Hayi si Manuel h-in-assoso-nna

who Manuel -WH[Obj]-think.Prog-Agr[3s]

[ $t$ ch-um-ulî’ $t$ i salappi’]?

-WH[Nom]-take the money

“Who does Manuel think has taken the money?” (Chung 1998:250)

b. Hafa s-in-angani hao ni chi’lu-mu


[ $t$ malago’-na $t$ ]

WH[Obl].want-Agr[3s]

“What did your sister tell you that she wants?” (Chung 1998:247)

In order to account for this pattern, Chung proposes that the Case feature of a complement CP can propagate to the C head and then to the intermediate wh-trace in its specifier.
This means that the *wh*-phrase will revalue its case feature when it moves through an intermediate CP. When agreement takes place with a verb in a higher clause, agreement will register the case of the CP from which movement has taken place.

To summarize, case agreement is trigged by A’-movement. Infl must have compatible case features with a *wh*-trace in its m-command domain. Different forms of
agreement that appear in long distance movement contexts are the result of revaluing the case feature of the operator when it moves through an intermediate CP.

4.2.2. Case Agreement Approach to Palauan

*Wh*-agreement in Palauan seems to be a bit less complex than in Chamorro. According to Georgopoulos (1991), the mood of the verb agrees with the Case of the extracted XP. The verb is inflected for realis mood when a subject is extracted. (84a) shows an example of topicalization and (84b) a *wh*-question.

(84)a. a sensei a omes er a rengalek t
   teacher Real.Imper.look P children
   “The teacher is looking at the children.” (Georgopoulos 1991:84)

b. ng-te’a a kileld-ii a sub t
   Cl-who Real.Perf.heat-3s soup
   “Who heated up the soup?” (Georgopoulos 1991:88)

The verb is inflected for irrealis mood when a VP-internal XP is extracted.

(85)a. a blai a le-silseb-ii t a se’el-ik
   house Irr-3.Perf.burn-3s friend-1s
   “My friend burned down the house.” (Georgopoulos 1991:87)

b. ng-te’a a l-ulekod-ir t a rubak
   Cl-who Irr-3.Perf.kill-3s old.man
   “Who did the old man kill?” (Georgopoulos 1991:88)

*Wh*-words extracted from PPs are resumed by a pronoun.
In the case of long distance movement, only the verb in the originating clause agrees with the Case of the moved XP. Higher clauses are inflected to agree with the Case of the CP from which the movement has taken place, just as in Chamorro.

(87)a. ng-te’a [a l-oumerang [el d-omdasu
   Cl-who Irr-3.believe Comp Irr-1p.think
   [e ng-mo er a siabal i]]
   Comp Real-go P Japan
   “Who do they believe that we think will go to Japan?” (Georgopoulos 1991:92)

b. ng-gera, [a ‘om-dilu [el longiil er ngak
   Cl-what Irr-2.said C Irr-3.wait P me
   [el bo kuruul er ngii]]
   Comp Irr-Fut Irr-do P it
   “What did you say that they’re waiting for me to do?” (Georgopoulos 1991:93)

Georgopoulos proposes the following.
(88) **WH agreement**

In the S-structure domain between an A’ binder and its variable, Inflection agrees with

a. the Case of the argument containing the variable, or
b. the Case of the variable.

In a local dependency, for instance a cleft, the head of the free relative is coindexed with the variable by chain binding\(^{31}\) in relativization, and case is assigned to the chain. The case feature is then passed to the matrix NP, which shares it with matrix Infl, through their Spec-Head relationship. The following structure is adapted from Georgopoulos (1991:134). The subscript indicates the case feature.

\[(89)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{I’} \\
\text{I}_x & \text{NP}_x & \text{NP}_x \\
\text{IP} \\
\text{… e}_x \text{…}
\end{array}
\]

In a long distance dependency, Infl in the clause containing the variable agrees with the case feature of the variable. In (90), this agreement takes place in a Spec-Head configuration. If the variable were in non-subject position, its case feature would be passed along the g-projections (in the sense of Kayne 1983) of its governor to Infl. Matrix Infl must

\[^{31}\text{Georgopoulos, for independent reasons, proposes a base-generation account of A’-dependencies in Palauan. Operators are merged in their surface positions and coindexed with resumptive pronouns that function as variables. For this reason, there will be no wh-trace in an intermediate [Spec, CP].}\]
agree with the case of the complement CP. The fact that the complement CP contains a variable is transmitted to matrix Infl as a syntactic feature, so this Infl knows that it must establish an agreement relation with this CP. The case feature is then passed to the head of the relative clause and shared with the matrix NP and matrix Infl. This means that case cannot be assigned to the A' chain between the head of the relative clause and the variable, since the case feature of the former must be that of the embedded CP and not that of the variable itself.

(90)  

(adapted from Georgopoulos 1991:135)

To summarize, agreement takes place in either a Spec-Head or government (following g-projections) configuration. Case assignment to the chain and case agreement must have different mechanisms in local and long distance dependencies. In addition, a special mechanism must be invoked in long distance binding contexts to inform Infl that an XP in the clause contains a variable.
4.2.3. Case Agreement for Malagasy

Malagasy also exhibits the extraction asymmetry. An internal argument cannot be extracted from a clause in which the external argument is the topic (absolutive).

(91)a. *ny akoho [namono tamin’ny antsy ny mpamboly
   Det chicken Past.AT.kill Past.with.Det knife Det farmer
   “the chicken which the farmer killed with the knife”

b. ny akoho [novonoin’ny mpamboly
   Det chicken Past.TT.kill Det farmer
tamin’ny antsy
   Past.with.Det knife
   “the chicken which the farmer killed with the knife” (Pearson 2001:129)

Under Pearson’s (2001) analysis, the wh-operator must move to the pivot and topic positions. As I presented in chapter 4, a specific DP in a declarative clause is merged with an interpretable [op] feature, which forces this DP to move to [Spec, Piv], where it checks case agreement.

(92)a. Nohanin-ny gidro ny voankazo.
   Past.AccP.eat Det lemur Det fruit
   “The lemur ate the fruit.” (Pearson 2001:172)
Next, the topic DP moves to [Spec, Top], which has [D] and [op] features. Predicate-initial word order is derived by fronting the remainder of the clause to the outer specifier of Top.

In the case of A′-movement, the [op] feature is assigned to the operator. Movement to [Spec, Piv] and case agreement take place as in declarative clauses. Movement then targets [Spec, Wh], which is located in the same position as TopP but whose head contains a [q] feature to be checked with the operator.
Long distance extraction is derived through clausal pied-piping. The embedded absolutive first moves to the pivot and topic positions in the originating clause. TopP inherits the [op] feature from the DP in its specifier, so when the matrix Piv scans for an [op] feature, it attracts the embedded clause.

(95)a. Kasain-dRasoa [hosasana ɪ t ]i Koto.
   TT.intend-Rasoa Irr.wash Det Koto
   “Koto, Rasoa intends to wash him.”

b. (adapted from Pearson 2001:126)

   Next, the embedded topic is attracted to the matrix [Spec, Top] to check the [op] and [D] features of this projection.
To summarize, Pearson (2001) requires special features and functional projections in order to ensure that case agreement takes place. First, a DP must be merged with an [op] feature so that something will always be attracted to [Spec, Piv]. PivP, too, exists solely for the purposes of case agreement. Additionally, Pearson must stipulate that an [op] feature be inherited by an embedded Top so that the clause can be pied-piped in cases of long distance extraction.

4.2.4. Case Agreement for Tagalog

Rackowski (2002) proposes a case agreement analysis of Tagalog. Nominative case is checked by T and accusative by v. Inherent oblique case is assigned by applicative projections to DPs in their specifiers. Absolutives are assumed by Rackowski to be subjects. Under her analysis, the subject is defined as the nominal which is located closest to T in the structure and undergoes an agreement relation with T.

The subject is sometimes the nominative DP merged in external argument position. It can also be an internal argument which has raised to the edge of the argument structure domain. By exploiting the generalization that absolutes are always specific and antipassive direct objects generally nonspecific, Rackowski proposes (following Diesing 1992 and others) that specific VP-internal DPs undergo object shift to become the closest DP to T and will therefore be the nominal to agree with T. When Agree obtains between T and the
subject, the case feature of the subject is copied to T and appears as voice morphology (-in, -um-, or an applicative) on the verb.

(97) shows a transitive clause, where the theme has absolutive status. For Rackowski, this is an example of accusative agreement. Under her analysis, accusative case is checked by v with the internal argument in its base position.

(97)a. Lu-lutu-in ng lalaki ang adobo.
    Asp-cook-Acc Case man Ang adobo
    “The man will cook the adobo.” (Rackowski 2002:112)

b. VoiceP
   mān
    voice VP
     V[CV[ VP
         cook adobo[ACC]

The direct object then shifts to the VoiceP phase edge (because it is specific). When T is merged into the structure, it probes into its domain for a DP to check its uninterpretable features. The closest DP is the theme argument, located in the outer specifier of Voice. Agree takes place between this DP and T, and the accusative case feature of the theme is copied to the verb and spelled-out as the voice marker -in.
(98) gives the derivation of the antipassive version of (97). In Rackowski’s terms, this is an instance of nominative case agreement. The internal argument is nonspecific and will not undergo object shift. When T probes for a DP, it will now agree with the external argument, which is merged in [Spec, Voice]. The nominative case feature on this DP is then spelled out on the verb as a reflex of -um-.

(99) gives the derivation of the antipassive version of (97). In Rackowski’s terms, this is an instance of nominative case agreement. The internal argument is nonspecific and will not undergo object shift. When T probes for a DP, it will now agree with the external argument, which is merged in [Spec, Voice]. The nominative case feature on this DP is then spelled out on the verb as a reflex of -um-.

(99) gives the derivation of the antipassive version of (97). In Rackowski’s terms, this is an instance of nominative case agreement. The internal argument is nonspecific and will not undergo object shift. When T probes for a DP, it will now agree with the external argument, which is merged in [Spec, Voice]. The nominative case feature on this DP is then spelled out on the verb as a reflex of -um-.

In cases of long distance wh-movement, Rackowski (2002) claims that the complement CP is the subject of the matrix clause and moves to the outer specifier of Voice to agree with T. The wh-word moving from the embedded clause is located in [Spec, C] of this clause, i.e. the phase edge, and can then be attracted by the matrix C.
To summarize, case agreement is triggered by the movement of a specific DP to the vP phase edge. In the case of long distance extraction, it must be stipulated that CP becomes the subject, since this movement could not be motivated by semantic factors such as specificity.

5. Problems with the Case Agreement Approach

The case agreement analyses sketched in section 4 are all intended to account for the absolutive restriction on extraction in an Austronesian language. However, there is tremendous variety among the mechanisms proposed for each language. First, the structural configuration in which agreement takes place is different in every case. For the Tagalog analysis, it is a Probe/Goal relation between T and a specifier of v. For Malagasy, it is a
Spec-Head configuration in the C domain. In the Chamorro analysis, it is a government relation between Infl and a \textit{wh}-trace. The Palauan analysis incorporates government and Spec-Head configurations, and allows for case agreement to take place between Infl and the variable itself or with an XP containing the variable.

The trigger for case agreement also takes different forms. In Tagalog, it is the specificity of the DP which becomes subject. In Malagasy, it is the [op] feature which is assigned to a DP at the time of merge. In Chamorro and Palauan, it is the existence of a variable (or XP containing a variable) in the m-command domain of Infl.

It should be clear from this summary that each proposal for Austronesian case agreement is unique in certain ways. Many of them also require stipulation of mechanisms, as noted in the appropriate subsections in section 4, specifically for the purpose of ensuring case agreement. However, the fact that this empirical phenomenon is so pervasive in one language family suggests the possibility of a uniform analysis. In section 6, I will show how the restriction on A’-dependencies in Malagasy, Chamorro, and Palauan can be subsumed under the analysis of the absolutive restriction on extraction which I have proposed for Tagalog and Seediq in section 3. I will also show how this analysis can be extended further to include Indonesian, a language in which the correlation between A’-movement and verbal morphology is not very amenable to a case agreement approach. In the present section, I discuss some specific problems with Rackowski’s (2002) analysis of Tagalog.

5.1. Specific Direct Objects in Antipassives

According to Rackowski’s proposal, T will agree with a specific theme or patient argument that has undergone object shift to the outer specifier of Voice. This nominal will then be identified as the subject and the verb will carry -\textit{in}-/-\textit{in}- morphology. As I have shown in chapter 2, direct objects of antipassive -\textit{um}- verbs tend to be nonspecific. Under Rackowski’s analysis, they do not undergo specificity shift. However, there is one
environment where this constraint on specificity is relaxed. Specifically, this happens when extraction of the external argument has occurred, for instance in a cleft or relative clause. (101a) shows a declarative antipassive clause. The internal argument is interpreted as nonspecific. (101b) shows a clefted version of (101a) formed on the agent. It is possible for the oblique object to be interpreted as definite and specific.

(101)a. K-um-ain=ako ng isdá.
    -Intr.Perf-eat=1s.Abs Obl fish
    “I ate (a) fish.”

b. Ako ang k-um-ain ng isdá.
    1s.Abs Abs -Intr.Perf-eat Obl fish
    “I am the one who ate a/the fish.”

Under Rackowski’s analysis, a specific internal argument will move to the vP phase edge and copy its case features to T. This in effect would disallow specific direct objects in antipassives and predict (incorrectly) that (101b) is ungrammatical.

(102)
Rackowski recognizes this as a potential problem and attempts to avoid it with the stipulation that when T carries a [uOp] feature (as it must in A'-extraction contexts), this feature must be bundled together with the [uCase] feature, requiring that the operator be the DP to undergo case agreement with T. Rackowski claims that specificity shift of the object is blocked if that shift would prevent T from checking both its operator and case features with the operator in the external argument position. In this situation, the object is allowed to be interpreted as specific in its base position.

(103)

\[ T \rightarrow V \]

\[ eat + T_{[uOp, uCase]} \]

\[ V \rightarrow \]

\[ Op \rightarrow \]

\[ Voice \rightarrow vP \]

\[ v \rightarrow VP \]

\[ t_{eat} \]

\[ fish \]

The problem is that this stipulation undermines the mechanism which feeds case agreement. Specificity shift, which provides an elegant means of moving the subject into a position where it can agree with T, must be abandoned in the case of operator movement.

That difficulty does not arise in my analysis, since identification of the absolutive is not dependent upon semantic criteria like specificity. Rather, the specific interpretation of the object is a consequence of the structural properties of the clause. In the cleft in (101b), the direct object is contained within the headless relative portion of the clause, located in the matrix subject position, which is located outside the nuclear scope (in the sense of Diesing 1992), and receives a presuppositional interpretation at LF.
It should be pointed out that, since the embedded verb is intransitive; this \( v \) does not have an EPP feature. Therefore the embedded object is not forced to move out of VP within the relative clause. However, this does not necessarily force a nonspecific interpretation on the object. Diesing (1992) notes a parallel with German. Scrambling forces a presuppositional reading for the raised DP. But a DP which remains inside VP prior to Spell-Out can still undergo QR at LF and escape existential closure, if it is specific or quantificational. Therefore, a specific interpretation should still be possible for an oblique DP in an antipassive, since QR is available independent of whether \( v \) has an EPP feature.

Another problem for Rackowski’s analysis is that it predicts that a specific interpretation for an antipassive object should be possible any time the external argument is extracted. As we have seen, an oblique object contained in the relative clause of a pseudocleft can be interpreted as specific, since the containing relative clause gets a presuppositional reading at LF. However, if the oblique object is embedded inside a relative
clause in argument position, interpretation of the object is dependent on the position in the matrix clause of the containing relative.

If the matrix clause is transitive and the relative is in direct object position, then the relative clause will be attracted by the EPP feature on matrix v and raise out of the domain of existential closure. The relative clause as a whole will therefore receive a presuppositional interpretation. An embedded oblique object may also be interpreted as specific, just as in the case of pseudoclefts observed above.

(105)a. B-in-ilí =ko ang pusa-ng k-um-ain ng dagá.
-Tr.Perf-buy=1s.Erg Abs cat-Lk -Intr.Perf-eat Obl rat
“I bought the cat which ate a/the rat.”

b. 

If, however, the containing relative clause is itself the oblique object in a matrix antipassive, then the relative as a whole, including the embedded object, must receive a nonspecific interpretation. This is expected, since the relative clause will remain inside VP and undergo existential closure at LF.
The contrast between (105) and (106) shows that mapping in the matrix clause plays a crucial role in determining specificity of an embedded oblique object. And since the relative clauses in both (105) and (106) are formed through extraction of the agent, specificity of the object is clearly not tied to the presence of an operator in external argument position, showing the inadequacy of Rackowski’s (2002) account.

5.2. Case-checking in Applicative Constructions

Under Rackowski’s (2002) case agreement analysis, monotransitive verbs check accusative case with the internal argument. A specific direct object raises to the outer specifier of Voice where it agrees with T and copies its case feature to the verb, spelled out in this case as -in.
In applicative constructions, Rackowski follows Pylkkänen (2002) in merging an applied object directly into the specifier of an applicative projection, where it receives inherent oblique case. The applied DP then raises to the outer specifier of Voice to agree with T, and the case feature is spelled out as the applicative affix on the verb, either -i- or -an.

However, since applicatives appear on transitive verbs which should otherwise check accusative case, there remains a question as to the fate of the accusative case feature of this verb. The presence of the applicative projection should block agreement between v and the theme DP. Because of this, Rackowski claims that the theme is assigned inherent case in this situation. But the verb, which is the same verb as in the monotransitive example in (107), should still have an unchecked case feature.
Under the current proposal, applicative constructions do not pose this type of problem. As discussed in chapter 2, the applied argument is merged directly in the specifier of the applicative projection, following Marantz (1993). In this position, the applied DP checks absolutive case with v, while oblique objects are assigned inherent case, just as they are in antipassives.

5.3. Function of Subject

Rackowski claims that Tagalog patterns with accusative languages in its case marking system. Case is checked or assigned to nominals in their base positions, as follows.
However, this case assignment system is not made to correlate with grammatical function. Rackowski states that the subject of a clause is structurally the highest nominal and the one that agrees with T for case features. This nominal does not, however, necessarily function as subject. As discussed at length in chapter 2, in transitive clauses in ergative languages like Tagalog, the ergative nominal functions as the subject in many respects. The ergative DP is able to bind reflexives, serve as an imperative addressee, and be controlled PRO in a nonfinite clause.

Rackowski’s subject may also carry any of the above cases, including accusative. This irregularity might be dismissed as an example of quirky case-marking. Subjects in a large variety of languages (including Icelandic, Japanese, Russian, Tamil, and many others) appear in non-nominative case under certain circumstances. It should be noted, however, that quirky case in these languages is typically identified with a semantic role, for instance experiencer. This split in case-marking, then, can be reduced to different roles of the external argument: nominative-marked agents and non-nominative-marked experiencers.

However, if Rackowski’s system were taken to be an example of quirky case-marking, a very different picture would emerge. Here, the aberrant case shows up not on external arguments but rather on internal arguments which have been promoted to subject status. In applicative constructions, the subject would carry dative or instrumental case. A theme or patient subject would have accusative case. It should be noted that accusative subjects occur very rarely cross-linguistically.
The system depicted in (110) actually forces a unique view of grammatical functions in Tagalog that is reminiscent of Schachter (1976). As I have discussed in chapter 2, Schachter claims that subject properties in Philippine languages are divided between the ang-marked absolutive and the external argument. In Rackowski’s case agreement analysis, the subject is the DP that agrees with T and enjoys the A’-extraction privilege. The external argument is merged in the highest position in argument structure and checks nominative case with T.

I have shown in chapter 2 and again in section 3 of this chapter how this split in subject properties, which is a pervasive characteristic of syntactic ergativity, can be accounted for in an ergative analysis of Tagalog syntax, without having to posit a separate typological class and unique syntactic analysis for this language.

5.4. Applied Objects as Objects or Subjects?

Under Rackowski’s (2002) case agreement analysis, the applied object in applicative constructions is merged directly in the specifier of Appl, where it is assigned inherent case.

(111)a. I-t-in-awa ng lalaki ang kanyáng asawa.
App-Perf.laugh Erg man Abs his wife

“The man laughed for his wife.”
When this DP raises in specificity shift, its case feature is copied to T (to be spelled out as applicative morphology on the verb), and the applied object is identified as the subject of the clause.

There is some doubt, however, as to whether the applied DP should be considered a subject. Cross-linguistically, applicatives are thought to license or create direct objects with accusative structural case (Marantz 1984, Baker 1988, and others), but Rackowski claims they have inherent oblique case.
In many languages with applicative constructions, the applied object takes on the properties of direct object (Chichewa; Baker 1988). In (113a) the benefactive applied argument controls object agreement. In (113b), this argument becomes the subject of a passive.

Chichewa (Baker 1988:247-8)

(113)a. Amayi a-ku-mu-umb-ir-a mtsuko mwana.
   woman Subj-Pres-Obj-mold-for-Asp waterpot child
   “The woman is molding the waterpot for the child.”

   zebras Subj-Past-buy-for-Pass-Asp shoes by hare
   “The zebras were bought shoes by the hare.”

These functions of the accusative DPs in these constructions are unavailable to the theme argument, i.e. the underlying direct object.

Chichewa (Baker 1988:247-8)

(114)a.*Amayi a-na-umb-ir-a mwana mtsuko.
   Woman Subj-Past-Obj-mold-for-Asp child waterpot
   “The woman is molding the waterpot for the child.”

b. *Nsapato zi-na-gul-idw-a mbidzi (ndi kalulu).
   shoes Subj-Past-buy-for-Pass-Asp zebras by hare
   “Shoes were bought for the zebras by the hare.”
Rackowski’s treatment of applied objects as subjects in Tagalog would be difficult to reconcile with the clear object properties of applied DPs in other languages. This, again, is an undesirable typological consequence.

The current proposal does not suffer from this lack of cross-linguistic applicability. Applied objects check absolutive case with v and therefore should have the grammatical properties of absolutes, canonical direct objects in ergative languages. The object properties of applied objects are therefore accounted for automatically.

(115) TP
    laugh
    vP
    man
    tV+Appl+v[Abs]
    ApplP
        wife[Abs]
        tV+Appl
        VP

6. Ergative Analysis Extended to Other Austronesian Languages

In section 4, I introduced four case agreement analyses, which were each developed for a different Austronesian language. In section 5, I outlined some problems faced by the case agreement approach proposed for Tagalog by Rackowski (2002). In this section, I show how the ergative approach of this thesis can account for extraction facts in all of these languages, in the hope that a unified analysis may eventually be developed, which accounts not only for Austronesian syntax but also provides a platform for comparison with ergative languages outside the Austronesian family.
6.1. Indonesian

In chapter 2, I proposed an analysis of case-checking in Indonesian. In this section, I will extend that analysis to account for extraction facts. I will also show that the case agreement approach would not be able to account for the same range of facts.

The analysis of Indonesian case-checking which I presented in chapter 2 is as follows. T checks nominative case and v accusative in an active clause. As I pointed out earlier, this differs minimally from the ergative-absolutive Tagalog system, where absolutive case is checked by either v or T, depending on the transitivity of the verb.

(116)a. Indonesian Case-checking

T = Nominative
v = Accusative

b. Tagalog Case-checking

T = Absolutive (intransitive verb)
v = Absolutive (transitive verb)

The extraction restriction, however, is analyzed in essentially the same way in Tagalog and Indonesian. In chapter 2, I proposed that in active clauses in Indonesian, like intransitives in Tagalog, v does not have an EPP feature. Only passive v in Indonesian (analogous to transitive in Tagalog) will carry an EPP feature and allow extraction of an internal argument.

The extraction facts are accounted for in the following way. In an active clause, the external argument wh-phrase in [Spec, v] is attracted by C. v checks accusative case with the highest VP-internal DP. But no DP can raise out of VP, since there is no EPP feature on
v. *Wh*-questions in Indonesian, like in Tagalog and Seediq, take the form of clefts. It is therefore a null operator that moves and not the *wh*-word itself.

(117)a. Siapa yang mem-beli buku-nya?

who C Act-give book-Def

“Who bought the book?”

b. 

```
CP
    Op[Nom] C'
        C[EPP] TP
            meN[uNom] vP
                tOp v' v[μAcc] VP
                    V book[Acc]
```

Internal arguments can be extracted only in passive clauses, when *v* has an EPP feature.

(118)a. Apa yang di-beli Ali?

what C Pass-buy Ali

“What did Ali buy?”
As in Tagalog and Seediq, applied objects are merged between vP and VP. These check accusative case with v in active clauses. Again, since there is no EPP feature on v, they are not eligible to undergo A’-movement.

(119)a.*Siapa yang Ali mem-beli-kan buku?

“Who did Ali buy a book?”
Internal arguments can be extracted only in passive clauses, when v has an EPP feature. The applied object will be the one to move in a passive applicative construction.

(120)a. Siapa yang di-beli-kan buku oleh Ali?

who C Pass-buy-App book by Ali

“Who was bought a book for by Ali?”
To summarize, nominative and accusative case are checked, respectively by T and v. However, this otherwise accusative language retains one property of ergative syntax: the extraction restriction. Only subjects can undergo A’-movement. This is accounted for in parallel fashion to the ergative languages Tagalog and Seediq. The passive prefix *di-* has an EPP feature, which allows an internal argument to move out of VP.

These facts about extraction in Indonesian pose a very serious challenge for a case agreement analysis. The reason is because there is not always a one-to-one correspondence between case and agreement markers on the verb. In a monotransitive construction, *meng-* might be viewed as nominative and *di-* as accusative agreement. However, when an applicative is involved, complications arise. Consider again applicative constructions. Like other accusative languages with applicative constructions, applicative morphology can appear on both active and passive verbs. In the active clause in (121a), the applied object remains in the VP, while the external argument is licensed as the subject. In the passive
clause in (121b), the applied object raises to subject position to check nominative case. It should be noted that this is the same behavior just observed for applied objects in Chichewa.

   “Ali bought Nuri a book.”

   “Nuri was bought a book by Ali.”

As for A’-extraction, only the subject is eligible to move, as shown above. In an active clause, only the external argument subject can be extracted. Not even the applied object is eligible. The applied object can be extracted only in the case of a passive applicative construction.

(122)a. Siapa yang  mem-beli  buku-nya?
   who  C  Act-give  book-Def
   “Who bought the book?”

b. *Siapa yang Ali  mem-beli-kan buku?
   “Who did Ali buy a book?”

c. Siapa yang  di-beli-kan buku oleh Ali?
   who  C  Pass-buy-App  book by  Ali
   “Who was bought a book by Ali?”
If we assume that the applied object is assigned inherent oblique case, then this case could be responsible for the appearance of -kan on the verb, as the reflex of the case agreement relationship between this argument and T. However, the verb must also carry the passive marker di-. A case agreement analysis would imply that applied objects would have to have two case features in Indonesian in order to extract: oblique and accusative. Therefore, Indonesian is an Austronesian language which has the extraction restriction but for which there cannot be established the one-to-one-correspondence between voice affixes and DP case features which is necessary under a case agreement approach.

6.2. Chamorro

The analysis proposed in this thesis may also be able to account for wh-extraction in Chamorro. I will not consider the question of whether Chamorro is an ergative language. Cooreman et al. (1984) and Cooreman (1987) take the ergative view, while Chung (1998) claims it is accusative. Campana (1992) proposes a split-ergative analysis. As I have shown in the preceding subsection for Indonesian, it is not necessary for the language to display ergative morphology while still maintaining the extraction restriction. In the case of Indonesian, this is a remnant of historical change. Chamorro and Palauan are classified as Western Austronesian languages and not Oceanic (Lynch 1998, Topping 1973, and others) and as such have close historical ties to the languages of either the Philippines or Indonesia.

Parallels between Chamorro and Philippine languages can be found in the verbal morphology. As in Tagalog, -um- is used to form intransitive verbs.

(123)a. M-um-etgot i lahi.
   -Intr-become.strong the man
   “The man became strong.”
b. **S-um-ag a yo’ gi gima’**.

-Intr-stay I at home

“I stayed at home.”

(Topping 1973:226)

As discussed above, transitive verbs in declarative clauses have no -*um*- and are prefixed with subject agreement.

(124)a. **Ha-atan i taotao mansu i guaga’-na**.

Agr[3s]-watch the man tame the fish.basket-Agr[3s.Poss]

“The tame man looked (in) his basket.”

(Chung 1998:21)

b. **Ma-fa’gasi i lalahi i kannai-niha**.

Agr[3p]-wash the men the hand-Agr[3p.Poss]

“The men washed their hands.”

(Chung 1998:36)

Chamorro also has -*in*-, though it marks passive in this language and not transitive.

(125) **Ni-li’i as Juan nigap**.

3s.Pass-see Obl Juan yesterday

“She was seen by Juan yesterday.”

Given this background, *wh*-extraction can be accounted for in a way parallel to Tagalog, Seediq, and Indonesian. Recall from section 4 Chung’s proposal for case agreement.
Case Agreement Approach

(126) Nominative  \(-\text{um-}\)  
Accusative  \(-\text{in-}\) or subject agreement  
Oblique  nominalization

In contrast to this, I propose the following approach, which accounts for the extraction restriction in Chamorro as a remnant of earlier ergative syntax.

(127) Chamorro (Remnant) Ergative Analysis

v has no EPP feature:  \(-\text{um-}\)  
v has an EPP feature:  \(-\text{in-}\)  

subject agreement  
nominalization

The derivations are as follows. As in Tagalog, \(-\text{um-}\) appears only in syntactically intransitive clauses, where there will be no EPP feature on v, therefore allowing only extraction of external arguments.

(128)a. Hayi  \(\text{-um-}a\’gasi\)  \(t\)  \(i\) kareta?  
who  WH[Nom]-wash  the  car

“Who washed the car?”  
(Chung 1998:236)
The direct object can be extracted from a transitive clause (with subject agreement) for the same reason as in Tagalog: transitive v can host an EPP feature.

(129)a. Hafa un-kakannu’ t ?
what WH[Obj].Agr[2s]-eat.Prog
“What are you eating?”

(Chung 1998:239)
Direct objects can also be extracted when the verb is inflected with passive morphology.

(130) Hafa k-in-anono’-mu t ?
    what -WH[Obj]-eat.Prog-Agr[2s]

“What are you eating?” (Chung 1998:237)

This is reminiscent of both Tagalog and Indonesian. This morpheme is cognate with the transitive perfective marker in Tagalog. In its syntactic behavior, it resembles passive morphology in Indonesian. Whether it is considered to be more closely tied to transitivity or passive voice, it is clear that it occurs in clauses where an EPP feature appears on v. To derive a passive clause, the EPP on v attracts the internal argument to v’s outer specifier, from where this DP continues to subject position, as in an Indonesian passive.

(131)a. Ni-li’i as Juan nigap.
    3s.Pass-see Obl Juan yesterday

“She was seen by Juan yesterday.”
In cases of *wh*-extraction, the internal argument proceeds directly to [Spec, C], bypassing subject position\(^{32}\).

(132)a. Hafa k-\textbf{in}-annono’-mu \(t\) ?

what -WH[Obj]-eat.Prog-Agr[2s]

“What are you eating?” (Chung 1998:237)

\(^{32}\) Chung (1998) claims that the passive *-in- is distinct from the *-in- found in *wh*-extraction contexts. Following Chung, I also assume this to be the case. The *wh*-moved object, therefore, will be able to check case inside VP and need not move through subject position.
The fact that the verb must be nominalized in order to extract an oblique may be a strategy employed for avoiding a minimality violation which would be incurred by extracting over the direct object.

(133) Hafa para fa’gase-mmu ni kareta t  ?

“What are you going to wash the car with?” (Chung 1998:236)

In a transitive clause, the direct object would be merged above the adjunct. Attract Closest would ensure that the EPP feature on v attract the direct object and not the adjunct.
Long distance *wh*-movement behaves exactly as it does in Tagalog. Extraction is permitted only when the matrix verb is transitive.

(135)a. Hayi si Manuel h-in-assoso-nna

who Manuel-WH[Obj]-think.Prog-Agr[3s]

[ch-um-uli’ t i salappi’]? 

-WH[Nom]-take the money

“Who does Manuel think has taken the money?” (Chung 1998:250)
6.3. Palauan

The account of Palauan is even more straightforward than Chamorro, since there is only a two-way morphological distinction. The verb is inflected for realiz mood when the subject is extracted and irrealis for movement of VP-internal material.

(136)a. ng-te’ a a kileld-ii a sub t
   Cl-who Real.Perf.heat-3s soup
   “Who heated up the soup?”

b. ng-te’a a l-ulekod-ir t a rubak
   Cl-who Irr-3.Perf.kill-3s old.man
   “Who did the old man kill?” (Georgopulos 1991:88)

Under the current analysis, irrealis accompanies an EPP feature on v, while realiz does not. Note that the generalization can be extended to long distance movement. Higher verbs along the path of movement must be irrealis.
6.4. Malagasy

There is also no need to resort to case agreement in Malagasy. The extraction asymmetry observed in section 3.3.3 is exactly parallel to Tagalog. I take theme topic morphology -in to accompany an EPP feature on v, while actor topic morphology m- (n- in past tense) does not.

(138)a. ny akoho
Det chicken

[novonoin'ny mpamboly tamin'ny antsy]
Past.TT.kill.Det farmer Past.with.Det knife

“the chicken which the farmer killed with the knife”
(139)a. *ny akoho [namono tamin’ny antsy ny mpamboly]
   Det chicken Past.AT.kill Past.with.Det knife Det farmer
   “the chicken which the farmer killed with the knife”

b. Under this approach, there is no need to posit a PivP. It is also unnecessary to
   stipulate that one DP must be merged with an [op] feature. It is the verbal morphology and
the merged position of the absolutive DP that determines what is eligible to undergo movement.

To summarize section 6, I have shown how the analysis developed in section 3 for the absolutive extraction restriction in Seediq and Tagalog can be extended to other Austronesian languages. This provides a unified analysis in place of the disparate proposals put forth in the literature utilizing the concept of case agreement. My proposal is also able to account for the same extraction restriction in Indonesian, a language for a case agreement analysis is particularly unsuited.

7. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have shown how the analysis of ergativity proposed in chapter 2 accounts for the absolutive restriction on extraction. Only transitive v hosts an EPP feature to attract a VP-internal DP to the vP phase edge. This ensures that the DP attracted by C will always be the absolutive: the internal argument absolutive in a transitive clause, the external argument in an antipassive, or the single argument of an intransitive verb.

I have also extended this analysis to other Austronesian languages. I have identified weaknesses in accounts based on case agreement and shown that a unified analysis of the extraction restriction is possible under the current proposal.

Additionally, I have proposed a structure for DP wh-questions in Tagalog and Seediq, which are derived through predicate-fronting in parallel fashion to other non-verbal predicate structures in these languages. I have further shown how the predicate-fronting analysis proposed in chapter 4 provides an explanation for why DP wh-questions in these languages must take the form of clefts and cannot be derived through DP wh-movement.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

This thesis has proposed a typology of syntactic ergativity and verb-initial word order within the theory of Multiple Spell-Out. Most of the empirical foundation for this study comes from the Austronesian languages Tagalog and Seediq. However, supporting evidence from other languages, some Austronesian and others outside the Austronesian family, has served to substantiate the broader applicability of these claims.

The analysis of ergativity has concluded that there are two types of syntactically ergative language, v-type and T-type. The two differ in terms of the roles played by T and v in checking absolutive case. In T-type languages, absolutive case is checked uniformly by T. In v-type languages, case is checked by T in intransitive clauses but by v in transitive clauses. I showed that Tagalog, Malagasy, and Eskimo languages belong to v-type, while Seediq, Dyirbal, and Mayan languages belong to T-type.

(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolutive Case-checking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive clause:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive clause:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to case-checking, I proposed an analysis of the absolutive restriction on extraction. In syntactically ergative languages of both types, only a DP with absolutive status can undergo A’-movement. I proposed that transitive v hosts an EPP feature, which draws the absolutive DP into its outer specifier, from where it can undergo further movement to [Spec, C]. Antipassive v does not have an EPP feature, thereby preventing an oblique
object from moving to the vP phase edge and ensuring that this DP will not be A’-extracted from the clause.

In terms of word order, I have shown that Tagalog is very similar to Celtic and Semitic languages, VSO order being derived through head movement of the verb to a position above vP. The ergative and absolutive nominals remain in their base positions in unmarked word order.

For VOS order in Seediq, I have proposed a predicate-fronting account. The absolutive DP moves to a topic position in the C domain. Subsequently, the remnant TP moves further to its left. I have shown that TP-fronting is not driven by feature-checking. Rather, VOS word order is the indirect result of a general prohibition on spelling out a DP in initial position in a phase.

\[(2) \quad \textbf{Stranded DP Constraint} \quad \text{(applies at PF)} \]

A DP cannot be spelled out in the leftmost position in a phase edge.

The TP is not directly attracted to [Spec, C] by the DP already there. Rather, TP-fronting is free to take place or not. If it does not, then (2) will cause the derivation to crash at PF. If it does take place, then the derivation converges.

I have shown that this predicate-fronting analysis can account for VOS word order not only in Seediq, but also in Malagasy and Niuean. Optional VOS word order in Tagalog can also be subsumed under this analysis. Additionally, the fact that predicate-fronting is optional in Tagalog and only takes place when the absolutive is dislocated provides crucial evidence that TP-fronting correlates with topicalization of the absolutive and is not contingent on morphological properties of T.

I have suggested that the word order constraint in (2) is ultimately rooted in the way in which Austronesian clause structure is mapped to interpretation at LF.
(3) **Phase Edge Interpretation**

If the edge of a phase HP has the form \([HP \ XP \ [DP \ldots]]\), where X is not D, DP is mapped to the presupposition and XP to focus.

I have shown that in VOS clauses, the predicate contains new or focused information, while the absolutive is always definite or topicalized. I have shown further that \([XP \ DP \ldots]\) word order in the C domain in other constructions, such as multiple *wh*-questions and the bodyguard construction in Malagasy, provide further evidence for this mapping. The fact that DP *wh*-questions take the form of defts in most Austronesian languages can also be explained as a consequence of (3).
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