

## On the Left Periphery in Indonesian

Indonesian is typologically unusual in permitting both *wh*-fronting and *wh*-in-situ, a challenge to unified analyses of *wh*-questions which incorporate a notion of Move as necessarily feature-driven (e.g. Cheng 1997's Clausal Typing Hypothesis). I propose here to resolve this challenge, advancing a novel unified analysis of Indonesian questions, both *wh*- and *yes-no* types.

In Indonesian, a *wh*-phrase can either move overtly to the left periphery, where it optionally bears the 'question marker' *-kah*, or remain in situ, where *-kah* cannot appear (1). These two options are not equally available, with several interesting argument/adjunct asymmetries to be explained; PPs, additionally, pattern with neither arguments nor adjuncts. First, *wh*-in-situ is permitted only for *wh*-arguments (and *wh*-PPs); *wh*-adverbials are required to move (2). Second, *v*Ps in which the verb bears the 'active marker' *meng-* are islands to movement of *wh*-arguments, whether complements or subcomplements of the verb, but not to *wh*-adjuncts (adverbials or PPs) (3). Third, fronted *wh*-arguments must be set off from the remainder of the clause by *yang*, although *wh*-adjuncts (again, either adverbials or PPs) cannot be (4).

Previous analyses have posited a variety of identities for both *yang* and *-kah*. Saddy (1991), for example, simply proposes *yang* is a focus marker, which does not account for its restricted distribution. I expand on Saddy's suggestion, proposing that there are in fact three Indonesian *wh*-focus markers (following Rizzi 1997, I take *wh*-movement to be a particular type of focus movement): *yang* is a [+*wh*, +D] focus marker, which attracts only *wh*-DPs to its specifier, while  $\emptyset$  is *yang*'s [+*wh*, -D] counterpart, which permits only non-DP *wh*-phrases (i.e., PPs and adverbials) to be attracted to its specifier. The third, also null, has the same featural specification as *yang*, but lacks *yang*'s EPP property, and is found in *wh*-in-situ contexts. I assume that *wh*-phrases in situ have their *wh*-feature checked long-distance by an operator merged into [Spec, CP] (cf. Cole & Hermon's (1998) unselective binding analysis), a treatment which best accounts for the fact in situ *wh*-phrases, unlike those fronted, can appear inside islands (5).

I further propose that *-kah* is an enclitic that freely merges with phrasal constituents – both *-wh* and non-*wh* constituents – and is licensed only by a ([+*wh*]) Foc (6). To account for the fact that *-kah* only (and optionally) appears on *wh*-phrases that have been fronted, I suggest the licensing requirements for *-kah* are more stringent than for *wh*-phrases generally, requiring a local (i.e., spec-head) configuration. I also show the proposed structure to capture the parallel behavior of *-kah* and *-lah*, a focus marker found only in non-*wh* contexts (a parallel previously noted by Cole, et al., to appear for Malay). Like *-kah*, *-lah* cannot appear on in-situ constituents, and cannot attract constituents within a *meng*-headed *v*P (7). Additionally, the same *yang*-driven asymmetry is realized: *yang* obligatorily separates *-lah*-focused DPs, but not adjuncts, from the TP (7(8)). The analysis also captures a key difference between *-kah* and *-lah*: while *-kah* is optional on fronted *wh*-phrases, *-lah* is obligatory on fronted constituents, a logical consequence of *wh*-phrases bearing inherent focus.

The proposed analysis accounts for the diverse Indonesian question/focus facts in the most theoretically parsimonious way. One benefit of this analysis is that all questions with a fronted *wh*-constituent are shown to involve *wh*-movement (contra e.g. Cheng 1997, who posits different fronting mechanisms for arguments and adjuncts), and, moreover, that Move is, in keeping with Minimalist assumptions, feature-driven. A second benefit is that this view of *-kah* enables us to unify the analyses of *wh*-questions and *yes-no* questions in which a non-*wh*-constituent – which, like focused constituents in the *-lah* construction, is obligatorily marked with *-kah* – is fronted (9). A third benefit is that this analysis of *yang*, as Foc, has implications for the analysis of relative clauses, which, similar to questions with a fronted *wh*-DP, require *yang* (10).

## Examples

- (1) a. **Apa(+kah)** yang Ali beli?  
 What(+Q) COMP Ali buy  
 ‘What did Ali buy?’  
 b. Ali membeli **apa(\*+kah)**?  
 Ali ACT-buy what(\*+Q)  
 ‘Ali bought what?’
- (2) a. **Kapan(+kah)** Ali tinggal?  
 What(+Q) Ali leave  
 ‘When did Ali leave?’  
 b. \*Ali tinggal **kapan**?  
 Ali leave when  
 ‘Ali left when?’
- (3) a. \*Apa yang Ali **membeli apa**?  
 what COMP Ali ACT-buy **what**  
 ‘What did Ali buy?’  
 b. Kapan Ali **membeli+nya kapan**?  
 When Ali ACT-buy+3SG **when**  
 ‘When did Ali buy it?’
- (4) a. Siapa(+kah) **\*(yang)** tertawa?  
 who(+Q) **\*(COMP)** INVOL-laugh  
 ‘Who laughed?’  
 b. Kapan(-kah) **(\*yang)** Ali tertawa?  
 when(-Q) **(\*COMP)** Ali INVOL-laugh  
 ‘When did Ali laugh?’
- (5) a. Ali menjadi terlalu gemuk [CP karena dia makan **apa**?]  
 Ali *meng-be* too chubby [CP because 3SG eat what]  
 ‘Ali got fat because he ate what?’  
 b. \*Apa yang Ali jadi terlalu gemuk [CP karena dia makan]?  
 what COMP Ali be too chubby [CP because 3SG eat]  
 ‘What did Ali get fat because he ate?’
- (6) [<sub>FocP</sub> kapan+kah [<sub>Foc</sub> Ø [ TP Ali [<sub>VP</sub> ~~Ali~~ [<sub>VP</sub> tertawa ~~kapan+kah~~
- (7) Pintu itu+lah yang Ali **(\*mem-)**buka.  
 door DEM+FOC COMP Ali **(\*ACT-)**open  
 ‘It was this door that Ali opened.’
- (8) Kemarin+lah **(\*yang)** Ali **mem-beli** mobil baru.  
 yesterday+FOC**(\*COMP)** Ali ACT-buy car new  
 ‘It was yesterday Ali bought a new car.’
- (9) Sudah pulang+**kah** Ali?  
 already return+Q Ali  
 ‘Did Ali already go home?’
- (10) Buku **yang** Ali beli itu mahal sekali.  
 Buku COMP Ali buy DEM expensive very  
 ‘The book that Ali bought is very expensive.’

## References

- Cheng, L. 1997. A typology of *wh*-questions. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cole, P. & G. Hermon. 1998. The typology of *wh*-movement. *Wh*-questions in Malay. *Syntax* 1:221-258.
- Cole, P., G. Hermon & N. Aman. To appear. Clefted questions in Malay. *Malay/Indonesian Linguistics*, D. Gil & J. Collins, eds. London: Curzon Press.
- Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of grammar*, L. Haegeman, ed. p. 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Saddy, D. 1991. *Wh*-scope mechanisms in Bahasa Indonesia. *More Papers on Wh-movement (MITWPL 15)*, L. Cheng and H. Demirdache, eds. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.