

## Morphology and restrictions on non-subject extraction

It has been assumed by many that certain Austronesian languages allow only subjects to extract. For example, Keenan and Comrie (1977) pointed out that relativization in languages such as Tagalog and Malagasy can target subjects but not objects. This generalization, in fact, is less clear-cut both in terms of theory and data. One theoretical question that has been raised revolves around the appropriate analysis of the element assumed to be the subject. Is it a subject (A-position) or topic (A'-position)? In terms of data, Chung (1976) has shown that in Bahasa Indonesia, extraction of the object is possible if the verb is in the bare form. Cole et al. (1999) have reported similar results for certain dialects of Javanese, Cole & Hermon (2005) for Singapore Malay, and Larsen (2008) for Banjar. The Banjar example in (1b) shows extraction of a Theme from object position in a relative clause. The full DP Agent (*lalakian* 'man') ensures that this Agent DP is in the subject position and not in a VP internal position, which allows only pronouns. The data set for non-subject extraction can be extended to Tagalog. Cena (1979) has shown that some Tagalog constructions also allow non-subject extraction (see (2) for an example of a comitative construction). In this paper we argue that a full understanding of the theoretical problem provides an account for the data problem.

We tackle three issues in this paper: (i) why objects extract in some languages but not others, (ii) why objects extract with some verb forms and not others, and (iii) why passives do not allow extraction of non-subjects. We begin by noting that the verbal forms that allow non-subject extraction have in common that they show none of the voice morphology typical to these languages. This has already been noted for the Bahasa Indonesia data by Saddy (1991) and Soh (1996), but it can also be extended to the Tagalog example. We link this observation to an analysis of clause structure that combines the proposals of Pearson (2004) and Travis (2006). With these authors, we assume that (a) the relevant languages have topics rather than subjects, (b) these topics are located in A'-positions and (c) their argument roles are identified by verbal clitic heads (otherwise analysed as the voice morphology). The clitic status of the morphology ensures the A' status of the topics, which in turn blocks extraction over them.

To pursue this a bit further, we assume that a predication relation is set up between a semantic subject in a syntactic A'-position, and a semantic predicate which is syntactically a TP with one unsaturated argument designated by the voice morphology on the verb (much like Clitic Left Dislocation structures in Italian as in Cinque (1990)). Crucially, we claim that it is the presence of the verbal clitic which licenses this predication relationship between the A'-position and the remaining material and it is this dependency which allows us to answer the questions above. In many of the languages under discussion, certain verbal clitics can be realized by null morphemes. For example, we see this in one type of passive in Bahasa Indonesia (shown in 0)). In this case the zero morpheme designates the role of the A'-element as Theme. We claim, however, that other bare forms are radically bare in that they contain no verbal clitics. In these constructions, the predication relation is, as in English, between the highest argument (generally the Agent) in an A-position and a VP predicate. Because the subject of the predication will be an A-position, A' extraction of the object is allowed. With this in place, we can answer the three questions outlined above. (i) Only languages that allow radically bare roots will allow non-subject extraction, (ii) only these bare forms will allow non-subject extraction, and (iii) only constructions with the highest argument external to the VP will allow non-subject extraction.

- (1) a. **lalakian** marusak cangkir ngintu (adapted from Larsen 2008)  
 man MAN-break glass that  
 ‘The man broke the glass.’
- b. cangkir ngintu<sub>i</sub> nang **lalakian** rusak t<sub>i</sub> tinggi  
 glass that COMP man break tall  
 ‘The glass that the man broke is tall.’
- (2) a. kasama ng doktor **ang anak** (adapted from Cena 1979)  
 KA+with COM doctor SU child  
 ‘The child is with the doctor.’
- b. madismaya ang doktor<sub>i</sub> na kasama t<sub>i</sub> **ang anak**  
 disappoint SU doctor LK KA+with SU child  
 ‘The doctor who the child is with was disappointed.’
- (3) Perempsan itu dia lihat (from Cole & Hermon 2005)  
 woman that he 0-see  
 ‘The woman was seen by him.’

#### REFERENCES

- Cena, Resty. 1979. Tagalog Counterexamples to the Accessibility Hierarchy. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 31:119-124.
- Chung, Sandra. 1976. On the Subject of Two Passives in Indonesian. In *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles Li, 57-98. New York: Academic Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. Types of A'-Dependencies. vol. 17: *Linguistic Inquiry Monograph*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Cole, Peter, Jonczyk, Elizabeth, and Lilley, Jason. 1999. A note on extraction from object in Javanese and other Javanic languages. In *Proceedings of Proceedings of the sixth meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLAVI)*, eds. Carolyn Smallwood and Catherine Kitto, 87-93. Toronto Working Papers.
- Cole, Peter, and Hermon, Gabriella. 2005. Subject and Non-Subject Relativization in Indonesian. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 14:59-88.
- Keenan, Edward L., and Comrie, Bernard. 1977. Noun Phrase Accessibility. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.
- Larsen, Blakey. 2008. Nonsubject Extraction in Austronesian Languages: a Case Study in Banjar, McGill University: Honours Thesis.
- Pearson, Matthew. 2004. Voice morphology, Case and argument structure in Malagasy. In *Proceedings of Proceedings of the 11th Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, ed. Paul Law, 229-243. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*.
- Saddy, Douglas. 1991. WH scope mechanisms in Bahasa Indonesia. In *More papers on wh-movement*, eds. Lisa L. S. Cheng and Hamida Demirdache, 183-218. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Travis, Lisa deMena. 2006. Voice Morphology in Malagasy as Clitic Left Dislocation or Malagasy in Wonderland: through the looking glass. In *Clause structure and adjuncts in Austronesian languages*, eds. Hans-Martin Gärtner, Paul Law and Joachim Sabel, 281-318. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.