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1 Introduction

1.1 Encoding of anaphoric dependencies
Natural language provides multiple ways to encode coconstrual relations
(1) a. Mike hurt himself. antecedent-anaphor relation
b. What will college cost what? filler-gap dependency
c. Sandy tried PRO to water ski. control
d. No waitress should ignore her customers. variable binding
e. A man walked in. He smiled. coreference

(2) a. What did you buy ti? English
b. Op, Lisi mai-le shenme? Chinese
Lisi bought what
‘What did Lisi buy?’

Coconstruals can be formed in different modules of the grammar: syntax, semantics, or discourse
(3) a. syntax: movement, co-argument reflexives
b. semantics: variable binding
c. discourse: coreference

1.2 Left Dislocation
Left Dislocation (LD): a construction in which a phrase appears at the left edge of a clause, dislocated from its expected position and related to some clause-internal anaphoric element

(4) a. Peanuts, I don’t like __.
b. il tuo libro, Gianni lo ha letto
the your book Gianni 3SG.ACC have read.PTCP
‘Your book, I have read it.’
c. Peanuts, I don’t like them.
d. Paul, Pierre vient de se battre avec cet idiot
Paul Pierre come C REFL fight with this idiot
‘Paul, Peter has just fought with this idiot.’ (Hirschbühler 1997:56)

(5) a. movement analyses: filler-gap coconstrual
b. base-generation: interpretive/coreference coconstrual


(6) Main differences between LET and HTLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>HTLD/HTCLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prosodic break</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resumptive pronoun</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case connectivity</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no (always NOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to movement constraints</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>base-generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) Two types of pre-predicate constituents:
- constituents that are necessarily clause internal, hence must have a syntactic relation to the core clause
- left-dislocated constituents that can be external to the core clause and do not have to be represented syntactically in that clause

1.3 Functions of left dislocation
Dislocation for topicalization
Dislocation associated with focus reading: For today’s purposes, we will treat WH and Focus as a single category (NB: a simplification!)

(8) Yucatec Mayan
a. Peedróoh= e’ t=u häänt-ah ðon.
Pedro=d3 PFV=A.3 eat:TRR-CMPL(B.3.SG) avocado
‘As for Pedro, he ate (an) avocado’. (VS: (2a))
b. Peedróoh(‘=e’) hännt ðon.
Pedro=d3 eat:TRR(SUBJUNCTIVE)(B.3.SG) avocado
‘PEDRO ate (an) avocado’. (VS: (4))
c. Peedróoh il (*leti’=e’) ba’x h
Pedro see(SUBJ)(B.3.SG) 3.SG=D3 what PFV
happen-B.3.SG
‘It was Pedro who saw what happened.’ (VS: (8c))
1.4  Left-dislocation for WH/Focus

In general, a surface Wh1/Focus1 can reflect displacement, cleft, or pseudocleft

Pseudocleft: biclausal copular construction in which the wh-phrase/focus phrase is the predicate and the subject is a relative clause or contains one

\(9\) a. [The thing you saw] is what?
   a’. What is [the thing you saw]?
   b. [La personne que tu as vue] est qui?
   b’. Qui est [la personne que tu as vue]?

\(10\) [The thing you saw] is an illusion.

Cleft: biclausal impersonal construction in which the wh-phrase/focus phrase is a focused ‘pivot’

\(11\) a. It is [what] [that you saw]?
   b. Qu'est-ce que tu veux Julie?

\(12\) It is [an illusion] [that you saw].

Additional complications: null copula; null complementizer/absence of complementizer; null agreement markers (as in Yucatec Maya); null expletives

• structural ambiguity of wh-questions

\(13\) ko hai na’e ta’a’i ‘e Mele?  Tongan
KO who PAST hit ERG Mele
‘Who did Mele hit?’

   a. displacement (~movement)
   
   ko [hai] na’e ta’a’i ‘e Mele hai?
   WH PREDICATE SUBJECT
   ‘Who did Mele hit?’

   b. pseudocleft
   
   ko [hai] na’e tå ‘e Mele?
   WH PREDICATE SUBJECT
   ‘The one that Mele hit is who?’

   c. cleft
   
   ko hai na’e tå ‘e Mele expl?
   who that Mele hit PREDICATE SUBJECT
   ‘It is who that Mele hit?’

Given this ambiguity, it is often difficult to determine the exact strategy being used to form wh-questions. What kinds of evidence can we appeal to?

2  Identifying clefts and pseudoclefts

2.1  Signs of biclausal structures

\(14\) ko hai na’e ta’a’i ‘e Mele?  Tongan
KO who PAST hit ERG Mele
WH REMAINDER
‘Who did Mele hit?’

\(15\) ko Sione na’e ta’a’i ‘e Mele.  Tongan
KO J PAST hit ERG Mele
FOCUS REMAINDER
‘Mele hit JOHN.’

only (pseudo)clefts have a bipartite (biclausal) structure: WH + REMAINDER

\(16\) a. WH/FOCUS is or is part of the predicate
   b. language is predicate-initial elsewhere
   c. REMAINDER has relative clause-like properties
   d. REMAINDER has dependent clause characteristics

• WH/FOCUS is or is part of the predicate: its position in the predicate is marked by pre- and post-predicate particles of various kinds (TAM, adverbs, question particles)

TAM markers

\(17\) ne’e ko ai [‘ae ne’e ‘alu ai]  Wallis
PAST KO who that PAST go there
WH REMAINDER
‘Who went there?’ (Nguyen 1998: 313)

\(18\) a. tokony hamangy an-dRabe Rasoa should visit ACC-Rabe Rasoa
Rasoa should visit Rabe.’

b. tokony iza no hamangy an-dRabe?
should who PRT visit ACC-Rabe
WH REMAINDER
‘Who should visit Rabe?’
predicate-edge particle placement

(19)a. ko hai nai na’e ‘alu? Tongan
KO who Q PAST leave
‘Who left?’
b. na’e lau tohi nai ‘a e leka?
PAST read book Q ABS DET child
‘Did the child read?’

adverb

(20)a. he a foki te mea na lea mai ai koe ananafi?
ART what again ART thing PAST say DIR RP 2SG yesterday
‘What was it again that you told me yesterday?’
(Hovdhaugen et al. 1989: 53, 54)
b. o fea foi na e sau ai?
KO where also PAST you come RP
‘… and where did you come from?’
(Mosel and Hovdhaugen 1992: 489)

• language is predicate-initial elsewhere: non-verbal-predicate-initial sentences, (pseudo-) noun incorporation which creates a complex predicate in the initial position

non-verbal predicate sentences

(21) ko e faia ko ia. Tongan
KO DET teacher 3SG
‘She is a teacher.’

(22) ‘e ‘i fade toku ‘ohoana. Wallis
PRES at/in house my spouse
‘My spouse is in the house.’ (Nguyen 1998: 310)

(23) ma te po te koika. Marquesan
PREP ART night ART feast
‘The feast will be during the night.’ (Cablitz 2006: 58)

non-verbal predicate questions

(24) e fia le pasece? Samoa
GEN how.much DET fare
‘How much is the fare?’ (M & H 1992: 489)

(25) ne aa ana pati? Tuvalu
PAST what her word
‘What did she say?’ (Besnier 2000: 19)

(26)a. ko fē e toki? Tongan
KO where DET ax
‘Where is the ax?’
b. ko hai e faia ko?
KO who DET teacher
‘Who is the teacher?’

(pseudo) noun incorporation

(27)a. takafaga tūmau nī e ia e tau ika
hunt always EMPH ERG 3SG ABS PLURAL fish
‘He is always fishing.’ Niuean
b. takafaga ika tūmau nī a ia
hunt fish always EMPH ABS 3SG
‘He is always fishing.’ (Massam 2001: 157)

(28)a. e taki e le favine le motokā kula Futuna
IMPF drive ERG ART woman ART car red
‘The woman is driving a red car.’
b. e taki motokā le favine
IMPF drive car ART woman
‘The woman drives.’ (Moyse-Faurie 1997b: 239)

(29) kua hari koohatu mai ia moo te haangi Maori
PERF carry stone hither 3SG for ART hangi
‘She brought some stones for the stone oven.’ (W. Bauer, p.c.)

• REMAINDER has relative clause-like properties: relative clauses and wh-questions subject to the same restrictions and grammatical processes

parallel strategies in relativization and wh-questions

three relativization strategies in Niuean (Seiter 1980: 93-97): deletion, pronominalization, no relativization

1. deletion—relativized noun is deleted, applies to core arguments (A, S, O or a subset thereof)

(30)a. e tama ne hau (*a ia) i Makefu Niuean
ABS child NFUT come ABS he from Makefu
‘the child who comes from Makefu’
b. e tagata ne hoka (*e ia) a Maka
ABS man NFUT stab ERG he ABS Maka
‘the man who stabbed Maka’
c. e tagata ne moto e koe (*a ia)
ABS person NFUT punch ERG you ABS he
‘the person who you punched’ (Seiter 1980: 94-96)
2. pronominalization—relativized noun is reduced to a pronoun, applies to oblques, time nominals, static agents, benefactives, etc.

(31)a. e taga ne tuku ai e ia e uga
ABS bag NFUT put in.it ERG he ABS crab
‘the bag in which he put the coconut crab’
b. e maga-aho ne kua makona ai a ia
ABS moment NFUT PERF full then ABS it
‘the moment he was full’
c. e fakamatalaaga ne fanogonogo a au ki ai
ABS speech NFUT listen ABS I to it
‘the speech which I listened to’ (Seiter 1980: 94-95)

3. impossible—comitative NPs cannot be relativized

(32) *e tama ne fakatau ō hifo a Maka (mo ia)
ABS child NFUT together go.down.PL ABS maka with it
(‘the child who Maka came down with’) (Seiter 1980: 95)

the same kinds of constituents are questioned using the same strategies

1. deletion

(33)a. ko hai ne nofo (*a ia) he fale ko?
KO who NFUT live ABS he in house that
‘Who lives in that house?’
b. ko hai ka kini (*e ia) e māla?
KO who FUT clear ERG he ABS plantation
‘Who’s going to clear the plantation?’
c. ko hai ne fahi e Sione (*a ia)?
KO who NFUT beat ERG Sione ABS he
‘Who did Sione beat?’ (Seiter 1980: 110)

2. pronominalization

(34)a. ko fe ne nofo ai a Moka?
KO where NFUT live there ABS Moka
‘Where does Moka live?’
b. ko hai ne matakuai ai e tama mukemuke?
KO who NFUT frightened it ABS child infant
‘Who is the child afraid of?’
c. ko fe ne fina atu a Tale ki ai?
FOC where NFUT go DIR ABS Tale to there
‘Where did Tale go off to?’ (Seiter 1980: 110-111)

3. impossible question

(35) *ko hai ka kini e Pita (mo ia) e māla?
KO who FUT clear ERG Pita with him ABS plantation
‘Who will Pita clear the plantation with?’ (Seiter 1980: 111)

Polynesian: GENITIVE RELATIVE construction

the highest subject/agent in a relative clause may optionally be expressed as the possessor of the head noun

(36)a. ‘ua fa’ariri te tamari’i (i) te ‘urū Tahitian
PST make mad DET child ACC DET dog
‘The child annoyed the dog.’
b. te tamari’i kē [i fa’ariri tē (i) te ‘urū]
DET child DEP.TNS make.mad ACC DET dog
‘the child that annoyed the dog’
c. te ‘urū tā te tamari’i [i fa’ariri tē]
DET dog POSS DET child DEP.TNS make.mad
‘the dog that the child annoyed’
‘the child’s dog that annoyed’

genitive relative also allowed in wh-questions/focus

(37)a. e aha tā te tamari’i [i fa’ariri j] Tahitian
PR S what POSS DET child DEP.TNS make.mad
‘What did the child annoy?’
b. e tō o’e ‘urū tā te tamari’i [i fa’ariri].
PR S your dog POSS DET child DEP.TNS make.mad
‘The child annoyed YOUR DOG.’
(‘It is your dog that the child annoyed.’)
• remainder has dependent clause characteristics

only dependent TAM markers allowed

(38)a. e aha tā te tamari’i [i/*e/*ua fa’ariri]? Tahitian
PR S what POSS DET child DEP.TNS/PRS/PST make.mad
‘What did the child annoy?’

presence of subordinators (relativizers, complementizers, etc.)

(39) teefea teelaa e too kiaa koe?
Tuvaluan
which REL Npast fall to you
WH REMAINDER
‘Which is on your land?’ (Besnier 2000: 23)

2.2 distinguishing cleft from pseudocleft

pseudocleft

(40)a. [The thing you saw] is what?
b. [La personne que tu as vue] est qui?
HRCs are formally distinct from the REMAINDER in wh-questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clausal Organization</th>
<th>Pseudocleft</th>
<th>Cleft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Headless relative properties</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. “dummy” head present</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. REMAINDER has nominal properties</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. REMAINDER has subject properties</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **REMAINDER** has headless relative properties

*language independently has headless relative clauses (HRC)*

(43)  
_**Tahitian**_  
`e raverahi ho’i [te i parau-hia]_HRC_`  
PRES many really ART PAST call-PASS  
e iti rā [te i mā’ti-hia]_HRC_  
PRES small but ART PAST choose-PASS  
lit. “The ones who are called are many, the ones who are chosen are few.”  
‘Many are called, but few are chosen.’

(44)  
`ko tino maattua o te fenua`  
KO people old of DET island.community  
[kolaa e fakannofo ki potu]  
REL NPAST CAUS-SH to post  
‘Elderly people of the island are the ones who are made to sit against the posts.’  
(Besnier 2000: 72)  
_Tuvaluan_

HRCs are formally distinct from the REMAINDER in wh-questions.

(45)a.  
`o ai [na fasia le maile]_REMAINDER_?`  
KO who PAST hit DET dog  
‘Who hit the dog?’  
(Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 633)  
_Samoan_

b.  
`o ai [1-e na fasia a’u]_HRC_?`  
KO who DET-REL PAST hit me  
‘Who is the one who hit me?’  
(Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 633)

(46)a.  
`ko hai [te ne tāmate’i au]_REMAINDER_?`  
KO who FUT 3SG kill me  
‘Who will kill me?’

b.  
`e tāmate’i e Sione ‘a [hai te ne tāmate’i au]_HRC_`  
FUT kill ERG Sione ABS who FUT 3SG kill me  
‘Sione will kill whoever kills me.’

c.  
`ko Mele [ia na’a ne kaiha’asi ‘a e ika]_HRC_`  
KO Mele 3SG PAST 3SG steal ABS DET fish  
‘Mele is the one who stole the fish.’  
(Custis 2004: 125)  
_Tongan_

The absence of genuine headless relative clauses can be offered as an argument against a pseudocleft analysis.

- **“dummy” head noun present**

(47)  
kooi _ttino ne fiuti nee ia te atu?_  
KO, who the.person PAST pull ERG he the bonito  
‘Who caught the bonito?’  
(Besnier 2000: 10)  
_Tuvaluan_

(48)  
se aa te _mea ne iita e?_  
a what DET thing PAST angry RP  
‘What were [they] angry about?’  
(Besnier 2000: 11)  
_Tuvaluan_

(49)  
po o fea tonu le _mea na pa’u ai le va’alele?_  
Q KO where right DET place PAST fall there DET plane  
‘Where exactly had the plane fallen down?’  
(Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 490)  
_Samoan_

(50)  
e aha te _tumu i hee mai ai hua vehine?_  
DET what DET reason PAST go DIR RP that woman  
‘Why did that woman come?’  
(Mutu 2002: 69)  
_Marquesan_

- **REMAINDER** has nominal properties

*distribution of a nominal*

should be accessible for topicalization with _ko_

(51)a.  
`ko ai lou _igoa?_`  
KO who 2SG.POSS name  
‘What is your name?’

b.  
`ko lou _igoa_ ko ai_`  
KO 2SG.POSS name KO who  
‘What is your name?’  
(Lit.: “your name, what is?”)  
(Moyse-Faurie 1997a: 176)  
_Futuna_

nominal marking

expected (but not attested): case marking appropriate for a nominal constituent
REMAINDER has subject properties
position: position following the predicate phrase is consistent with the Predicate-Subject order

Raising/copy-raising: If a language has independently attested raising/copy-raising, the remainder should be accessible to it (Malagasy ex)

2.3 Yucatec Mayan fronting (VS 2015): Cleft or movement?

(52) Yucatec Mayan
   a. Pèedróoh= t=u hàant-ah òon.
      Pedro=D3 PFV=A.3 eat:TRR-CMPL(B.3.SG) avocado
      ‘As for Pedro, he ate (an) avocado’. (VS: (2a))
   b. Pèedróoh(*=e’) hàant òon.
      Pedro=D3 eat:TRR(SUBJUNCTIVE)(B.3.SG) avocado
      Focus Agent-Focus (AF) morphology
      ‘PEDRO ate (an) avocado’. (VS: (4))

Is (52b) a cleft or a movement structure?

(53) a. [Pèedróoh] [hàant òon].
     Pedro= D3 eat:TRR(SUBJUNCTIVE)(B.3.SG) avocado
     a. biclausal structure: AF is needed for the extraction of transitive subject (ergative) in the formation of a relative clause
     b. monoclausal structure: AF is needed for A-bar movement of transitive subject (ergative)

(54) Agent-focus morphology
   a. biclausal structure: AF is needed for the extraction of transitive subject (ergative) in the formation of a relative clause
   b. monoclausal structure: AF is needed for A-bar movement of transitive subject (ergative)

(55) Evidence in support of (53b)
   a. agreement
   b. binding
   c. status of the pre-predicate constituent

Agreement
(56) a. It’s you who are responsible.
   b. It’s you who is responsible.

(57) a. Tèech k=a bin tak Yaxley.
   2.SG IPFV=A.2 go as far as Yaxley
   ‘YOU are going up to Yaxley.’ (VS: (12a))
   b. *Tèech [k=u bin tak Yaxley].
   2.SG IPFV=A.3 go as far as Yaxley
   (‘YOU are the one that is going up to Yaxley”) (VS: (12b))
   c. Tèech le k=u bin tak Yaxley=o’.
   2.SG DEF IPFV=A.3 go as far as Yaxley=D.2
   ‘YOU are the one that is going up to Yaxley.’ (VS: (12c))

Binding:
(58) It is you who cuts himself

In Yucatec, fronted constituent preserves the binding possibilities of the basic configuration (not sure how strong this argument is given the structure of Mayan anaphors: POSS + baah ’self’)

(59) a. Tèech hats’-ik a/*u bàah.
   2.SG beat:TRR-INCMPL(B.3.SG) A.2/A.3 self
   transitive v agrees with object
   ‘YOU are hitting yourself.’ (VS: (14a))
   b. Tèech le k=u hats’-ik
   2.SG DEF IPFV=A.3 beat:TRR-INCMPL(B.3.SG)
   u bàah=o’.
   A.3 self=D.2
   ‘YOU are the one that is hitting yourself.’ (VS: (14b))

Interrogative particle placement: interrogative particle wàah follows predicates in clefts but can appear in any position in the structure under consideration
Interim conclusion: Yucatec Maya has two ways of expressing focus, via movement and via cleft

(60) a. cleft/pseudo-cleft
   [proP Pèedróoh] [DP le [CP hàant òon]].
   Pedro DEF eat:TRR(SUBJUNCTIVE)(B.3.SG) avocado

   b. A-bar movement
   Pèedróoh háant tì òon.

(61) What is the difference?
   a. Cleft ~ exhaustive focus
   b. Movement ~ narrow focus/absence of exhaustive focus

Evidence: exhaustive focus is incompatible with ‘even’, ‘also’; narrow focus is fully compatible with those expressions

(62) a. xan ‘also’
   b. tak xan ‘even’

(63) tak xan Pèedróoh k’áat-ik tì wàah=o’.
    even Pedro ask-INCMPL(B.3.SG) tortilla=D2
    ‘EVEN PEDRO is asking for tortilla.’ (VS: (31b)

(64) *tak xan Pèedróoh [le k’áat-ik wàah=o’].
    even Pedro DEF ask-INCMPL(B.3.SG) tortilla=D2
    (‘It is even Pedro that is asking for tortilla.’) (VS: (32b)

3 Extraposition

Extraposition (EX): the non-canonical placement of certain constituents (EXPs) in a right-peripheral position different kinds of extraposition (Baltin 2006, Sheehan 2010)

(65) a. He said yesterday [that they were not prepared]. SIMPLE EX
   b. A man walked in [who was wearing a red hat]. EX FROM NP
   c. I heard a rumor yesterday [that he was involved in a lawsuit]. EX FROM NP
   d. Bob put on the table [all the gifts that his wife HEAVY XP SHIFT insists that they will have to return].

3.1 Extraposition in Malagasy (Potsdam & Edmiston 2015)

3.1.1 Malagasy word order: VOXS

(66) a. Nametraka voninkazo teo ambonin’ ny latabatra i Koto. PAST.put flower LOC on DET table K
   ‘Koto put flowers on the table.’
   b. Mananatra ny zafikely ny mandrakariva i Dadabe admonish DET grandchild(SG) always grandpa
   ‘Grandpa admonishes his grandchildren constantly.’

Optional simple extrapolation

(67) a. Nametraka voninkazo i Koto teo ambonin’ ny latabatra PAST.put flower Koto LOC on DET table
   ‘Koto put flowers on the table.’
   b. Mananatra ny zafikely i Dadabe mandrakariva admonish DET grandchild(SG) always grandpa
   ‘Grandpa admonishes his grandchildren constantly.’

(68) What can extrapolate optionally
   a. PP arguments: locatives, recipients, goals, instruments, benefactives, material and source
   b. adverbials: temporal, manner, locative, reason, frequency adverbials
   c. standards of comparison
   d. controlled clauses: complements and adjuncts
Obligatory extraposition for full CPs (Keenan 1976, Pearson 2001, Potsdam & Polinsky 2007)
complement clause
(69) a. Manantena Rabe [cP fa hividy fiara aho]
    hope Rabe that buy car 1SG.NOM
    ‘Rabe hopes that I will buy a car.’
b. *Manantena [cP fa hividy fiara aho] Rabe
    hope that buy car 1SG.NOM R
    (‘Rabe hopes that I will buy a car.’)

adverbial clause
(70)a. Tsy nianatra Rabe [satria narary ny vadiny],
    NEG study Rabe because sick DET spouse.3SG
    ‘Rabe didn’t study because his wife was sick.’
    NEG study because sick DET spouse.3SG Rabe

Impossible extraposition: objects
(71)a. Nametraka (an-ny) voninkazo i Koto
    PAST:put ACC-DET flower Koto
    'Koto put flowers on the table.'
b. *Nametraka (PP) i Koto (PP) (an-ny) voninkazo (PP)
    PAST:put Koto ACC-DET flower

(72) Distribution of Malagasy EX
a. OPTIONAL: various complements, adverbials, controlled clauses
b. OBLIGATORY: full clauses
c. IMPOSSIBLE: objects

(73) Big questions:
    a. Why can DPs NOT extrapose (cf. (72c))? 
b. What determines the obligatory extraposition of CPs (cf. (72b))? 
c. What is the nature of optional extraposition (cf. (72a))? 

3.1.2 Malagasy optional extraposition: Analyzing the structure
(74) Analytical possibilities:
b. base-generation (Rochemont & Culicover 1990)
d. ellipsis (de Vries 2009)

3.1.3 Malagasy clause structure: PredP fronting
(75) Main ingredients:
a. underlying SVO order 
b. subject occupies the specifier of a phrase YP above PredP
c. VOS derived by leftward movement of a predicate constituent (PredP)
to a position to the left of the subject
d. PredP reconstructs to base position at LF (Massam 2000, Potsdam 2007)

(76)
(77) Base-generation: the constituent that appears extraposed is generated outside the PredP

(78) Movement: the constituent that appears extraposed is generated inside the PredP; it A-bar moves to a position outside the predicate, and PredP undergoes (remnant) fronting

3.1.4 Evidence for A-bar movement (P&E 2015)

(79) Extraposed constituents behave as though they are in a predicate-internal position, based on reconstruction facts
a. EXPs show reconstruction for syntactic selection
b. EXPs can contain a pronoun bound by the subject or object (incl. variable binding)
c. EXPs require reconstruction for NPI licensing

d. EXPs require reconstruction for binding
i. EXPs show reconstruction for syntactic selection
   selection is required for idiom formation (Bruening 2010)
ii. EXPs require reconstruction for variable binding, cf. extraposed PP containing pronoun bound by object; object does not c-command EXP unless it reconstructs back inside the predicate
iii. EXPs require reconstruction for NPI licensing
   NPIs must be c-commanded by negation
   Malagasy negation tsy is contained in the predicate and forms a constituent with the verb
(82) a. ✔ [[NEG PREDICATE] SUBJECT]
   b. ✘ [NEG [PREDICATE SUBJECT]]
   subject NPIs disallowed (unless licensed by genericity or modality) (Paul 2005)
(83) *Tsy nanongo an’ i Koto n’iza n’iza
   NEG PAST.pincher ACC Koto anyone
   (’No one pinched Koto.’) (Paul 2005:363, (13a))
   NPIs allowed inside the predicate and such constituents may extrapose
(84) Tsy nandroso vary (tamin’ n’iza n’iza ) i Be (tamin’ n’iza n’iza )
   NEG PST.serve rice PREP anyone Be PREP anyone
   ’Be didn’t serve rice to anyone.’
   Reconstruction of the extraposed NPI required on the assumption that the surface position of EXPs is outside the predicate
3.1.5 Interpretive effects of extraposition
Extraposed constituents are backgrounded/presupposed (Paul & Rabaovololona 1998, Pearson 2001)

(85)a. [Namaky boky tany an-tokotany] ve i Tenda?
   read book LOC PREP -garden Q Tenda
   ‘Was reading a book in the garden what Tenda was doing?’
b. [Namaky boky] ve i Tenda tany an-tokotany?
   read book Q Tenda LOC PREP -garden
   ‘Was reading a book what Tenda was doing in the garden?’
   (Pearson 2001:180)

Prediction: asserted/non-backgrounded material should not extrapose
i. answers to questions are bad in EXP

(86) Q: Oviana no nody Rabe?
   when FOC gone PAST go.home Rabe
   ‘When did Rabe go home?’
A1: Lasa nody omaly hariva Rabe
   gone PAST go.home yesterday evening Rabe
   ‘Rabe went home yesterday evening.’
A2: #Lasa nody Rabe omaly hariva
   gone PAST go.home Rabe yesterday evening

ii. wh-expressions can only be interpreted as echo in EXP

(87) Lasa nody oviana Rabe?
   gone PAST go.home when Rabe
   ✓ ‘When did Rabe go home?’
   ✓ ‘Rabe went home WHEN?’ (echo/reprisal question)
(88) Lasa nody Rabe oviana?
   gone PAST go.home Rabe when
   ✓ ‘Rabe went home WHEN?’ (echo/reprisal question)
   X ‘When did Rabe go home?’

3.1.6 Interim conclusion
Malagasy extraposition of non-objects/non-CPs to the right is A-bar movement
It interpretive effects can be reduced to “backgrounding”

No “backgrounding” in CP-extraposition

Is extraposition always A-bar movement (=filler-gap coconstrual)? Is there evidence of interpretive coconstrual in V1 languages?

3.2 VOS in Tongan: Base generation
A recap of Tongan

(89) Tongan left-dislocation: only ABS argument can A-bar move, all other expressions have to be resumed in the core clause
   PRED J PRS 3SG CL go to New Zealand
   ‘John, (he) goes to New Zealand.’
   PRED J PRS 3SG CL steal ABS DET money
   ‘John, (he) steals money.’

(90) Tongan right-dislocation (Lecture 2)
   ‘John goes to New Zealand.’
b. ‘Oku (*ne) kaiha’asi ‘a e pa’anga ‘e Sione/John.DA
   PREDJ PRS 3SG CL steal ABS DET money ERG John
   ‘John steals money.’

The right-dislocated subject cannot have Definitive accent (DA), which indicates its backgrounded status

Right-dislocated idioms do not reconstruct
Right-dislocated subject must be in the case form required by the verb (connectivity)

(91) properties of Tongan left- and right-dislocation (cf. Lambrecht’s observations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Left dislocation</th>
<th>Right dislocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation: the dislocated XP is topic</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax: evidence for movement</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosody: must be de-accented</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity: Must appear in the same case form as required by the position in the associated clause</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: can be indefinitely displaced from the core clause</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(92) Tongan dislocations

a. Left-dislocation: A-bar movement of Absolutive
b. Right-dislocation: Base generation of all arguments

Both dislocations have interpretive effects: Extraposed constituents are backgrounded/presupposed

(93) Outstanding question: further interpretive difference between Tongan LD and RD?
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