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1 Introduction: The status of the external argument

Many Austronesian languages favor just one syntactic argument (external argument, EA) in extractions and clause linkage. What is the status of this argument, and the general clausal architecture in Austronesian?

Malagasy (the external argument is underlined)

(1) a. nividy kadoa ny zaza
bought gift DET child
‘The child bought a gift.’

b. ny zaza (izay) nividy kadoa
DET child REL bought gift
‘the child that bought a gift’

c. *ny kadoa (izay) nividy ny zaza
DET gift REL bought DET child
(‘the gift that the child bought.’)

Two main hypotheses concerning the status of the external argument:

SUBJECT ANALYSIS: EA is subject, occurring in an A-position

TOPIC ANALYSIS: EA is topic, occurring in an A’-position

Goal of the talk:

- present new evidence from Malagasy Control structures in support of the Topic Analysis

Outline of the talk

- overview of Malagasy structure and preliminary evidence in support of the Topic Analysis
- two Malagasy Control structures and Control as movement
- Theme Focus Control and its implications for Malagasy clause structure
- Agent Focus Control and its implications for Malagasy clause structure
- Control complement clauses in Malagasy and the Topic Analysis
- conclusions and open questions

2 Malagasy: General information

2.1 Basics of Malagasy morphosyntax

Austronesian language, spoken by about 14 million people in Madagascar
VOS word order, accusative, impoverished case marking

(2) a. n-i-vidy ny kadoa (omaly) ny zaza (omaly)
PAST-AGENT FOCUS-bought DET gift yesterday DET child
‘The child bought a gift (yesterday).’

b. no-vid-in’ ny zaza (omaly) ny kadoa (omaly)
PAST-buy-THEME FOCUS DET child yesterday DET gift
‘The gift, the child bought (yesterday).’
(‘The gift was bought by the child (yesterday).’)

all verbs show morphological tense marking;
there are no dedicated non-finite forms

Table 1. Malagasy tense prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>past</th>
<th>present</th>
<th>future /irrealis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n(o)</td>
<td>ø-/m-</td>
<td>h(o)-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

one element is the EA, which is encoded with position and verbal morphology;
the verbal voice morphology indicates the external argument

Table 2. Malagasy voice morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Agent focus, AF (“active”)</th>
<th>Theme focus, TF (“passive”)</th>
<th>Applied object focus, CF (“circumstantial”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morphologica l marking</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>ø- in-toa-voa-</td>
<td>Active stem + suffix –an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: vidy ‘buy’</td>
<td>-i-vidy</td>
<td>-vid-in-</td>
<td>ivedi-an-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(for details, see Keenan and Polinsky 1997)

(3) a. Agent focus
n-i-vidy ny kadoa ho an-dreni-ny ny zaza
PAST-AF-buy DET gift for OBL-mother-3SG DET child
‘The child bought a gift for his mother.’
2.2 Root clause and arguments for the Topic Analysis

Theme focus construction:

(4) novidin’ ny zaza ny kadoa
   bought.TF DET child DET gift
   ‘The child bought the gift.’ (‘The gift was bought by the child.’)

Subject Analysis (Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis 1992)

(5) novidin’ ny zaza ny kadoa
   PREDICATE SUBJECT

Topic Analysis (Pearson 2001, 2005, and others)

(6) novidin’ ny zaza ny kadoa
   PREDICATE SUBJECT TOPIC

Table 3. Differences between Subject and Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>property</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>specificity/referentiality</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definiteness</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓/✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mapping into focus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- no existentially quantified NPs as EA
- no non-referential expressions as EA
- formal marking of definiteness on the EA
- no focus expression in the EA position

(7) a. mihinany trondro fotsinina ilay zaza
     eat.AF [fish only] this child
     FOCUS
     ‘This child eats only fish.’

b. *mihinany trondro ilay zaza fotsinina eat.AF fish [this child only]
   FOCUS
   (‘Only this child eats fish.’)

(8) a. nohanin’ ilay zaza fotsinina ny trondro
     eat.TF [this child only] DET fish
     FOCUS
     ‘Only this child ate fish.’ (lit. ‘The fish was eaten only by this child.’)

b. *nohanin’ ilay zaza ny trondro fotsinina
     eat.TF’ this child [DET fish only]
     FOCUS
     (‘This child ate only fish.’)

- reconstruction for binding (Pearson 2001, 2005)

(9) a. nodiovin’ ilay zaza ny tena-ny
     cleanse.TF this child DET self-3SG
     ‘This child cleaned himself.’

b. nobaben’ ny renin-dRasoa izy i
     carry.TF DET mother-Rasoa 3SG
     ‘Rasoa’s mother carried her on the back.’

Root clauses are amenable to the Topic Analysis

What about more complex structures?

3 Control structures

3.1 Malagasy Control structures

Control (Equi): an interpretational dependency between two argument positions in which the referential properties of an overt one, the controller, determine the referential properties of a non-overt one, the controllee.

(10) The farmer, _, wanted _ to kill the chicken

                    CONTROLLER CONTROLLEE

Control structures under discussion:

(11) a. nanandrana [namono ny akoho __) Rabe; AGENT FOCUS
try.AF kill.AF DET chicken Rabe
‘Rabe tried to kill the chicken.’

b. nandraman-dRabe; [novonoina __) ny akoho THEME FOCUS
try.TF-Rabe kill.TF DET chicken
(lit. ‘The chicken was tried by Rabe to be killed.’)
‘Rabe tried to kill the chicken.’

3.2 Control as movement
Analysis of control as movement (O’Neill 1995, Hornstein 1999, 2003, and many others)
derivational analysis of control (O’Neill 1995, Hornstein 1999, 2003): the controller-controllee relationship is derived by movement of the overt DP from the controllee position to the controller position
(12) [IP Rabe [VP try [IP Rabe [VP kill chicken]]]] MOVEMENT
(13) [IP Rabe [VP try [IP PRO [VP kill chicken]]]] BASE-
geneneration

General arguments in favor of the movement analysis:
- theory-internal considerations (Boeckx and Hornstein 2003, 2004)
- existence of backward control (Polinsky and Potsdam 2002a, b, 2003), which is particularly problematic for the base-generation analysis
- unification of control and raising, with experimental evidence showing similar processing of control and raising structures (Walenski 2002; Featherston et al. 2000)

Malagasy-internal arguments in favor of the movement analysis:
- backward control is attested in Malagasy (Polinsky and Potsdam 2003, 2005)
- in the Theme focus control construction, PRO in the postverbal agent position is problematic for the base-generation analysis

Assuming the derivational analysis of control, can Malagasy control constructions inform the choice between the Subject Analysis and Topic Analysis?

4 Theme Focus Control

(14) a. n-andram-an-dRabe no-vono-ina ny akoho
PAST-try-TF-Rabe PAST-kill-TF DET chicken
(lit. ‘The chicken was tried by Rabe to be killed.’)
‘Rabe tried to kill the chicken.’

b. kasa-in-dRasoa ho-sas-ana ny zaza
intend-TF-Rasoa FUT-wash-TF DET child
(lit. ‘The child is intended by Rasoa to be washed.’)
‘Rasoa intends to wash the child.’

4.1 Characteristics of TF Control

- the construction is accepted by all speakers (as widely as AF control); it involves a wide range of typical Control predicates
- the control predicate is in the Theme focus form
- the control predicate imposes selectional restrictions on its agent; evidence: imperative formation; volitionality of the agent
- the embedded predicate cannot be in the Agent focus form (appears either in the Theme focus or Circumstantial form)
- controller and controllee are both post-verbal agents (not external arguments)

(15) n-andram-and[Rabe]no-vono-ina ny akoho
PAST-try-TF-Rabe PAST-kill-TF DET chicken
(lit. ‘The chicken was tried by Rabe to be killed.’)
‘Rabe tried to kill the chicken.’

- the construction is biclausal (Polinsky and Potsdam 2003, 2005); evidence: scope of negation, adverbial scope, binding; dependent rather than anaphoric tense

(16) n-andram-an-dRabe no/ho/*Ø-vono-ina ny akoho
PAST-try-TF-Rabe PAST/FUT/*PRES-kill-TF DET chicken
(lit. ‘The chicken was tried to be killed by Rabe.’)
‘Rabe tried to kill the chicken.’
(see Landau 2004 for the dependent vs. anaphoric tense difference)
the external argument (theme DP) moves to the matrix clause

(17) a. n-­andram-­an-­dRabe  no-­vono-­ina  _k k ny akoho_k
PAST-­try-­TF-­Rabe  PAST-­kill-­TF  DET chicken
(lit. ‘The chicken was tried by Rabe to be killed.’)
‘Rabe tried to kill the chicken.’

b. ny akoho_k dia  nandram-­an-­dRabe  novonoina
DET chicken TOP  tried-­Rabe  killed
‘The chicken, Rabe tried to kill it.’

c. inona no  nandram-­an-­dRabe  novonoina?
what  FOCUS tried-­Rabe  killed
‘What did Rabe try to kill?’

4.2 TF Control is Obligatory Control

Obligatory vs Non-Obligatory Control: What is the range of possible controllers available to a controller?

(18) a. Pat_i plans __i,*k  to  sing
b. Pat_i thinks that __i,*k  to  sing would be fun
   NOC
   a. It would ruin Pat_i’s career __i,*k  to  sing in public
   NOC

(19) properties of OC versus NOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>NOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. allows PRO_arb reading (no antecedent)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. permits strict reading under ellipsis</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. paraphrasable with a pronoun</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. allows a non-local antecedent</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. allows a non-c-commanding antecedent</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Landau 2000, Hornstein 2003, Jackendoff and Culicover 2003, and references therein)

Table 4. Malagasy OC/NOC diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TF control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no antecedent, PRO_arb reading</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permits strict reading under ellipsis</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows a non-local antecedent</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows a non-c-commanding antecedent</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows a split antecedent</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see Appendix for the relevant data)

Theme focus control instantiates Obligatory Control, therefore it should be analyzed as movement

5 Movement analysis of Theme Focus Control

5.1 The Subject Analysis: A-movement

(20) syntactic assumptions:
   a. spec,VP is VP-internal agent position
   b. V-to-I movement yields V+agent word order

(21) a. n-­andram-­an-­dRabe  no-­vono-­ina  ny akoho
PAST-­try-­TF-­Rabe  PAST-­kill-­TF  DET chicken
   SUBJECT
   (lit. ‘The chicken was tried by Rabe to be killed.’)
   ‘Rabe tried to kill the chicken.’

b. I'   IP
   DP
   the chicken


What if one of the chains is not A-movement?
5.2 *The Topic Analysis: Aˈ-movement*

**Proposal:** the external argument undergoes Aˈ-movement (TF Control is Obligatory Control; Control is analyzed as movement)

(22) *Topic Analysis*
- the external argument (clause final DP) is obligatory topic (subject to Aˈ-movement)
- the post-verbal DP is subject

(23)a. n-andram-an-dRabe no-vono-ina ny akoho
PAST-try-TF-Rabe PAST-kill-TF DET chicken
SUBJECT TOPIC
‘Rabe tried to kill the chicken.’

b. Top
   |   Top
   |   IP
   |   try.TF
   |   VP
   |   DP
   |   V
   |   TopP
   |   Rabe
   |   try.TF
   |   DP
   |   V
   |   TopP
   |   the chicken
   |   Aˈ Topic
   |   Subject
   |   the chicken

Advantages of the Topic Analysis:
- avoids Relativized Minimality problems
- maintains the analysis of control as Aˈ-movement and accommodates the OC characteristic of Passive Control
- Movement analysis of Control provides an additional argument for the Topic Analysis of the clause-final DP
- What about Agent Focus Control?

6 *Characteristics of Agent Focus Control*

(24)a. nanandrana namono ny akoho Rabe
try.AF kill.AF DET chicken Rabe
‘Rabe tried to kill the chicken.’

b. manaiky hosasan-dRasoa ny zaza
agree.AF wash.TF-Rasoa DET child
‘The child agrees to be washed by Rasoa.’

- the control predicate is in the Agent focus form
- the control predicate imposes selectional restrictions on its EA; evidence: imperative formation, volitionality of the agent
- the embedded predicate is not restricted in voice form
- the controller and controllee are both EAs
- the construction is biclausal (Polinsky and Potsdam 2002a); evidence: negation, adverbial scope, dependent tense
- the construction represents Obligatory Control (see Appendix)
7 Movement analysis of Agent Focus Control

7.1 The Topic Analysis: First try

(26) a. nanandrana namono ny akoho Rabe try.AF kill.AF DET chicken Rabe
‘Rabe tried to kill the chicken.’

(27) Improper Movement

\[ \alpha \]

\[ X \quad Y \quad X \]

where X and Y are different types of syntactic positions (A/A')

alternatives
1. Improper Movement should not be a part of the Minimalist Program (Hornstein 2001:76)
2. Improper Movement is only impossible from complement position (Hornstein 2001:113)
3. complement clause does not contain the A'-position (spec,TopP)

7.2 Control complement is a reduced clause

Proposal: control complements do not have an EA position

- overt EA is impossible in complement clause

(28) *mikasa [hangalatra ny toaka irez/Rasoa ny mpianatra]
    intend.AF steal.AF DET booze 3SG/Rasoa DET student
    (‘The student intends for Rasoa/her/himself to steal the booze.’)

not a semantic restriction

(29) a. mikasa ny mpianatra [fa izaho no hangalatra ny toaka]
    CP intend the student that I FOCUS steal DET booze
    ‘The student intends that I steal the booze.’

b. mikasa ahy [hangalatra ny toaka ny mpianatra]
    CP intend me steal DET booze DET student
    ‘The student intends for me to steal the booze.’

c. mikasa [ny hangalara-ko ny toaka] ny mpianatra
    CP intend DET steal-my DET booze DET student
    ‘The student intends my stealing the booze.’

- floating quantifier daholo ‘all’ requires an EA and is impossible in control complement clause

daholo immediately follows the predicate (VP) and can only be bound by the
EA, although it does not form a constituent with it (Keenan 1995)

(30) a. namaky boky daholo ny mpianatra
    read.AF book all DET student
    ‘The students all read the book.’
    *‘The students all read the books.’

b. novakin’ ny mpianatra daholo ny boky
    read.TF DET student all DET book
    ‘The students read all the books.’
    *‘The students all read the book.’
**daholo in control clauses**

(31) a. mikasa hianatra teny anglisy daholo ny mpianatra
   intend.AF learn.AF English all DET students
   ‘The students all intend to learn English.’

   b. *nanaiky [hianatra teny anglisy daholo] ny mpianatra
   extraposed control complement cannot contain daholo

   c. nanaiky [hianatra teny anglisy] daholo ny mpianatra

**extraposed control complement cannot contain daholo**

(32) a. mikasa hianatra teny anglisy an’i Amerika daholo ny mpianatra
   intend.AF learn.AF English in America all DET students
   ‘The students all intend to learn English in America.’

   b. *mikasa ny mpianatra [hianatra teny anglisy an’i Amerika daholo]
   intend.AF DET student learn.AF English in America all
   (‘The students intend to all learn English in America.’)

   c. mikasa daholo ny mpianatra [hianatra teny anglisy an’i Amerika]
   intend.AF all DET student learn.AF English in America
   ‘The students all intend to learn English in America.’

**daholo cannot be interpreted under the scope of embedded clause negation**

(33) a. nanaiky tsy hamaky ilay boky daholo ny mpianatra
   agree.AF NEG read.AF that book all DET students
   ‘The students all agreed to not read that book.’
   *‘The students agreed to not all read that book.’

   b. nanaiky [tsy hamaky ilay boky] daholo ny mpianatra
   agree.AF NEG read.AF that book all DET students

   c. *nanaiky [tsy hamaky ilay boky daholo] ny mpianatra
   agree.AF NEG read.AF that book all DET students

**daholo is not licensed in SOR complement clause**

(34) a. *nanaiky anay hividy vatomamy daholo ny mamako
   agree.AF us buy.AF candy all DET mother.1SG
   (‘My mother agreed for us all to buy candy.’)

   b. nanaiky anay [hividy vatomamy daholo ___] ny mamako
   agree.AF us buy.AF candy all DET mother.1SG

* cross-linguistic considerations

Cross-linguistically, topic positions are less available in control complements

Japanese (Kuroda 1972, and many others)

(35) *Jiroo-ga kono-eiga-wa mi-yoo-to shi-ta
   Jiro-NOM this-movie-TOP watch-DESID-COMPL do-PAST.DECL
   ‘*Jiro tried, this movie, to watch.’
   (OK as: ‘Jiro tried to watch THIS movie.’—contrastive reading only)

French (Rizzi 1997)

(36) ??Je pense, ton livre, pouvoir le comprendre
   I think your book be.able-INF 3SG understand-INF
   ‘*I think, your book, to be able to understand it’

English

(37) *I tried, this paper, to read

☞ The control complement clause does not contain an A’-position
   (spec,TopP)

7.3 The Topic Analysis: Second try (without embedded TopP)

(38) a. nanandranana namono ny akoho Rabe
   try.AF kill.AF DET chicken Rabe
   ‘Rabe tried to kill the chicken’

b. TopP

   Top'

   DP

   Rabe

   Top

   IP

   VP

   A'-mvt

   try.AF

   Rabe

   A-mvt

   kill.AF

   Rabe

   V

   IP

   VP

   the chicken
Advantages of the reduced complement Topic Analysis

- avoids improper movement
- maintains the analysis of control as movement
- accommodates the independent evidence that embedded clause does not contain a topic projection

7.4 Revisiting the movement analysis of Theme Focus Control

TF derivation also has no TopP

(39) a. nandraman-dRabe novonoina ny akoho
    try.TF-Rabe kill.TF DET chicken

' Rabe tried to kill the chicken.'

b. TopP
   Top'
   DP
   Top
   IP
   try.TF
   I
   V'  
   DP
   VP
   V
   Rabe
   I
   V'  
   DP
   VP
   V
   kill.TF
   Rabe
   try.TF
   kill.TF
   the chicken

7.4 Revisiting the movement analysis of Theme Focus Control

Crucial analytical assumptions:
1. control is analyzed as movement (Hornstein 1999, 2003)
2. control complements have no A'-topic position (section 7.2)

- What determines voice morphology?

PROPOSAL: Voice is determined by the argument of the verb that undergoes A'-movement
(see Pearson 2004 for an implementation of this claim in Malagasy)

PROBLEM: if a clause lacks an argument undergoing A'-movement, how is the voice in that clause determined?

(40) a. kasain-dRasoa hosasana ny zaza
    intend.TF-Rasoa wash.TF DET child

'Rasoa intends to wash the child.'

b. *kasain-dRasoa hanasa ny zaza
    intend.TF-Rasoa wash.AF DET child

'Rasoa intends to wash the child.'

- Cross-linguistically, topic positions are less available in control complements; is there a principled motivation for such reduced structure?

8 Conclusions and open questions

- The status of the Malagasy external argument (clause-final DP)
  SUBJECT ANALYSIS: EA is subject and occupies an A position
  TOPIC ANALYSIS: EA is topic and occupies an A'-position

Control structures provide evidence for the Topic Analysis
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Appendix: Obligatory Control properties of Agent Focus and Theme Focus Control in Malagasy

- arbitrary interpretation of missing antecedent
  (41) a. manantena hitsidika an'i Frantsa Rabe hope.AF visit.AF OBL’DET France Rabe
      ‘Rabe hopes for someone to visit France.’
      OK: ‘Rabe hopes to visit France.’
  b. antenain-dRabe hotsidihina i Frantsa hope.TF-Rabe vist.TF DET France
      ‘Rabe hopes for someone to visit France.’
      OK: ‘Rabe hopes to visit France.’

- strict vs. sloppy reading under ellipsis
  (42) a. mikasa hamono ny omby Rasoa. Izaho koa. intend.AF kill.AF DET cow Rasoa 1 SG also
  b. kasain-dRasoa hovonoina ny omby. Izaho koa. intend.TF-Rasoa kill.TF DET cow 1 SG also
      SLOPPY: ‘Rasoa intends to kill the cow and I do too.’
      *STRICT: ‘Rasoa intends to kill the cow and I intend for her to do so too.’

- non-local antecedent
  (43) a. mino Rasoa fa think.AF Rasoa that
      mikasa hanambady an'i Tana ny governemanta intend.AF leave.AF LOC’ DET Antananarivo DET government
  b. mino Rasoa fa think.AF Rasoa that
      kasain’ny governemanta hilaozana i Tana intend.TF’DET government leave.TF DET Antananarivo
      ‘Rasoa thinks that the government intends her to leave Antananarivo.’
      **Rasoa thinks that the government intends her to leave Antananarivo.’

- non-c-commanding antecedent
  (44) a. mikasa hanambady an-dRasoan y_fianakavian-dRabe AF intend.AF marry.AF ACC.Rasoan DET family-Rabe
  b. kasain’ny fianakavian-dRabe hovadinina i Rasoan intend.TF’DET family-Rabe marry.TF DET Rasoan
      ‘Rabe’s family intends to marry Rasoan.’
      *STRICT: ‘Rabe’s family intends him to marry Rasoan.’

- split antecedent
  (45) a. araka ny reniny dia nanaiky hividy AF according to DET mother.his TOP agreed.AF buy.AF
      ilay trano Rabe
  b. araka ny reniny dia neken-dRabe TF according to DET mother.his TOP agreed.TF-Rabe
      hovidina ilay trano buy.TF this house
      ‘According to his mother, Rabe agreed to buy this house.’
      * ‘According to his mother, they agreed to buy this house.’

- split antecedent
  (45) a. araka ny reniny dia nanaiky hividy AF according to DET mother.his TOP agreed.AF buy.AF
      ilay trano Rabe
  b. araka ny reniny dia neken-dRabe TF according to DET mother.his TOP agreed.TF-Rabe
      hovidina ilay trano buy.TF this house
      ‘According to his mother, Rabe agreed to buy this house.’
      * ‘According to his mother, they agreed to buy this house.’