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1 The Issue

Malagasy MISSING SUBJECT CONSTRUCTION (MSC) (Keenan 1976)—complement clause subject is missing under coreference with a higher element

(1) a. manantena Rabe fa hividy fiara
    hope.PRESENT Rabe that buy.FUTURE car
    ‘Rabe hopes to buy a car.’

   b. [manantena Rabei [fa hividy fiara Δ]]
    hope Rabe that buy car

FINITE CONTROL ANALYSIS (Keenan 1976:276-278)
Malagasy permits control into a tensed, finite clause, as in some other languages missing subject in MSC arises from ordinary mechanisms of Control

NP DROP ANALYSIS (Keenan 1976:278)
Malagasy is a subject-drop language (Rahajarizafy 1960, Keenan 1976, Pearson 2005)
missing subject arises from NP drop in the embedded clause, licensed by higher matrix constituent

Outline of the talk:

• basic facts of Malagasy grammar
• arguments against the Finite Control analysis of the MSC
• MSC as an instantiation of NP Drop; Malagasy as a topic drop language

2 Malagasy Basics

predicate-initial (VOS) language

Philippine-style voicing system—verbal morphology registers the grammatical role of clause-final DP “subject”

(2) a. n-i-vidy akoho i Bao
    PAST-AT-buy chicken Bao
    ‘Bao bought the chicken.’

   b. no-vidi-n’ i Bao ny akoho
    PAST-buy-TT Bao the chicken
    ‘The chicken was bought by Bao.’

   c. n-i-vidi-an’ i Bao ny akoho i Soa
    PAST-AT-buy-CT Bao the chicken Soa
    ‘Soa was bought a chicken by Bao.’

obligatory extraposition of complement clauses with overt C˚

(3) a. manantena Rabe [fa handeha ho any Frantsa aho]
    hope.Rabe that go.AT LOC France 1SG.NOM
    V S CP
    ‘Rabe hopes that I will go to France.’

   b. *manantena [fa handeha ho any Frantsa aho] Rabe
    hope that go LOC France 1SG.NOM Rabe
    V CP S

obligatory tense morphology on verbs

(4) Malagasy tense prefixes

past  present  future/irrealis
n(o)-  ø-  h(o)-

no dedicated non-finite verb forms, future/irrealis substitutes

(5) a. te h-ividy fiara aho
    want.AT FUT-buy.AT car 1SG.NOM
    ‘I want to buy a car.’

   b. nanandrana h-amon’ akoho ilay vehivavy
    tried.AT FUT-kill.AT chicken that woman
    ‘That woman tried to kill a chicken.’

3 The Missing Subject Construction (MSC)

MSC—missing complement clause subject (represented atheoretically as Δ) interpreted as coreferential with a higher DP

(6) manantena Rabe[ [fa hividy fiara Δ]]
    hope.AT Rabe that FUT.buy.AT car
    ‘Rabe hopes to buy a car.’
3.1 Keenan’s (1976) description

only subjects of AT verbs trigger deletion
(7) a. *antenain-dRabe, fa hividy fiara Δ
   hope.TT-Rabe that buy car
   (‘Rabe hopes to buy a car.’)
 b. *manantena ny fianakavian-dRabe, fa hanambady an-dRasoa Δ
   hope.FAM-Rabe that marry ACC-Rasoa
   (‘Rabe’s family hopes that Rabe will marry Rasoa.’)
 c. *manantena Rabe, sy Rakoto fa hanambady an-dRasoa Δ
   hope.Rabe and Rakoto that marry ACC-Rasoa
   (‘Rabe and Rakoto hope that Rabe will marry Rasoa.’)

only subjects can be missing
(8) a. *manantena Rabe, [fa hamangy Δ, Rasoa] hope Rabe that `visit.
   (‘Rabe hopes that Rasoa will visit him.’)
 b. *manantena Rabe, [fa hovangiana Δ, Rasoa] hope Rabe that `visit.
   (‘Rabe hopes that Rasoa will be visited by him.’)

3.2 The Finite Control analysis

MSC is an instance of Control into a finite clause
(9) manantena Rabe, [CP fa hividy fiara PRO,] hope Rabe that buy car
   (‘Rabe hopes to buy a car.’)

    finite control is documented for other languages: Hebrew (Landau 2004),
    Japanese (Uchibori 2000), Persian (Hashemipour 1988, 1989, Ghomeshi
    2001), Bulgarian, Albanian (Landau 2004), perhaps Greek (Terzi 1992)

Hebrew (Landau 2004)
(10) hem, kivu _e PRO, yelxu ha-bayta mukdam
    they hoped that will.go.3PL home early
    (‘They hoped to go home early.’)

    MSC shows basic characteristics of Obligatory Control (OC)
(11) obligatory control characteristics (Hornstein 1999)
 a. does not allow an arbitrary reading of missing subject
 b. does not allow a non-local antecedent
 c. does not allow a non-c-commanding antecedent

3.3 The NP Drop analysis

Malagasy is a discourse-oriented, subject-drop language (Rahajarizafy 1960,
dropped NP’s referent must have been previously established as topic of
discourse
(12) manantena Rabe-topic [CP fa hividy fiara Δ]
    hope Rabe that buy car he
    (‘Rabe hopes to buy a car.’)

(analysis to be developed in section 5)

4 Argumentation Against Finite Control

The MSC does not show properties of Obligatory Control, Finite Control,
or attested Malagasy control structures

4.1 Unlike obligatory control

(13) obligatory control characteristics
 a. does not allow an arbitrary reading of missing subject
 b. does not allow a non-local antecedent
 c. does not allow a non-c-commanding antecedent
 d. controller choice governed by the Minimal Distance Principle
 e. controllee must be complement clause subject
 f. does not allow a split antecedent

    antecedent choice not governed by minimality restriction
(14) Minimal Distance Principle (MDP) (Rosenbaum 1967)
    PRO is coindexed with the lowest DP that c-commands it
(15) a. Sandy, _tried_ PRO, to win
    b. Sandy, persuaded me, PRO, to go

    SUBJECT CONTROL

    OBJECT CONTROL
ordinary control in Malagasy obeys MDP

(16)a. niteny tamin-dRasoa [hianatra teny gasy ꜓ ꜓] Rabe ꜓ tell to-Rasoa learn Malagasy Rabe
   ‘Rabe told Rasoa to learn Malagasy.’
   **‘Rabe told Rasoa that he (Rabe) will learn Malagasy.’

b. nampahatsiahy ny zanany [hanidy ny varavarana ꜓ ꜓] Rasoa ꜓ remind thechild lock the door
   Rasoa
   ‘Rasoa reminded her children to lock the door.’
   **‘Rasoa reminded her children that she will lock the door.’

c. nandresy lahatra an-dRabe ꜓ [haka rivotra ꜓ ꜓] aho, persuade ACC-Rabe take wind I
   ‘I persuaded Rabe to take a vacation.’
   **‘I persuaded Rabe that I will take a vacation.’

eXceptions are few and cross-linguistically stable (Larson 1991, Ruzicka 1999, Jackendoff and Culicover 2003)

(17) Sandy ꜓ promised me ꜓ PRO ꜓ ꜓ ꜓ to leave

MSC triggered by a subject in presence of an object

(18)a. niteny tamin-dRasoa Rabe ꜓ [fa hianatra teny gasy ꜓] tell to-Rasoa Rabe that learn Malagasy
   ‘Rabe said to Rasoa that he (Rabe) will learn Malagasy.’

b. nampahatsiahy ny zanany Rasoa ꜓ remind the children Rasoa
   [fa hanidy ny varavarana ꜓] that lock the door
   ‘Rasoa reminded her children that she (Rasoa) will lock the door.’

c. nandresy lahatra an-dRabe ꜓ [haka rivotra ꜓ ꜓] aho, persuade ACC-Rabe take wind I
   ‘My parents persuaded Rabe that they should take a vacation.’

- dropped subject can be further embedded in a relative clause: focus construction

focus construction is a pseudocleft (Paul 2001)

(19)a. Rasoa no nihomehy Rasoa PRT laugh
   ‘It’s Rasoa who laughed’

b. [IP [predicate Rasoa] [DP/headless rel. Op ꜓ no nihomehy ꜓ ꜓] Rasoa PRT laugh
   lit. ‘The one that laughed is Rasoa.’

dropped subject can be inside headless relative clause of focus construction

(20) manantena i Rasoa ꜓ [fa rahampitso ꜓ no handeha ꜓] hope Rasoa that tomorrow PRT go
   ‘Rasoa hopes that tomorrow she will go.’

- split antecedent allowed for dropped subject

ordinary control resists split antecedents (Hornstein 1999, pace Landau 2000)

(22) *Kim ꜓ persuaded Sandy ꜓ PRO ꜓ ꜓ ꜓ to respect each other

ordinary control in Malagasy does not permit split antecedents

(23) *nampahatsiahy an-dRasoa ꜓ [hifanajana ꜓ ꜓] i Rabe ꜓ remind ACC-Rasoa respect.RECIP Rabe
   ‘Rabe reminded Rasoa to respect each other.’

MSC permits split antecedent interpretation

(24)a. nandresy lahatra an-dRasoa ꜓ i Rabe ꜓ [fa hividy ilay fiara ꜓ ꜓] persuade ACC-Rasoa Rabe that buy that car
   ‘Rabe persuaded Rasoa that they will buy this car.’

b. nampahatsiahy an-dRasoa ꜓ i Rabe ꜓ remind ACC-Rasoa Rabe
   [fa hifanajana manomboka androany ꜓ ꜓] that respect.RECIP begin today
   ‘Rabe reminded Rasoa that they will respect each other starting today.’

☞ The MSC does not have characteristics of obligatory control
4.2 Unlike finite control

(25) finite control characteristics
   a. irrealis interpretation of complement clause
   b. restriction to certain matrix predicates
   c. preference for third person controllers

- irrealis interpretation of complement clause not required
  temporal properties of control complements are restricted by the matrix
  predicate (Bresnan 1982, Varlokosta 1993, Stowell 1995, Martin 1996,

embedded verb in finite control has an irrealis interpretation (Landau 2004)

MSC does not show any temporal dependency

(26)a. mihevitra i Rabe fa n-ahita gidro tany an-tsena
    think Rabe that PAST-see lemur LOC ACC-market
    ‘Rabe thinks he saw a lemur at the market.’

   b. mihevitra i Rabe fa h-ahita gidro any an-tsena
      think Rabe that FUT-see lemur LOC ACC-market
      ‘Rabe thinks he will see a lemur at the market.’

factive predicates allow MSC

(27)a. nanadino i Rasoa fa efa nividy vary
    forget Rasoa that already buy rice
    ‘Rasoa forgot that she already bought rice.’

   b. gaga ny mpiasa fa handray valim-pitia
      be.surprised the worker that receive reward
      ‘The worker is surprised that he will receive a reward.’

- matrix predicate is semantically unrestricted
  finite control is restricted to certain matrix predicates (directive and commissive
  verbs in Hebrew (Landau 2004))

MSC is not restricted: propositional, factive, directive, desiderative, and others

(28) verbs that permit the MSC
   mihevitra ‘think’, mieritreritra ‘think’, mikasa ‘intend’, maniiky
   mitetika ‘plan, plot’, manambara ‘announce’, manapakevitra ‘decide’,
   manonofy ‘dream’, manontany ‘demand, ask’

(29) a verb allows the MSC iff it takes a CP complement

- 1st/2nd person controllers not dispreferred
  1st and 2nd person controllers are not permitted in finite control with an overt
  complementizer (Landau 2004 for Hebrew, Hashemipour 1988 for Persian)

Persian

(30)a. Leyla, tæsmim gereft ke Δ mosafaeræt ber-e
    Leyla decision took.3SG that travel go.SUBJ-3SG
    ‘Leyla decided to go on a trip.’

   b. *pro, tæsmim gereft-æm ke Δ mosafaeræt ber-æm
       decision took-1SG that travel go.SUBJ-1SG
      (‘I decided to go on a trip.’)

no restriction against 1st/2nd person in Malagasy

(31)a. mihevitra aho fa handeha ho any Antsirabe
    think 1SG.NOM that go LOC Antsirabe
    ‘I think I will go to Antsirabe.’

   b. manantena ianao fa hividy fiara amin’ ny herin-taona
      hope 2SG.NOM that buy.AT car PREP the next year
      ‘You hope to buy a car next year.’

☞ The MSC does not have characteristics of finite control

4.3 Unlike Malagasy control

syntactic patterns of control in Malagasy are well documented (Keenan 1976,
Potsdam 2002a, 2003, 2005)

the controller-controllee relationship in the MSC is either more restricted or
differently restricted than in ordinary control (see Appendix for data)

☞ The MSC does not pattern with ordinary control in Malagasy

5 NP Drop Analysis

5.1 Proposal

NP Drop is Topic Drop:
- Malagasy is a topic-drop language, with a Germanic-style topic drop

(see Richards 2000, Pearson 2001, 2005 for comparison between Austronesian
and Germanic)
(see Balkenende 1995 for topic drop in Dutch, Vikner 1995, Rohrbacher 1999 for topic drop in German, Sigurðsson 1993 for topic drop in Old Icelandic, Diesing 1990, Santorini 1992 for topic drop in Yiddish, among others)

- constituents that are dropped must be in a privileged syntactic position
- referential identification of the (embedded) null topic is determined by an interpretive rule

5.2 Malagasy as a topic drop language

- clause-final DP is a structural topic

cannot be an existentially quantified or non-referential

(32)a. *hande ha ho any ny zaza
    go.AT LOC the child
    ('Some children/A child will go there."
    ok: 'The child/children will go there.'

b. *tsy hande ha ho any na iza na iza
    NEG go.AT LOC anyone
    ('No one will go there.')

overtly marked for definiteness

(33) mitomany *(ny/ilay) zaza
    cry the/that child
    'The/that child is crying.'

cannot be focus

(34) *mihinana trondro ilay zaza fotsiny
    eat fish [this child only]
    ('Only this child eats fish.')


structural position: spec,TopP (see Pearson 2001, 2005)

(35) TopP
    Top' DP, structural topic position
    Top IP
    I' t, subject position

• topic drop

under appropriate discourse contexts the subject may be dropped (Rahajarizafy 1960, Keenan 1976, Pearson 2005)

Rahajarizafy (1960:14) "Quand le sujet grammatical est suffisamment précis par le contexte, surtout en parlant, il est souvent sous-entendu."

(36) Tonga e!
    'I/you/he arrive(s).'
    *'Someone arrives.'

null topic always interpreted as specific

5.3 A pro analysis of topic drop and the MSC

• topic drop in general

the Malagasy null topic is an instance of pro
pro must be licensed and identified (following Rizzi 1986)

(37) pro in Malagasy is licensed by Top' in spec,Top

licensing: pro only occurs in spec,Top

(38)a. *mamaky pro i Rabe
    read Rabe
    ('Rabe is reading it/them.')

b. nangalarina pro ny vola-ko
    steal.TT the money-1SG.Poss
    'My money was stolen (*by him/you/me).'

pro licensed in spec,TopP is always a topic (specific, etc.)

• topic drop and the MSC

the missing subject is pro in the embedded subject/spec,TopP position

(39) manantena i Rabe, [fa [hividy fiara ti]IP pro]TopP
    hope.AT Rabe that buy.AT car
    'Rabe hopes to buy a car.'
accounts for the categorical subject restriction in the MSC (= (8))

(40)a. *manantena Rabe, [fa hamangy pro, Rasoa]  
  hope Rabe that visit.AT Rasoa  
  (‘Rabe hopes that Rasoa will visit him.’)  
  
  b. *manantena Rabe, [fa hovangiana pro, Rasoa]  
  hope Rabe that visit.TT Rasoa  
  (‘Rabe hopes that Rasoa will be visited by him.’)

predicts NP Drop regardless of embedded verb voice morphology

(41) manantena i Rabe, fa hofidina pro,  
  hope Rabe that choose.TT  
  ‘Rabe hopes that he will be chosen.’

5.4 referential identification of pro

the referential identity of the null topic is determined by an interpretive rule

(42) identification of pro in Malagasy embedded clauses (first try)  
  co-index pro with a c-commanding DP in spec,TopP (higher topic)

(43) manantena Rabe, fa hividy fiara pro,  
  hope.AT Rabe that buy.AT car  
  ‘Rabe hopes to buy a car.’

only subjects of AT verbs trigger deletion (= (7))

(44)a. *antenain-dRabe, fa hividy fiara pro,  
  hope.TT Rabe that buy car  
  (‘Rabe hopes to buy a car.’)  
  
  b. *manantena ny fianakavian-dRabe, fa hanambady an-dRasoa pro,  
  hope.AT thefamily-Rabe that marry ACC-Rasoa  
  (‘Rabe’s family hopes that Rabe will marry Rasoa.’)  
  
  c. *manantena Rabe, sy Rakoto fa hanambady an-dRasoa pro,  
  hope.AT Rabe and Rakoto that marry ACC-Rasoa  
  (‘Rabe and Rakoto hope that Rabe will marry Rasoa.’)

MSC is not possible with sentential subjects

(45)a. *mahagaga an-dRasoa, [fa nofidina pro,  
  surprise ACC-Rasoa that choose.TT  
  (‘That she was chosen surprised Rasoa.’)  
  
  b. gaga i Rasoa, [fa nofidina pro,  
  be.surprised Rasoa that choose.TT  
  ‘Rasoa is surprised that she was chosen.’

(46) *antenain-dRabe, [fa hividy fiara pro,  
  hope.TT Rabe that buy car  
  (‘That he will buy a car is hoped by Rabe.’)

antenced can be multiple clauses up (focus pseudocleft) (= (20))

(47) manantena i Rasoa, [fa rahampisalo no handeha pro],  
  hope Rasoa that tomorrow go  
  ‘Rasoa hopes that tomorrow she will go.’

intervening object permitted (= (18))

(48)a. niteny tamin-dRasoa Rabe, [fa hianatra teny gasy pro,  
  tell to-Rasoa Rabe that learn Malagasy  
  ‘Rabe said to Rasoa that (Rabe) will learn Malagasy.’  
  
  b. mampahatsiha ny zanany Rasoa,  
  remind the children Rasoa  
  [fa hanidy ny varavarana pro,  
  that lock the door  
  ‘Rasoa reminded her children that she (Rasoa) will lock the door.’  
  
  c. nandresy lahatra an-dRabe ny ray aman-dreniko  
  persuade ACC-Rabe the parent.1SG  
  [fa tsy maintsy haka rivotra pro,  
  that should take.AT wind  
  ‘My parents persuaded Rabe that they should take a vacation.’

MSC is impossible if matrix predicate has no topic position: nominalizations

(49)a. ny fanantenan-dRabe, [fa hitety any Madagasikara izy/*pro,  
  the hope-Rabe that travel LOC Madagascar 3SG.NOM  
  ‘Rabe’s hope that he will travel in Madagascar’  
  
  b. ny fanirian-dRabe, [fa hanambady an-dRasoa izy/*pro,  
  the desire-Rabe that marry ACC-Rasoa  
  ‘Rabe’s desire that he marry Rasoa’

5.5 refinements

with some transitive predicates, the object can identify pro

(50)a. nandresy lahatra ahaka i Rabe, fa tsy maintsy haka rivotra pro,  
  persuade me Rabe that should take wind  
  ‘Rabe persuaded me that he/I should take a vacation.’  
  
  b. mampahatsiha ahaka i Rabe, fa hanidy ny varavarana pro,  
  remind me Rabe that lock the door  
  ‘Rabe reminded me that he/*I will lock the door.’
5.6 Topic Drop and Finite Control: comparing the analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties of the MSC</th>
<th>Topic Drop</th>
<th>Finite Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prohibits arbitrary reading of missing DP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing DP must be subject</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows a non-local antecedent (as in clefts)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows a non-c-commanding antecedent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows a split antecedent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no tense dependency in the embedded clause</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broad range of matrix predicates</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no restriction to third person antecedent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Conclusions

6.1 Summary

The missing subject construction in Malagasy is an instance of topic drop, not finite control.

(54) a. manantena Raibe fa hividy fiara hope.PRESENT Raibe that buy car
      ‘Rabe hopes to buy a car.’

b. manantenaRabe, [fa [hividy fiara t]IP pro]TOPP TOPIC DROP

c. *manantena Rabe, [fa hividy fiara PRO] FINITE CONTROL

The MSC further supports the analysis of Malagasy as a subject-drop language, with dropped subject limited to topic (similar to Germanic topic-drop).

The identification of pro in spec,Top position is syntactically determined but subject to overriding discourse factors.

6.2 Further questions

- ellipsis facts

the topic drop analysis predicts the MSC should permit strict and sloppy readings under ellipsis (confirmed by preliminary data):

(55) mino i Raibe fa hahomby pro. Mino izany koa i Rasoa believe Rabe that succeed believe that also Rasoa
      ‘Rabe believes that he will succeed. Rasoa also believes that she will succeed.’
      SLOPPY

‘Rabe believes that he will succeed. Rasoa also believes that Rabe will succeed.’

no strict reading under obligatory control

(56) te hahomby i Rasoa. Tia izany koa aho want.AT succeed.AT Rasoa want.AT that also I
      ‘Rasoa wants to succeed and I do too’
      SLOPPY

*‘Rasoa wants to succeed and I want her to also’  *STRICT

- predict impossibility of topic drop in embedded clauses lacking the topic projection
• variation in intervention data
  *persuade* vs *remind*: can the overriding factors be lexically determined?

• variation by person: non-subject discourse participants may be stronger interveners than third person expressions

• *pro* in root clauses (no c-commanding higher topic): how is *pro* identified?
  (57) mangatsiaka *pro*
  be.cold.AT
  ‘I am cold.’
  ?/*‘It is cold.’

• licensing of arbitrary *pro*: spec,VP
  (58) nangalarina *pro ny vola-ko*
  steal.TT the money-1SG.POSS
  ‘My money was stolen (by someone).’

• does Malagasy have finite control?
  irrealis complementizer *mba* forces object control interpretation
  (59)a. nandresy lahatra i Rabe
c  persuade me Rabe
  mba tsy maintsy haka rivotra Δvīk
  C.IRREALIS should take wind
  ‘Rabe persuaded me that *he/I should take a vacation.’
  b. nampanatsiay i Rabe
  remind me Rabe
  mba hanidy ny varavarana Δvīk
  C.IRREALIS lock the door
  ‘Rabe reminded me that *he/I will lock the door.’
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Appendix

comparison of ordinary and finite control patterns in Malagasy

- intransitive verb
  ordinary control
  (60)a. subject—subject
  manantena [hividy ilay fiara Δ] Rabe
  hope.AT buy.AT that car Rabe
  ‘Rabe hopes to buy that car’

  b. agent—agent
  antenain-dRabe, [hovidina Δ] ilay fiara
  hope.TT-Rabe buy.TT that car
  ‘Rabe hopes to buy that car’

  MSC is more restrictive
  (61)a. subject—subject
  manantena Rabe, [fa hividy ilay fiara Δ]
  hope.AT Rabe that buy.AT that car
  b. *agent—agent
  *antenain-dRabe, [fa hovida Δ] ilay fiara
  hope.TT-Rabe buy.TT that car
  ‘Rabe hopes to buy that car’

- transitive verb
  ordinary control
  (62)a. object—subject (AT)
  nampahatsiahy ahy, [hanidy ny varavarana Δ] i Rabe
  remind.AT me lock.AT the door Rabe
  b. *subject—subject (AT)
  *nampahatsiahy ahy [hanidy ny varavarana Δ] i Rabe
  remind.AT me lock.AT the door Rabe
  c. subject—subject (TT)
  nampahatsiahyvin-dRabe [hanidy ny varavarana Δ] aho
  remind.TT-Rabe lock.AT the door I
  d. object—agent (CT)
  nampahatsiahyvin-dRabe, ahy, [hohidiana Δ, k ny varavarana]
  remind.CT-Rabe me that lock.TT the door
  ‘Rabe reminded me to lock the door.’

MSC shows different patterns
(63)a. *object—subject (AT)
*nampahatsiahy ahy, i Rabe [fa hanidy ny varavarana Δ]
remind.AT me Rabe that lock.AT the door
b. subject—subject (AT)
 nampahatsiahy ahy i Rabe, [fa hanidy ny varavarana Δ]
remind.AT me Rabe that lock.AT the door

c. subject—subject (TT)
 nampahatsiahyvin-dRabe aho, [fa hanidy ny varavarana Δ]
remind.TT-Rabe I that lock.AT the door

d. *object—agent (CT)
*nampahatsiahyvin-dRabe, ahy, [fa hohidiana Δ, k ny varavarana]
remind.CT-Rabe me that lock.TT the door

‘Rabe reminded me that I/he will lock the door.’
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