QUESTIONS AND CLEFTS IN MALAGASY[*]

PAUL LAW
Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
law@zas.gwz-berlin.de

I argue that the structure of questions and clefts in Malagasy is neither mono-clausal with direct movement to SpecCP of the type familiar in languages like English, nor pseudo-cleft. I show that placement of the clefted phrase, the restriction on predicate position, the lack of certain adjunct relative clauses and coordination are problematic for either analysis, but can be accounted for in a bi-clausal structure with an empty copula in the matrix clause to which the *wh*-phrase or clefted phrase moves from some base-position.

1. INTRODUCTION

As is well-known since Keenan (1976), questions, relative clauses, topicalization and clefts in Malagasy, like many other Austronesian languages, are all subject to the same constraint, namely, only a particular argument (of the verb with specific morphology) can be extracted:[1]

(1) a. Rabe$_i$ no nividy   ity trondro ity t_i.
          FOC bought.ACT this fish   this
       'It is Rabe who bought this fish.'
    b. Iza$_i$ no nividy   ity trondro ity t_i?
          FOC bought.ACT this fish   this
       'Who bought this fish?'

(2) a. *Ity trondro ity$_i$ no nividy t_i Rabe.
          this fish   this FOC bought.ACT
       'Rabe bought this fish.'
    b. *Inona$_i$ no nividy t_i Rabe?
          what FOC bought.ACT
       'What did Rabe buy?'

The very similar grammatical patterning in (1)-(2) have led to the general consensus in the literature that questions and clefts should be analyzed in the same way.

[1] Abbreviations: ACC=accusative, ACT=active, FOC=focus, NOM=nominative, OBL=oblique, P=preposition, PASS=passive, PST=past, REL=relative, SG=singular, TOP=topic. For the sake of simplicity and uniformity, morphemes are not precisely segmented, and the glosses given here may deviate from the originals.

Following Schachter 1993, I will call the extracted argument **the trigger** instead of subject, as it does not have exactly the same properties of subject in familiar languages like English (cf. Schachter 1976). The constructions in (1) have the focus property similar to English cleft. The morpheme *no* is commonly taken to be a focus particle. For descriptive conveniences, I will call the position before the focus particle *no* **the cleft position**, the phrase appearing in that position **the clefted phrase**, and the phrase containing the focus particle *no* and the rest of the sentence **the no-*phrase*. These labels may conjure up some various well-known concepts with the same names in the theoretical literature, but they have no theoretical standing for our purposes here.

Of special interest is the construction where the trigger and an adjunct both occur before the focus particle *no*:

(3) Amin'ity savony ity$_j$ Rasoa$_i$ no manasa lamba t_j t_i
    with this soap this   FOC wash.ACT clothes
    'It is with this soap that Rabe is washing clothes.'

Keenan (1976:269) refers to this phenomenon as the Body Guard Condition (BGC). Whenever a non-subject is moved, it may always be optionally accompanied by the real subject, here called the trigger.

There is by now a substantial literature on the question of why only the trigger can be extracted (Nakamura 1998, Paul 2002, Aldridge 2002, Richards 2000, Rackowski 1998 and Sabel 2002), and I will not have anything new to offer here. The issue that I would like to address, however, is the structure of questions and clefts, specifically, the (final) landing site of the *wh*-phrase or the clefted phrase. I argue that these have neither the structure in which the extracted phrase moves to SpecCP (Maclaughlin 1995, Pensalfini 1995, Sabel 2002, Potsdam 2003), nor the structure of pseudo-cleft (Paul 2001, Potsdam 2004), both of which haven been extensively discussed for English. Placement of pre- and post-predicate particles (Potsdam 2004) is very problematic for the first approach, while the predicate restriction, the different distributions of the focus particle *no*, the determiner *ny* and the relative complementizer *izay*, the lack of a pseudo-cleft structure for certain adjuncts as well as coordination pose serious difficulties for (some particular assumptions of) the second approach. I suggest a bi-clausal structure with a phonetically null copula in the matrix clause for questions and clefts, and that the clefted phrase in fact lands in the matrix clause. When both an adjunct and the trigger occur before the focus particle *no*, the adjunct is in the matrix clause, while the trigger following it is in the *no*-phrase. I show how the various problems that arise in the other two approaches can be resolved in the bi-clausal analysis.

2. MONO-CLAUSAL ANALYSIS

Questions in English are commonly taken to involve movement of a *wh*-phrase from argument position to SpecCP (Chomsky 1982). It therefore does not seem unreasonable to assimilate the structure for questions in Malagasy to that for English. That is, with the focus particle *no* being in C (Sabel 2001), the example in (1a) would then have the structure in (4a):

(4) a.   [$_{CP}$ Iza$_i$ [no [$_{IP}$ nividy ity trondro ity t_i]]]
     b.   [$_{CP}$ Rabe$_i$ [no [$_{IP}$ nividy ity trondro ity t_i]]]

Since the clefted non-*wh*-phrase *Rabe* in (1a) is apparently in the same position as the *wh*-phrase *iza* 'who' in (1b), the example in (1a) can be given the same structure as that in (4a), as in (4b).

The problem that arises is that there is not enough room for both the adjunct and the trigger when they occur before the focus particle *no*, as in (3). Sabel (2001) thus suggests that the adjunct and the trigger form one constituent, by a process that he calls cluster formation, and the two move as one constituent to SpecCP:

(5) [$_{CP}$ [Amin'ity savony ity$_j$ Rasoa$_i$] [no [$_{IP}$ manasa lamba t_j t_i]]]

The structure in (5) is claimed to be the same as that for multiple-*wh*-questions in Bulgarian.

The advantage of this view of Malagasy questions and clefts is that they pretty much have the same structure as those in English and that the structure of fronting both an adjunct and the trigger is the same as that of multiple *wh*-phrase construction in Bulgarian.[2] But there are a number of problems with this analysis. First, it is unclear how the mono-clausal analysis can account for the placement of pre- and postpredicate particles (cf. Potsdam 2004:248-249). The quantifier *daholo* 'all' may not occur as first constituent before the predicate, but can appear just before but not after the trigger, as shown in (6a) (the adverb *foana* 'always' behaves similarly):

(6) a.   (*Daholo (no))   nihinana   vary (daholo) ny   vahiny   (*daholo).
             all   FOC   ate.ACT   rice   all   the   guest   all
             'All the guests ate rice.'
     b.   (*Daholo) iza   (daholo) no   nihinana   vary (*daholo)?
             all   who   all   FOC   ate.ACT   rice   all
             'Who all ate rice?'

Since the quantifier does not appear after the trigger, the two cannot form one constituent. There is then no reason to suppose that the order *iza daholo* 'who all' in (6b) can be derived by fronting the two. If cluster formation of the sort in (5) is possible, one might wonder why it cannot apply to (the second occurrence of) *daholo* in (6a) and the trigger to derive, incorrectly, the order *daholo iza* 'all who' in (6b), the two being in comparable positions as the adjunct and the trigger in (5). Moreover, if questions are mono-clausal CPs, then it is not clear how the order *iza daholo* 'who all' is to be derived, as the quantifier *daholo* 'all' does not occur in clause-initial position.

Similarly, placement of pre-predicate particles is also a problem. The modal *tokony* 'should'

---

2   The clefted adjunct PP *in the kitchen* in *it's in the kitchen that they caught the mouse* in English is most likely not in a Spec position, however. As my informants do not accept questions with more than one *wh*-phrase in the same clause in Malagasy, I will not consider multiple-*wh* questions in this paper.

or the emphatic particle *tena* occurs just before the predicate, but not elsewhere (Potsdam 2004):

(7) a. (Tokony (*no)) mamangy (*tokony) an-dRabe (*tokony) Rasoa (*tokony)?
         should   FOC   visit.ACT should   ACC   should   should
         'Rasoa should visit Rabe.'

   b. (Tokony) iza   no   mamangy an-dRabe?
        should   who FOC   visit.ACT ACC
        'Who should visit Rabe?'

   c. Nanontany an-dRabe Rasoa (*tokony) raha   (tokony) hividy   trondro izy.
        asked.ACT ACC-   should   whether should   buy.ACT fish   3SG
        'Rasoa asked Rabe whether she should buy fish.'

As the modal *tokony* 'should' cannot appear immediately before the trigger in (7a), it is not possible to derive the order *tokony iza* 'should who' in (7b) by fronting the two. Even if the *wh*-phrase *iza* 'who' can be moved to SpecCP, the order *tokony iza* 'should who' in (7b) cannot be derived. The non-occurrence of *tokony* to the left of the complementizer *raha* 'whether' (cf. (7c)) shows that it cannot be adjoined to CP. In principle, the order can be derived by right-adjoining *iza* 'who' to the modal *tokony* 'should' that is base-generated in its surface position, but there is no independent motivation for such adjunction.

Second, a serious problem for the structure in (5) where the fronted adjunct and trigger form one constituent is the fact that the fronted phrases cannot both occur before a post-predicate particle, or the second part of a predicate-framing expression, as shown in (8a) and (8b):

(8) a. Any   an-trano$_k$ (*Rabe) foana   Rabe$_i$ no   mamangy an-dRasoa.
         there ACC-house   always   FOC   visit.ACT ACC-
         'It's always in the house that Rabe visits Rasoa.'

   b. Tsy   any   an-trano$_k$ (*Rabe$_i$) intsony   Rabe$_i$ no   mamangy an-dRasoa.
        not   there ACC-house   no longer   FOC   visit.ACT ACC-
        'It's not any longer in the house that Rabe visits Rasoa.'

   c. Tsy   mamangy an-dRasoa   intsony   Rabe.
        not   visit.ACT ACC-   no longer
        'Rabe does not visit Rasoa any longer.'

Thus, if the framing expression *tsy … intsony* 'not … any longer' does not form a syntactic constituent with the verb and the Patient argument in (8c), then there is no reason to believe that it forms a syntactic constituent with the fronted adjunct and trigger in (8b) either.

3. PSEUDO-CLEFT ANALYSIS

Paul (2001:708, 711) suggests that questions and clefts in Malagasy are in fact (concealed) pseudo-clefts, having a structure in which two DPs are juxtposed, such as the structure in (9):

(9) [$_{IP}$ [$_{I'}$ I° [$_{XP}$ I Sahondra]] [$_{DP}$ no   nanapaka ity   hazo ity]]
                                               FOC   cut.ACT   this   tree this

'It was Sahonra who cut this tree.' (lit. The one who cut this tree is Sahondra)

Here, the focussed element *i Sahondra* is the matrix (copular) predicate, and the clause final subject is a headless relative (*no* is originally glossed as DET for determiner). She points out that as Malagasy is verb-initial, the null hypothesis is that the clause-initial focus is a predicate (Paul 2001:712). The minimal difference in (10) and (11) seemingly suggests that the clefted phrase before *no* in the a-examples is the predicate, just as it is in the b-examples:

(10) a. Any   Antananarivo no   mipetraka i Ketaka.
          there   FOC   live.ACT
          'It's in Antananarivo that Ketaka lives.'
      b. Any   Antananarivo   i Ketaka.
          there
          'Ketaka is in Antananarivo.'

(11) a. Mpianatra no   namaky   teny.
          student   FOC   read.ACT word
          'It's students who are reading.'
      b. Mpianatra i Ketaka.
          student
          'Ketaka is a student.'

Moreover, negation *tsy* and the verbal particle *toa* 'seem' generally precede the predicate; they too precede the clefted phrase (Paul 2001:713-714):

(12) a. Tsy mpianatra Rasoa.
          not   student
          'Rasoa is not a student.'
      b. Tsy Rasoa no   nanoroka   an-dRakoto.
          not   FOC kiss.ACT   ACC
          'It's not Rasoa who kissed Rakoto.'

(13) a. Toa   nanoroka   an-dRakoto Rasoa.
          seem   kiss.ACT   ACC
          'Rasoa seems to have kissed Rakoto.'
      b. Toa   Rasoa no   nanoroka   an-dRakoto.
          seem   FOC kiss.ACT   ACC
          'It seems to be Rasoa who kissed Rakoto.'

According to Paul (2001:718), the example in (14) is grammatical with the phrasal coordinator *sy*, but not the sentential coordinator *ary* (cf. Keenan 1976:274-275):

(14)   Rasoa [no   nijinja   vary] sy/*ary [no   nanapaka bozaka]
               FOC   harvest.ACT   rice   and   FOC   cut.ACT   grass

'It was Rasoa who harvested rice and cut grass.'

The significance of the example in (14), if correct, is that the bracketed constituents containing *no* must be phrasal, and not sentential (i.e. IP or CP). The facts in (10)-(14) thus appear to be evidence for the clefted phrase being the predicate.

Despite her glossing of *no* in the examples as a determiner, Paul (2001:712) leaves open the possibility that it is a complementizer. Potsdam (under review) argues that it is in fact the latter. He points out that *no* seems to alternate with the uncontroversial complementizer *izay* in the *na ... na ...* '*or... or*'-clause, a relative clause of sorts:

(15)   [Na iza   na iza   (izay/no)   tsy   mamafa   lalana]   dia   voasazy.
          or who   or who   REL/FOC   not   sweep.ACT   road   TOP   punish.PASS
        'Whoever doesn't sweep the road will be punished.'

Furthermore, just like the relative complementizer *izay* in a headless relative, *no* cannot be preceded by the determiner *ny* or the demonstrative *ilay*:

(16)   a.   (*Ny/*Ilay)   izay   nihomehy.
                the/that   REL   laugh.ACT
             'the/that one who was laughing.'
        b.   Iza   (*ny/*ilay)   no   nihomehy?
             who   the/that   FOC   laugh.ACT
             'Who is the/that one who laughed.'

If the reason why the example in (17a) is excluded is because the bracketed phrase, a headless relative with the relative complementizer *izay*, has a definite DP *ny prezida* 'the president' as the predicate:

(17)   a.   *Te   hahalala   [izay   ny   prezida] aho.
              want   meet.ACT   REL   the   president   I
             'I want to meet the one who is the president.'
        b.   *Iza [no   ny   prezida]?
              who   FOC   the   president
             'Who is the president?'

then the example in (17b) can be ruled out for the same reason, if the bracketed phrase is also a headless relative with the definite DP *ny prezida* 'the president' as the predicate. Now, given that the focus particle *no* apparently is in the same position as *izay*, it does not seem too far-fetched, on this view, to suppose that it is a relative complementizer as well.

As for the BGC, Paul (2003) suggests that the adjunct is the predicate, predicating of the *no*-phrase, a DP, and the trigger occurs in the Spec of the *no*-phrase. In (18), then, the fronted trigger

is a kind of possessor, and Op is the familiar empty operator (Chomsky 1982):

(18) [IP [I° [PREDP Omaly   ] [DP Rabe [no   [CP Op$_i$ [nividy   vary t$_i$]]]]]]
　　　　　　　　　　　yesterday　　　　　　　FOC　　　　　　buy.ACT rice
　　　　'It is yesterday that Rabe bought rice.'

In spite of an impressive range of facts, there are quite a number of problems with the pseudo-cleft analysis. First, in the pseudo-cleft analysis, the *no*-phrase is a DP, regardless of *no* being a determiner or relative complementizer. But as Paul (2001:718-718) notes, the focus particle *no* is not used elsewhere in the language apart from clefts, and the headless relative marked by *no* is restricted to the subject position of certain copula clauses. Indeed, the examples in (19) and (20) show that *no* does not alternate with the uncontroversial determiner *ny*:

(19)　a.　Nanasa　　ny/*no　lamba　　Rabe.
　　　　　　wash.ACT　the/FOC　clothes
　　　　　　'Rabe washed the clothes.'
　　　b.　Fantatro　　ny/*no　zaza　（izay/*no) nahita　　　an-dRakoto.
　　　　　　know.1SG　the/FOC　child　that　　　see.ACT　　ACC
　　　　　　'I know the child who saw Rakoto.'

(20)　a.　Lehibe ny/*no　zaza.
　　　　　　big　　the/FOC　child
　　　　　　'the child is big.'
　　　b.　I Ketaka no/*ny　mpianatra tsara　　indrindra.
　　　　　　　　　　FOC/the　student　　good　　most
　　　　　　'Ketaka is the best student.'

The non-alternation of *no* and *ny* in (19) and (20) shows clearly that *no* is not a determiner, and the non-occurrence of *no* in the place of *izay* in (19b) indicates that *no* is not a relative complementizer either. Therefore, it is empirically incorrect to stipulate that *no* is restricted to subject position of certain copula clauses.

Second, clefting of some adjuncts cannot be given a pseudo-cleft analysis. As Paul (2001:719-720) points out, the bracketed phrases in (21) cannot mean 'the one who is cutting grass' since the Agent *Bakoky* is explicitly expressed:

(21)　a.　Amin'-ny antsy [no　manapaka　bozaka　i Bakoly]
　　　　　　with.the　knife　　FOC ACT.cut　　grass
　　　　　　'It is with a knife that Bakoly is cutting grass.'
　　　b.　*Ny　　antony　[izay manapaka bozaka　i Bakoly]
　　　　　　 the　　reason　　REL　cut.ACT　　grass
　　　　　　'The reason why Bakoly is cutting grass.'

She suggests that the bracketed phrases in (21) are headless relatives, interpreted as event nominals (like gerunds in English). In other words, the bracketed phrase in (21a) means 'the event of Bakoly cutting glass is with a knife'. But the explanation is problematic for cases of long-distance extraction. The example in (22a) cannot mean 'the event of Rasoa saying that Bakoly is cutting grass with a knife', unexpected if the *no*-phrase in (21a) is an event nominal (I owe this argument to Hans-Martin Gärtner):

(22) a. Amin'-ny antsy no   nolazain-dRasoa fa   manapaka bozaka i Bakoly.
          with-the knife FOC said.PASS   that cut.ACT   grass
          'It's with a knife that Rasoa said that Bakoly is cutting grass.'
      b. Nahoana [no   manapaka bozaka   i Bakoly]?
          why   FOC   cut.ACT   grass
          'Why is Bakoly cutting grass?'

Moreover, if the ungrammaticality of the example in (21b) is taken to be due to an event being equated with a reason, then the same would apply ruling out the example in (22b), incorrectly. There is thus no good reason to suppose that the bracketed phrase in (21a) is a headless relative.

   Third, there is evidence that the clefted phrase is not the predicate. Quite generally, strong quantifiers like *all* and *most* cannot be the predicate (cf. Keenan 1987):

(23) a. Most students are boys.
      b. *Students are most boys.

(24) a. All the students are boys.
      b. *Students are all the boys.

The same is true of Malagasy. Strong quantifiers like *akabetsahan* 'most' and *rehetra* 'all' do not occur in predicate position:

(25) a. Zazalahy [ny   akabetsahan'ny   mpianatra]
          boy   the most   the   student
          'Most students are boys.'
      b. *[(Ny) akabetsahan'ny   zazalahy] ny   mpianatra.
             the   most   the boy   the student
          'The students are most boys.'

(26) a. Zazalahy [ny   mpianatra rehetra]
          boy   the student   all
          'All the students are boys.'
      b. *[(Ny) zazalahy rehetra]   ny   mpianatra.
             the   boy   all   the student
          'The students are all the boys.'

But these appear in the clefted position without any problem:

(27)   a.   [(Ny) akabetsahan'ny   zazalahy] no   mpianatra/faly.
                the   most   the boy   FOC   student/happy
              'Most boys are student/happy.'
         b.   [(Ny) zazalahy   rehetra   ] no   mpianatra/faly.
                the   boy   all   FOC   student/happy
              'All the boys are students/happy.'

In fact, the grammatical contrasts in (28) (Paul 2001:714, footnote 6) and (29) show that DPs with the determiner *ny* may not occur in predicate position:

(28)   a.   Ny   mpianatra no   mamaky teny.
             the   student   FOC   AT.read word
              'It's the students who are reading.'
         b.   *Ny mpianatra i Ketaka.
               the student
              'Ketaka is the student.'

(29)   a.   (*Ny) prezida   Rabe.
               the   president
              'Rabe is the president.'
         b.   [(*Ny) tantsaha (izay/*no)   manan-karena   indrindra] Rabe.
               the   farmer   that/FOC   have-rich   most
              'Rabe is the wealthiest farmer.'

If the clefted phrases in (27) and (28a) are the predicates, then it would be quite mysterious why they should differ from those in (25b), (26b), (28b) and (29) in not being subject to the constraint that strong quantifiers may not occur in predicate position.

Fourth, my informants accept the coordination example in (14) only if the focus particle *no* in the second conjunct is left out. If the *no*-phrase is in fact a DP, then one would expect it to be able to be conjoined with another DP, the expectation is not borne out. Conjoining a DP with the determiner *ny* and a *no*-phrase as in (30) is impossible (cf. the example in (30b) is like that in (14) with *ny* replacing *no* in the second conjunct. It would be of special interest to see whether the examples in (30) are accepted by the speakers who accept the example in (14) with *sy*):

(30)   a.   *Faly   [ny   lehilahy nijinja   vary]
              happy   the   man   harvest.ACT   rice
                 sy [no   lehilahy nanapaka bozaka   ]
                 and FOC man   cut.ACT   grass
              'The man who harvested rice and the man who cut grass are happy.'

b. *Rasoa [no   nijinja   vary]   sy   [ny   nanapaka   bozaka]
              FOC harvest.ACT rice   and   the   cut.ACT   grass
       'It was Rasoa who harvested rice and cut grass.'

Fifth, contrary to Potsdam's (under review) claim, there is evidence that the focus particle *no* is not a relative complementizer like *izay*. The alternation between *no* and *izay* in (15) is only apparent. When the *na ... na ... 'or...or'*-clause occurs all the way to the right, *no* is impossible; nor is it possible as object of the preposition *amin* or as complement of a noun:

(31)   a. Voasazy   izay/*no tsy   mamafa   lalana (na iza   na iza).
              punish.PASS that/FOC not   sweep.ACT road   or   who   or who
              'Those who don't sweep the road will be punished, (whoever they are).'
       b. Handihy   amin'iza na iza na za   izay/*no tonga aloha i Rabe.
              dance.ACT   with-who or who or who that/FOC arrive first
              'Rabe will dance with whoever comes first.'
       c. Sarin-trano   na inona na inona
              picture-house or what   or what
                    izay/*no   manana tafo mena dia   hovidin-dRabe.
                    that/FOC   have   roof red   TOP   buy.PASS
              'Rabe will buy pictures of any house that has a red roof.'

In fact, *no* and *izay* do not alternate in many other cases. Replacing *izay* with *no* in (10a) would result in ungrammaticality, and also in cases like those in (32):

(32)   a. Rabe no/*izay   nihomehy.
                    FOC/that   laugh.ACT
              'Rabe was laughing.'
       b. Iza   no/*izay   nihomehy?
              who   FOC/that   laugh.ACT
              'Who was laughing?'

If the *no*-phrase is a headless relative, then there is no reason for why it cannot be conjoined with a headless relative with *izay*:

(33)   [Izay/*no   nihira   ] sy   [izay/*no   nandihy   ] dia   olona nitovy ihany.
            that/FOC   sang.ACT and   that/FOC   danced.ACT   TOP   people same   just
         'The one who sang and the one who sang was just the same.'

In sum, the evidence weighs overwhelmingly against the clefted phrase being the predicate and the focus particle *no* being a determiner or a relative complementizer.[3] The *no*-phrase can

---

3   Space limitation does not allow me to discuss facts from other languages that Paul considers. Adjunct questions in English (cf. *Where did John buy the book?*) have the same presuppositional property, but are clearly not pseudo-clefts. Presupposition thus cannot used as an argument for pseudo-cleft.

therefore not be a DP; as a result, the pseudo-cleft analysis of questions and clefts in Malagasy cannot be correct.

4. A BICLAUSAL ANALYSIS

I would like to suggest that questions and clefts in Malagasy have a biclausal structure with a phonetically null copula verb (represented as BE) in the matrix clause, taking the projection of the focus particle *no* as complement (represented here as FP). The trigger or an adjunct XP moves from its base-position to the Spec position of the null copula in the matrix clause, as in (34a):

(34) a. $[_{VP} XP_i [BE \ t_j]] [_{FP} t_i [no [_{IP} \dots t_i \dots]]]_j$
      b. $[_{VP} YP_k [BE \ t_j]] [_{FP} XP_i [no [_{IP} \dots t_i \dots t_k \dots]]]_j$

The BGC has the same structure, except that the trigger moves to the Spec of FP, and the adjunct moves to the same position in the matrix clause, i.e. SpecVP, where the trigger or adjunct would occupy when it moves alone, as in (34b).

The structure in (34b) for the BGC is very much like that in (18) in that the trigger is part of the *no*-phrase, but differs from it in that the trigger and the adjunct move from a position in the *no*-phrase. Since the BGC is an instantiation of the biclausal structure where both the trigger and the adjunct are fronted, it is therefore not an independent condition, fronting of either the trigger or the adjunct being possible independently.

Like many languages, Malagasy does not have an overt copula like *be* in English. However, if every main clause must have a verb, then it follows that there is a phonetically empty verb in the examples in (10b), (11b), (20a), (25a), (26a) and (29) where the predicate lacking tense and focus morphology is clearly not of the category verb. These cases thus constitute independent evidence for the null copula BE. Moreover, placement of predicate-framing expressions like *tsy intsony* (cf. Keenan 1976:252) shows that there is a VP to the left of the focus particle *no*:

(35) a. Tsy $[_{VP}$ nividy   vary tany   an-tsena] intsony   Rabe.
           not   bought.ACT rice there ACC-market any longer
           'Rabe did not buy rice at the market any longer.'
      b. tsy $[_{VP}$ Rabe$_i$ $[_{VP}$ BE t_j] intsony] $[_{FP} t_i [$ no $[_{IP}$ nividy   vary tany an-tsena $t_i]]]_j$
           not   any longer   FOC bought.ACT rice there ACC-market
           'It's not Rabe any longer who bought rice at the market.'

Quite generally, clausal complements occur to the right of the trigger, as the grammatical contrast in (36) shows. It is therefore of little surprise that the projection of the focus particle *no* containing the clause in (35b) too must be right-extraposed:

(36) a. *Nilaza   [fa   nahandro trondro Rasoa] Rabe.
          say.ACT   that cook.ACT fish
          'Rabe said that Rasoa cooked fish.'

    b. Nilaza   *t$_j$* Rabe   [fa   nahandro trondro Rasoa]$_j$
      say.ACT   that cook.ACT fish
      'Rabe said that Rasoa cooked fish.'

As pre- and post-predicate particles as well as the clefted phrase occur after negation and before the second part of a predicate-framing expression, they are located in a rather low position in the matrix clause:

(37)   a. Tsy (*Rabe$_i$) [$_{VP}$tokony [$_{VP}$ [$_{VP}$ Rabe$_i$ [BE *t$_j$*]] foana   ]]   intsony
         not   should   always   any longer
                  [$_{FP}$ (*Rabe$_i$) [no   [$_{IP}$ mamangy an-dRasoa *t$_i$*]]]$_j$
                                  FOC   visit.ACT   ACC-
         'It should not always be Rabe any longer who visits Rasoa.'
    b. Tsy (*any an-trano$_k$) [$_{VP}$ tokony [$_{VP}$ [$_{VP}$ any   an-trano$_k$ [BE *t$_j$*]] foana]]
         not   there ACC-house   should   there   ACC-house   always
                  [$_{FP}$ Rabe$_i$ [no   [$_{IP}$ mamangy an-dRasoa *t$_k$ t$_i$*]]]$_j$
                              FOC   visit.ACT   ACC-
         'It should not always be in the house that Rabe visits Rasoa.'

It is not entirely obvious where precisely these are located in the matrix clause, even though the clefted phrase in (37a) clearly is not part of the projection of the focus particle *no*. Since there is a VP projection in the matrix clause, there is one SpecVP position and possibly several VP-adjoined positions. As the pre- and post-predicate particles are optional, a hallmark of adjuncts, it seems plausible that they can be adjoined to the left and right of VP respectively. Moreover, because only one fronted phrase may occur between pre- and post-predicate particles (cf. the examples in (8a) and (8b)), SpecVP is just the right position to host the clefted phrase.

Not only does the biclausal account of questions and clefts avoid many problems of the other two analyses, it also explains several facts that the other two do not. First, pre- and post-predicate particles are left- and right-adjoined respectively to the (matrix) VP (headed by the empty predicate BE) just like they are in other cases.

Second, as the focus particle *no* is not a determiner like *ny* or a relative complementizer like *izay*, it is just as expected that it does not alternate with these (cf. the examples in (19)-(20), (29b) and (31)-(32)). Similarly, it also follows that the projection of the focus particle *no*, a non-DP, cannot be conjoined with a DP that is headed by either the determiner *ny* (cf. (30)) or the relative complementizer *izay* (cf. (33)), coordination being generally possible only if the conjuncts are of the same logical type (cf. Sag, Gazdar, Wasow and Weisler 1985).

Third, as the null copula BE, not the clefted phrase, is the matrix predicate, strong quantifiers may occur immediately before the focus particle *no*. It is BE, not the strong quantifiers, that is the predicate (cf. the discussion of the examples in (27)). Thus, the positions of negation *tsy* and the verbal particle *toa* 'seem' in (12) and (13) are not necessarily evidence for the clefted phrase being the predicate. They are consistent with them left-adjoining to the VP headed by BE.

Fourth, the separation of an adjunct and the trigger in the BGC in (34) is not a problem, the two not forming a constituent. The clefted phrase is in the matrix clause, and the trigger is in the Spec of the following *no*-phrase.

Fifth, the biclausal analysis of Malagasy questions and clefts has the conceptual advantage that the syntactic structure of questions and clefts where only one phrase is fronted and that of the BGC where two phrases are fronted are essentially the same.

4. SOME APPARENT SIMILARITIES BETWEEN *NO* AND *IZAY*

If it is true that the focus particle *no* is not a relative complementizer like *izay*, then the question that arises is why they seem to be possible or impossible in some syntactic contexts, as the examples in (15)- (17) appear to show.

The non-occurrence of the determiner *ny* before the demonstrative *ilay* in (16a) or the focus particle *no* is quite simply due to their not being NPs. The headless relative *izay nihomeny* 'the one who was laughing' is a DP, and the *no*-phrase is not an NP. In both cases, the complement position of the determiner *ny* is not of the category NP that it can take as complement.

The ungrammaticality of the examples in (17) is related to the restriction on the predicate, as Potsdam (under review) already points out, and has nothing to do with the category of *izay* or *no*. It is clear that *ny prezida* 'the president' in (17a) is in predicate position, and is excluded for the same reason as in (28a) and (29). In the biclausal analysis for questions and clefts, what follows the focus particle *no* is the predicate. So the DP *ny prezida* 'the president' in (17b) is ruled out in predicate position for the same reason.

The *izay/no* alternation in (15) is only apparent. The structure with *izay* and that with *no* are different. The variant with *no* has the structure in which *na iza na iza* 'whoever' is fronted to the cleft position within the phrase preceding the topic marker *dia*, whereas the variant with *izay* has the structure in which *na iza na iza* 'whoever' is adjoined to the matrix clause:

(38)　a.　[Na iza　na iza$_i$　no　tsy　mamafa　　lalana t_i]　dia　voasazy.
　　　　　　or who　or who　FOC　not　sweep.ACT　road　　TOP　punish.PASS
　　　　　'Whoever doesn't sweep the road he/she will be punished.'
　　　b.　[Na iza　na iza] [[izay tsy　mamafa　　lalana]　dia　voasazy]
　　　　　　or who　or who　　REL　not　sweep.ACT　　road　　TOP　punish.PASS
　　　　　'Whoever doesn't sweep the road he/she will be punished.'

The fronting of *na iza na iza* 'whoever' in (38a) is just like the fronting of the proper name *Rabe* in (39a), while evidence for *na iza na iza* being an adjunct to the matrix clause in (38b) comes from the fact that it need not be present, as in (39a), and may occur to the right of the matrix predicate, as in (39b):

(39) a. [Rabe*ᵢ* no   tsy   mamafa   lalana *tᵢ*] dia   voasazy.
              FOC   not   sweep.ACT   road   TOP   punish.PASS
          'Rabe does sweep the road, he will be punished.'
      b. Izay tsy   mamafa   lalana dia [[voasazy   ] [na iza   na iza]]
          REL not   sweep.ACT   road   TOP   punish.PASS   or who   or who
          'Whoever doesn't sweep the road he/she will be punished.'

5. CONCLUSION

In sum, there is considerable evidence for questions and clefts as well as the BGC in Malagasy having a biclausal structure with an empty copula in the matrix clause.

The biclausal analysis can but the monoclausal analysis cannot explain the placement of pre- and post-predicate particles as well as the non-adjacency of the fronted adjunct and trigger in the BGC. It avoids several empirical and conceptual problems with the pseudo-cleft analysis. Strong quantifiers occur in cleft position since the clefted phrase is not the predicate, but is fronted from argument position. The focus particle *no* is neither a determiner nor a relative complementizer, as it does not alternate with the determiner *ny* or with the relative complementizer *izay*. This fact is further supported by the impossibility of coordinating a *no*-phrase and a DP. Additionally, the lack of certain adjunct RCs is also no problem, for adjunct clefts do not involve DPs with a RC, but are derived by direct movement to the cleft position from a base-position that is to the right of the predicate in the *no*-phrase.

The biclausal analysis has the conceptual advantage that clefting or questioning of a trigger, an adjunct, or a trigger and an adjunct has a uniform account.

REFERENCES

ALDRIDGE, EDITH. 2002. Nominalization and *wh*-movement in Seediq and Tagalog. *Language and Linguistics* 3, 393-427.

KEENAN, EDWARD. 1974. Remarkable subjects in Malagasy. In Charles Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*, pp. 247-301. New York: Academic Press.

KEENAN, EDWARD. 1987. A semantic definition of 'indefinite NP'. In Eric Reuland and Alice ter Meulen (eds.), *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, pp. 286-317. Cambridge: MIT Press.

MACLAUGHLIN, DAWN. 1995. Wh-movement in Malagasy: An extraction asymmetry. In Alinlabi (ed.), *Theoretical Approaches to African Linguistics*, pp. 117-128. Trenton: Africa World Press.

MASSAM, DIANE and CAROLINE SMALLWOOD. 1997. Essential features of predication in English and Niuean. In K. Kusumoto (ed.), *Proceedings of NELS 27*, pp. 263-272. Amherst: GLSA Publications.

NAKAMURA, MASANORI. 1998. Reference set, minimal link condition, and parameterization. In Pilar Barbosa, Danny Fox, Paul Hagstrom and Martha McGinnis (eds.), *Is the Best Good Enough?: Optimality and Competition in Syntax*, pp. 292-313, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

PAUL, ILEANA. 2001. Concealed pseudo-clefts. *Lingua* 111, 707-727.

PAUL, ILEANA. 2002. On extraction asymmetries. In Andrea Rackowski and Norvin Richards (eds.), *Proceedings of AFLA 8* (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 44), pp. 211-224. Cambridge: MITWPL.

PAUL, ILEANA. 2003. Multiple topics: Evidence from Malagasy. In Anastasia Riehl and Thess Savella (eds.), *Proceedings of AFLA 9* (Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics 19*)*, pp. 137-148. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Linguistic Club Publications.

PEARSON, MATTHEW. 1998. Predicate raising and 'VOS' order in Malagasy. In Ileana Paul (ed.), *The structure of Malagasy, volume II* (UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics 20), pp. 94-110. Los Angeles: UCLA Department of Linguistics.

PENSALFINI, ROBERT J. 1995. Malagasy phrase structure and the LCA. In Robert Pensalfini and Hiroyuki Ura (eds.), *Papers on Minimalist Syntax* (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 27), pp. 209-211. Cambridge: MITWPL.

POTSDAM, ERIC. 2003. Evidence for semantic identity under ellipsis from Malagasy sluicing. In Mokoto Kadowaki and Shigeto Kawahara (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 33*, pp. 285-302. Amherst: GLSA Publications.

POTSDAM, ERIC. 2004. Wh-questions in Malagasy. In Paul Law (ed.), *Proceedings of AFLA 11* (ZAS Papers in Linguistics 34), pp. 244-258, Berlin: Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.

POTSDAM, ERIC. under review. The cleft structure of Malagasy *wh*-questions. In Hans-Martin Gärtner, Paul Law and Joachim Sabel (eds.), *Clause Structure and Adjuncts in Austronesian Languages*, Berlin: Mouton.

RACKOWSKI, ANDREA 1998. Malagasy adverbs. In Ileana Paul (ed.), *The structure of Malagasy, volume II* (UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics 20), pp. 21-33. Los Angeles: UCLA Department of Linguistics.

RICHARDS, NORVIN. 2000. Another look at Tagalog subjects. In Ileana Paul, Vivianne Philips and Lisa Travis (eds.), *Formal Issues in Austronesian Linguistics*, pp. 105-116. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.

SABEL, JOACHIM. 2001. Deriving multiple head and phrasal movement: the cluster hypothesis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32, 532-547.

SABEL, JOACHIM. 2002. Wh-questions and extraction asymmetries in Malagasy. In Andrea Rackowski and Norvin Richards (eds.), *Proceedings of AFLA 8* (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 44), pp. 309-324. Cambrige, MA: MITWPL.

SAG, IVAN A. AND GERALD GAZDAR, THOMAS WASOW AND STEVEN WEISLER. 1995. Coordination and how to distinguish categories. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 3*, 117-171.

SCHACHTER, PAUL. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, Actor, Actor-Topic or None of the above? In Charles Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*, pp. 491-518. New York: Academic Press.

SCHACHTER, PAUL. 1993. Tagalog. In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld and Theo Venneman (eds.), *Syntax: An International Handbook of Comtemporary Research*, pp. 1418-1430. Berlin: de Gruyter.