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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) a. Rabe, no nividy ity trondro ity ti.
    FOC bought.ACT this fish this
    ‘It is Rabe who bought this fish.’

b. Iza, no nividy ity trondro ity ti?
    FOC bought.ACT this fish this
    ‘Who bought this fish?’

(2) a. *Ity trondro ity, no nividy ti Rabe.
    this fish this FOC bought.ACT
    ‘Rabe bought this fish.’

b. *Inona, no nividy ti Rabe?
    what FOC bought.ACT
    ‘What did Rabe buy?’

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

* I would like to thank Leoni Nicoletta Andriamanana, Andriamilo Zo Rafanomezantsoa, Emmanuel Rajaona, and Malalanirana Annita Rasamoely for sharing with me their native judgment, as well as the audience at the AFLA 12 conference for comments and suggestions. I am responsible for all errors of fact and interpretation.

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, and 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 have 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):
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 ityj Rasoa] [ no [IP manasa lamba tj tj ]] ]

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. 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. (*Daholono) 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
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-adjointing *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-tranok (*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-tranok (*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 juxtaposed, such as the structure in (9):

(9) \[ IP [r ] 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 kisses 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:


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):

\[
(18) \quad [\text{IP} [\text{I}^\circ [\text{PREDP} \text{ Omaly } ] \text{DP} \text{ Rabe } [\text{no} \text{ [CP Op[ nividy vary t] ]]}] ]\text{FOC buy.ACT rice yesterday}]
\]

‘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-dRaso 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. 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 be 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, [ BE t] ] [ FP, t, [ no [ IP, ... t, ... ]] ]

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.’


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 nanahandro trondro Rasoa]$_i$

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$_i$) $[VPtokony[VP[Rabe$_i$[BE $t_j$]]foana]]$ intsony

not should always any longer

$[FP(*Rabe$_i$)[no[IPmamangy an-dRasoat$_i$]]]$,

FOC visit.ACT ACC-

‘It should not always be Rabe any longer who visits Rasoa.’

b. Tsy (*any an-tranok$_k$) $[VPtokony[VP[VP any an-tranok$_k$[BE $t_j$]]foana]]$

not there ACC-house should there ACC-house always

$[FP[Rabe$_i$[no[IPmamangy an-dRasoat$_i$t$_i$]]]$,

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:

\[(38)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad [\text{Na iza na iza, no tsy mamafa lalana t},] \text{ dia voasazy.} \\
& \quad \text{or who or who FOC not sweep.ACT road TOP punish.PASS}
\end{align*}
\]
\text{‘Whoever doesn’t sweep the road he/she will be punished.’}

\[
b. & \quad [\text{Na iza na iza }, [\text{izay tsy mamafa lalana } ] \text{ dia voasazy } ]
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
& \quad \text{or who or who REL not sweep.ACT road TOP punish.PASS}
\end{align*}
\]
\text{‘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, 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.
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