



- (2) a. Hihiram ang babae ng laruan sa bata. (Tagalog)  
 borrow.ACT woman toy child  
 ‘The woman will borrow a toy from a/the child.’
- b. Hihiram-in ng babae ang laruan sa bata.  
 borrow-PASS woman toy child  
 ‘A/the woman will borrow the toy from a/the child.’
- c. Hihiram-an ng babae ng laruan ang bata.  
 borrow-DIR woman toy child  
 ‘A/the woman will borrow a toy from the child.’

While the postverbal arguments may be re-ordered in Tagalog, marking the arguments differently may result in pragmatically odd interpretations. For instance, if in (2a) *babae* ‘woman’ were prefixed with *ng* and *laruan* ‘child’ with *ang*, the sentence would have the interpretation in which the toy borrows a woman from the child.

In Tsou, an Austronesian language spoken in Mount Ali, Taiwan, the Actor largely occurs in the end of the sentence with the nominative marker *’e*, *’o* or *na* when the thematic verb bears active morphology, and the Patient does so when the thematic verb has passive morphology:

- (3) a. M-i-ta eobak-o ta mo’o ’e pasuya. (Tsou)  
 ACT-REA-3S hit-ACT OBL NOM  
 ‘Pasuya hit Mo’o.’
- b. Ø-i-ta eobak-a ta pasuya ’e mo’o.  
 NACT-REA-3S hit-PASS OBL NOM  
 ‘Mo’o was hit by Pasuya.’

Arguments other than the Nominative-marked argument are marked with the Oblique marker *ta* or *to* (Szakos 1994, Zeitoun 2000). Following Schachter (1993), the argument that is marked or positioned in a specific way as correlated with verbal morphology will here be called *the trigger*.

The facts in (4)-(5) apparently show that the postverbal trigger in Malagasy and Tagalog cannot be a *wh*-phrase (Sabel 2002 and Richards 1998):

- (4) a. Nividy trondro Rabe. (Malagasy)  
 bought.ACT fish  
 ‘Rabe bought fish.’
- b. \*Nividy trondro iza?  
 bought.ACT fish who  
 ‘Who bought fish?’
- (5) a. Bumili si Pedro ng isda. (Tagalog)  
 bought.ACT fish  
 ‘Pedro bought fish?’

- b. \*Bumili sino ng isda?  
 bought.ACT who fish  
 ‘Who bought fish?’

From a comparative perspective, it is of some interest that Tsou has no restriction on postverbal *wh*-phrase. Either a *wh*-phrase or a non-*wh*-phrase may occur in the same postverbal position:

- (6) a. M-o m-hin-o to tposə na oko. (Tsou)  
 ACT-REA ACT-buy-REA OBL book NOM child  
 ‘A child bought a book.’  
 b. M-o m-hin-o to tposə na sia?  
 ACT-REA ACT-buy-REA OBL book NOM who  
 ‘Who bought a book?’

Despite the contrast in (4) and (5) on the one hand, and the lack thereof in (6), we argue that the grammatical patterns in (4)-(6) can be given a unified account.

We suggest that the distribution of postverbal *wh*-phrase triggers is not related to a ban on postverbal indefinite triggers (Sabel 2002, Richards 1998),<sup>2</sup> but is due to the same general requirement on the form of the trigger in postverbal position. Specifically, a *wh*-phrase trigger is allowed postverbally just in case it can independently have the form that satisfies the formal requirement on the trigger in postverbal position. As it turns out, even in Malagasy and Tagalog, the contrast in (4) and (5) fails to hold of certain postverbal *wh*-phrase triggers, a fact that has not received much attention and systematic investigation.

The paper proceeds as follows. First, we present empirical evidence that the trigger in postverbal position is not necessarily definite or specific, contrary to the common perception in the literature (Keenan 1976 and Schachter 1993). Second, we show that a *wh*-phrase trigger is sometimes possible in postverbal position in Malagasy and Tagalog. Third, in light of these facts, we argue that the non-occurrence of certain *wh*-phrases in postverbal position is not related to the definiteness requirement on the trigger in that position, there being none, but to the form of the trigger that is independently required.

## 2. TRIGGER AND DEFINITENESS

The trigger in Austronesian languages is commonly taken to be definite. According to Keenan (1976:252-253), the surface subjects of Malagasy simplex Ss, here called the trigger, are

<sup>2</sup> On a cautionary note, it has to be mentioned that these authors only give the rough outlines of an account. Thus Richards (1998) suggests that "the semantics of a *wh*-word might be incompatible with specificity" and Sabel (2002) assumes that "Malagasy *wh*-words are inherently [-specific]." This limitation to just *wh*-words is clearly insufficient for dealing with *wh*-phrases like *which*-NP. Sabel explicitly concedes the relevance of D-linking for the latter. Likewise, our own findings will have ultimately to be weighed against a more sophisticated theory of definiteness/specificity, taking into account generic and kind referring readings of DPs as well as the universal vs. free choice construal of *any*-NP.

necessarily definite, and indefinite NPs without any determiner may occur as objects, but never as subjects:

- (7) a. Lasa \*(ny) mpianatra. (Malagasy)  
       gone the student  
       ‘The students left.’  
       b. Nahita mpianatra Rabe.  
       saw.ACT students  
       ‘Rabe saw some students.’

Similarly, Schachter (1993:1419) claims that the trigger in Tagalog is regularly interpreted as definite (cf. the interpretations in (2)), in concordance with Schachter and Otones’s (1972:60) suggestion that the *ang*-marked topic never expresses a meaning of indefiniteness.

If the trigger is necessarily definite, then the exclusion of postverbal *wh*-phrase triggers can be straightforwardly linked to the definiteness constraint on the trigger, *wh*-phrases not being definite (Richards 1998 and Sabel 2002). The same account carries over to Tsou. As indicated in the interpretation in (6a), postverbal trigger argument need not be definite. It is therefore just as expected that in Tsou a *wh*-phrase may occur in the same postverbal position of the trigger.

That there may be a connection between definiteness of the trigger argument and postverbal *wh*-phrase trigger is buttressed by the fact that non-triggers are not necessarily definite or specific and postverbal *wh*-phrase non-triggers are possible:

- (8) a. Nividy inona Rabe? (Malagasy)  
       bought.ACT what  
       ‘What did Rabe buy?’  
       b. Bumili si Pedro ng ano? (Tagalog)  
       bought.ACT what  
       ‘What did Pedro buy?’  
       c. M-o m-hin-o to cuma ’o oko? (Tsou)  
       ACT-REA ACT-buy-REA OBL what NOM child  
       ‘What did the child buy?’

As simple and plausible as it may sound, there is empirical evidence, perhaps not very well-known, showing that the trigger in Malagasy and Tagalog need not be definite or specific (contra Paul (1999:69,81) for Malagasy).

In the existential construction (cf. the construction with the expletive *there* in English), the argument of the existential predicate must be indefinite, as has been extensively discussed in the literature (cf. Milsark 1974). This is true of Malagasy as well. As shown in the example in (9a), taken from Paul (1999:68), a DP with the determiner *ny* may occur as argument of the existential predicate *misy* ‘exist’:

- (9) a. Misy any an-trano ny lehilahy. (Malagasy)  
 exist there at-house the man  
 ‘Some of the men are in the house.’  
 b. Tsy misy any an-trano ny lehilahy.  
 not exist there at-house the man  
 ‘No man is in the house.’

Paul originally gives the translation as partitive. One might argue that *ny lehilahy* ‘the man’ is in fact definite, but is embedded under a phonetically empty determiner whose meaning is *some*, giving rise to the partitive reading. If so, then the example in (9a) would not be a counterexample to the generalization that the argument of an existential predicate must be indefinite.

There is good reason to suppose that the argument in (9a) is not interpreted as partitive, however. As indicated in the interpretation in (9b), the trigger must be understood to be under the scope of negation. In order for it to have a partitive reading and have wide scope over negation, an overt lexical item like *sasany* ‘some’ must be used, as in (10a):

- (10) a. Tsy misy any an-trano ny sasany amin’ny lehilahy.  
 not exist there at-house the some P-the man  
 ‘Some of the men are not in the house.’  
 b. Tsy misy intsony ny zaza mitomany.  
 not exist any longer the child cry  
 ‘Some of the children are no longer crying.’

Similarly, our informants understand the example in (10b), contrary to Paul’s (1999:76) rendition as partitive, as saying that no children are crying.

In (11) are more examples of *ny*-marked trigger that is not definite. Thus, the sentence in (11a) is coherent only if the argument *ny kianja filalaovana* ‘playground’ is not definite or specific, the following clause denying the existence of a playground:

- (11) a. Ilainay ny kianja filalaovana,  
 need.PASS.1PL the ground play  
 satria tsy manana toerana afahan’ny ankizy milalao izahay.  
 because not have ground can the children play we  
 ‘We need a playground,  
 because we don’t have any place where children can play.’  
 b. Omeo ahy ny kaopy raha mba misy ao.  
 give.PASS me the cup if PRT there are there  
 ‘Give me a cup, if there is any!’

- c. Nilaza tamin-ko ny sefo, fa ho hirahiny ny dokotera  
 said.ACT to-me the director that will send.3SG the doctor  
 (fa kosa tsy fantatro hoe iza).  
 but not know.1SG COMP who  
 ‘The director told me that he’ll send a doctor (but I don’t know which).’
- d. Te hanao trano ianao. Tena ananao ve ny sary?  
 want.ACT build.ACT house you really have.2SG Q the picture  
 ‘You want to build a house. Do you really have a plan?’

In (11b), the *if*-clause makes it clear that the speaker has no knowledge of whether a cup exists; so the *ny*-marked DP *ny kaopy* ‘cup’ is understood to be non-specific or indefinite. In the same vein, *ny dokotera* ‘doctor’ in (11c) is not specific or definite, since the speaker explicitly says that s/he does not know which doctor is coming. In (11d), *ny sary* ‘plan’ may be understood to refer to an existing plan or to one that does not yet exist.<sup>3</sup>

Similarly, there are examples in Tagalog where the *ang*-marked trigger need not be definite or specific. In the examples in (12), taken from Adams and Manaster-Ramer (1988:83) and Schachter and Otnes (1972:534) respectively, the trigger need not be definite or specific:

- (12) a. Darating bukas (Tagalog)  
 come.ACT tomorrow  
 ang isang babae-ng nakilala ko sa probinsya.  
 one woman-LNK met.PASS I in province  
 ‘A woman is coming tomorrow who I met in the province.’
- b. Kailangan ng puno ang tubig.  
 need tree water  
 ‘Trees need water.’

In (12a), the referent of the trigger can just be any woman that the speaker has met in the province (or it can also be a specific one that the speaker has in mind). The generic sentence in (12b) clearly does not refer to any specific body of water.

More examples with indefinite and non-specific triggers are given in (13). Note that the mood in (13a) and (13b) is imperative:

- (13) a. Basahin mo ang libro at sabihin mo sa akin,  
 read.PASS you book and tell you me  
 kung makikita mo ang mali sa libro.  
 whether see.PASS you mistake book  
 ‘Read the book and tell me whether you find any mistake in the book!’

<sup>3</sup> For consistency, *ny* is glossed throughout as the definite determiner. As is clear from the text, however, it does not necessarily have the definite interpretation.

- b. Gamitin mo ang anuma-ng pinggan.  
 use 2SG any-LNK dish  
 ‘Use any dish.’
- c. Ibibigay niya sa akin ang tasa, kung mayroon.  
 give.PASS he me cup, if there is  
 ‘He’ll give me a cup, if there is one/any.’

While it is not impossible that the trigger in (the second conjunct of) the example in (13a) may refer to some specific mistakes, it is certainly possible for it to have no specific reference. That is, the order is to find just anything that is incorrect. The command with the indefinite modifier *anuman* ‘any’ in (13b) evidently indicates that the referent of the trigger *ang anumang pinggan* is just any dish. In (13c), like in (11b), the continuation is a clear indication that the referent of the trigger in the main clause, *ang tasa* ‘a cup’, is not any specific one.

There are in fact declarative examples with indefinite triggers showing unequivocally that the trigger may very well be indefinite (Schachter and Otnes 1972:535):

- (14) a. Sasabihin nila sa iyo ang anumang mangyari.  
 tell.PASS they you anything happen  
 ‘They will tell you anything that happens.’
- b. Pinapahinto nila ang sinumang nagdaan.  
 stop.PASS they anyone pass by  
 ‘They stop anyone who passes by.’

The examples in (14) somehow escaped attention in the syntactic literature, giving rise to the misperception that the trigger must be definite or specific.

The facts in (9)-(14) are evidence that the trigger need not be definite or specific. If this is correct, then we obviously cannot relate the ungrammaticality of the examples in (4b) and (5b) to the general requirement that the trigger be definite or specific.

### 3. POSTVERBAL *WH*-PHRASE TRIGGER

While the examples in (4b) and (5b) are indeed ungrammatical, it is unwarranted to generalize across-the-board to the effect that postverbal *wh*-phrase trigger is never possible. As shown in (15), some *wh*-phrase triggers may occur postverbally in Tagalog:

- (15) a. Bumili ng isda ang ano?  
 buy.ACT fish what  
 ‘Who bought fish?’
- b. Bumili ng isda ang aling babae?  
 buy.ACT fish which woman  
 ‘Which woman bought fish?’

- c. Bumili ng isda ang ilang babae?  
 buy.ACT fish how many woman  
 ‘How many women bought fish?’

The examples in (15) may but need not be understood as echo questions. This point is crucial, for if they were necessarily echo questions, then they need not be taken to be evidence that postverbal *wh*-phrase triggers in *wh*-questions are possible.

The questions in (15) can be *wh*-questions, since they can be embedded by the subordinator *kung* as indirect question complements or as sentential subjects:<sup>4</sup>

- (16) a. ?Hindiko alam kung bumili ng isda ang ano.  
 not I know.PASS COMP buy.ACT fish what  
 ‘I don’t know who bought fish.’  
 b. ?Hindi maliwanag kung bumili ng isda ang aling babae.  
 clear COMP buy.ACT fish which woman  
 ‘Which woman bought fish is not clear.’  
 c. ?Dikalala ang tanong kung bumili ng isda ang ilang babae.  
 unknown question COMP buy.ACT fish how many woman  
 ‘The question of how many women bought fish is .’

The lack of the interpretation of *kung* as *whether* in (16), in contrast with cases like (17) without an overt *wh*-phrase in the same clause, excludes the possibility that the embedded questions in (16) are echo questions:<sup>5</sup>

- (17) a. Hindi ko alam kung bumili ng isda ang babae.  
 not I know.PASS whether buy.ACT fish woman  
 ‘I don’t know whether the woman bought fish.’  
 b. Kung mapapasa si Pedro ang tanong.  
 whether pass.ACT question

<sup>4</sup> The less than perfect grammaticality of the examples in (16) is most probably due to the garden-path effect. When the hearer first hears *kung* without an overt *wh*-phrase in the immediate vicinity, he or she would think that it is interpreted as *whether* (cf. (17)), and is part of an embedded yes/no question. Only much later in the sentence does the hearer encounter an overt *wh*-phrase, and realize that *kung* is not interpreted as *whether*. The garden-path effect disappears when the overt *wh*-phrase occurs earlier in the sentence:

- (i) Hindi ko alam kung ang aling babae ang bumili ng isda.  
 not I know.PASS COMP which woman buy.ACT fish  
 ‘I don’t know which woman bought fish.’

<sup>5</sup> It is an independent issue as to how the morpheme *kung* ‘whether’ in (17) is to be related to *kung* in (16) where it does not have that interpretation. One possibility is that *kung* is just a grammatical formative with some abstract Q feature (Baker 1970) appearing on C. It is interpreted as *whether* if a phonetically empty yes/no question operator appears in its Spec position, and it lacks that interpretation when it co-occurs with an overt *wh*-phrase in the same clause.



‘Whether Pedro will pass (the exam) is the question.’

Quite generally, the sentence an echo question echoes is independently possible. Thus, the echo questions in (18a) and (20a) echo the independently possible sentences in (18b) and (20b):

- (18) a. John wondered whether Mary bought WHAT?  
 b. John wondered whether Mary bought the book.
- (20) a. Whether John will pass WHAT is an interesting question?  
 b. Whether John will pass the written exam is an interesting question.

By contrast, as the sentences in (20b) and (21b) are independently impossible, there would then be no source for echo questions. We can take the ungrammaticality of the examples in (20a) and (21a) as evidence that echo questions do not satisfy selectional restriction imposed by predicates taking indirect question complements:

- (20) a. \*John wondered Mary bought WHAT.  
 b. \*John wondered Mary bought the book.
- (21) a. \*John will pass WHAT is an interesting question.  
 b. \*John will pass the written exam is an interesting question.

Returning now to (16), we can see that the embedded clauses in these examples are not indirect yes/no questions, *kung* not being interpreted as *whether*. They are not echo questions either, for predicates taking indirect question complements cannot take echo questions as complements (cf. (20a) and (21a)). The embedded clauses in (16) are thus *wh*-questions with postverbal *wh*-phrase triggers. Now, as the examples in (15) are formally the same as the embedded clauses in (16) (apart from the absence of *kung*), they too are (possibly) *wh*-questions. This thus shows that postverbal *wh*-phrase triggers in *wh*-questions are possible.

It is significant that the example in (5b) is also impossible as an echo question, showing that *sino* ‘who’, in contrast with *ang ano* ‘who’, simply cannot occur in postverbal position.

The facts in Malagasy are slightly more complicated, but the general pattern seems to be the same. All my informants accept an example like that in (22a); however, judgment varies with respect to those in (22b) and (22c) (we will return to the dialectal variations in the next section):

- (22) a. Hitan-dRabe ny sarin’-iza? (Malagasy)  
 see.PASS the picture-who  
 ‘Who did Rabe see pictures of?’  
 b. (\*) Hitan-dRabe ny sary firy?  
 see.PASS the picture how many  
 ‘How many pictures did Rabe see?’

- c. (\*) Hitan-dRabe ny inona?  
 see.PASS the what  
 ‘What did Rabe see?’

Like Tagalog, the examples in (22a), (22b) and (22c), for the speakers that accept them, are not echo questions, but are *wh*-questions. They can be embedded under a predicate taking an indirect question as complement:

- (23) a. Manotany tena aho hoe hitan-dRabe ny sarin’-iza.  
 ask.ACT self I COMP see.PASS the picture-who  
 ‘I am wondering who Rabe saw pictures of.’  
 b. (\*) Tsy mazava hoe hitan-dRabe ny sary firy?  
 not clear COMP see.PASS the picture how many  
 ‘It’s not clear how many pictures Rabe saw.’  
 c. (\*) Fanontaniana tsara be hoe hitan-dRabe ny inona?  
 question good very COMP see.PASS the what  
 ‘What Rabe saw is a very good question.’

*Hoe* in Malagasy is similar to *kung* in Tagalog in that it may sometimes be interpreted as *whether*. In contrast with the examples in (23), *hoe* is interpreted as *whether* in cases like (24) where the embedded clause contains no overt *wh*-phrase:

- (24) a. Manotany tena aho hoe hitan-dRabe ny sarin.  
 ask.ACT self I whether see.PASS the picture  
 ‘I am wondering whether Rabe saw the picture.’  
 b. Tsy mazava hoe hitan-dRabe ny sary.  
 not clear whether see.PASS the picture  
 ‘It’s not clear whether Rabe saw the picture.’

So our argument that the examples in (15) in Tagalog are *wh*-questions, not echo questions, also holds for the examples in (22) in Malagasy as well, which we will not repeat.

In sum, it seems clear that one cannot in principle exclude *wh*-phrase triggers in postverbal position. Therefore, the ungrammaticality of the examples in (4b) and (5b) cannot be due to the trigger being necessarily definite or specific. Moreover, such an account also cannot explain why certain *wh*-phrase triggers, e.g. those in (15) and (22), may occur postverbally. We argue presently that whether a certain *wh*-phrase trigger may occur in postverbal position crucially depends on whether it can independently have the form that is required of the postverbal trigger.

#### 4. THE FORM OF THE TRIGGER

In Malagasy, the trigger argument occurring in the end of the sentence must be preceded by *ny*, while a non-trigger argument need not:

- (25) a. Novidin-dRabe \*(ny) trondro. (Malagasy)  
 bought.PASS the fish  
 ‘Rabe bought the fish.’  
 b. Nividy (ny) trondro \*(ny) vehivavy.  
 bought.ACT the fish the woman  
 ‘The woman bought (the) fish.’

It is of special interest that *ny* is not required on the trigger argument in preverbal position:

- (26) a. (Ny) trondro no novidin-dRabe.  
 the fish FOC bought.PASS  
 ‘It is Rabe who bought fish.’  
 b. (Ny) vehivavy no nividy (ny) trondro.  
 the woman FOC bought.ACT the fish  
 ‘It is the woman who bought (the) fish.’

Similarly, in Tagalog the trigger argument in postverbal position usually must be prefixed by the marker *ang*; leaving it out would lead to ungrammaticality:

- (27) a. May desk \*(ang) bawa’t bata. (Tagalog)  
 have desk each child  
 ‘Each child has a desk.’  
 b. Narito na \*(ang) lahat ng tao.  
 here now all people  
 ‘All the people are here now.’
- (28) a. Bumili \*(ang) bata ng lapis.  
 buy.ACT child pencil  
 ‘The child bought a pencil.’  
 b. Binili ng bata \*(ang) lapis.  
 buy.PASS child pencil  
 ‘A child bought the pencil.’

However, the marker *ang* can sometimes be missing on a DP in the clause-initial position. This is true of DPs with quantifiers like *bawa’t* ‘each’ and *lahat* ‘all’ (Schachter and Otones 1972:486-487), as well as other DPs:

- (29) a. (Ang) bawa’t bata ay may desk.  
 each child have desk  
 ‘Each child has a desk.’  
 b. (Ang) lahat ng tao ’y narito na.  
 all people here now  
 ‘All the people are here now.’



way as the postverbal trigger:

- (32) a. 'E/\*na pasuya Ø-i-ta eobak-a ta mo'o.  
 NOM NACT-REA-2S beat-PASS OBL  
 'Pasuya was beaten by Mo'o.'  
 b. Ø-i-ta eobak-a ta mo'o 'e/\*na pasuya.  
 NACT-REA-2S beat-PASS OBL NOM  
 'Pasuya was beaten by Mo'o.'

We can now bring the requirement on the form of the trigger in postverbal position to bear on the restriction on postverbal *wh*-phrase triggers. As we can see, the postverbal triggers in the ungrammatical examples in (4b) and (5b) precisely do not have the form required of the trigger in postverbal position. The ungrammaticality of these examples is therefore due to the fact that the marker *ny* or *ang* is missing on the postverbal trigger argument (cf. the grammatical contrasts in (25), (27) and (28)).

These examples would become grammatical, if the trigger or the DP related to it appears in preverbal position (cf. Law (2005) for a discussion of the structure of *no*-clefts in Malagasy):

- (33) a. Iza no nividy trondro? (Malagasy)  
 who FOC buy.ACT fish  
 'Who bought fish?'  
 b. Sino ang bumili ng isda? (Tagalog)  
 who buy.ACT fish  
 'Who bought fish?'

The grammaticality of the examples in (33) is just as expected, given the facts in (26), (29) and (30). In all these cases, the *wh*-phrases are not in postverbal position, and hence are not required to have the form of the trigger in postverbal position.

The occurrence of certain *wh*-phrases in preverbal position suggests that there is a connection between postverbal *wh*-phrase trigger and the required form of the trigger in postverbal position. All my Malagasy informants have the same judgment for the examples in (34a) and (34d) and accept those in (34b) and (34c) without *ny*:

- (34) a. (Ny) sarin'-iza no hitan-dRabe? (Malagasy)  
 the picture-who FOC saw.PASS  
 'Who did Rabe see a picture of?'  
 b. (\*) Ny sary firy no hitan-dRabe?  
 the picture how many FOC saw.PASS  
 'Who did Rabe see a picture of?'  
 c. (\*) Ny inona no hitan-dRabe?  
 the what FOC saw.PASS  
 'What did Rabe see?'



In Tsou, preverbal non-*wh*-phrase trigger is prefixed in the same way as postverbal trigger (cf. (32)). We would therefore expect that the same holds of a *wh*-phrase trigger as well. The expectation is borne out (cf. footnote 6 for questions in Tagalog):

- (37) a. (Na/\*'E) sia na m-o eobak-o ta mo'o? (Tsou)  
 NOM NOM ACT-REA beat-ACT OBL  
 'Who beat Mo'o?'  
 b. M-o eobak-o ta mo'o na/\*'e sia?  
 ACT-REA beat-ACT OBL NOM  
 'Who beat Mo'o?'

It should be evident now why some *wh*-phrases may but some others may not appear as the trigger in postverbal position. The reason has to do with whether the *wh*-phrase independently can have the form required of the postverbal trigger.

## 5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present empirical evidence for our claim that the trigger argument in postverbal position is not necessarily definite or specific, and that certain *wh*-phrases may occur as postverbal triggers. We argue that the exclusion of certain *wh*-phrase triggers in postverbal position is not due to a general constraint on the trigger argument that it be definite or specific, there being none. We suggest that the occurrence of postverbal *wh*-phrase triggers is related to their possibly having the form that is required of the trigger in postverbal position.

## REFERENCES

- ADAMS, KAREN L. AND ALEXIS MANASTER-RAMER. 1988. Some questions of topic/focus choice in Tagalog. *Oceanic Linguistics* 27, 79-101.
- BAKER, C.-L. 1970. Note on the description of English questions: The role of an abstract question morpheme. *Foundations of Language* 6, 197-219.
- KEENAN, EDWARD. 1976. Remarkable subjects in Malagasy. In Charles Li (ed.) *Subject and Topic*, pp. 248-301. New York: Academic Press.
- LAW, PAUL. 2005. Questions and clefts in Malagasy. This volume.
- PAUL, ILEANA. 1999. Malagasy existentials: A syntactic account of specificity. In Ileana Paul, Vivian Philips and Lisa Travis (eds.) *Formal Issues in Austronesian Linguistics*, pp. 65-83. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- RICHARDS, NORVIN. 1998. Syntax and semantics in Tagalog *wh*-extraction. In Matthew Pearson (ed.) *Recent Papers in Austronesian Linguistics* (UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics 21), pp. 259-276. Los Angeles: UCLA.
- SCHACHTER, PAUL. 1993. Tagalog. In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Venneman (eds.) *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, pp. 1418-1430. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- SCHACHTER, PAUL and FE OTANES. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

- 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. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.
- SZAKOS, JOSEPH. 1994. *Die Sprache der Cou: Untersuchungen zur Synchronie einer austronesischen Sprache auf Taiwan*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Bonn.
- ZEITOUN, ELIZABETH. 2000. *Zouyu Cankao Yufa* [A reference grammar of Tsou]. Taipei, Taiwan: Yuan Liou Publishing Company.