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Preface

This volume consists of papers presented at the seventh meeting of AFLA (Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association), held at the Vrije Universiteit on May 11-13, 2000.

For the first time in the history of AFLA, this meeting was held outside the North-American continent, and contained contributions by speakers from eleven different countries: New Zealand, Australia, Indonesia, Brunei Darussalam, Taiwan, the USA including Hawaii, Canada, the UK, France, Germany, and The Netherlands.

Apart from the languages that are traditionally well-represented at Austronesian conferences, we were happy to see that the program also contained work on relatively small or lesser described languages, such as the minority languages of Taiwan, North-West Borneo, Eastern Indonesia, Papua and Oceania.

Special themes of this conference were Iconicity and Argument marking. The papers in this volume show that the program covered a broad range of subdisciplines -- from discourse grammar, phonology, morphology, syntax, to semantics -- and that the authors are working within various theoretical frameworks. But despite the obvious differences in expertise, interest and background, the atmosphere on the conference was typically AFLA: lively and constructive, with an average rate of attendance of about 80%. The papers in this volume deserve the same rate of attention.

This meeting has again furthered the unwritten mandate of AFLA to encourage the formal study of Austronesian languages, especially work by speaker linguists and junior scholars. Six scholars presented analyses of their native language, and more than half of the 45 participants subscribed as ‘student’. This suggests that the future of Austronesian linguistics looks very bright indeed.

The eighth edition of AFLA will be held in the spring of 2001 at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in Boston, USA. The principal organiser will be Ileana Paul.

Marian Klamer, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Proceedings of previous AFLA meetings:

A Selection of the papers of AFLA 2, in 1995 is published as:

The proceedings of AFLA 3 and AFLA 4 in 1996/1997 are published as:

The proceedings of AFLA 6 in 1999 are published as:
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Against Long Movement in Madurese¹

William D. Davies
University of Iowa

0. Introduction

It has been claimed on the basis of Indonesian and Malay data such as (1) and (2) that long distance movement (at least across two clause boundaries) is possible in Javanic languages. Under that analysis, the wh-element, siapa ‘who’, binds an empty operator which moves from the most deeply embedded clause into the highest clause. Thus, in (1) and (2) there appears to be a long-distance relation between the wh-element and the empty position e in the embedded clause.²

(1) Indonesian
   Siapa, yang [ Ali kira [ (yang) e, mem-beli mobil]]?
   who A think AV-buy car
   ‘Who did Ali think bought a car?’

(2) Malay (Cole & Hermon 1998 (27a))
   Siapa, [ Ali buktikan [ yang e, (men-)curi kereta]]?
   who A prove that (men-)steal car
   ‘Who did Ali prove stole the car?’

Data such as (3) and (4), from Madurese and Javanec, seem to confirm this for these languages as well.

(3) Sapa, se [ Ali kera [ (jhaq/se) e, melle montor]]?
    who REL A think COMP/REL AV-buy car
    ‘Who did Ali think bought a car?’

(4) Sapa, sing [ di-kira Ali [ (nek) e, tuku montor]]?
    who REL OV-think A COMP buy car
    ‘Who did Ali think bought a car?’

¹I would like to thank Chris Culy, Stan Dubinsky, and Ilenea Paul for helpful discussion of some of the issues considered here or comments on earlier drafts. Errors and shortcomings are regretfully mine alone. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation through grant SBR 98-09044 to the University of Iowa.

²Cole, Hermon, and Aman (to appear) and Paul (2000) provide evidence for the empty operator movement analysis of cleft questions for Malay and Malagasy, which extends to Madurese and, most likely, to Western Austronesian in general.
However, I will show on the basis of data from Madurese that long-distance movement may well be illusory. In fact, the Madurese data support an analysis in which the relation between the *wh*-element and the “extraction site” must be radically local; in particular, only a single clause node may intervene. I speculate on the strength of the evidence for Madurese that long-distance movement may be disallowed in all Javanic languages. Evidence from Javanese of the type I discuss for Madurese is included in an appendix. First, however, I show that if there is extraction from clauses, it must be from clausal subjects.

1. Extraction restricted to sentential subjects

The question in (3) appears to provide prima facie evidence that I am incorrect in my overall assertion. Saddy (1991) and Cole & Hermon (1998) have argued explicitly for long-distance movement in Indonesian and Malay, respectively. However, I will attempt to show that (3) does not provide counterevidence to my claim, but that the analysis proposed for these other languages is not tenable for Madurese.

Evidence for this comes from the interpretation of *wh*-questions. Note the asymmetry in the interpretation of the pair of sentences in (5).

(5) a. Bila se Siti nggera jhaq Marlena noles buku?
    when REL S AV.think COMP M AV.write book
    “When did Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?”

b. Bila se Siti kera jhaq Marlena noles buku?
    when REL S think COMP M AV.write book
    “When did Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?”
or
    “When did Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?”

(5a) is a question only about the time of the thinking event, while (5b) is ambiguous, the primary interpretation being a question about the time of the writing event. The sole difference between the two sentences is the morphology on the matrix predicate *kera* ‘think’—actor voice in (5a) and the bare verb form in (5b).

Saddy (1991) and Cole & Hermon (1998) account for the difference in interpretation through a morphological constraint that prohibits movement of an NP across a verb with actor voice morphology (the *meng*-prefix in Indonesian and Malay). As should be noted, in the Indonesian and Malay examples in (1) and (2), the matrix verb lacks the AV prefix; both

---

3. Although (5b) is ambiguous, the interpretation in which the question pertains to the event in the embedded clause is strongly preferred.

4. As explained below, actor voice (AV) occurs on transitive predicates in which the agent or actor is surface subject.
Against long movement in Madurese

sentences would be ungrammatical were it to occur, as (6) and (7) show.

(6) *Siapa yang [ Ali mengira [ (yang) mem-belí mobil]]?
    who A AV.think AV-buy car
(Who did Ali think bought a car?)

(7) *Siapa [ Ali mem-buktikan [ yang (men-)curi kereta]]?
    who A AV-prove that AV-steal car
(Who did Ali prove stole the car?)

Both Saddy and Cole & Hermon claim that the matrix verbs in the grammatical sentences are active and not “passive”.⁵

However, I argue that these are indeed passive clauses, drawing on data from Madurese. Note that the Madurese question in (5b) is equivalent to the sentence in (8), which takes the object voice (or “passive” prefix) e. That is, it is first a question about the writing event and secondarily a question about the thinking event.

(8) Bila se e-kera Siti jhaq Marlena noles buku?
    when REL AV-think S COMP M AV.write book
    ‘When did Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?’
    or ‘When did Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?’

I wish to claim that in (5b) and (8) the matrix is “passive”, in the same way that the clauses in (9b) and (9c) are passive.

    A dog that AV-bite A
    ‘The dog bit Ali.’
 b. Ali bhurus jhuwa kekeq.
    A dog that bite
    ‘The dog bit Ali.’
    A OV-bite dog that
    ‘The dog bit Ali.’

The data in (9) illustrate the basic voice system in Madurese. Actor voice (AV) morphology occurs on the verb when the agent or actor of a transitive sentence (and some intransitives)

⁵It is not clear that passive is the right term to use in the description of clauses in which the theme is the subject in preference to the agent or actor. However, the terminology has wide currency and is a convenient shorthand; so I use it here.
occurs as the subject, as in (9a). AV is marked by a nasal prefix or the prefix a-. (9b,c) are what have sometimes been referred to as passives (especially in Indonesian (Chung 1976, Kana 1986, Smel'don 1996)). In both, a non-actor is the subject and the actor occurs either immediately preverbally in the bare verb form (9b) or postverbally in the object voice (OV) form (9c), where object voice is invariably marked by the prefix e-. 6

If the matrix clauses in (5b) and (8) are passives, they actually demonstrate extraction from a sentential subject and not a complement clause. The reason that extraction appears to be from a complement is that the sentential subject has been extraposed. Thus, I argue that (5b) has the analysis in (10).

(10)  [ bila e_j se Siti kera e_j ] [ jhaq Marlena noles buku e_j ]

In (10), the clausal constituent jhaq Marlena noles buku e, originates as the complement of kera ‘think’, moves to subject position e_j, and is extraposed to postverbal position.7 When in subject position, bila ‘when’ (or more accurately the operator that it binds) is fronted. Although the sentence is clearly open to alternative analyses at this point, in what follows I will motivate the appropriateness of elements of (10). There are three types of evidence favoring subjechood of the clause containing the extraction site.

1.1 Clausal complements as subjects of passives

First of all, the entire complement clause may occur as the subject of the clause, provided that the verb is in the bare form (11a) or the object voice form (11b), as demonstrated here with declarative sentences.

(11)  a. Jhaq Marlena noles buku Siti kera.
    COMP M AV.write book S think
    ‘Siti thinks that Marlena wrote the book.’

       b. Jhaq Marlena noles buku e-kera Siti.
    COMP M AV.write book ov-think S
    ‘Siti thinks that Marlena wrote the book.’

1.2 Verbal suffixes

Second, there are predicates that require additional verbal morphology when the sentential complement occurs in subject position. The verb bala ‘say’ takes a sentential complement, as

6 Additional details regarding the Madurese voice system are available in Davies 1999a.

7 I take no position here regarding whether the extraposed clause is higher or lower in the tree structure than the wh-element.
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in (12).

(12) Siti a-bala [ jhaq Hasan entar daq Jakarta ].
    S AV-say COMP H go to J
    'Siti said that Hasan went to Jakarta.'

When the sentential complement occurs in subject position, bala obligatorily takes the suffix -aghi, (13a); when the suffix is not present, ungrammaticality results, (13b).

(13) a. [ jhaq Hasan entar daq Jakarta ] Siti bala-aghI.
    COMP H go to J S say-AGHI
    'Siti said that Hasan went to Jakarta.'

b. *[ jhaq Hasan entar daq Jakarta ] Siti bala.
    COMP H go to J S say
    (Siti said that Hasan went to Jakarta.)

The data in (14) show a similar situation with the verb kasta 'regret'. When the suffix -e occurs on the predicate, the sentential complement can be the subject (14b); but when the suffix is not present, the sentence is ungrammatical, (14c).

(14) a. Ita kasta [ jhaq Bambang mangkat ].
    I regret COMP B leave
    'Ita regrets that Bambang left.'

b. [ jhaq Bambang mangkat ] Ita kasta-e.
    COMP B leave I regret-E
    'Ita regrets that Bambang left.'

c. *[ jhaq Bambang mangkat ] Ita kasta.
    COMP B leave I regret
    (Ita regrets that Bambang left.)

The relevance of this is that it is only possible to form a question with a sentence-initial wh-phrase relevant to the embedded clause when the requisite "clausal subject" morphology occurs on the matrix predicate.

(15) a. *Dagrama se Siti bala jhaq Hasan entar daq Jakarta?
    how REL S say COMP H go to J
    (How did Siti say that Hasan went to Jakarta?)
b. Daqroma se Siti bala-\textit{aghi} jhaq Hasan entar daq Jakarta?\footnote{This sentence is ambiguous between the interpretation given in (15b) in which it is a question about the event described in the complement clause and an interpretation in which it is a question about the event described in the matrix clause. As these types of questions always carry this systematic ambiguity, henceforth I will ignore the interpretation regarding the matrix event unless it is of particular relevance.} \newline \text{how REL S say-AGHI COMP H go to J} \newline \text{‘How did Siti say that Hasan went to Jakarta?’}

Only (15b), in which the verb takes the suffix -\textit{aghi}, is grammatical.\footnote{To form a grammatical question in which the matrix event is questioned without the -\textit{aghi} suffix, AV morphology is necessary on the matrix verb, as in (i).} Parallel data are available with the verb \textit{kasa} ‘regret’.

(16) a. Bila se Ita kasta jhaq Bambang mangkat?\newline \text{when REL I regret COMP B leave} \newline \text{‘When did Ita regret that Bambang left?’}

b. Bila se Ita kasta-e jhaq Bambang mangkat?\newline \text{when REL I regret-E COMP B leave} \newline \text{‘When did Ita regret that Bambang left?’}

(16a), which lacks the suffix, can only be interpreted as a question about the time of Ita’s regret; that is, the matrix event is questioned. The complement event can only be questioned if the suffix occurs on the matrix verb, as in (16b). The obligatoriness of the additional verbal morphology in (15b) and (16b) requires an account. Given the fact that this morphology is also obligatory when the complements occur as subjects, (13a) and (14b), a reasonable hypothesis is that the complements in (15b) and (16b) are also subjects, albeit extraposed subjects.

1.3 “Control” structures

A third argument for the subject status of the complements is available based on a widespread construction involving matrix verbs. Most matrix verbs in Madurese allow an additional argument to occur provided that the argument is coreferent to an embedded pronominal element. This is illustrated for the verbs \textit{kera} ‘think’ in (17) and \textit{bala} ‘say’ in (18). Note that once again, \textit{bala} must take the suffix -\textit{aghi}.
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(17) Siti ngera Marlena jhaq (abaqøang) noles buku.
S AV-think M COMP she AV-write book
‘Siti thinks about Marlena that she wrote the book.’

(18) Siti a-bala-aghı Hasan jhaq (abaqøang) entar daq Jakarta.
S AV-say-AGHI H COMP he go to J
‘Siti said about Hasan that he went to Jakarta.’

In Davies (2000), I argue that there is no raising in Madurese but that Marlena and Hasan are dependents of the matrix clause and control a pronoun (usually nonover) in the complement. These additional objects can be promoted to subject, as in (19) and (20), the bare verb counterparts of (17) and (18), respectively.

(19) Marlena Siti kera jhaq (abaqøang) noles buku.
M S think COMP she AV-write book
‘Siti thinks about Marlena that she wrote the book.’

(20) Hasan Siti bala-aghı jhaq (abaqøang) entar daq Jakarta.
H S say-AGHI COMP he go to J
‘Siti said about Hasan that he went to Jakarta.’

What is significant for present purposes is the interpretation given to questions when this additional argument occurs as the subject of the matrix clause.

(21) Bila se Marlena Siti kera jhaq (abaqøang) noles buku?
when REL M S think COMP she AV-write book
‘When did Siti think about Marlena that she wrote the book?’

(22) Daqama se Hasan Siti bala-aghı jhaq (abaqøang) entar daq Jakarta?
how REL H S say-AGHI COMP he go to J
‘How did Siti say about Hasan that he went to Jakarta?’

Importantly, (21) and (22) are questions only about the matrix predicate. Were it the case that long-distance movement was possible here, these questions should be as ambiguous as (5b) and (15b); that is, it should be possible to interpret these as questions about either the matrix event or the embedded event, with a potential preference for the embedded interpretation. We can account for the lack of ambiguity in these questions if extraction is limited to sentential subjects. In (21) and (22), the sentential complements cannot be subjects because that position is the province of the NPs Marlena and Hasan. Since the complements are not sentential subjects, the interpretation of the wh-phrase is limited to the matrix predicate.

---

Aspects of this construction are also discussed in Davies 199a,b.
1.4 Questioning from in situ sentential subjects

A final piece of evidence for the restriction of extraction to sentential subjects comes from the fact that these questions can be formed when the sentential element still resides in subject position, as in (23-25). All of these sentences are ambiguous regarding whether it is the matrix or embedded predicate that is the focus of the question; however, as with the previous ambiguous examples, the preferred interpretation is the embedded predicate.\(^{11}\)

(23) Bila se Marlena noles buku Siti kera?
    when REL M AV.write book S think
    ‘When did Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?’

(24) Daqrema se Hasan cntar daq Jakarta Siti bala-aghi?
    how REL H go to J S say-AGHI
    ‘How did Siti say that Hasan went to Jakarta?’

(25) Bila se Bambang mangkat Ita kasta-e?
    when REL B leave I regret-E
    ‘When did Ita regret that Bambang left?’

Additionally, base-generated sentential subjects show the same properties that have been established for sentential complements above. This is illustrated in the following data:

(26) Jhaq Ali ng-rosaq komputer nyongong-aghi Siti.
    COMP A AV-ruin computer AV.surprised-AGHI S
    ‘That Ali ruined the computer surprised Siti.’

(27) Daqrema se Ali ng-rosaq komputer nyongong-aghi Siti?
    how REL A AV-ruin computer AV.surprised-AGHI S
    ‘How did that Ali ruin the computer surprise Siti?’

(28) Daqrema se nyongong-aghi Siti jhaq Ali ng-rosaq komputer?
    how REL AV.surprised-AGHI S COMP A AV-ruin computer
    ‘How did it surprise Siti that Ali ruined the computer?’

In (27), there is a clear case of questioning an element in a sentential subject. In (28), the sentential subject has been extraposed and the interpretation is the same as (27), where there is no extraposition.

\(^{11}\)These sentences can frequently be disambiguated with appropriate intonation. However, as written with no intonational cues, they are ambiguous.
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While it might seem relatively strange to claim (at this juncture) that extraction from clauses is only possible from sentential subjects, this actually brings Madurese (and other Javanic languages) into synchronicity with many languages in the Western Austronesian subgroup. Keenan (1972) has claimed for Malagasy and Kroeger (1993) for Tagalog that extraction from clauses is only possible from sentential subjects. Thus, while the analysis thus far provides no explanation for this peculiarity, it does put these languages on an equal footing.

2. Partial movement and extraposition

However, as stated above, I do not wish to leave the analysis here. Having established the relevance of subjection above, I now provide evidence for the claim that there is no real movement out of the embedded clause. That is, there is no long-distance movement at all in Madurese. Rather what obtains in the case of (5b) and (15b) and many other examples is so-called “partial” movement followed by extraposition of the sentential subject. I attempt to motivate this analysis below.

2.1 Partial movement

As is well-known, Western Austronesian languages have what has been characterized as “partial wh-movement” in which a wh-phrase occurs in initial position of an embedded clause yet has wide scope. As (29) shows, Madurese is no exception to this.

(29) Siti ngera bila se Marlena noles buku?
    S AV.think when REL M AV.write book
    ‘When does Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?’

Despite the fact that bila ‘when’ occurs in the embedded clause, (29) is a wide scope question, and a perfectly natural construction. (29) is synonymous with the preferred interpretation of (23), where the entire complement clause occurs as the subject rather than the object.

(23) Bila se Marlena noles buku Siti kera?
    when REL M AV.write book S think
    ‘When did Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?’

Thus, (23) can also be analyzed as an instance of partial movement. That is, the appropriate analysis of (23) is (30), where the wh-phrase is still contained in the sentential subject, rather than (31), where it occurs in the matrix clause.

(30) = (23) \[ [ \text{bila}, [\text{Op, se} \text{Marlena noles buku } c_i ], \text{Siti } kera \ c_j ] \]

(31) bila, [ Op, se [ [ Marlena noles buku } e_i ] Siti kera } e_j ]

41
Following this line of thought, the appropriate analysis of (5b) is (32), where partial movement and extraposition cooccur.\footnote{Here I again leave unspecified precisely where in the structure the extraposed clause occurs inasmuch as this does not bear on present concerns.}

\[(32) = (5b) \left[ \left[ \text{bila}_k \ e_k \right] \left[ \text{se} \ \text{Siti} \ \text{kera} \ e_j \right] \left[ \text{Op}_i \ \text{jhaq} \right] \text{Marlena noles buku} \ e_i \right]_k \]

The structure in (32) contains the elements of (30) and adds to it the extraposition of the constituent \( (k) \) which includes the null operator and the remainder of the complement clause.\footnote{One might object that the usual state of affairs is that the relative particle \( \text{se} \) is used in the complementizer position of questions but in (5b,32) \( \text{jhaq} \) shows up as the complementizer of the extraposed sentential subject and the \( \text{se} \) particle is claimed to be part of the matrix clause. First off, \( \text{se} \) is possible in the position occupied by \( \text{jhaq} \) here. Second, precisely this set of complementizers (\( \text{jhaq} \) in the embedded clause and \( \text{se} \) in the matrix) occur in (i), in which the sentential subject has not been extraposed.}

\[(33) \text{bila}_k \left[ \left[ \text{e}_k \right] \left[ \text{se} \ \left[ \left[ \text{e}_k \right] \right] \left[ \text{Siti} \ \text{kera} \ e_j \right] \left[ \text{Op}_i \ \text{jhaq} \right] \text{Marlena noles buku} \ e_i \right]_k \right] \]

Evidence for the partial movement/extraposition analysis is available from (i) extraposition of sentential subjects, (ii) extraposition of relative clauses, and (iii) extraposition of sentential complements with partial \( \text{wh} \)-movement.

### 2.2 Extraposition of sentential subjects

First, sentential subjects can routinely be extraposed, as illustrated in (34b) and (35b).

\[(34) \text{a. } \left[ \text{Jhaq} \ \text{Marlena noles buku} \right] \ \text{e-kera} \ \text{Siti.} \]
\[(\text{COMP}_M \ \text{AV.write book} \ \text{OV-think} \text{ S}) \]
\['\text{Siti thinks that Marlena wrote the book.}'\]

\[(34) \text{b. } \text{E-kera Siti} \left[ \left[ \text{jhaq} \ \text{Marlena noles buku} \right] \right]. \]
\[(\text{OV-think} \text{ S} \ \text{COMP}_M \ \text{AV.write book}) \]
\['\text{Siti thinks that Marlena wrote the book.}'\]

\[(35) \left[ \left[ \text{bila} \ e_k \right] \left[ \text{se} \ \left[ \left[ \text{e}_k \right] \right] \left[ \text{Siti} \ \text{kera} \ e_j \right] \left[ \text{Op}_i \ \text{jhaq} \right] \text{Marlena noles buku} \ e_i \right]_k \right] \]

\[\text{Evidence for the partial movement/extraposition analysis is available from (i) extraposition of sentential subjects, (ii) extraposition of relative clauses, and (iii) extraposition of sentential complements with partial wh-movement.}\]
2.3 Extrapolation of relative clauses

Second, relative clauses in Javanic languages are formed using the same strategy as focussed wh-questions, and relative clauses can be extraposed. A relative clause in subject position is illustrated in (36).

    package that REL OV-send B OV-open I
    'Ita opened that package that Bambang sent.'

In (35) *paket jhuwa se ekarom Bambang* 'that package that Bambang sent' is the subject of the verb in object voice, *e-bukaq* 'open'. The parallel between this construction and the questions in which the sentential complement is in subject position is unmistakable. As (37) illustrates, the relative clause can be extrapolated to clause-final position, leaving the head in clause-initial position.

(37) Paket jhuwa e-bukaq Ita [ se e-kerem Bambang ].
    package that OV-open I REL OV-send B
    'That package was opened by Ita that Bambang sent.'

It is also possible to extrapolate relative clause in object position. In (38b), the modifying clause occurs sentence-finally, separated from its head, *buku*, by the PP *daq Ali* 'to Ali'.

(38) a. Marlena a-bariq buku [ se Siti toles ] daq Ali.
    M AV-give book REL S write to A
    'Marlena gave the book that Siti wrote to Ali.'

b. Marlena a-bariq buku daq Ali [ se Siti toles ].
    M AV-give book to A REL S write
    'Marlena gave the book to Ali that Siti wrote.'
2.4 Extrapolation of sentential complements

The final evidence for the partial movement/extrapolation analysis comes from sentential complements. As illustrated above in (29), partial movement with wide scope interpretation is possible with sentential complements. In the same way that relative clauses in object position can be extraposed and thus separated from their heads, sentential complements can be separated from a wh-phrase, as in (40).

(39) *Biq telpon Siti a-bala-aghi *daqëma [se Marlena ng-rosaq komputer daq Ali] *
with telephone S AV-say-AGHI how REL M AV-ruin computer to A
*How did Siti tell Ali by telephone that Marlena ruined the computer?*

(40) Biq telpon Siti a-bala-aghi *daqëma daq Ali [jhaq/se Marlena ng-rosaq komputer] *
with telephone S AV-say-AGHI how to A COMP/REL M AV-ruin computer
*How did Siti tell Ali by telephone that Marlena ruined the computer?*

The sentence in (39) is only marginally acceptable due to the heavy nature of the complement clause in relation to the following PP. However, it serves as the basis for comparison with the completely acceptable (40). In (40), the wh-element *daqëma* ‘how’ precedes the PP *daq Ali* ‘to Ali’ and the sentential complement follows. In both (39) and (40) it is unambiguously the event in the embedded clause which is the focus of the question, as the matrix clause already includes a manner adverbial, the instrumental PP *biq telpon* ‘by telephone’.

If the analysis is correct, this predicts that it should be possible to extrapolate a sentential subject that includes a partially moved wh-phrase in its initial position. As (41) shows, this is correct.

(41) Nyengong-aghi Siti *daqëma se Ali ng-rosaq komputer?*
AV-surprise-AGHI S how REL A AV-ruin computer
*How did it surprise Siti that Ali ruined the computer?*

Preferable to (39) is (i), in which the heavy constituent is shifted to clause-final position.

(i) Biq telphon Siti a-bala-aghi daq Ali daqëma se Marlena ng-rosaq komputer?
with telephone S AV-say-AGHI to A how REL M AV-ruin computer
*How did Siti tell Ali by telephone that Marlena ruined the computer?*
3. Conclusion

The foregoing data lend plausibility to an analysis of Madurese cleft questions which rejects all long distance movement in favor of a radically local relation. The natural question to ask is whether this is a desirable move. Is anything gained under the proposed analysis? I would claim that there is. If we leave aside the proposal that all wh constructions are radically local, we are left with the fairly convincingly established fact that all extraction from clauses must be from sentential subjects. While this accords with observations about other Western Austronesian languages, this condition in and of itself is relatively unusual—certainly not what would be expected given what we know of the world’s languages in general. Attempts to explain the restriction of movement to sentential subjects in various Austronesian languages frequently wind up relatively complex and largely mere descriptions of the facts. Adoption of the present proposal eliminates the need for any arcane machinations and perhaps makes the affected languages seem a little less unusual.

The “partial” movement aspect of the proposed analysis is, of course, needed in any event, so its inclusion adds nothing to the grammar of Madurese. Therefore, in some respects restriction to radical locality results in a simpler grammar. What goes begging, obviously, is any explanation for why these A-bar relations should be restricted in this way. I have no good explanations for this at this juncture. My speculations run along the following lines: if it turns out that the partial movement/extraposition story would work somehow for all these ‘sentential subject’ languages, then one might look to the voice system for an explanation since all these languages have rich voice systems. On the other hand, if it is just the Javanic languages that are open to this kind of analysis, we might take the results that we find in the “control” construction to be indicative of some larger constraint in the language against inter-clausal movement. The absence of long-distance movement then follows naturally. What remains is to find what aspect of Madurese grammar drives this restriction.

References


In Davies 2000, I provide evidence on the basis of Cebuano that the same type of restriction against inter-clausal movement may actually obtain in the Philippine languages as well. If this speculation/result holds up, it might be that all (or most) of the languages with the restriction on extraction from clauses to subject clauses are open to the same explanation as Madurese.
Appendix: Javanese

Javanese cleft wh-questions show the same attributes as the Madurese. The data included below parallel the Madurese data discussed in the main text, and the same arguments can be made as were made on the basis of Madurese. Following the number of the Javanese example is the Madurese example that it is related to.

(J1) = (5a) Kapan sing Siti ngira nek Marlena nulis buku?
    REL S AV.think AV.write book
    'When did Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?'

(J2) = (8) Kapan sing di-kira Siti nek Marlena nulis buku?
    when REL OV-think S COMP M AV.write book
    'When did Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?'
    or
    'When did Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?'

(J3) = (11b) Nek Marlena nulis buku sing di-kira Siti.
    COMP M AV.write book REL OV-think S
    'That Marlena wrote the book was thought by Siti.'

(J4) = (12) Siti kandha nek Ali ng-antem asu.
    S say COMP A AV-hit dog
    'Siti said that Ali hit the dog.'
Against long movement in Madurese

\[(J5) = (13a) \text{ Nek Ali ng-antem asu di-kandha-kna Siti.} \]
\[
\text{COMP A AV-hit dog OV-say-KNA S}
\]
\[
\text{‘Siti said that Ali hit the dog.’}
\]

NB: In these data (from Surabayan Javanese), -(k)na is equivalent to Madurese -agh. In Central Javanese this is realized as -(k)ake, while still other speakers use -(k)ne.

\[(J6) = (13b) *\text{Nek Ali ng-antem asu di-kandha Siti.} \]
\[
\text{COMP A AV-hit dog OV-say S}
\]
\[
\text{(Siti said that Ali hit the dog.)}
\]

\[(J7) \text{ Piye sing Siti kandha nek Ali ng-antem asu?} \]
\[
\text{how REL S say COMP A AV-hit dog}
\]
\[
\text{‘How did Siti say that Ali hit the dog?’}
\]

NB: This is grammatical in Javanese since kandha usually occurs without AV morphology. However, this is a question about the saying event not the hitting event.

\[(J8) = (15b) \text{ Piye sing di-kandha-kna Siti nek Ali ng-antem asu?} \]
\[
\text{how REL OV-say-KNA S COMP A AV-hit dog}
\]
\[
\text{‘How did Siti say that Ali hit the dog?’}
\]

\[(J9) = (18) \text{ Siti ngandha-kna Ali nek (dheweke) ng-antem asu.} \]
\[
\text{S AV-say-KNA A COMP he AV-hit dog}
\]
\[
\text{‘Siti said about Ali that he hit the dog.’}
\]

\[(J10) = (20) \text{ Ali di-kandha-kna Siti nek (dheweke) ng-antem asu.} \]
\[
\text{A OV-say-KNA S COMP he AV-hit dog}
\]
\[
\text{‘Siti said about Ali that he hit the dog.’}
\]

\[(J11) = (22) \text{ Piye sing Ali di-kandha-kna Siti nek (dheweke) ng-antem asu?} \]
\[
\text{how REL A OV-say-KNA S COMP he AV-hit dog}
\]
\[
\text{‘How did Siti say about Ali that he hit the dog?’}
\]

\[(J12) = (23) \text{ Kapan eging Marlena nulio buku di kira Siti?} \]
\[
\text{when REL M AV.write book OV-think S}
\]
\[
\text{‘When did Siti think that Marlena wrote the book?’}
\]

\[(J13) = (26) \text{ Nek Bambang mangkat nyosah-na Ita.} \]
\[
\text{COMP B leave AV-sad-KNA I}
\]
\[
\text{‘That Bambang left made Ita sad.’}
\]
(J14) = (27) Kapan sing Bambang mangkat nyosah-na Ita?
when REL B leave AV.sad-KNA I
‘When did that Bambang left make Ita sad?’

(J15) = (28) Kapan sing nyosah-na Ita nek Bambang mangkat?
when REL AV.sad-KNA I COMP B leave
‘When did it make Ita sad that Bambang left?’

(J16) = (34b) Di-kira Siti nek Marlena nulis buku.
OV-think S COMP M AV.write book
‘Siti thinks that Marlena wrote the book.’

(J17) = (36) Buku iku [ sing di-tulis Marlena ] di-waca Siti.
book that REL OV-write M OV-read S
‘That book that Marlena wrote was read by Siti.’

(J18) = (37) Buku iku di-waca Siti [ sing di-tulis Marlena ].
book that OV-read S REL OV-write M
‘That book was read by Siti that Marlena wrote.’

(J19) = (39) Karo telpun Siti ngandha-kna piye sing Ita lunga nang Jakarta
with telephone S AV.say-KNA how REL I go to J
to A
‘How by telephone did Siti say to Ali that Ita went to Jakarta?’

(J20) = (40) Karo telpun Siti ngandha-kna piye nang Ali {neksing}
Ita lunga nang Jakarta?
with telephone S AV.say-KNA how to A COMP/REL
I go to J
‘How by telephone did Siti say to Ali that Ita went to Jakarta?’