Proceedings of the Sixteenth Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA)

University of California, Santa Cruz

May 1 - 3, 2009

edited by Sandy Chung, Daniel Finer, Ileana Paul, and Eric Potsdam

Table of Contents

photos courtesy of
Sandy Chung and
Justin Nuger

PREFACE

Although the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA) has been holding annual meetings since 1994, until now it has had no consistent approach to the publication of its *Proceedings*. Papers from AFLA 2 and AFLA 14 were published as edited volumes; in other years the local organizers published the *Proceedings* in their Department's Working Papers series; in still other years no *Proceedings* was published. The 16th annual meeting of AFLA was held May 1-3, 2009, at the University of California, Santa Cruz. During the business meeting, the idea was floated that the *Proceedings* henceforth be published electronically, in a consistent format, at the AFLA website (http://ling.uwo.ca/afla/), which is generously hosted by the University of Western Ontario. The initial result is this volume, which has emerged very quickly indeed—less than six months after AFLA 16 was held. Our hope is that on-line publication of this and future volumes of the *Proceedings of AFLA* will enable research on the formal linguistics of Austronesian languages to reach as wide a readership as possible.

We want to thank UCSC's Linguistics Department and its Linguistics Research Center for hosting AFLA 16, the authors for submitting their papers so efficiently, and the University of Western Ontario for hosting the website at which this volume is posted. We also wish to acknowledge the precedent set by the *Proceedings of AFLA 12*, which was published on-line as *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics* No. 12, and whose stylesheet heavily influenced the stylesheet we constructed for the *Proceedings of AFLA*.

Sandra Chung
Daniel Finer
Ileana Paul
Eric Potsdam

MOVEMENT AND LOCALITY IN SUNDANESE WH-QUESTIONS

William D. Davies   Eri Kurniawan
University of Iowa   University of Iowa
                             Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
william-davies@uiowa.edu   eri-kurniawan@uiowa.edu

Sundanese presents two options for forming nominal *wh*-questions: with the *wh*-phrase in situ and with the *wh*-phrase fronted in a cleft construction, a property common to Indonesian languages. Recent years have seen a debate regarding whether or not the languages include long distance *wh*-movement, Saddy (1991) and Cole & Hermon (1998) proposing long distance movement for Indonesian and Malay, respectively, and Davies (2003) arguing against it for Madurese. After examining a number of properties of Sundanese questions, we argue that while there is evidence of A-movement in Sundanese, there is no long distance *wh*-movement of nominal arguments.

1. Background

As is true of other Indonesian-type languages, Sundanese presents three strategies for nominal *wh*-questions (non-prepositional arguments) in multiclausal structures, each of which is exemplified in (1-3).

(1)   Ali ng-anggap [Hasan kakara meuli   *mobil naon*]?
        A   AV-assume   H   recently AV.buy car   what
        'What car did Ali assume Hasan had recently bought?'

(2)   *Mobil naon* nu   di-anggap   ku Ali [(nu) kakara   di-beuli ku Hasan]?
        car   what REL OV-assume by A   REL recently OV-buy by H
        'What car did Ali assume Hasan had recently bought?'

(3)   Ali ng-anggap [*mobil naon* nu   kakara   di-beuli ku Hasan]?
        A   AV-assume car   what REL recently OV-buy by H
        'What car did Ali assume Hasan had recently bought?'

In (1), the *wh*-phrase *mobil naon* 'what car' occurs in situ in the embedded clause. In (2), the *wh*-phrase occurs sentence initially and there is a gap in the embedded clause. And in (3), it occurs in initial position in the embedded clause, again with a gap in the embedded clause. Despite there being three structures, all three sentences have the same interpretation.

These are the same structures that have been reported for other Indonesian-type languages, such as Indonesian by Saddy (1991), Malay by Cole & Hermon (1998) and Madurese by Davies (2003). Two principal analyses of these structures have been proposed in recent

years. Saddy and Cole & Hermon have proposed in situ, long distance movement and partial movement for the Indonesian/Malay analogues. Conversely, Davies (2003) has proposed that there is no interclausal *wh*-movement in Madurese, instead asserting that all nominal *wh*-elements are generated in the clauses in which they occur. As we show presently, an analysis that includes long-distance A'-movement faces severe challenges, and so we argue that like Madurese there is no interclausal *wh*-movement in the Sundanese structures. Rather any apparent movement between clauses either is A-movement or is not cross-clausal movement at all.

Before proceeding to the proposal, we identify the analysis of in situ questions and sketch the competing analyses for the sentence-initial *wh*-questions. Following, we present aspects of the Sundanese questions that any analysis must account for. We then identify how each of these challenges is met by our analysis.

2. The Analyses

There have been two principal analyses of in situ questions in the generative literature: (a) the movement analysis (Huang 1982, Watanabe 1993) and (b) the unselective binding analysis (Tsai 1994, Cole & Hermon 1998). Without argument, we adopt the unselective binding analysis proposed by Cole & Hermon for Malay. In this analysis, an Operator generated in the matrix scope position binds the *wh*-variable, accounting for the scopal properties of the *wh*-phrase, as in (4), in which the embedded *wh*-phrase *buku naon* has matrix scope.

(4)   [wh-Op$_i$ [Ali ng-anggap [Hasan kakara   meuli   *mobil naon$_i$*]]] embedded wh-phrase
              A AV-assume H   recently AV.buy car   what
        'What car did Ali assume Hasan had recently bought?'

The analysis we adopt for *wh*-in situ in Sundanese is the same as in the analyses of Malay and Madurese.

Where the two analyses differ is with respect to the cleft question structures, and what type of movement may be involved. For Malay cleft questions, Cole & Hermon (1998, 2000) propose movement of a null *wh*-operator from its base position to the Spec, CP of the headless relative clause that contains it. In a monoclausal structure, the *wh*-phrase moves to the clausal Spec, CP. This is illustrated in (5).

(5)   [Apa$_i$] [Op$_i$ [(yang) Fatimmah baca t$_i$]]?
        what   REL F   read
        'What did Fatimmah read?'

In the long distance structure, the operator first moves to the intermediate Spec, CP by A'-movement and then to the higher Spec, CP, as in (6).

(6)   [Apa$_i$] [Op$_i$ [(yang) Hasan harap [t$_i$ [(yang) Fatimmah baca t$_i$?]]]]
        what   REL H   hope   REL F   read
        'What did Hasan hope Fatimmah read?'

In the analysis without interclausal A'-movement proposed for Madurese, the *wh*-operator is generated in the clause in which it surfaces and must occupy the subject position, at which point it may then move to Spec, CP. The apparent gap in the embedded clause to which it is thematically linked is a null pronominal *wh*-element. Davies (2003) argues that the *wh*-phrase is generated as a prepositional object in a prolepsis construction. Thus, a long distance structure has the *wh*-element generated in object position of the matrix clause from which it moves to subject by a passive-like A-movement.

(7)   [Sapa$_i$] [Op$_i$ [se   t$_i$ e-kera t$_i$ (bi') Hasan [pro$_i$ maca   buku rowa?]]]
        who   REL   OV-think by H   A.read book that
        'Who does Hasan think read that book?'

In what follows we propose that in Sundanese long distance structures the *wh*-phrase must target the matrix subject position but never undergoes interclausal A'-movement. It may only undergo A-movement. However, unlike Davies' proposals for Madurese, we propose that the Sundanese DP can undergo raising.

3. The Sundanese *wh*-structures

There are a number of properties characteristic of Sundanese *wh*-constructions that any analysis must take into account.

3.1 Passive

As is true of (Standard) Malay/Indonesian and Madurese, no verb may appear in the active voice between the *wh*-phrase and its thematic position. In the long-distance structure in (2), repeated below, both the matrix verb *anggap* 'assume' and the embedded verb *baca* 'read' are in the passive. If either verb in (2) were active, the sentence would be ungrammatical, as illustrated in (8), where the active verbs are in bold.

(2)   *Mobil naon* nu   di-anggap   ku Ali [(nu) kakara di-beuli ku Hasan]?
        car   what REL OV-assume by A   REL recently OV-buy by H
        'What car did Ali assume Hasan had recently bought?'

(8) a. *Mobil naon nu   Ali **ng-anggap** [(nu) kakara   di-beuli ku Hasan]?
            car   what REL A   AV-assume REL recently OV-buy by H
    b. *Mobil naon nu   di-anggap   ku Ali [(nu) Hasan kakara   **meuli**]?
            car   what REL OV-assume by A   REL H   recently AV.buy

c. *Mobil naon* nu   Ali **ng-anggap** [(nu) Hasan kakara   **meuli**]?
   car   what REL A   AV-assume REL H   recently AV.buy
   (What car did Ali assume Hasan had recently bought?)

The data in (9) and (10) simply serve to illustrate that this is a general phenomenon and not peculiar to a small set of verbs.

(9)   a. Naon nu   di-sangka   ku Ahmad [(nu) di-sumput-keun ku Dédén]?
          what REL OV-suspect by A   REL OV-hide-KEUN by D
          'What did Ahmad suspect Deden hid?'
       b. *Naon nu   Ahmad nyangka   [(nu) di-sumput-keun   ku Dédén]?
           what REL A   AV-suspect REL OV-hide-KEUN by D
       c. *Naon nu   di-sangka   ku Ahmad [(nu) Dédén nyumput-keun]?
           what REL OV-suspect by A   REL D   AV.hide-KEUN
       d. *Naon nu   Ahmad nyangka   [(nu) Dédén nyumput-keun]?
           what REL A   AV-suspect REL D   AV.hide-KEUN

(10)   a. Naon nu   di-carita-keun   ku Dédén [(nu) di-cét   ku Ahmad]?
          what REL OV-say-KEUN by D   REL OV-paint by A
          'What did Deden say Ahmad painted?'
       b. *Naon nu   Dédén nyarita-keun   [(nu) di-cét   ku Ahmad]?
           what REL D   AV.say-KEUN REL OV-paint by A
       c. *Naon nu   di-carita-keun   ku Dédén [(nu) Ahmad nge-cét]?
           what REL OV-say-KEUN by D   REL A   AV-paint
       d. *Naon nu   Dédén nyarita-keun   [(nu) Ahmad nge-cét]?
           what REL D   AV.say-KEUN REL A   AV-paint

Saddy (1991) handles this phenomenon in Indonesian with a constraint on active voice that rejects as ill-formed any structure in which a nominal moves "over" a verb that occurs with the *meng-* prefix. Saddy (1991:185-186) states the constraint informally as in (11).

(11)   *Active Voice Constraint for Indonesian/Malay* (following Saddy 1991)
        If movement takes place out of a VP, then the [*meng-*] verbal prefix must delete.

Cole & Hermon (1998) identify the same constraint in Malay. Such a rule for Sundanese would be similar but would be formulated in terms of the active marker *ng(a)-*. However, such a constraint would be insufficient for Sundanese because there are verbs that occur without active voice marking, and movement across them is still ungrammatical. One such predicate is *percaya* 'believe'.

(12)   Siti percaya [Ujang bisa ng-oméan naon]?
        S   believe U   able AV-fix   what
        'What did Siti believe Ujang was able to fix?'

The in situ question is illustrated in (12). When one tries to move *naon* into initial position in the matrix clause, the result is ungrammatical.

(13)   *Naon (nu) Siti percaya nu   bisa di-oméan ku Ujang?
           what   REL S   believe REL able OV-fix   by U
          (What did Siti believe that Ujang was able to fix?)

The verb must be in the passive voice for the question to be well-formed.

(14)   Naon nu   **di-percaya** ku Siti (nu) bisa di-oméan ku Ujang?
          what REL OV-believe by S   REL able OV-fix   by U
          'What did Siti believe Ujang was able to fix?'

Therefore, in Sundanese the proper condition is that the verb must be in the passive voice in order for movement to take place.

3.2 Object Control

The next notable feature is that the cleft strategy is not available for questioning an element in the complement of an object control verb; only in situ questions are acceptable. Therefore, while (15a) is perfectly well-formed, (15b and c) are not.

(15) a. Hasan maksa   Ali [ng-inum   naon]?
          H   AV.force A   AV-drink what
          'What did Hasan force Ali to drink?'
      b. *Naon nu   Ali di-paksa   ku Hasan di-inum?
           what REL A   OV-force by H   OV-drink
      c. *Naon nu   di-paksa   ku Hasan di-inum   ku Ali?
           what REL OV-force by H   OV-drink by A

There are, however, two other classes of complement-taking predicates that seem to allow long-distant movement but exhibit slightly different sets of facts. The first is exemplified by verbs such as *sangka* 'suspect', as in (16).

(16)   Imas nyangka   [(yén)   Ujang geus   nga-jual sawah].
          I   AV.suspect COMP U   already AV-sell paddy field
          'Imas suspected that Ujang had sold the paddy field.'

The object of the embedded clause can be questioned in situ (17) or via long-distance movement (18).

(17)   Imas nyangka   [Ujang geus   nga-jual *naon*]?
      I   AV.suspect U   already AV-sell what
      'What did Imas suspect Ujang had sold?'

(18)   *Naon* nu   di-sangka   ku Imas [(nu) di-jual   ku Ujang]?
      what REL OV-suspect by I   REL OV-sell by U
      'What did Imas suspect Ujang had sold?'

Other verbs that exhibit the same behavior are *percaya* 'believe' and *anggap* 'assume'. These can all be characterized as raising verbs. (19) and (20) illustrate raising the embedded subject and object, respectively.

(19)   Asép di-anggap   ku Enéng [nga-leungit-keun kongkorong].
      A   OV-assume by E   AV-lose-KEUN necklace
      'Asep was assumed by Eneng to have lost the necklace.'

(20)   Kongkorong di-anggap   ku Enéng [di-leungit-keun   ku Asép].
      necklace   OV-assume by E   OV-lose-KEUN by A
      'The necklace was assumed by Eneng to have been lost by Asep.'

Note that when *kongkorong* 'necklace', which is merged as the embedded object, is the matrix subject, both the embedded and matrix verbs occur in the passive voice (20).
      The other class of predicates can be exemplified by *carita* 'say', as in (21).

(21)   Eri nyarita [(yén)   Ahmad bakal nge-cét   imah].
      E AV.say COMP A   will   AV-paint house
      'Eri said (that) Ahmad will paint the house.'

Again, the embedded object can be questioned in situ (22) or with the long-distance structure (23).

(22)   Eri nyarita [Ahmad bakal nge-cét   *naon*]?
      E AV.say A   will   AV-paint what
      'What did Eri say Ahmad will paint?'

(23)   *Naon* nu   di-carita-**keun** ku Eri [nu   bakal di-cét   ku Ahmad]?
      what REL OV-say-KEUN by E   REL will   OV-paint by A
      'What did Eri say Ahmad will paint?'

Note the appearance of the applicative suffix *-keun* on the matrix verb. Without this suffix, the sentence is ill-formed, as shown in (24).

(24)　*Naon nu　di-carita ku Eri [nu　bakal di-cét　ku Ahmad]?
　　　　what　REL OV-say　by E　REL will　OV-paint by A
　　　　(What did Eri say Ahmad will paint?)

This suffix is not a requirement for the long-distance questions with the *sangka*-class of verbs. One function of the *-keun* suffix is as an applicative that occurs when prepositional arguments are made direct arguments. With *carita* 'say', it occurs when the topic of discussion occurs as direct object or subject.

(25)　Hasan nyarita ka　Asép ngeunaan Méli.
　　　　H　　AV.say to　A　　about　　M
　　　　'Hasan said to Asep about Meli.'

(26)　Hasan nyarita-**keun**　　Méli ka Asép.
　　　　H　　AV.say-KEUN M　　to A
　　　　'Hasan said about Meli to Asep.'

(27)　Méli di-carita-**keun**　(ku) Hasan ka Asép.
　　　　M　　OV-say-KEUN by　H　　　to A
　　　　Lit: Meli was said about by Hasan to Asep.
　　　　'Hasan said about Meli to Asep.'

In (25), both objects occur in prepositional phrases, and *-keun* does not occur. In (26), *Méli*, the topic of discussion, occurs as a direct object and the suffix is present, and in (27) *Méli* is the subject of the passive, and the suffix again occurs obligatorily. In what follows, we detail an analysis of Sundanese questions which naturally accounts for all of the characteristics we have outlined.

4. Analysis

The facts about Sundanese *wh*-questions follow naturally in an analysis which posits no long-distance A'-movement but require additional stipulation in an analysis with long-distance A'-movement.

4.1 Passive

The first issue is why passive is required on all of the verbs between the position in which the operator is merged and its surface position. As described above, it is possible to formulate a constraint to this effect, ruling out any structures in which an element moves across an active voice verb. And this constraint is required in an A'-movement analysis, both in monoclausal and multiclausal structures.

　　　However, passive follows naturally if A'-movement is eschewed, leaving A-movement as the only means for getting the operator into the proper position. If it must be in the subject

position of the highest clause, the only way it can move to that argument position is via A-movement. In a monoclausal structure in which the operator is in a non-subject position, the only means available in Sundanese for moving it there is by the passive; thus the passive morphology is expected. In a multiclausal structure, if the operator originates in the embedded clause, the sole mechanism for getting it to matrix subject position is raising. As only subjects can raise, the operator must be in the embedded subject position. This parallels the situation with a declarative sentence with raising. In (28), *buku éta* 'that book' is merged as the object of the embedded clause, moves to embedded subject position via A-movement, and then raises to the matrix clause.

(28)   [Buku éta]$_i$ di-sangka (t$_i$) ku Eri t$_i$ di-baca t$_i$ ku Méli.
        book   DET OV-suspect   by E   OV-read by M
        'That book was suspected by Eri read by Meli.'

The question in (9a) precisely parallels the structure in (28).

(9) a. Naon nu   di-sangka   ku Ahmad [(nu) di-sumput-keun   ku Hasan]?
        what REL OV-suspect by A   REL OV-hide-KEUN by H
        'What did Ahmad suspect that Hasan hid?'

In this way, the passive morphology in both matrix and embedded clauses follows without stipulation in the A-movement analysis.
        Additionally, the A'-movement analysis predicts that as long as only passive voice occurs it should be possible for the operator to move across the verb. That, however, turns out not to be true. With many ditransitive verbs, it is possible to passivize the goal argument, as in (29b).

(29) a. Asép ngirim   buku ka Enéng.
        A   AV.send book to E
        'Asep sent a book to Eneng.'
     b. Enéng di-kirim-an   buku ku Asép.
        E   OV-send-AN book by A
        'Eneng was sent a book by Asep.'

With the verb *kirim* 'send', the goal *Enéng* can be passivized as long as the suffix *–an* occurs. With the verb in the passive voice, there should be nothing to prevent an object from being questioned in the A'-movement analysis. However, as (30) illustrates, such a structure is ill-formed.

(30)   *Naon nu   Enéng di-kirim-an   ku Asép?
         what REL E   OV-send-AN by A
         (What was Eneng sent by Asep?)

4.2 Object Control

The object control facts also fall out under the proposed analysis as neither the embedded nor matrix subject positions are unoccupied. Of course, the facts are captured under the A'-analysis via the passive voice constraint.

4.3 *–keun*

Two classes of predicates are distinguished on the basis of whether or not the suffix *-keun* obligatorily appears on the matrix verb in apparent long-distance movement questions. While verbs like *carita* 'say', *haréwos* 'whisper', and others require the suffix, verbs such as *sangka* 'suspect', *percaya* 'believe', and others do not. The *sangka*-class are raising predicates. With these verbs the embedded subject can raise to the matrix clause, as illustrated in (31b).

(31) a. Indung-na   percaya Rina geus   nga-bersih-an méja.
        mother-POSS believe R   already AV-clean-AN table
        'Mother believes Rina cleaned the table.'

    b. Rina di-percaya ku indung-na   geus   nga-bersih-an méja.
        R   OV-believe by mother-POSS already AV-clean-AN table
        'Rina is believed by her mother to have cleaned the table.'

When the embedded subject is an operator rather than a non-interrogative DP, the operator can raise in the same manner, as in the question in (32).

(32)   Saha nu   di-percaya ku indung-na   (nu) geus   nga-bersih-an méja?
        who REL OV-believe by mother-POSS REL already AV-clean-AN table
        'Who is believed by her mother to have cleaned the table?'

        The *carita*-class presents a different fact pattern. Recall that in declarative structures the *-keun* suffix is not required, illustrated again with the verb *haréwos* 'whisper'.

(33) a. Enéng nga-haréwos (yén)   Méli malsu-keun   buku éta.
        E   AV-whisper COMP M   AV.plagiarize-KEUN book DET
        'Eneng whispered that Meli plagiarized that book.'
    b. Saha nu   di-haréwos-**keun**   ku Enéng (nu) malsu-keun   buku éta?
        who REL OV-whisper-KEUN by E   REL AV.plagiarize-KEUN book DET
        'Who did Eneng whisper plagiarized that book?'

As with *carita* 'tell', with *haréwos* 'whisper' the suffix is obligatory. Without *–keun* (33b) is ill-formed. The explanation for the obligatory suffix is that the question operator is never a dependent of the embedded clause; it is a matrix clause dependent that is coindexed with an

embedded clause dependent (the null subject of *malsukeun* 'plagiarize ' in (33b)), that is, (33b) is a type of prolepsis structure and –*keun* licenses the proleptic element. This becomes more obvious in (34), a declarative structure in which the proleptic DP in the matrix clause, *Méli* is coreferential with the embedded pronominal subject *manéhna*.

(34)   Méli di-haréwos-**keun**   ku Enéng (manéhna) malsu-keun   buku éta.
         M   OV-whisper-KEUN by E   she   AV.plagiarize-KEUN book DET
         'Eneng whispered about Meli that she plagiarized that book.'

As is true of questions, –*keun* is obligatory with declaratives; thus the ungrammaticality of (35).

(35)   *Méli di-haréwos   ku Enéng (manéhna) malsu-keun   buku éta.
          M   OV-whisper by E   she   AV.plagiarize-KEUN book DET
          'Eneng whispered about Meli that she plagiarized that book.'

Again, the long-distance structure does not readily account for this fact. Passive structures for verbs of this clause do not require –*keun*. As (36a) shows, the goal of *haréwos* 'whisper' can be passivized and –*keun* is not present. However, even when the matrix verb is passive, as here in (36b), it is still impossible to question an element from the embedded clause.

(36) a. Asép di-haréwos-an   ku Enéng buku éta   di-palsu-keun   ku Méli.
         A   OV-whisper-AN by E   book DET OV-plagiarize-KEUN by M
         'Asep was whispered to by Eneng that the book was plagiarized by Meli.'
     b. *Buku naon (nu) Asép di-haréwos-an   ku Enéng (nu) di-palsu-keun   ku Méli.
         book what REL A   OV-whisper-AN by E   REL OV-plagiarize-KEUN by M
         'What book was Asep whispered to by Eneng had been plagiarized by Meli.'

The occurrence of the –*keun* suffix has a simple explanation in the A-movement analysis. Verbs of the *carita*-class do not countenance raising. As raising is the sole means for moving an element of an embedded clause to the matrix clause, an embedded element cannot be directly questioned. Instead, a proleptic structure is required, and with verbs of this class the proleptic DP is licensed by –*keun*. An analysis that incorporates long-distance A'-movement must stipulate this fact.

5. Subjects, Possessors, and A-movement

Up until this point, all cleft questions have involved the subject of the matrix clause. However, possessors of NPs can also be questioned by the cleft strategy.

(37)   Saha nu   mobil-na di-jual ku Asép?
         who REL car-POSS OV-sell by A
         'Whose car was sold by Asep?'

This type of cleft question is only possible when the DP is the subject of the clause.

Given the subject restriction on this structure, the A- and A'-movement analyses make different predictions regarding the questioning of possessors of embedded dependents. The A'-movement analysis predicts that it should be possible to question the possessor of the embedded subject as long as the matrix verb is passive—the possessor of the embedded subject is extracted to Spec,CP of the embedded clause and then moves to the higher Spec,CP by A'-movement. However, as (38) shows, this structure is not well formed.

(38) a. *Saha nu   di-sangka   ku Méli (nu)   mobil-na di-jual   ku Asép?
        who REL OV-suspect by M   REL car-POSS OV-sell by A
        (Whose car did Meli suspect was sold by Asep?)
     b. [Saha$_i$] [Op$_i$ [nu di-sangka   ku Méli [t$_i$ [[mobil-na t$_i$]$_j$ di-jual t$_j$ ku Asép]]]]

The derivation in (38b) shows *saha* 'who' moves as part of the DP to subject position in the embedded clause, is extracted to the lower Spec,CP and is raised to the higher Spec,CP. This violates neither the subject constraint nor the passive voice constraint, but the structure is ungrammatical nonetheless.

However, the ungrammaticality of (38) is expected under the proposed analysis as the only way of moving from the embedded clause to the matrix clause is by A-movement. Thus, if the possessor in the embedded clause is extracted in the embedded clause, there is no means to move it to the matrix clause. The A-movement analysis predicts that in order for the possessor to be questioned in the matrix clause it is necessary to first raise the entire DP to matrix subject position, as in (39).

(39) a. Saha nu   mobil-na di-sangka   ku Méli di-jual   ku Asép?
        who REL car-POSS OV-suspect by M   OV-sell by A
        'Whose car is suspected by Meli to have been sold by Asep?'
     b. [Saha$_i$] [Op$_i$ [nu [mobil-na t$_i$]$_j$ di-sangka ku Méli [t$_j$ di-jual t$_j$ ku Asép]]]

While the grammatical (39) is compatible with either the A- or A'-movement analysis, the ungrammatical (38) is incompatible only with the A-movement analysis. Once more, the facts follow naturally from the proposed analysis.

6. Conclusion

Although the constellation of facts associated with Sundanese *wh*-questions differs from that of Madurese in some regards, just as proposed for Madurese (Davies 2003), the most explanatory analysis is one that includes A-movement but no A'-movement. In recent work, Gerassimova and Sells (2008) propose essentially the same account for Tagalog, which points to the possibility that this is another syntactic feature shared by Indonesian and Philippine languages. While these analyses provide compelling explanations for unexpected or recalcitrant syntactic and morphosyntactic peculiarities that otherwise must be stipulated, a crucial question that at this

point begs an answer but must eventually be addressed is why the subject position plays the prominent role that it does in these *wh*-structures.

References

Cole, Peter, & Gabriella Hermon. 1998. The typology of *wh*-movement. *Wh*-movement in Malay, *Syntax*1:221-258.

Cole, Peter, & Gabriella Hermon. 2000. Partial *wh*-movement: evidence from Malay. In U. Lutz, G. Müller and A. von Stechow (eds.), *Wh-Scope Marking*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Davies, William D. 2003. Extreme locality in Madurese *wh*-questions, *Syntax* 6:237-259.

Davies, William D. 2005. Madurese prolepsis and its implications for a typology of raising, *Language* 81:645-665.

Gerassimova, Veronica, & Peter Sells. 2008. Long-distance dependencies in Tagalog: the case for raising. *WCCFL* 26:190-198.

Huang, C.T. James. 1982. Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Saddy, Douglas. 1991. *Wh*-scope mechanisms in Bahasa Indonesia. In *More Papers on Wh-Movement*. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 15.

Takahashi, Daiko. 1993. Movement of wh-phrases in Japanese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11:655–678.

Tsai, Wei-Tien. 1994. On economizing the theory of A'-dependencies. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.