This paper proposes an analysis of VOS word order in Austronesian languages, particularly the Atayalic language Seediq. I propose that VOS word order results from movement of the absolutive DP to a topic position in the C domain and then fronting the remnant TP to the left of the absolutive. However, unlike other recent predicate-fronting accounts of VOS word order in Austronesian languages, TP-fronting on my analysis is not feature-driven but rather is the indirect result of topicalization of the absolutive. Specifically, I propose a PF constraint which disallows a DP to be spelled out in initial position in the CP phase edge. This PF constraint is in turn related to an LF mapping procedure in which a clause-initial TP, PP, or adverb is interpreted as new or focused information, while a DP topic or absolutive following it is interpreted as given or presupposed.

1. Introduction

Recent approaches to VOS word order in Austronesian languages are based on leftward fronting of all or part of the predicate (Massam 2000, 2001, 2003 for Niuean; Rackowski & Travis 2000, Pearson 2001 for Malagasy). For example, Massam (2000, 2001) proposes a VP-fronting analysis of VOS word order in Niuean in which the VP moves to [Spec, IP] to check a [Pred] feature on Infl. [Pred] is taken to be the VOS counterpart of a [D] EPP feature.
(1)a. [VP Tagafaga ika] tumau ni a ia.
   hunt fish always Emph Abs he

   “He is always fishing.”

b. 

   \[
   \text{IP} \\
   \text{VP} \quad \text{I'} \\
   V \quad \text{NP} \\
   \text{vP} \\
   \text{DP}_{\text{Abs}} \quad t_{\text{VP}}
   \]

Pearson (2001) proposes a predicate-fronting analysis of VOS word order in Malagasy which involves a larger constituent. The subject moves from TP to a topic position above TP. The remnant TP is then attracted to an outer specifier of Top by the \( [T] \) feature on Top\(^1 \).

---

(2)a. [TP Nohanin-ny gidro] ny voankazo.
   Past.AccP.eat-Det lemur Det fruit

   “The lemur ate the fruit.”

b. 

   \[
   \text{TopP} \\
   \text{TP} \quad \text{Top'} \\
   \text{fruit} \quad \text{Top'} \\
   \text{Top}_{\text{[T]}} \quad t_{\text{TP}}
   \]
The approach to VOS word order taken in this paper also falls in the category of predicate-fronting and at first blush bears strong resemblance to Pearson’s (2001) account for Malagasy. Like the Malagasy analysis sketched above, my proposal for the Atayalic language Seediq is that the absolutive moves from its base position to a topic position above TP. Then the remnant TP fronts to the left of the absolutive.

Seediq

(3)a. Wada burig-un na Ape ka patis na Pawan.
Past buy-Tr Erg Ape Abs book Gen Pawan
“Ape bought Pawan’s book.”

b. 

However, my approach differs from Pearson’s in one key respect. While topicalization of the absolutive is driven by an EPP feature on C, fronting of the remnant clause is not feature-driven but rather the indirect consequence of topicalization of the absolutive. Specifically, I propose that it is the following PF constraint which underlies VOS word order in Austronesian languages.

---

1 The full analysis is more complex than given in this brief sketch. I give more of the details in section 5.1.
A DP cannot be spelled out in the leftmost position in a phase edge.

When the CP phase in question reaches PF, if the absolutive has undergone topicalization and resides in a specifier of CP, there must also be a non-DP phrase to its left in order to prevent the derivation from crashing at PF. Predicate-fronting serves to fulfill the Stranded DP Constraint and allow the derivation to converge.

The Stranded DP Constraint is not a random stipulation but rather is related to another fact of Austronesian syntax: how an Austronesian sentence is interpreted. The majority of Austronesian languages have verb-initial word order, and the leftmost portion of the predicate tends to be interpreted as new information or focus, while material further to the right is interpreted as old information or as being topicalized. I formalize this generalization as the following LF mapping procedure.

(5) **Phase Edge Interpretation**

If the edge of a phase HP has the form \([\text{HP} \ [\text{XP} \ [\text{H':DP} \ldots]]]\), where X is not D, DP is mapped to the presupposition and XP to focus.

Viewed in this way, VOS word order can be seen as the mirror image of SVO order. In typical SVO languages, an EPP feature on T requires a DP to move to initial position in the clause. Under my proposal, VOS word order places a restriction on DPs appearing in the left periphery of the clause. In this sense, my proposal is similar to Massam’s (2000, 2001) positing a [Pred] feature to replace the [D]-type EPP feature on
T. However, as I will show in this paper, feature-driven attraction of the predicate does
not account for all types of predicate-fronting. Additionally, my proposal has broader
application, accounting for a greater range of languages and constructions and can
ultimately be related to interpretive properties of Austronesian sentences.

This paper is divided into three main parts. In sections 2 and 3, I present and
argue for the predicate-fronting approach to Seediq word order. In section 4, I
demonstrate the role of the Stranded DP Constraint in Seediq word order derivation by
showing that predicate-fronting does not take place across the board but only when a DP
is spelled out in the CP or vP phase edge. In sections 5 and 6, I show how the Stranded
DP Constraint and Phase Edge Interpretation underlie a variety of constructions in other
Austronesian languages, including the Malagasy bodyguard construction and the cleft
strategy for wh-questions.

2. The Derivation

This section presents the derivation of VOS basic word order in Seediq. As
Seediq is an ergative language, “S” refers to the absolutive DP. The verb and auxiliary
verbs indicating tense/aspect or negation, if there are any, occur in clause-initial position.
The absolutive appears in clause-final position. In the monotransitive clause in (6a), the
ergative DP immediately follows the verb, with the absolutive DP following the ergative.
In the applicative construction in (6b), the applied argument has absolutive status and
occurs clause-finally. The ergative argument in this example is a clitic pronoun,
attaching to the first prosodic word in the sentence, here the tense auxiliary. (6c) is an
antipassive. The external argument has absolutive status and follows the verb and direct object.

(6)a. Wada burig-un na Ape ka patis.
   Past buy-Tr Erg Ape Abs book
   “Ape bought the book.”

b. Wada=na s-tabu huling ka buuts rodux.
   Past=3s.Erg App-feed dog Abs bone chicken
   “She fed the chicken bones to a/the dog.”

c. Wada m-ari hulama ka Ape.
   Past Intr-buy treat Abs Ape
   “Ape bought a treat.”

In this section, I propose that the word order illustrated above is derived by moving the absolutive DP out of TP to a specifier of CP and then fronting the remnant TP to an outer specifier of CP, where it will be spelled out to the left of the absolutive.

2.1. Movement of the Absolutive

In this subsection, I propose the mechanisms involved in movement of the absolutive from its base position into the C domain. Ultimately, the absolutive DP moves to a topic above TP, an EPP feature on C driving this movement. First, however, I discuss how it is precisely the absolutive which undergoes topicalization and not another
DP. As shown below, movement of another DP, for example the ergative DP, would result in ungrammaticality.

\[ \text{(7)a.} \quad [\text{TP} \quad \text{Wada} \quad \text{bube-un} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{Pihu} \quad t_{\text{Abs}} \quad ] \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{dangi=na}. \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Past} & \quad \text{hit-Tr} \\
\text{Erg} & \quad \text{Pihu} \\
\text{Abs} & \quad \text{friend=3s.Gen}
\end{align*}
\]

“Pihu hit his friend.”

\[ \text{b.} \quad *[\text{TP} \quad \text{Wada} \quad \text{bube-un} \quad t_{\text{Erg}} \quad \text{dangi=na} \quad ] \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{Pihu}. \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Past} & \quad \text{hit-Tr} \\
\text{} & \quad \text{Abs} \\
\text{} & \quad \text{friend=3s.Gen}
\end{align*}
\]

“Pihu hit his friend.”

The analysis I propose takes as its theoretical foundation the theory of Multiple Spell-Out as proposed by Chomsky (2000, 2001a, 2001b). The status of vP as a phase and the Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky2001b:5) play crucial roles in this account.

(8) Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC)

The domain of a phase head is not accessible to operations, but only the edge is.

The PIC dictates that movement of VP-internal material must first pass through the edge of vP, i.e. the outer specifier. In the case of object \(wh\)-movement, for example, \(v\) must have an EPP feature to first draw this DP into its outer specifier. From this position in the edge of vP, the object is accessible to the [wh] feature on C and can undergo
further movement to [Spec, CP]. Direct movement from within VP to [Spec, CP] would violate the PIC.

(9) What did you \([v_{\text{P}} \text{ t}_\text{what} [v' \text{ t}_\text{you} [v_{\text{[EPP]} \text{ [VP eat t}_\text{what} \text{ ]}]})]]\)?

It is assumed for English that EPP features are generated on \(\nu\) when needed. What I propose for ergative languages is that the appearance of EPP features on \(\nu\) is restricted in the following way.

(10) Transitivity and EPP

- Transitive \(\nu\) has an EPP feature, drawing the absolutive DP to its outer specifier. From here it can undergo further movement to [Spec, CP]. This DP also gets a presuppositional reading at LF.
- Intransitive \(\nu\) has no EPP feature; the direct object in an antipassive does not raise out of VP and undergoes Existential Closure at LF.

The EPP feature on transitive \(\nu\) ensures that the absolutive DP moves to the \(\nu\)P phase edge so that it can be further attracted to [Spec, C]. In a transitive clause, the transitive suffix -\(\text{un}\) is merged in \(\nu\). The EPP feature on \(\nu\) forces the internal argument to raise to the outer specifier of \(\nu\), where it checks absolutive case with T.
(11)a. Wada bube-un na Pihu ka dangi=na.

Past hit-Tr Erg Pihu Abs friend=3s.Gen

“Pihu hit his friend.”

b.

It is the absolutive DP in the outer specifier of vP which will be attracted by the EPP feature on C, assuming that this feature enters into an Agree relation with the closest matching element in its c-command domain. The ergative DP will therefore not be attracted, since it is structurally lower and therefore further away from C than the absolutive.

In an applicative construction, the applied argument is merged in [Spec, Appl]. It is then attracted by v’s EPP feature and checks case with T.

(12)a. Wada s-bari hulama na Ape ka laqi.

Past App-buy treat Erg Ape Abs child

“Ape bought the child a treat.”
In antipassives, which are intransitive, \( \nu \) does not have an EPP feature. The internal argument does not move to the \( \nu P \) phase edge, leaving the external argument the only DP in the \( \nu P \) phase edge and in a position to check case with T. In Seediq, the intransitive prefix \( m- \) is merged in T and values absolutive case on the closest DP in its c-command domain, in this case the external argument in [Spec, \( \nu \)].

(13)a. Wada m-ari patis ka Awe.
   Past Intr-buy book Abs Awe
   “Awe bought a book.”

b. 

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{TP} \\
T_{[\nu \text{Abs}]} \\
\text{vP} \\
DP_{[\text{Abs}]} \quad \nu' \\
\text{DP}_{[\text{Erg}]} \quad \nu' \\
\text{ApplP} \\
\text{Appl}' \\
t_{DP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{TP} \\
T' \\
m_{[\nu \text{Abs}]} \quad \text{vP} \\
DP_{[\text{Abs}]} \quad \nu' \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]
In an unaccusative, absolutive case is checked with the internal argument. Following Chomsky (2001a), I assume that unaccusative vP is a weak phase, allowing T to probe into VP and check case with the internal argument absolutive.

\[ (14) \text{a.} \] Mu-chieka ka sapah.

Intr-cracked Abs house

“The house is cracked.”

\[ (14) \text{b.} \]

\[ \text{TP} \quad \text{T'} \quad \text{mu-[u/abs]} \quad \text{vP} \]

\[ \text{v} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{DP}_{[\text{abs}]} \]

At this point, movement of the absolutive to the C domain can be accounted for by positing an EPP feature on C, as I stated at the beginning of this section. The DP which moves must be the absolutive, because it is this DP which will be the closest to the probe on C. This analysis of movement of the absolutive DP also accounts for the restriction on A’-movement, in which only absolutes are eligible to undergo A’-extraction\(^2\).

\[^2\text{This is the well-known subject or topic restriction on A’-movement in Austronesian languages. Accordingly, numerous disparate analyses have been proposed to account for this fact in a variety of Austronesian languages (Schacter & Otanes 1972, Richards 2000, Rackowski 2002 for Tagalog; Holmer 1996, Chang 1997 for Seediq; Keenan 1976, Pearson 2001 for Malagasy; Chung 1994, 1998 for Chamorro; Georgopoulous 1991 for Palauan; among many others). The approach proposed in this paper, however, suggests a uniform account of this phenomenon across languages, though development of this cross-linguistic mechanism is beyond the scope of this paper. }\]
Relativization

(15)a. sapah b-n-ari na tama

house Tr-Perf-buy Erg father

“house which Father bought”

b. *sapah m-n-ari ka tama

house Intr-Perf-buy Abs father

“person who built the house”

Transitive $v$ has an EPP feature which attracts the absolutive DP in (15a) to its outer specifier. From there, it can be further attracted to the specifier of CP.

Intransitive $v$, on the other hand, has no EPP feature. Direct extraction of the antipassive object from VP in (15b) violates the PIC.
2.2. Seediq Verb-movement

Although I did not indicate this in the discussion on absolutive case-checking and topicalization, the verb also undergoes head movement to an aspectual position above vP. This accounts for the positioning of the verb to the left of the ergative DP in [Spec, vP].

(18)  \[\text{TP Wada [AspP burig-un [vP na Ape [vP t\text{y} \text{ t}_{\text{Abs}} ]]}}\]

Past buy-Tr Erg Ape

ka patis na Pawan.

Abs book Gen Pawan

“Ape bought Pawan’s book.”

In this subsection, I argue that the verb reaches its position by head-movement and not via remnant VP-movement. This fact is particularly relevant to the analysis of predicate-fronting which I develop below. Specifically, since verb-movement is required independently of predicate-fronting, it is unlikely that features on the verb head are the
motivating factor, and therefore this provides indirect support for the Stranded DP Constraint.

I begin by introducing Seediq tense/aspect morphology. Verbs can reduplicate or be infixed to indicate aspect, as shown in (19a) and (19b). In order to indicate imperfective in Seediq, an auxiliary must be used, as shown in (19c).

(19)a. m-n-ege
   Intr-Perf-give
   “gave”

   b. b-bege
      Red-give
      “will give”

   c. gagam-ege
      Pres Intr-give
      “be giving”

The synthetic forms for the perfective and contemplative may also be substituted by analytic forms. (20) shows that perfective can be expressed either by the infix or with the auxiliary.

(20)a. M-n-ari patis ka Awe.
      Intr-Perf-buy book Abs Awe
      “Awe bought a book.”
b. Wada m-ari patis ka Awe.
Past Intr-buy book Abs Awe
“Awe bought a book.”

Note, however, that when the negator ini appears, only the auxiliary can be used.

(21)a. Wada ini ekan ido ka Pawan.
Past Neg eat rice Abs Pawan
“Pawan did not eat rice.”

b. *Ini m-n-ekan ido ka Pawan.
Neg Intr-Perf-eat rice Abs Pawan
“Pawan did not eat rice.”

This indicates that perfective aspect is associated with a position higher than negation, i.e. with T. When the verb carries the infix, as in (20a), it must move to T or to the head of T’s complement in order to allow it to undergo Merger, in the sense of Halle and Marantz (1993) and Emick and Noyer (2001).

However, even in the presence of an auxiliary, the verb can still be reduplicated to show aspect. Although infixation and reduplication cannot be combined in Seediq, present tense and incompletive aspect can occur together, present being expressed by the combination of an auxiliary and reduplication.
This suggests the following structure, in which the auxiliary is merged in T, and the verb moves to an aspectual projection below it.  

---

3 Travis (2000) has also proposed two aspectual projections for Austronesian languages. Travis (1991)
However, the word order in (18) does not rule out a derivation in which the verb moves inside VP. This would be remnant VP-movement, the absolutive object having moved to the topic position in [Spec, C]. VP-fronting would allow the verb to check its aspectual features in the specifier of Asp.

On the other hand, there is other evidence in favor of the head-movement analysis. Another characteristic of verbal morphology in the context of negation is that the verb must be in its irrealis form.

---

specifically assigns reduplication to the lower projection.
This suggests a selectional relationship between negation and the projection hosting the verb stem. In other words, the verb must be the head of the sister of Neg and not contained inside its specifier. Further evidence for verb-movement out of $vP$ comes from adverb placement. Adverbs like $riong$ ‘often’ intervene between the verb and direct object, indicating that the verb has moved out of VP, stranding the object.
b. S-bari **riong** hulama na ape ka laqi.

   App-buy often treat Erg Ape Abs child

   “Ape often buys the child a treat.”

This adverb follows the verb even when the negator *ini* appears in the clause, indicating that the verb-movement still takes place in the presence of negation but that the landing site is located below Neg.

(28)a. Ini=ku usa riong.

   Neg=1s.Abs go often

   “I don’t go often.”

b. 

```
  NegP
    ini
    AspP
      V+v+Asp
        vP
          riong
            v'
              DP_{Ag}
                v'
                  t_{V+v}
                    VP
```

I may point out at this time that an analysis of VOS word order which combines verbal head movement with phrasal predicate fronting is not so surprising, as this is the approach also taken by Pearson (2001) for Malagasy. Under this analysis, the verb raises to T, before TP is fronted to the outer specifier of Top, as shown in (2) above.

Before closing this subsection, I summarize the process of VOS word order derivation in Seediq. In the transitive clause shown in (29), the absolutive DP is merged
in VP. The EPP feature on v attracts this DP to the vP phase edge, where the absolutive checks case with T. The verb also undergoes head movement from VP and raises to the Asp position. Next, an EPP feature on C forces the absolutive to move to its specifier. Remnant TP-fronting takes place subsequently, and the Stranded DP Constraint is satisfied.

\[(29)\text{a. } \text{Wada burig-un na Ape ka patis na Pawan.} \]

Past buy-Tr Erg Ape Abs book Gen Pawan

“Ape bought Pawan’s book.”

\[(29)\text{b.} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\quad \text{C'} \\
\quad \quad \text{patis} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{C}_{[\text{EPP}]} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{wada}_{[\text{Abs}]} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{AspP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{vP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{t}_{\text{patis}} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{v'} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Ape} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{v'} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{tpatis} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{tv} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{t}_{\text{V+EPP}} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{tv} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{tpatis} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{tv} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{t}_{\text{V+EPP}} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{VP} \\
\end{array}\]

3. Arguments for the Predicate-fronting Approach
In this section, I present arguments for the predicate-fronting approach, specifically evidence for topicalization of the absolutive and subsequent fronting of the remnant TP. The first set of arguments shows that neither the absolutive nor any clause-internal elements c-commands the other, which is expected since the absolutive moves out of TP, followed by fronting of the remnant TP around the absolutive. The second set of arguments shows that the absolutive moves to a position in the C domain, where it is interpreted as a topic. Lastly, I argue for fronting of the remnant predicate by demonstrating that this constituent is an island to extraction, in effect displaying a freezing effect characteristic of movement to a specifier or adjoined position.

3.1. Structural Relations

I have proposed that VOS word order in Seediq is derived by moving the absolutive DP (S) out of TP and then fronting the remnant TP to the left of this DP. In the resulting structure, no clause-internal element c-commands the absolutive. The following discussion shows that this is indeed the case. I further contrast Seediq with the VSO language Tagalog, in which the absolutive DP does not move out of its base position and therefore resides in a position c-commanded by the ergative nominal and by negation.
3.1.1. Structural Relations in Seediq

In Seediq, only absolutes in antipassives can antecede reflexives. Therefore, the agent absolutive in the antipassive in (30) can bind the benefactive reflexive. In their base positions, the agent absolutive c-commands the reflexive, satisfying Condition A of the Binding Principles. Subsequently in the derivation, the absolutive DP moves to the C domain, but it will never be in a position which is c-commanded by the reflexive.

(30)a. Wada=nak m-ari rulu ka Ape.
Past=Refl Intr-buy car Abs Ape

“Ape bought herself a car.”

b.  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{Past} \quad \text{AspP} \\
V+v+Asp \quad \text{vP} \\
\text{DP}_{Abs} \quad \text{v'} \\
\text{t}_{V+v} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{tV} \quad \text{DP}_{Refl}
\end{array}
\]

The transitive version of (30) is not grammatical. In this sentence, the intended antecedent has ergative status. The reflexive is the absolutive, licensed by the benefactive applicative morphology on the verb. In their base positions, the ergative c-commands the reflexive, satisfying Condition A.
(31)a.*Wada=nak s-bari rulu na Ape.

Past=Refl.Abs App-buy car Erg Ape

b.               TP
     Past     AspP
       V+v+Asp  vP
            DP_Erg  v’
                t_{V++[EPP]}        VP
                          t_V  DP_Refl

However, c-command relations will be reversed when the absolutive DP moves out of its base position to the outer specifier of $v$. If we assume cyclic application of Condition A (Baltin 2000), the absolutive DP is no longer bound by the ergative DP. In fact, the absolutive reflexive now c-commands and binds the intended antecedent, invoking a Condition C violation$^4$.

(32)               AspP
     V+v+Asp  vP
          DP_Refl  v’
               DP_Erg  v’
                   t_{V++}        VP
                             t_V  t_Refl

$^4$ Hoji (1985), Tada (1993), Oka (1996), Takano (1996), McGinnis (1999), and others have shown that short scrambling in Japanese also alters binding relations.
NPI licensing also provides evidence that absolutives reside in a high position at the relevant point in the derivation. Neg licenses a VP-internal oblique object NPI in an antipassive.

(33)a. Wada ini bari aní mumaanu ka Ape.

Past Neg buy any thing Abs Ape

“Ape didn’t buy anything.”

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{Ape} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{EPP} \\
\text{TP} \\
wada \\
\text{AspP} \\
\text{ini} \\
bari \\
vP \\
v \text{VP} \\
\text{ani mumaanu} \\
tv \text{V} \\
tv_{+v} \text{VP} \\
tv_{Ape} \text{v} \\
\end{array}
\]

However, Neg does not license an absolutive NPI.

(34)a. *Ini burig-i na Ape ka aní mumaanu.

Neg buy-Tr.Irr Erg Ape Abs any thing

“Ape didn’t buy anything.”
Therefore, we can conclude that Neg in (34) does not c-command the absolutive.

3.1.2. Contrast with VSO

The correlation between word order and structural relations observed in the preceding subsection for Seediq is bolstered by comparison with the VSO language Tagalog. VSO word order in Tagalog refers to the order verb-agent-theme/patient-other. “S”, in other words, is the semantic subject, i.e. the external argument in a transitive clause. When the verbal morphology is transitive, this argument has ergative status. The other arguments in the clause follow the ergative DP, the theme or patient DP typically immediately following the agent, while other arguments and adjuncts follow this. The main difference between basic word order in Tagalog and Seediq is that the absolutive
nominal does not have a fixed position in the former, as it does in the latter. In Tagalog, the absolutive tends to remain in its thematic position in unmarked word order.

(35)a. B-in-ili  ng babae **ang isda** kay Huan.
   -Tr.Perf-buy Erg woman Abs fish Dat Juan
   “The woman bought the fish from Juan.”

b. B-in-ilh-a n  ng babae ng isda  si Huan.
   -Tr.Perf-buy-App Erg woman Obl fish Abs Juan
   “The woman bought the fish from Juan.”

c. B-um-ili **ang babae**  ng isda kay Huan.
   -Intr.Perf-buy Abs woman Obl fish Dat Juan
   “The woman bought a fish from Juan.”

This indicates that the absolutive DP does not undergo movement from its base position and that Tagalog VSO word order can be derived in a similar manner to Celtic and Semitic languages, by head movement of the verb to a position above its arguments (cf. Emonds 1980, Sproat 1985; Chung & McCloskey 1987; McCloskey 1990, 1991, 1996a, 1996b, 1997, 1998; Bobaljik & Carnie 1996, Noonan 1995; Roberts 2005; and others for Celtic; and Mohammad 1988, Kaplan 1991, Ouhalla 1994, Shlonsky 1997, Doron 2000, and others for Semitic). As in Seediq, the Tagalog verb also undergoes head movement to an aspectual projection above vP. All other vP-internal material, however, remain in their base positions. There is no EPP feature on T or Asp, and verb-movement is triggered by morphological features on the verb.

- Tr.Perf-buy Erg woman Abs fish

“The woman bought the fish.”

b. 

It is Asp and not T which serves as the landing site of verb-movement, because, as in Seediq, negation precedes the verb, as shown in the following example.

(37) Hindi b-in-ili'ng babae ang isda.

Neg - Tr.Perf-buy Erg woman Abs fish

“The woman did not buy the fish.”

It follows from the verb-movement analysis proposed above that the ergative and absolutive DPs remain in their base positions, with the result that the ergative DP c-commands the absolutive. Initial evidence for this is the fact that an ergative nominal can antecede an absolutive reflexive, as shown below.
(38)a. P-in-igil \( \text{ng lalaki } \text{ang sarili}=\text{niya}. \)
   -Tr.Perf-control Erg man Abs self=3s.Gen
   “The man controlled himself.”

b. *P-in-igil \( \text{ng sarili}=\text{niya} \text{ ang lalaki} \)
   -Tr.Perf-control Erg self=3s.Gen Abs man

Ergative DPs can also bind variables in absolutive position.

(39) Mina-maha\( \text{ng bawat } \text{bata} \text{ ang kani-kaniya} \text{-ng aso}. \)
   Red.Tr-love Erg each child Abs 3s.Dist-Lk dog
   “Each child loves his/her own dog.”

These facts can be accounted for by the structure I have proposed, in which verb-initial word order is derived by moving the verb out of \( vP \) but leaving the ergative and absolutive arguments in their base positions.
This analysis is also supported by weak crossover effects. In (41), the operator cannot bind the variable, which it A’-moves over\(^5\).

\[(41)\text{a. } \ast\text{Sino} \quad \text{ang} \quad [\text{CP Op}_i [\text{TP} \quad \text{yina-yapo}\_s \quad \text{ng} \quad \text{nanay} \_\text{niya}\_t_i \_]]].
\]

\[\text{who} \quad \text{Abs} \quad \text{Red.Tr.Perf-hug} \quad \text{Erg} \quad \text{mother} \_3s.Gen\]

“Who\(_{ij}\) is his\(_i\) mother hugging?”

b.

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{Op}_i \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{AspP} \\
\text{yinayapos} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{t}_V^{+v} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{t}_V \\
\text{t}_o \text{p}
\end{array}\]

In contrast, (42) does not exhibit weak crossover effects, since the operator originates in external argument position and does not move over the intended variable.

\[(42)\text{a. } \text{Sino}_i \quad \text{ang} \quad [\text{CP Op}_i [\text{TP} \quad t_i \quad \text{yuma-yapo}\_s \quad \text{sa} \quad \text{anak} \_\text{niya}\_i \_]]].
\]

\[\text{who} \quad \text{Abs} \quad \text{Red.Intr-hug} \quad \text{Dat} \quad \text{child} \_3s.Gen\]

“Who\(_i\) is hugging his\(_i\) child?”

---

\(^5\) \text{Wh}-questions like (41) take the form of pseudo-clefts in Tagalog and many other Austronesian languages. I propose an analysis of this cleft structure in section 6.
Licensing of negative polarity items additionally indicates that ergative and absolutive nominals do not move to a position above negation prior to Spell-Out. Negative polarity items take the form of a *wh*-word followed by the adverbial particle *man* ‘even if/also’, e.g. *anuman* ‘anything’ (*ano* ‘what’ + *man*), *sinuman* ‘anyone’ (*sino* ‘who’ + *man*). These function as NPIs in the context of negation but not in positive contexts, indicating that they are licensed as NPI only when c-commanded by a negator.

(43)a. Wala-ng **anuman** sa kwarto.
not.exist-Lk anything P room
“There is nothing in the room.”

b. *Mayroon-g **anuman** sa kwarto.
exist-Lk anything P room
“*There is anything in the room.”

NPI is licit in negative existential constructions when the NPI is the complement of the existential verb or when it is in the absolutive possessor position.
The woman didn’t buy anything.”

“Noone bought books.”

The same is true in non-stative, agentive clauses. The NPI can appear in the VP as an oblique or absolutive.

(45)a. Hindi siya t-um-anggap ng anuman-g mungkahi.

Neg 3s.Abs -Intr.Perf-accept Obl any-Lk proposal

“He/she didn’t accept any proposal.”

b. Hindi niya t-in-anggap ang anuman-g mungkahi.

Neg 3s.Erg -Tr.Perf-accept Abs any-Lk proposal

“He/she didn’t accept any proposal.”

An NPI can also appear in external argument position, as ergative or absolutive.


Neg -Intr.Perf-accept Abs anyone Obl proposal-3s.Gen

“Noone accepted his/her proposal.”
b. Hindí t-in-anggap ng **sinuman** ang mungkahi-niya.

Neg -Tr.Perf-accept Erg anyone Abs proposal-3s.Gen

“Noone accepted his/her proposal.”

The NPI examples above show that both ergative and absolutive DPs are located in a position c-commanded by negation in declarative clauses.

The contrast between Tagalog and Seediq in terms of structural relations is accounted for naturally by the different derivations I have proposed for deriving their word order. In Tagalog, VSO word order is generated by moving the verb to Asp. Since the ergative and absolutive DPs remain in their base positions, the absolutive DP continues to be c-commanded by the ergative DP and by negation throughout the derivation. In Seediq, on the other hand, the absolutive moves out of TP, above the ergative DP and negation. The remnant TP then fronts to its left, thereby resulting in a structure in which neither the absolutive DP nor TP-internal material c-commands the other.
3.2. Evidence for Absolutive Topicalization in Seediq

The remainder of section 3 further explore the structural correlates of the VOS analysis of Seediq word order. I have proposed that the absolutive DP moves to [Spec, C], which I assume to be an A’-position, where it is interpreted as a topic. This section gives evidence for this movement of the absolutive.

3.2.1. Resumptive Pronouns

Initial evidence is provided by clitic doubling. In (48a) and (48b), the absolutive yaku is resumed by clitics right-adjacent to the verb.

(48)a. \[TP Gaga=ku=daha ngal-un ] ka yaku duri.
Pres=1s.Abs=3p choose-Tr Abs 1s even

“They have chosen even me.”

b. \[TP M-usa=ku mu-huma kyuuri=na ] ka yaku.
Intr-go=1s.Abs Intr-plant cucumber=3s.Gen Abs 1s

“I went to plant his cucumbers.”

These clitics could merely be instantiations of agreement with the absolutive, as proposed by Chang (1997). However there is evidence to the contrary. By hypothesis, the absolutive DP must move out of TP to the C domain, so it is unclear whether (48a) and (48b) are cases of agreement or clitic dislocation. Evidence that clitics only occur
with topics comes from the behavior of ergative clitics. An ergative pronoun replaces a full nominal argument, as shown in (49a). However, when an full ergative DP occurs in its base position, it cannot be resumed by a pronoun, as shown in (49b) and (49c).

(49)a. \[_{TP} \text{ Wada=na biq-un hulama } \text{ laqi} \]

Past=3s.Erg give-Tr treat child.Abs

“He/she gave the child a treat.”

b. \[_{TP} \text{ Wada burig-un } \text{ na Ape } \text{ ka patis-ni.} \]

Past buy-Tr Erg Ape Abs book-Dem

“Ape bought this book.”

c. \[^[_{TP} \text{ Wada=na burig-un na Ape } \text{ ka patis-ni.} \]

Past=3s.Erg buy-Tr Erg Ape Abs book-Dem

“Ape bought this book.”

I conclude from this that the clitics in (48) are pronouns and not agreement markers. As such, they do not cooccur with a DP in argument position inside TP, which indicates in turn that the absolutive DPs in (48) have moved outside of TP, as per the hypothesis put forth in this paper.
3.2.2. Coordination

Coordination also provides evidence that absolutes move out of TP. (50a) shows coordination of clauses in which ATB extraction has moved the absolutive *laqi na* ‘her child’ from both conjuncts. (50b) conjoins an intransitive and an antipassive.

(50)a. \([\text{AspP} \quad S\text{-bari}=\text{na} \quad t_{\text{Abs}} \quad \text{hulama}] \quad \text{ma}\)
   
   \([\text{App-buy}=3s.\text{Erg} \quad \text{treat} \quad \text{and}\)

\([\text{AspP} \quad s\text{-smalu}=\text{na} \quad t_{\text{Abs}} \quad \text{lukus} \quad \text{dungan}] \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{laqi}=\text{na}.\)

\([\text{App-make}=3s.\text{Erg} \quad \text{clothes also} \quad \text{Abs} \quad \text{child}=3s.\text{Gen}\)

“She buys a treat for and also makes clothes for her child.”

b. \([\text{AspP} \quad M\text{-usa} \quad t_{\text{Abs}} \quad \text{Purishia}] \quad [\text{AspP} \quad m\text{-ari} \quad t_{\text{Abs}} \quad \text{sama}] \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{Ape}.\)

\([\text{Intr-go} \quad \text{Puli} \quad \text{Intr.buy} \quad \text{vegetable} \quad \text{Abs} \quad \text{Ape}\)

“Ape went to Puli and bought vegetables.”

The conjoined constituents in both (50a) and (50b) contain the inflected verb. The conjuncts in (50a) additionally contain the ergative pronoun. In section 2.2, I showed that Seediq verbs move to an aspectual projection above vP. Therefore, the conjoined constituents – and therefore the constituent from which the absolutive DP moves – must be no smaller than AspP.
3.2.3. Information Structure

As I have claimed that VOS word order derivation in Seediq involves movement of the absolutive DP to a topic position above TP, there should be evidence of this in terms of information structure. In this subsection, I provide evidence to support this assertion. In a typical declarative Seediq clause, new or focused information tends to appear first in the clause, inside the predicate, with definite material follows, generally in the form of the absolutive DP in clause-final position. Consequently, non-absolutive internal arguments in immediate post-verbal position tend to be indefinite, non-specific, while the absolutive DP must be definite or generic. (51) demonstrates that this is indeed the case. (51a) introduces *qushia mutaso* “clean water”, where it is immediately after the verb, before the locative NP and the agent absolutive. In (51b), where it represents old information, it is the absolutive, while the NP representing new information *lukus* “clothes” has oblique status.

(51)a. M-n-oda m-ari **qushia mutaso** Hori ka Ape.

Intr-Perf-go Intr-buy water clean Puli Abs Ape

“Ape went to Puli to buy clean water.”

b. Wada=na s-pahu lukus ka **qushia mutaso**.

Past=3s.Erg App-wash clothes Abs water clean

“She washed clothes with the clean water.”
In contrast to this, XPs which cannot be topicalized are not permitted to appear in absolutive position in Seediq. For instance, *wh*-words cannot occur in absolutive position. This is true not only for Seediq but also for Malagasy.

Seediq (Chang 1997:146)

(52)a.  **ima**   (ka)  \[CP O_{p}  [TP  s-m-ebut  \ t_{Op}  \ laqi ]\]

  who   Abs   -Intr-hit   child

  “Who hits a child?”

b.  *S-m-ebut  laqi  ka  **ima**?

  -Intr-hit   child   Abs   who

  “Who hits a child?”

Malagasy (Sabel 2003:11)

(53)a.  **Inona**  no  \[CP O_{p}  [TP  novidin-dRabe  \ t_{Op}  \ ]]?

  what   Foc   Past.TT.buy-Rabe

  “What did Rabe buy?”

b.  *Novidin-dRabe  (ny)  **Inona**?

  Past.TT.buy-Rabe   Det   what

  “What did Rabe buy?”

Another related asymmetry is that observed between strong and weakly quantified DPs. Strongly quantified DPs tend to be given absolutive status.
Interestingly, weakly quantified DPs cannot appear in absolutive position. If they appear in situ in the clause, they must have oblique status, e.g. as the object of an antipassive verb.

(55)a. Wada m-ari  

Past Intr-buy many pear Abs Awe-Def

“Awe bought a lot of pears.”

b.  ?*Wada=na  

Past=3s.Erg buy-Tr many pear Abs Awe-Def

Building on work by Milsark (1974), Diesing (1992) proposes that strong quantifiers, but not necessarily weak quantifiers, presuppose the existence of the entities they are applied to. This dichotomy is captured easily in the current analysis. Strongly quantified DPs move into topic position, where they will be mapped onto the presupposition, while weakly quantified DPs are contained inside the predicate and are mapped to the focused – or nonpresupposed – part of the clause.
3.3. Evidence for TP-fronting: CED Effects

As Seediq is a syntactically ergative language, DP *wh*-movement is limited to absolutes\(^6\), as noted in section 2.1.

**Seediq**

(56)a. \textbf{Maanu} [DP ka [CP Op [TP wada burig-un \(t_\text{Op}\) na Ape]]]?

who Abs Past buy treat Erg Ape

“Who did Ape buy a treat for?”

b. *\textbf{Maanu} [DP ka [CP Op [TP wada m-ari \(t_\text{Op}\) ka Ape]]]?

what Abs Past Intr-buy Abs Ape

“What did Ape buy?”

This is also true for Tagalog.

**Tagalog**

(57)a. \textbf{Ano} \# ang b-\textit{in}-asa ni Maria?

what Abs -Tr.Perf-read Erg Maria

“What did Maria read?”

b. *\textbf{Ano} \# ang b-\textit{um}-asa si Maria?

what Abs -Intr.Perf-read Abs Maria

“What did Maria read?”

\(^6\) This characteristic of syntactically ergative languages has been cited by numerous scholars, including
But there is a difference between Seediq and Tagalog: PPs and adjuncts are free to move into pre-verbal position in Tagalog.

**Tagalog**

(58) \(\text{Saan} = \text{ka} \text{ b-um-ili} \text{ ng libro} \text{ t}i?\)

where=2s.Abs -Intr.Perf-buy Obl book

“Where did you buy books?”

In Seediq, on the other hand, PPs and adjuncts cannot be fronted.

**Seediq**

(59)a. \(\text{M-n-ari} \text{ inu} \text{ patis Ape?}\)

Intr-Perf-buy where book Ape

“Where did Ape buy books?”

b. \(*\text{Inu}i\text{ m-n-ari} \text{ ti} \text{ patis Ape}\)

where Intr-Perf-buy book Ape

In Tagalog the *wh*-phrase fronts to [Spec, C].

---

Dixon (1979, 1994), Campana (1992), Manning (1996), and many others.
The lack of movement in Seediq can be accounted for assuming some version of Huang’s (1982) Condition on Extraction Domain, i.e. the fronted TP forms an island to extraction. A recent approach to CED effects is given by Nunes and Uriagareka (1999), who propose that moved XPs are spelled out before they are dislocated. Since the contents of the dislocated constituent have been spelled out, they are no longer accessible to the computation and therefore ineligible for movement.

This correlation between basic word order and adjunct fronting observed for Tagalog and Seediq can be found in other Formosan languages. Paiwan is a VSO
language, like Tagalog. The absolutive DP can, but need not, appear in clause-final position.

Southern Paiwan

(62)a. P-in-avai-an ni ama ta tsakit a kakedian.
   -Perf-give-Tr Erg father Obl knife Abs child
   “Father gave the child a knife.”

b. P-in-avai-an ni ama a kakedian ta tsakit.
   -Perf-give-Tr Erg father Abs child Obl knife
   “Father gave the child a knife.”

c. Sini-pavai a tsakit na kakedian tjay ama.
   App.Perf-give Abs knife Erg child Obl father
   “The child gave Father the knife.”

Bunun is another VSO language.

Bunun

(63)a. ‘is-anat mas tina’ ‘uvaz-a’ pandian.
   App-cook Erg mother child-that soup
   “Mother cooks soup for that child.” (Zeitoun 2000a:80)

b. ma-ludah tina’a ‘uvaz-tia’.
   Intr-hit mother-that child-that
   “That mother hits that child.” (Zeitoun 2000a:66)
In contrast to this, Tsou has VOS word order. The absolutive always appears in clause-final position.

**Tsou**

(64)a. i-si fii to emi to ino ‘o amo.
   Aux-3sErg give Obl wine Erg mother Abs father
   “Father was given some wine by mother.”

b. i-si mU’a to bUvnU to mamespinNi si papai.
   Aux-3sErg plant Obl flowers Erg woman Abs field
   “This field is where the woman planted some flowers.”

Now observe the placement of adjuncts. VSO Paiwan and Bunun allow fronting of locatives.

**Southern Paiwan**

(65)a. Inu na-suman tapau ti ama?
   where Intr.Perf.-build house Abs father
   “Where did the father build a house?”
b. A okama suman tapau i daruk.

Abs father build house P mountain

“The father builds a house in the mountains.”

c. I daruk suman tapau a okama.

P mountain build house Abs father

“In the mountains, the father builds a house.”

Bunun (Zeitoun 2000a:94)

(66) (*I-)'isa ‘uvaz-a’ dau’ tatangis?

Pres.where child Q cry

“Where is the child crying?”

VOS Tsou, on the other hand does not. Locative wh-words must follow the verb.

Tsou

(67)a. mi-ko oengiti nenu?

Intr-2s.Abs sleep where

“Where did you sleep?” (Huang et al. 1999:670)

b. te-ko uh nenu?

Fut-2s go where

“Where are you going?” (Zeitoun 2000b:124)
This cross-linguistic comparison substantiates the correlation between VOS word order and predicate-fronting. Predicate-fronting creates an island to extraction, so adjuncts cannot move to clause-initial position. I will add in passing that non-predicate-fronting analyses of VOS word order in Seediq do not present a ready account of this asymmetry. Based on Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis’ (1992) account of VOS word order in Malagasy, Holmer (1996) and Chang (1997) that basic word order in Seediq results from rightward movement of the absolutive to clause-final subject position. The "wh-phrase would remain in its base position in VP.

Seediq

(68)a. M-n-osa inu ka Pawan?

-Intr-Perf-go where Abs Pawan

“Where did Pawan go?”

b. IP (modified from Guilfoyle, Hung, & Travis 1992)

```
  IP
   /  \\
  \   \  \\
   \   \\
  mnosa Pawan
    \    \\
     \   \\
      \  \\
       \____
       t_Pawan

  V
    /  \\
   \   \\
    \   \\
     \  \\
      \____
       t_V

  inu
```

Extrapolating from this, VSO word order should result from the lack of (overt) movement of the absolutive, yielding the following surface structure. The "wh-phrase would move to [Spec, C].
4. Motivation for Predicate-fronting

In sections 2 and 3, I argued that the absolutive DP undergoes topicalization to a position in the C domain, and then the remnant TP fronts to the left of the absolutive. I have proposed that this movement is motivated indirectly by the Stranded DP Constraint, repeated below.

(70) **Stranded DP Constraint** (checked at PF)

A DP cannot be spelled out in the leftmost position in a phase edge.
Since the absolutive has a fixed position in the clause, this movement must always take place in the generation of basic word order. Furthermore, since the predicate always precedes the absolutive, remnant TP-fronting is also obligatory. Therefore, it is not obvious that predicate-fronting is the result of the Stranded DP Constraint and not, as Pearson (2001) proposes for Malagasy, the result of a [T] feature drawing TP to the outer specifier of a topic projection.

However, another characteristic of Seediq predicate-initial word order does help us to choose between these two approaches. This is in the case of VP-fronting in Seediq, which takes place on a more limited scale and can be seen to correlate exactly with the appearance of a DP in the vP phase edge.

Recall that in an antipassive, the verb and auxiliaries appear at the left edge of the clause, followed by VP-internal arguments and adjuncts and finally the external argument absolutive.

(71) Wada m-ari [vP t_{Abs} hulama t_{V} laqi] ka Ape.

Past Intr-buy treat child Abs Ape

“Ape bought the child a treat.”

In a mono-transitive clause with a full NP ergative nominal, the ergative DP immediately follows the verb, while the internal argument absolutive appears clause-finally.
(72) Wada burig-un \[ v_P \quad \text{na} \quad \text{Ape} \quad t_V \quad t_{Abs} \] \text{ka} \quad \text{patis}.

Past buy-Tr \text{Erg Ape Abs} \text{book}

“Ape bought the book.”

An interesting pattern emerges in the case of applicative constructions with full NP ergatives in situ. The oblique object appears between the verb and the ergative DP.

(73) Wada s-bari \text{hulama} \text{na} \text{Ape ka laqi}.
Past App-buy treat \text{Erg Ape Abs} \text{child}

“Ape bought the child a treat.”

This can be accounted for using a mechanism paralell to the TP-fronting proposed above. In (73), the ergative DP appears in its base position, in a specifier of $v_P$. Since this left edge of $v_P$, the Stranded DP Constraint should be violated and the derivation crash. This can be circumvented if the sister of $v$, i.e. ApplP in (73), moves to $v$’s outer specifier. The absolutive nominal is also attracted to the $vP$ phase edge by $v$’s EPP feature and subsequently moves to the topic position above TP, as proposed in section 2.
As I argued in section 2.2, the verb undergoes head-movement out of vP. Therefore, movement of the projection containing the direct object is not likely to be driven by features on the verb. Of course, it is possible to propose that it features of the object itself which is responsible for the displacement. However, an object shift account should be ruled out, due to the interpretation of the object. This object is interpreted as indefinite and nonspecific.

(75)a. Wadas-bari **hulama** na Ape ka laqi.
Past App-buy treat Erg Ape Abs child
“Ape bought the child a/*the treat.”

b. Wada puq-un **atak** na Ape ka qutsuruh-ni.
Past eat-Tr chopsticks Erg Ape Abs fish-Def
“Ape ate the fish with (*the) chopsticks.”

Diesing (1992) and others have shown that shifted objects in Germanic languages must receive presuppositional interpretations. If, however, the object remains inside VP,
as I propose above, they can undergo Existential Closure and receive a nonspecific interpretation.

Given that the position of the object in (73) is not accounted for by features of the verb or of the object, I will pursue the hypothesis posited in (74), that the object moves to the left of the ergative DP as part of the larger constituent, whose movement is necessary in order to circumvent a violation of the Stranded DP Constraint at PF. To this end, what I show in this section is that this fronting takes place precisely when a DP is spelled out in the edge of vP and does not take place when there is no DP there.

Typically, this DP is the external argument, as in (75). On the other hand, if the external argument moves from its base position, then VP-fronting does not take place. This is the case in a typical antipassive, where the external argument has absolutive status and moves to the C domain. In the following example, this is not immediately apparent from the surface order, as VP-movement in this case would be string vacuous.

(76)a. Wada m-ari [\(vP\ t_{Abs}\ t_{v+V}\ [vP\ hulama\ t_V\ laqi\ ]\] \ ka \ Ape.

Past  Intr-buy  treat  child  Abs  Ape

“Ape bought the child a treat.”

b. Wada m-ari [\(vP\ hulama\ t_V\ laqi\ ]\ t_{Abs}\ t_{v+V}\ t_{vP}\]  ka  Ape.

Past  Intr-buy  treat  child  Abs  Ape

“Ape bought the child a treat.”

A clearer picture is provided by embedded clauses containing wh-phrases. In an object control construction, the controller, which is the indirect object of the matrix
clause, precedes the complement clause. However, when the embedded CP contains a
*wh*-word, the complement clause appears to the left of the controller.

(77)a. H-m-eidaq  **laqi**  [CP  *m-ari*  *rulu*]  ka  tama.

- Intr-allow  child  Intr-buy  car  Abs  father

“The father allowed the child to buy a car.”

b. H-m-eidaq  [CP  *m-ari*  *maunu*]  laqi  ka  tama.

- Intr-allow  Intr-buy  what  child  Abs  father

“What did the father allow the child to buy?”

Note that the matrix verb in (77a) and (77b) is intransitive. These are both
antipassives. The matrix external argument checks absolutive case with T and is
topicalized to [Spec, C]. This means that there will be no DP in the vP phase edge at
Spell-Out. By hypothesis, VP-fronting should not be required. I argue here that (77b)
shows that VP-fronting does not take place. This is because movement of the entire VP
would not account for the relative positions of the CP and the controller. Assuming that
the controller is merged higher than the CP so that it c-commands PRO inside the
complement clause, then [vP  DP  V  CP] should be the base order. The matrix verb moves
to *v* and then to Asp, as argued in section 2. If VP-movement were to take place next,
then the order DP-CP between the internal arguments should be maintained. However,
this is not the order seen in (77b).
The word order in (77b) is accounted for, however, if VP-fronting does not take place but rather just the CP moves to the vP phase edge, pied-piping the \textit{wh}-phrase with it\textsuperscript{7}.

Therefore, I conclude that that VP-fronting does not take place in an antipassive like (77b), in which the external argument has absolutive status and has moved to [Spec, 7]

\textsuperscript{7} K. A. Jayaseelan (personal communication) claims that this type of pied piping also takes place in 52
C] and will not be spelled out in [Spec, v]. This is precisely what is predicted by the Stranded DP Constraint: VP-fronting takes place when a DP is spelled out in the vP phase edge but not otherwise.

However, this does not mean that VP-fronting never takes place in antipassives. VP-fronting must take place if [Spec, v] contains a DP at Spell-Out. Causative constructions are one such case. In the causative in (80), neither the embedded direct object nor the complement clause can be stranded to the right of the causee.

   Past=1s.Abs Caus-build house Pawan
   “I asked Pawan to build a house.”

   Past=1s.Abs Caus-buil Pawan house
   “I asked Pawan to build a house.”

   Past=1s.Abs Pawan Caus-build house
   “I asked Pawan to build a house.”

This can be accounted for by assuming that the causee is merged and spelled out in a specifier of the lower vP. The inner-most VP then fronts to the left edge of the second vP.

Malayalam. An embedded clause containing a focused element moves to a clause-medial focus position in
From the fact that VP-fronting can take place in an antipassive, it is clear that an analysis under which an antipassive or intransitive v lacks the requisite feature for attracting VP would not be tenable. The difference between (77b), in which VP-fronting does not take place, and (80a), in which VP-fronting does take place, is accounted for, however, by the Stranded DP Constraint, since VP-fronting takes place only in that case in which a DP is spelled out in a specifier of vP, i.e. (80a).

The Stranded DP Constraint also accounts for an interesting asymmetry between Tagalog and Seediq internally headed relative clauses. The head nominal appears immediately following the verb in an internally headed relative clause in these languages.

(82)a. s-n-malu sapah na tama (Seediq)

    -Perf-build house Erg father

    “house wich Father built”
(82) shows examples of theme head nominals. An external argument can function as internal head of a relative clause in Tagalog, but not in Seediq, as shown in (83b). The external argument may be the head of a relative clause, but only in initial or final position, as shown in (83c).

(83)a. nag-bigay na tao ng kendi sa bata (Tagalog)
   Intr.Perf-give Lk person Obl candy to child
   “person who gave candy to the child”

b. *m-n-atis seedaq patis-ni
   (Seediq)
   Intr-Perf-write person book-Def
   “person who wrote the book”

c. m-n-atis patis-ni seedaq kiya
   (Seediq)
   Intr-Perf-write book-Def person that
   “that person who wrote the book”
The verb-movement analysis of Tagalog word order can account for (83a). The head nominal appears in its base position in [Spec, \( v \)] and the verb moves to Asp. VP-internal material remains to the left of the head nominal.

(84) \[
\text{AspP} \\
 \quad \text{nagbigay} \\
 \quad \text{vP} \\
 \quad \text{tao} \\
 \quad \text{v'} \\
 \quad \text{tv} \\
 \quad \text{VP} \\
 \quad \text{kendi} \\
 \quad \text{V'} \\
 \quad \text{tv} \\
 \quad \text{bata}
\]

In Seediq, on the other hand, this derivation would not be possible. The VP cannot be stranded after the external argument.

(85) \[
\text{*TP} \\
 \quad \text{mnatis} \\
 \quad \text{vP} \\
 \quad \text{seediq} \\
 \quad \text{v'} \\
 \quad \text{tv} \\
 \quad \text{VP} \\
 \quad \text{patis}
\]

This follows from the Stranded DP Constraint. VP-fronting must take place in (83b), because the head nominal is spelled out in a specifier of \( v \), which should trigger VP-fronting and not allow VP-internal material to be stranded to the right of the absolutive.
In this section, I have argued that VP-fronting takes place in Seediq only when a DP is spelled out in the edge of vP, providing the primary support for my analysis of predicate-fronting based on the Stranded DP Constraint. At this point, the following parameter emerges. As I will show in section 6, the Stranded DP Constraint is active for CP in Seediq, Malagasy, and Tagalog. However, the constraint is not active for vP in Tagalog, as shown in the relative clause examples above. The constraint is also not active for vP in Malagasy, as this language has only TP-fronting and not VP-fronting. Note the contrast below between Seediq and Malagasy applicative constructions. As shown above, the VP containing the oblique theme fronts to the left of the agent in Seediq. In contrast, the agent precedes the oblique theme in the Malagasy example.

\[(86)\]a. Wadas-bari \([vP \ [VP \ tV \ hulama] \] na Ape \(t_{v+V} \ t_{VP}\) \ ka laqi.

Past App-buy treat Erg Ape Abs child

“Ape bought the child a treat.” (Seediq)

b. Nanapahan’i \([vP \ Sahondra \ t_{v+V} \ [VP \ ity \ hazo \ ity \ ny \ antsy]]\).

Past.CT.cut.Gen Sahondra this tree this Det knife

“The knife was used by Sahondra to cut the tree.” (Malagasy; Paul 2000:12)

5. Deeper Motivation for the Stranded DP Constraint

The next question which needs to be addressed is why the Stranded DP Constraint should exist in the first place. I suggested earlier that this ultimately rests on how an
Austronesian sentence is interpreted. These languages tend to be predicate-initial and focused material generally precedes presupposed elements.

(87) **Phase Edge Interpretation**

If the edge of a phase HP has the form \([_{HP} \ X_1 \ [_{H'} \ DP \ \ldots ]]\), where \(X_1\) is not D, DP is mapped to the presupposition and XP to focus.

In section 3.2.3, I have discussed how information structure interacts with VOS word order in Seediq. One key example is repeated below. The absolutive DP is always topicalized or presupposed; new information is contained inside the fronted TP.

(88)a. \([_{TP} \ M-n-oda \ m-ari \quad \textbf{qushia mutaso} \quad \text{Hori} \] \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{Ape}.\)

Intr-Perf-go  Intr-buy  water  clean  Puli  Abs  Ape

“Ape went to Puli to buy clean water.”

b. \([_{TP} \ Wada=na \ s-pahu \quad \text{lukus} \] \quad \text{ka} \quad \textbf{qushia mutaso}.\)

Past=3s.Erg  App-wash  clothes  Abs  water  clean

“She washed clothes with the clean water.”

I will explore further extensions of this hypothesis in this section by examining another Austronesian VOS language, Malagasy.
5.1. Malagasy Basic Word Order

Malagasy word order can be accounted for essentially in the same way as Seediq. The absolutive DP is attracted by C’s EPP feature. Then the remnant TP is spelled out and fronted to the left of the absolutive.

Malagasy (Pearson 2001:218)

(89)a. Nohanin-ny gidro ny voankazo.

Past.AccP.eat-Det lemur Det fruit

“The lemur ate the fruit.”

b. 

As Pearson (2001, 2005) shows, Malagasy displays the same restrictions on information structure that Seediq does. For example, the topic must be definite.

Icelandic (Pearson 2001:88)

(90)a. Novidin-dRajaona ny boky.

Past.AccP.buy-Rajaona Det book

“Rajaona bought the book.”
b. *Novidin-dRajaona boky.
   Past.AccP.buy-Rajaona book
   “Rajaona bought a book.”

Wh-phrases cannot appear in topic position.

Malagasy (Sabel 2003:11)

(91)a. Inona no novidin-dRabe?
   what Foc Past.TT.buy-Rabe
   “What did Rabe buy?”

b. *Novidin-dRabe (ny) inona?
   Past.TT.buy-Rabe Det what
   “What did Rabe buy?”

The topic position is also subject to topic-drop in both languages, while non-topic positions are not.

Malagasy (Pearson 2001:91)

(92)a. Vangian’-i Naivo izy.
   DatP.visit-Det Naivo 3s
   “Him, Naivo is visiting.”
b. Vangian’-i Naivo __.
   
   DatP.visit-Det Naivo
   
   “(Him), Naivo is visiting.”

c. Vangiany i Tenda
   
   DatP.visit-3s Det Tenda
   
   “Tenda, he is visiting.”

d. *Vangiana __ i Tenda
   
   DatP.visit Det Tenda
   
   “Tenda, (he) is visiting.”

Pearson (2001) proposes a different kind of predicate-fronting account of Malagasy word order. Pearson claims that the clause-final topic is merged with an interpretable [op] feature, associated with the scope-taking property of topics and assigned in the numeration to a specific DP. This [op] feature is then attracted by the uninterpretable [op] feature of Piv. (Pearson 2001:96) The topic DP then raises to [Spec, Piv], where case agreement determines the voice morphology on the verb.

Malagasy (Pearson 2001:172)

(93)a. Nohanin-ny gidro ny voankazo.
   
   Past.AccP.eat-Det lemur Det fruit
   
   “The lemur ate the fruit.”
Later in the derivation, the topic DP moves again to [Spec, Top], which has [D] and [op] features. Predicate-initial word order is derived by fronting the remainder of the clause to the outer specifier of Top, attracted by a [T] feature on Top.

Predicate-fronting is motivated by a strong feature that must be checked by Piv in Top. Pearson claims that these DP and predicate movements are parallel to movements involved in deriving V2 order in Germanic languages. He cites a number of parallels between Malagasy topics and topics in V2 constructions. As noted above, topics in Malagasy must be definite, and this position can be the target of topic-drop. Pearson shows that the same is true of topics in Icelandic.
(95)a. **Bokina** keypti Jon.

      book.the bought John

      “John bought the book.”

b. ??**Bok** keypti Jon.

      book bought John

      “John bought a book.”

(96)a. Ihn hab’ ich schon gesehen.

      him have I already seen

      “Him, I already saw.”

b. __ hab’ ich schon gesehen.

      have I already seen

      “(Him), I already saw.”

c. *Ihn hab’ __ schon gesehen.

      him have __ already seen

      “Him, (I) already saw.”

On this basis, Pearson claims that V2 topics and Malagasy topics move to the same position in the C domain. As for predicate-fronting, though this is realized as verbal head-movement in Germanic languages, Pearson proposes phrasal predicate-
fronting for Malagasy. He offers the following parameter, based on the realization of tense-aspect morphology.

(97)a. In languages with suffixal tense-aspect morphology, T-to-C movement, if overt, will involve X^0-movement.

b. In languages with prefixal (proclitic) tense-aspect morphology, T-to-C movement, if overt, will involve XP-movement. (Pearson 2001:207)

The fundamental aspects of the predicate-fronting analysis I have been advocating are very similar to Pearson’s (2001) account of Malagasy. Essentially, VOS word order is derived by moving the absolutive DP to a topic position and then fronting the remnant clause to its left. I am skeptical, however, of certain particulars of Pearson’s analysis, in particular the parallel with Germanic V2.

On the one hand, the analysis I am pursuing in this thesis does highlight an obvious similarity between Austronesian and Germanic syntax: predicate movement is triggered by topicalization. On the other hand, a parallel analysis of predicate-fronting and V2 glosses over an important difference between Austronesian predicate-fronting and Germanic V2. As Pearson points out, in Austronesian languages, the topic position must be filled by a DP, while the topic can be of different categories in Germanic languages: a DP in (98a), adverb in (98b), PP in (98c).
German (Pearson 2001:193)

(98)a. **Hans** veröffentlicht heuer in Deutschland ein Buch.

“Hans published a book this year in Germany.”

b. **Heuer** veröffentlicht Hans this.year in Deutschland ein Buch.

“Hans published a book this year in Germany.”

c. **In Deutschland** veröffentlicht Hans this.year ein Buch.

“Hans published a book this year in Germany.”

In Malagasy, clause-initial position can be filled by the predicate, an adverb or a PP. If a PP or adverb occupies the clause-initial position, the rest of the TP is stranded after the topic/absolutive. This configuration has been dubbed the “bodyguard” construction by Keenan (1976), who identifies the condition that a fronted non-DP may be accompanied by the absolutive.
Malagasy

(99)a. **Omaly** Rasoa no [nijinja vary]
yesterday Rasoa Foc Past.AT.harvest rice

“It was yesterday that Rasoa harvested rice.” (Paul 2000:195)
b. **Amin’ity savonyity** Rasoa no [manasa lamba]
with.this soap this Rasoa Cleft AT.wash clothes

“With this soap Rasoa washed the clothes.” (Keenan 1976:269)

The generalization seems to be, then, that topic/absolutive position in Austronesian languages is restricted to DPs but the pre-topic position can be filled by elements of different categories. In the case of Germanic V2, we see the inverse situation: the topic position is not restricted in terms of category, but the predicate position is limited to finite verbs.

There is also evidence that different landing sites are involved. In Germanic languages, V2 is prohibited in the presence of a complementizer.

Dutch (Diesing 2003)

(100)a. Gisteren **heeft** Herbert dat boek gekocht.
yesterday has Herbert that book bought

“Yesterday Herbert bought that book.”
b. **dat** Herbert gisteren dat boek gekocht **heeft**.
that Herbert yesterday that book bought has

“…that Herbert bought that book yesterday.”
However, predicate-fronting is not blocked by a complementizer in Malagasy. The absolutive in (101) follows the predicate in the embedded clause headed by the complementizer *fa*.

Malagasy (Pearson 2001:113)

(101) Mihevitra Rakoto
AT.think Rakato

[fa namangy ny dadany ny mpianatra]
that Past.AT.visit Det father-3Gen Det student

“Rakoto thinks that the student visited his father.”

Another way in which the parallel between Austronesian VOS and Germanic V2 breaks down is in information structure. We have seen in section 3.2.3 that absolutes or topics in Malagasy and Seediq must always be definite or generic. Initial position in Germanic languages, however, is not reserved for topics but can also be filled by focused elements, e.g. *wh*-phrases.

German (Fanselow 2003:37)

(102)a. den Fritz hat sie eingeladen
the.Acc Fritz has she invited

“It is Fritz who she has invited.”
b. wen hat sie eingeladen

who has she invited

“Who has she invited?”

For the reasons cited above, the parallel between VOS and V2 seems unwarranted. I therefore maintain the analysis of VOS word order in Malagasy proposed in (89), based on the Stranded DP Constraint and Phase Edge Interpretation. In the remainder of this section, I show how this proposal also accounts for two other constructions in Malagasy.

5.2. Multiple $\text{Wh}$-constructions

To reiterate, the crux of the proposal in this paper is that a DP can occupy a specifier of CP only when a non-DP precedes it. This pattern is exhibited in Malagasy in at least two other constructions besides basic VOS word order. One of them is multiple $\text{wh}$-fronting. When this happens, an adjunct and an argument $\text{wh}$-phrase are fronted together. One interesting fact is that the adjunct must precede the argument.

Malagasy (Sabel 2003)

(103)a. Aïza iza no mividy ny vary?

where who Foc.Pres.AT.buy the rice

“Where does who buy the rice?”
Note also that two DP *wh*-words cannot be fronted, again consistent with the current analysis in which a non-DP must precede the DP topic position.

Malagasy (Sabel 2003)

(104)a. *Iza inona no mividy?
       Who what Foc Pres.AT.buy
       “What does who buy?”

b. *Inona iza no mividy?
   What who Foc Pres.AT.buy
   “What does who buy?”

Additionally, Paul (2000) notes that the DP *wh*-phrase must be D-linked, in the sense of Pesetsky (1987). A sentence like (103a) is only felicitous when there is “a context-specified set of people, known to both the speaker and hearer, that restricts the range of possible answers.” (Paul 2000:201)

The derivation proceeds as follows. The DP *wh*-phrase moves to [Spec, C] and checks the EPP feature on this functional head. The derivation would crash at PF if this DP were left alone in the CP phase edge. But this crash is avoided if another XP is moved to the left of the DP. Fronting the entire TP could accomplish this. But I suggest
in this case that since there is a PP with a \textit{wh}-feature that needs to be checked, it is this PP\(^8\) which is moved. In terms of the interpretation, according to the Phase Edge Interpretation principle, the PP will be mapped to the focus and be interpreted as a true \textit{wh}-operator, while the DP \textit{wh}-phrase, is mapped to the presupposition and receives a D-linked interpretation.
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\textbf{5.3. Bodyguard Construction}

My analysis also can derive the “bodyguard” construction, introduced in section 5.1. This word order can be derived if we assume that the non-DP element attracted to the outer specifier of C can be just the PP. The particle \textit{no} is in the C position.

\footnote{In allowing a PP to move out of TP, Malagasy is different from the other VOS languages discussed in section 3.4. The reasons for this distinction are not fully understood, but it is possible that there are different gradations of VOS word order and that Malagasy belongs to a less strict type of VOS language. For example, the absolutive nominal does not always appear in clause-final position but can be followed by certain elements, including tensed complement clauses.}

\begin{verbatim}
Mihetitra Rakoto [fa namangy ny dadany ny mpianatra] \\
AT.think Rakato that Past.AT.visit Det father-3Gen Det student
\end{verbatim}

“Rakoto thinks that the student visited his father.”
(106)a. **Amin’ity** savonyity *Rasoa* [no manasa lamba].

with this soap this Rasoa Cl AT.wash clothes

“The with this soap Rasoa washed the clothes.”

b. \[ \text{CP} \]
\[ \text{PP} \]
\[ \text{C'} \]
\[ \text{DP}[^{\text{Abs}}] \]
\[ \text{C'} \]
\[ \text{C} \]
\[ \text{TP} \]
\[ t_{PP} \]

As for the interpretation, the DP still is interpreted as topic and not as part of the focus, as argued by Paul (2000). This is substantiated by the fact that the presupposition behind the adjunct can be negated but not the topic.

(107)a. **Malagasy** (Paul 2000:195)

(107)a. Omaly Rasoa no nijinja vary.

yesterday Rasoa Foc Past.AT.harvest rice

“It was yesterday that Rasoa harvested rice.”

b. Tsia, afak’omaly izy no nijinja vary.

no free’yesterday 3.Nom Foc Past.AT.harvest rice

“No, it was the day before yesterday that she harvested rice.”

c. #Tsia, omaly Rakoto no nijinja vary.

no yesterday Rakoto Foc Past.AT.harvest rice

“No, it was yesterday that Rakoto harvested rice.”
Additionally, Paul argues extensively that the adjunct in clause-initial position receives a focus interpretation, while the absolutive remains a topic. The fact that the question particle *ve* intervenes between the focused XP and the bodyguard in a question indicates that the clause-initial XP is located in a focus position.

**Malagasy** (Paul 2000:190)

(108) Omaly ve Rasoa no nanapaka bozaka?

yesterday Q Rasoa Foc Past.AT.cut grass

“Was it yesterday that Rasoa cut the grass?”

Paul (2000, 2003) argues that bodyguard constructions are a type of cleft. This claim is not inconsistent with the analysis I have proposed. In the following section, I present my analysis of Austronesian cleft constructions. Like the bodyguard construction, clefts derivation involves movement of the focused focused constituent to the left of the presupposition.

6. *Wh*-questions as Clefts

It is widely recognized that *wh*-questions formed on DPs in a great many Austronesian languages take the form of pseudoclefts (Georgopoulos 1991, Richards 1998, Paul 2001, Aldridge 2002, Massam 2003, and many others). The *wh*-phrase forms
the matrix predicate, while the rest of the clause constitutes a headless relative and resides in matrix subject position.

(109)a. Maanu [\text{DP} \text{ka} \text{CP} \text{Op} \text{TP} \text{b-n-ari}=\text{na} \text{t}_{\text{Op}})]? \quad \text{(Seediq)}

```
what  Abs  -Perf-buy=3s.Erg
```

“What did she buy?”

b. Ano [\text{DP} \text{ang} \text{CP} \text{Op} \text{TP} \text{ga-gaw-in}=\text{mo}_{\text{Op}})]? \quad \text{(Tagalog)}

```
what  Abs  Red-do-Tr=2s.Erg
```

“What are you going to do?”

c. Inona [\text{DP} \text{no} \text{CP} \text{Op} \text{TP} \text{novidin-dRabe} \text{t}_{\text{Op}})]? \quad \text{(Malagasy)}

```
what  Foc  Past.TT.buy-Rabe
```

“What did Rabe buy?”

The reason that these constructions must take the form of clefts, however, is still a subject of debate. The purpose of this section is to propose an answer to this question. Specifically, I show that the cleft strategy is a consequence of the analysis of VOS word order presented in this paper. Put simply, the Stranded DP Constraint and Phase Edge Interpretation prevent \textit{wh}-movement which would place a DP \textit{wh}-phrase in a clause-initial CP specifier position.

As discussed at length above, C in VOS languages has an EPP feature forcing the absolutive DP to move to its specifier. The remnant clause then fronts to C’s outer specifier.
(110)a. Wada burig-un na Ape ka patis na Pawan.

Past buy-Tr Erg Ape Abs book Gen Pawan

“Ape bought Pawan’s book.”

b. \[
\text{TP}
\]

As I have also argued in the preceding sections, predicate-fronting is an indirect consequence of the Stranded DP Constraint, which prohibits spelling out a DP in the left edge of a phase.

(111) **Stranded DP Constraint**

A DP cannot be spelled out in the leftmost position in a phase.
At LF, the Phase Edge Interpretive rule applies.

(112) **Phase Edge Interpretation**

If the edge of a phase HP has the form \([_{HP} \text{XP} [_{H'} \text{DP} \ldots]]\), where X is not D, DP is mapped to the presupposition and XP to focus.

The DP in the CP phase edge will then be interpreted as the topic and the TP as the focus of the clause.

(113) ![Diagram of Phase Edge Interpretation]

If, on the other hand, a *wh*-phrase were merged as the absolutive argument, this DP would be attracted to [Spec, C]. With [Spec, C] filled, the TP would then have to be fronted. Since the first XP in the C domain receives a focus interpretation, it would be TP that is interpreted as the focus, and the *wh*-phrase would be interpreted as the topic, yielding an anomalous interpretation.
However, if DP wh-questions are formed as pseudo-clefts, the headless relative checks absolutive case and moves to topic position. The focused constituent is then contained inside the fronted TP where it receives the intended interpretation.

(115)a. Maanu [\[DP ka [\[CP Op [\[TP b-n-ari=na \quad t_{op} ]\]]? (Seediq)

“What did she buy?”

b. Before closing this section, I will entertain an alternative analysis. As introduced in section 1, Massam (2000, 2001, and 2003) has proposed that in predicate-fronting languages like Niuean, T has a [Pred] feature and not an EPP feature. This ensures that these languages have verb-initial word order and that DPs never appear in clause-initial
position. Consequently, there can be no DP \textit{wh}-movement to [Spec, C]. As evidence, Massam (2003) notes that bare DP \textit{wh}-words cannot appear in clause-initial position but must be preceded by a predicate particle.

Massam proposes the following structure, in which \textit{ko} and the \textit{wh}-word form the predicate and are merged in [Spec, IP].

(116) \textbf{Ko} hai ne lalaga e kato e:?

Pred who C weave Abs basket this

“Who wove this basket?”

Massam’s proposal is somewhat extreme when applied to other Austronesian languages. In Tagalog, for instance, it cannot be the case that the predicate must appear in initial position in the clause, since focused PPs can precede the main verb.
Sa Maynila bi-bili si Maria ng bahay.

in Manila Red-buy Abs Maria Obl house

“Maria will buy a house in Manila.”

If the PP were moved to the [Spec, IP] focus position, then there would be no landing site for VP-fronting, and the placement of the verb to the left of the absolutive would not be accounted for.

It is clear, therefore, that the correct generalization is that only a non-DP element can occur in clause-initial position. But this element need not be a predicate, per se. This is precisely what is required by the Stranded DP Constraint.

One final point must be made before concluding this paper. I have been assuming in this section that the Stranded DP Constraint is active in Tagalog for CP. As I have shown in section 3.1.2, Tagalog is a VSO language, and as such basic word order generation does not involve phrasal predicate-fronting. However, there are instances where the effects of the Stranded DP Constraint can be observed. Clefting is one case, as
illustrated above. Another case is antipassive clauses, which allow both VSO and VOS word order.

Tagalog

(120)a. B-um-ili  si  Maria  ng  bahay.
   -Intr.Perf-buy Abs  Maria  Obl  house
   “Maria bought a house.”

b. B-um-ili  ng  bahay  si  Maria.
   -Intr.Perf-buy Obl  house  Abs  Maria
   “Maria bought a house.”

This can be analyzed as follows. The absolutive is optionally topicalized, moving to [Spec, CP]. The remanant TP then fronts to its left.
The correct generalization for Tagalog, then, is that if the absolutive moves to the C domain, then TP must also front, which is what is predicted by the Stranded DP Constraint. Below, I summarize the parameter settings for the Stranded DP Constraint in the languages discussed in this paper.

(122) **Stranded DP Constraint Parameter Settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seediq</td>
<td>vP, CP</td>
<td>(EPP on C =&gt; V-X-Abs word order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malagasy</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>(EPP on C =&gt; V-X-Abs word order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>(no obligatory EPP on C =&gt; V-Ag-Th word order)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that VOS word order is derived by a combination of topicalization of the “S” nominal and fronting of the remnant clause to the left of “S”. The main thrust of the argument has been to show that predicate-fronting is not triggered by morphological features but is the indirect result of a constraint prohibiting a DP in initial position in the CP phase edge and the building of comment-topic information structure for the clause.

I have illustrated the proposal primarily with data from the Atayalic language Seediq, but I have also shown how the analysis can be extended to other VOS Austronesian languages, like Malagasy. I have additionally shown how this word order analysis accounts for the fact that a cleft strategy is required for *wh*-questions formed on DPs in a great number of Austronesian languages.
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