Like many Western Malayo-Polynesian languages, Mandar (South Sulawesi) appears to require the agent voice in clauses where the external argument is extracted. Despite this pattern, the language does not show agent voice syntax when the extraction site contains a definite internal argument. In this context, the internal argument shifts out from the VP and triggers agreement. These patterns suggest the existence of a distinct $v^0$, syncretic with the antipassive $v^0 paN-$, which shifts and licenses a definite internal argument when $T^0$ cannot. The analysis provides evidence for a view of Philippine voice alternations as $vP$-level phenomena linked to the definiteness of the internal argument.

1. Introduction

Many Western Malayo-Polynesian (WMP) languages show an alignment system which privileges a single argument in each clause. This element often shows several special properties: particular case-marking, a distinct linear position, and some relation to verbal morphology known as voice. It can originate in several positions: for instance, as the external argument in the specifier of $v$ (EXT) or as the internal argument within the VP (INT). I refer to this argument as the subject.

The relationship between the subject and the voice morphology remains a matter of debate. One approach takes voice to have an indexing function: it tracks the subject in some way (Kroeger 1993; Rackowski 2002). Another approach links voice to movement of the object in the $vP$ alone (Aldridge 2004). I refer to these views as the INDEXING and TRANSITIVITY analyses of voice.

These two views take different approaches on the link between voice and extraction. Many WMP languages restrict extraction of arguments to the subject. On the INDEXING approach, this pattern holds because argument extraction directly conditions the shape of voice (e.g. through agreement). On the TRANSITIVITY approach, this is not possible: voice cannot be conditioned by extraction if this morphology sits in the $vP$. As such, this view derives the constraint from locality: extraction targets only the highest argument in the clause and voice determines what this will be.

The TRANSITIVITY approach thus predicts that extraction cannot determine the selection of voice morphology. On this view, voice should always be determined within the $vP$: the agent voice $v^0$ can appear when the INT can stay in the $vP$ and the patient voice $v^0$ surfaces when it cannot. In a derivational framework, $vP$-level object shift should precede extraction. As a result, extraction of the EXT should be unable to bleed movement of the INT out of the $vP$.

This approach runs into a problem across WMP. In many languages of this subgroup, the patient voice is required when the INT is definite (Schachter 1996). Nevertheless, this requirement

---

*Deep gratitude to Jupri Talib and Nabila Haruna for their friendship and generosity with their knowledge of Mandar. Special thanks to Sandy Chung for her invaluable guidance throughout this project, to Judith Aissen, Henrison Hsieh, Dan Kaufman, Tyler Lemon, Jed Sam Pizarro-Guevara, Justin Royer, Carly Sommerlot, Tamisha Tan, Maziar Toosarvandani, and Erik Zyman for discussion along the way, and to Kenyon Branan, Mitcho Erlewine, and Keely New for their support and encouragement at the earliest stages of this project. All remaining errors are my own. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 2018267201.
appears to be overridden by the constraint on extraction. When the EXT is extracted in the presence of a definite INT, these languages require the agent voice. I term this process *quirky extraction*.

The TRANSITIVITY approach does not allow extraction of the EXT to bleed movement of the INT in the vP. If anything, derivational logic suggests that the opposite should occur: the vP-level movement should bleed CP-level operations, rather than the other way around. As a result, this approach predicts that object shift must still be possible in the context above.

The present paper investigates the syntax of quirky extraction in Mandar (South Sulawesi). I demonstrate that this prediction is borne out. Like other WMP languages, Mandar appears to require agent voice morphology when the EXT is extracted. The resultant construction, however, does not show uniform agent voice syntax. In the context of quirky extraction, this language shows several patterns which suggest that the INT has left the vP. I argue that it moves to SPEC,vP.

These facts suggest that Mandar does not employ the agent voice v0 in the context of quirky extraction. Rather, I argue that the language employs a distinct v0: the *quirky intransitive*. This morpheme triggers movement of the INT within the vP. It appears only when the INT cannot interact with T0. The analysis extends to parallel constructions across the family.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 lays out the Mandar voice system and argues that the voice alternation is linked to TRANSITIVITY. Section 3 lays out the problem above: extraction of the EXT requires agent voice morphology even when the INT is definite. Section 4 shows that the resultant construction does not involve the agent voice: rather, it employs a distinct v0 which I term the quirky intransitive. Section 5 offers an analysis. Section 6 addresses an alternative perspective and extends the account to control. Section 7 concludes.

2. Mandar Background

Mandar is a language of the Northern subgroup of the South Sulawesi subfamily (Mills 1975). It shows a verb-initial word order, no case marking, pro-drop, and an ergative-absolutive alignment system. Transitive verbs bear an ergative prefix; absolutive arguments are indexed by enclitics.1,2

(1) Basic Mandar Clauses

| a. Tuna=aq yau. | b. Umm-an-de=i. | c. Na-lesa=aq. |
| ashamed=1.ABS 1.SG | ITR-eat=3.ABS | 3.ERG-tread=1.ABS |
| ‘I’m ashamed.’ | ‘He ate.’ | ‘He stepped on me.’ |

Muthalib and Sangi (1991, 345)  
Sikki et al. (1987, 1034)  
Muthalib and Sangi (1991, 299)

---

1 The data presented in this paper has been gathered from two sources: (i) texts published by the Indonesian language ministry and (ii) elicitation/conversation with two university-age speakers from Polewali Mandar Regency. The examples not taken from written sources have been gathered at distance via video-calling platform. Each example is elicited in the following way: (i) I provide a context in Indonesian, (ii) speak the sentence in Mandar, (iii) type the sentence, (iv) ask my consultant to read the sentence, (v) ask whether the sentence can be used in the given context, and then (vi) ask for the sentence to repeated with natural prosody. Consistent terminology is employed to discuss gramamticality: examples termed ‘ganjil or ‘tidak normal (‘awkward or ‘not normal) are marked ?; those termed ‘aneh or ‘salah (‘strange or ‘wrong) are marked *. All sessions are recorded. I use the standard orthography: <c> = /k/ and <q> = /t/. The Mandar corpus which I manage can be found here: http://kratylos.org/

2.1. The Subject Position

Each Mandar clause contains a subject: an argument which C-commands all others in the clause. The subject is a *High Absolutive* (Legate 2008). It is indexed by an absolutive agreement enclitic which sits in $T_0$ and surfaces in second position (Brodkin 2021). I refer to it as the absolutive.

(2) *Subject Agreement*

a. Mang-apa=nasang=ɔ mieq?
   ANT-what=all=2.ABS 2.PL ‘What are you guys doing?’
   JT: 11.5.357  

b. Andiang=i mala di-pau.
   NEG=3.ABS can PASS-say
   ‘It can’t be said.’
   Sikki et al. (1987, 1095)

Binding patterns show that the absolutive is the highest argument in its clause. Mandar has a condition-\textit{A} anaphor \textit{alawe} ‘self’ which must be locally C-commanded by its antecedent. Under certain predicates, this element can surface in $\text{EXT}$ position and be bound by the $\text{INT}$ (3).

(3) *Absolutives bind Ergative Anaphors*

   come=3.ABS/1.ABS self-1.GEN
   IM: ‘Myself came’
   JT: 12.19.265

b. Na-\textit{ita}=\textit{aq} alawe-u.
   3.ERG-see=1.ABS self-1.GEN
   ‘Myself saw me.’
   JT: 11.20.110

Patterns of variable binding illustrate the same fact. Mandar has a set of quantifiers which sit in a preverbal position and can associate with the absolutive argument. In the transitive voice, an $\text{INT}$ quantified in this way can bind a variable in the $\text{EXT}$. In other contexts, this is impossible.

(4) *Absolutives and Bound Variable Anaphora*

a. \textbf{Sangnging} na-salili=\textit{i} kindoq-na\textsubscript{i}
   every 3.ERG-miss=3.ABS mom-3.GEN kid
   ‘Her, mother misses every kid\textsubscript{i},’
   JT: 1.18.210

2.2. The Voice System

The Mandar verb shows morphology which correlates with the base position of the absolutive. This language distinguishes two transitive voices: an antipassive (agent voice) and a transitive (patient voice). The first employs the prefix $\text{maN}$-, built from the $\nu^0\text{paN}$- and the voice\textsuperscript{0} $<\text{um}>$ (5a). The second shows ergative prefixes in voice\textsuperscript{0} and a morphologically null $\nu^0$ (5b).

(5) *The Antipassive-Transitive Alternation*

a. \textbf{Mat}-tappas=\textit{aq} carecare.
   ANT-wash=1.ABS clothes
   ‘I’m washing clothes.’
   NH: 6.18.104

b. \textbf{U}-tappas=\textit{i} diqe baju=\textit{e}.
   1.ERG-wash=3.ABS this shirt=here
   ‘I washed this shirt.’
   NH: 6.18.120

\footnote{\textsuperscript{3}See Campbell 1989, 93, Friberg 1996, 139, and Valkama 1995, 33 for discussion of the antipassive in South Sulawesi. Unlike Philippine languages, Mandar requires a prefix like $\text{paN}$- whenever a verb with $<\text{um}>$ takes an $\text{INT}$.}
This voice morphology bears a connection to the base position of the absolutive. When the verb bears the antipassive prefix maN-, the EXT behaves as the absolutive. When the verb bears transitive morphology, the INT does so instead. The agreement pattern above illustrates.

The voice morphology does not play an indexing role in Mandar. It does not track the thematic role of the absolutive argument (pace Kroeger 1993). Absolutive experiencers, for instance, surface alongside verbs bearing at least three types of voice marking. Absolutive recipients show the same pattern: these can occur with both transitive or passive voice morphology (6). As such, I conclude that voice does not track the thematic role of the absolutive (Rackowski 2002).

(6) Thematic Role: Not Relevant

a. Nappa  di-bei=i  gaji.  ‘Only then will he be given his wage.’
   newly  PASS-give=3.ABS  wage
   Sikki et al. (1987, 567)

b. Na-bei=o  ato mu-alli?  ‘Did he give it to you or did you buy it?’
   3.ERG-give=2.ABS  or  2.ERG-buy
   Friberg and Jerniati (2000, 302)

The voice morphology does not track the abstract case of the absolutive argument either (pace Rackowski 2002). This fact can be seen with intransitive predicates. In Mandar, unergative verbs take <um>. Unaccusatives show no voice marking (7). As such, the presence of <um> must be connected to the existence of an EXT. It cannot be taken to reflect the fact that the absolutive argument bears underlying abstract nominative case. As such, I set the INDEXING analysis aside.

(7) Um: Introduces the EXT

a. Pole  inna=o  dionging?  ‘Where did you come from yesterday?’
   come  where=2.ABS  yesterday
   Friberg and Jerniati (2000, 223)

b. Mau  s-um-angiq.  umm-ande=to=i.  ‘Though he was crying, he still ate.’
   while  ITR-cry  ITR-eat=also=3.ABS
   Sikki et al. (1987, 190)

2.3. Definiteness and Object Shift

In Mandar, the voice system shows a definiteness effect: the antipassive voice cannot be used if the INT is definite. I take this to reflect a constraint on the position of the INT: it cannot remain in the VP when it is presuppositional (Diesing 1992). On this view, the transitive v0 allows the INT to move out from the VP while the antipassive v0 does not (Aldridge 2004) (8).

(8) Presuppositional Objects Force the Transitive

   ANT-see=1.ABS  D=NAME  JT: 6.21.133

b. ??Mam-baca=i  buku-u.  ‘He read my book.’

Each voice decomposes involves two heads. The higher of the two is the head which introduces the EXT: voice0 (Harley 2013). The two voices show different morphemes in this position: the antipassive voice recruits voice0 <um>, while the transitive recruits a voice0 which hosts ergative prefixes. Both morphemes appear only on predicates which take external arguments.
The lower of the two heads is that which triggers movement of the int: \(v^0\). The antipassive employs a \(v^0\) pa\(N\)- which does not trigger movement. The transitive employs a null \(v^0\) which does. The intransitive voice\(^0\) selects the antipassive \(v^0\); the transitive voice\(^0\) selects the transitive \(v^0\).\(^4\)

These two voices show different patterns of nominal licensing (Vergnaud 1977). In Mandar, two heads show agreement: \(T^0\) (absolutive enclitic) and the transitive voice\(^0\) (ergative prefix). I take these heads to license the nominals with which they agree. In the transitive voice, the ext is licensed by voice\(^0\) and the int by \(T^0\). In the antipassive, in contrast, the ext is licensed by \(T^0\). In this context, the int cannot be licensed through agreement (Coon, Pedro, and Preminger 2014).\(^5\)

I propose the following model of the voice alternation. In Mandar, the definiteness of the int determines which voice can be used. The transitive voice is forced if the int is definite and the antipassive occurs when it does not. Licensing patterns determine which argument is the absolutive. In the transitive, the int cannot be licensed in the vp and must interact with \(T^0\). This process makes it the absolutive. In the antipassive, the ext interacts with \(T^0\) and becomes the absolutive instead. In both voice frames, the absolutive argument moves to a subject position (Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis 1992). In ergativist terms, Mandar shows High Absolutive syntax.

3. The Quirky Extraction Problem

The remainder of this paper addresses the interaction between the definiteness effect above and a separate tension: the Subjects-Only Extraction Constraint (Keenan 1976). In Mandar, the voice alternations above correlate with a pattern of extraction. Only the absolutive argument is able to undergo \(\Lambda^\prime\)-extraction (9). This process triggers the disappearance of absolutive agreement.

(9) The Subjects-Only Extraction Constraint

a. i=Kacoq mas-saka manuq.  
D=NAME ANT-catch chicken  
‘Kacoq is catching chickens.’  
Sikki et al. (1987, 52)

b. Iqo u-salili.  
2.SG 1.ERG-miss  
‘You’re who I miss.’  
Muthalib and Sangi (1991, 157)

Mandar bans the extraction of all non-absolutive arguments. The antipassive voice does not allow extraction of the int. The transitive does not allow extraction of the ext. The same constraint holds over non-absolutive arguments in other constructions: for instance, the source argument of an experiencer verb or the comitative argument in a comitative construction.

(10) No Non-Subject Extraction

a. *Manuq mas-saka=i.  
chicken ANT-catch=3.ABS  
im: ‘He caught HENS.’  
JT: 2.17.9

b. *Yau u-salili=o  
1.SG 1.ERG-miss=2.ABS 2.SG  
im: ‘I miss you’  
JT: 12.18.301

\(^4\)There is ample evidence for this decomposition. The antipassive \(v^0\) can be seen without <\(um\)> in imperatives and nominalizations. The ergative prefixes sit in voice\(^0\), not \(v^0\): they precede exponents of \(v^0\) (causative pa-, comitative si-, and on one verb, the antipassive \(v^0\) pa\(N\)-). The ergative prefix and <\(um\)> sit in voice\(^0\): both drop in imperatives, remain in temporal nominalizations, and sit in complementary distribution the passive voice\(^0\) di- and involuntary voice\(^0\) ti-.

\(^5\) On this analysis, the absolutive argument is always licensed by \(T^0\). It differs from an alternative which allows the transitive int to be licensed by \(v^0\) Aldridge (2004). In Mandar, there is evidence for the first view: the antipassive ext and transitive int are both indexed by an absolutive agreement enclitic which (i) surfaces in 2P and (ii) disappears in non-finite clauses (Brodkin 2021). These facts suggest that the absolutive is always licensed by \(T^0\).
3.1. The Voice-Extraction Connection

This restriction reflects a constraint on locality. In Mandar, the probe behind A′-extraction must target the highest argument in its search domain (Aldridge 2004). This is the absolutive.

The voice morphology does not spell out features of the extracted argument. This can be seen in constructions which show different voice-marking patterns. Mandar has a comitative construction, for instance, formed with the prefix *si-. Comitative verbs take two arguments (11a). One argument triggers absolutive agreement and can represent a single party of a comitative event. The other argument surfaces either bare or inside of a comitative PP headed by *sola ‘with’ (11b).

(11) Comitative Constructions: *si-
   a. *Si-ita=bando=qo luluareq-mu.  
      COM-see=really=2.ABS sibling-2.GEN 
      ‘You’ll even meet your sibling.’ 
      Sikki et al. (1987, 32) 
   b. Si-ala=aq sola iCicciq. 
      COM-take=1.ABS with NAME 
      ‘I got married with Cicciq.’ 
      JT: 12.18.86

Extraction does not change the shape of this voice morphology. Comitative predicates allow extraction of the absolutive but not the other argument (12a)-(12b). The prefix *si- remains when the absolutive is extracted. Its form is not the result of agreement or impoverishment.

(12) Comitatives: Same Extraction Constraint
   a. Yau si-issang iting Kacoq=o!  
      1.SG COM-know that NAME=there 
      ‘I know that Kacoq!’ 
      JT: 11.20.41 
   b. *iCicciq si-ala=aq. 
      NAME COM-take=1.ABS 
      IM: ‘I married Cicciq.’ 
      JT: 11.20.94

These patterns illustrate that voice marking has no direct relationship to extraction. Across voice frames, only the absolutive argument can extract. The voice morphemes themselves encode operations within the vP and have no connection to patterns of extraction above this domain.

3.2. The Prediction

On this approach, voice selection is a vP-internal phenomenon. The INT must leave the vP when definite. This process typically requires the transitive v0 and forces the INT to become the absolutive. The probe behind A′-extraction enters the derivation in C and cannot influence the selection of voice. This constraint holds across WMP on the TRANSLITIVITY approach (Aldridge 2004).

This approach makes a prediction about extraction of the EXT. Extraction targets only the highest argument. As such, the EXT can extract when the INT is indefinite: in this configuration, the antipassive voice appears and the EXT is the absolutive. The antipassive voice cannot occur, however, in the presence of a definite INT. When the INT is definite, it must shift out from the vP, trigger the transitive voice, and become the absolutive argument. In summary:

(13) The Prediction:
   a. Neither the antipassive nor the transitive allows an EXT to extract & an INT to be definite.
   b. If no other strategy is available, extraction of the EXT should be blocked in this context.
This prediction is not borne out. Mandar allows the EXT to extract in the presence of an INT that is a DP. I term this pattern quirky extraction. In this context, the language employs what looks like antipassive morphology: the verb takes the prefix maN- (14). A similar pattern holds across WMP: the ban on definite INTs with agent voice morphology disappears when the EXT extracts.

(14) **Agent Extraction over Definite Objects**

a. Innai **maq**-urung=o **iqo?**
   who QI-kiss=2.ABS 2.SG
   ‘Who kissed you?’
   JT: 7.15.206

b. Iqo **mat**-timbe=i **kacciq-u**.
   you QI-throw=3.ABS mango-1.GEN
   ‘Maybe YOU threw out my mango.’
   Sikki et al. (1987, 27)

This pattern poses a problem for the model of voice alternations above. In this context, extraction seems to determine the form of voice: A’-movement of the EXT forces the appearance of antipassive morphology. On the present model, the voice alternation reflects movement within the vP—and this should not occur. Quirky extraction should never be possible unless the INT can be definite but remain below the EXT. Neither the transitive nor antipassive v0 allows this to occur.

4. **The Quirky Intransitive**

There is good reason to believe, however, that quirky extraction does not implicate typical agent voice syntax. The Mandar clauses in (14) above allow the INT to undergo a range of processes unavailable to the INT of the typical antipassive. Other WMP languages show similar patterns: quirky extraction requires antipassive morphology but allows deviant case-marking frames elsewhere.6

4.1. **Distinct Morphology**

Morphological patterns demonstrate that quirky extraction implicates a distinct v0 elsewhere in South Sulawesi. The Makassar languages show a distinct prefix in exactly this context.

The examples below illustrate in Coastal Konjo (Friberg 1996). This language forms the antipassive with a prefix an.N- which triggers nasal substitution. The verb kanre ‘eat’, for instance, retains its onset in the transitive but undergoes nasal substitution in the antipassive.

(15) **Coastal Konjo: Antipassive triggers Nasal Substitution**

a. **Ang-ng**anre=i Amir loka.
   ANT-eat=3.ABS NAME banana
   ‘Amir is eating bananas.’
   Friberg (1996, 143)

b. Apa **na-kanre** ri eleq-na?
   what 3.ERG-eat in morning-3.GEN
   ‘What does he eat in the mornings?’
   Friberg (1996, 146)

Konjo employs the same antipassive prefix when the EXT is extracted over an INT that is an NP (16a). In the context of quirky extraction, however, the language employs a distinct prefix an-. Unlike the antipassive prefix, this morpheme triggers no nasal substitution (16b).

---

6 The Mandar pattern is widespread in Sulawesi. In Tagalog, antipassive (*agent voice*) verbs bearing the infix <um> do not allow their objects to be definite or show differential object marking (*sa*). Quirky extraction forces the same morphology but obviates both constraints (Rackowski 2002). Squliq Atayal shows a similar pattern (Erlewine 2016).
Coastal Konjo: Agent Extraction over DP Objects triggers Distinct Morphology

a. Amir **ang-nganre loka**.  
NAME ANT-eat banana  
‘AMIR is eating bananas.’  
Friberg (1996, 143)

b. Ali **ang-kanre=i lamejaha-ta**.  
NAME Q1-eat=3.ABS sweet.potato-2  
‘ALI ate your sweet potato.’  
Friberg (1996, 146)

These two prefixes share the voice\(^0\) an- (from a prefixal form of -um-: (Sirk 1989)). They differ in the content of \(v\). The antipassive an.N- contains the antipassive \(v\) N-. This \(v\) triggers nasal substitution. The prefix aN-, however, contains a null \(v\) which does not trigger this process.\(^7\)

This \(v\) resolves the tension laid out above. Neither the antipassive nor the transitive voice permit quirky extraction. The antipassive \(v\) does not allow a definite INT to shift and the transitive \(v\) forces the INT to become the absolutive. The \(v\) above solves this problem: it allows the INT to be definite while allowing the EXT to be the absolutive argument. I term it the *quirky intransitive*.\(^8\)

4.2. The Mandar Evidence

Mandar does not show this prefixal split: extraction of the EXT requires the prefix maN- across the board. Nevertheless, the quirky intransitive construction shows an agreement pattern which makes it distinct. In Mandar (and Konjo), extracted arguments cannot trigger absolutive agreement.\(^9\) As such, clauses where the EXT extracts and the INT is indefinite show no agreement. Clauses with quirky extraction, however, show a different pattern: absolutive agreement indexes the INT.

Quirky Intransitive: Exceptional Object Agreement

a. Innai mam-balq **buku**.  
who ANT-sell book  
‘Who is reading books?’  
NH: 6.18.112

b. Innai **maq-urung=i sola-mmu?**  
1.SG Q1-propose=3.ABS friend-2.GEN  
‘Who kissed your friend?’  
JT: 11.20.470

The floated quantifier *nasang* shows a similar pattern. This element surfaces in 2p and cannot associate with the INT in the canonical antipassive (18a). In the context of quirky extraction, however, the pattern changes: here, *nasang* can associate with the INT (18b).

Floated Quantifier Nasang: Exceptional Association with the INT

a. **Mas-saka=nasang=i macang**.  
ANT-catch=ALL=3.ABS tiger  
‘They all caught a tiger.’  
JT: 7.15.24

b. Innai **maq-ita=nasang=i posa-u?**  
who Q1-see=ALL=3.ABS cat-1.GEN  
‘Who saw all my cats?’  
JT: 7.15.76

These patterns show that clauses with quirky extraction do not show antipassive syntax. Rather, they permit the INT to trigger an aberrant type of agreement and associate with the floated quantifier *nasang*. In the following subsection, I argue that these patterns implicate a distinct \(v\).

---

\(^7\) See Brodkin (in production) for comparative justification of this breakdown across the South Sulawesi Subfamily.

\(^8\) Jukes (2006) terms this the ‘Actor Focus’ in Makassarese. Some Mayan languages show a similar suffix.

\(^9\) This pattern reflects a type of antiagreement which holds across the subfamily Finer 1997.
4.3. The Quirky Intransitive Head

The patterns above could be interpreted in two ways. On one view, they could be linked to a morpheme which appears in the context above. On another, they could be treated as a derivational consequence of extraction. These analyses make different predictions: on the first view, but not the second, the patterns above should arise only in the presence of the prefix maN-.

In Mandar, the prediction of the first analysis is borne out. The agreement pattern above is linked to the prefix maN-. Comitative verbs, for instance, allow the INT to be definite and allow the EXT to extract. When both conditions hold, however, the verb cannot host agreement.

(19) **Comitatives: No Low Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Yau</th>
<th>si-issang=(*i)</th>
<th>ting</th>
<th>Kacoq=o!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>COM-know=3</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>NAME=there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I know that Kacoq!'</td>
<td>JT: 11.20.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Iqo</th>
<th>si-sara=(*i)</th>
<th>baine-mu?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.SG</td>
<td>COM-divorce=3</td>
<td>ABS wife-2.GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'You’re splitting?'</td>
<td>JT: 11.20.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This fact shows that the agreement pattern above must be linked to the prefix maN-. This pattern, however, is not general to the antipassive: it occurs only in the context of quirky extraction. As such, I argue that it must be linked to a morpheme homophonous with a subpart of the antipassive prefix which appears in this context. I identify it as the quirky intransitive v₀: paN₂-.

There is evidence that the agreement pattern is linked to this v₀. In Mandar, paN- is not the only v₀ which can combine with the intransitive voice₀<um>. The language also has a v₀ pe- which surfaces in the same construction. The agreement pattern above, however, cannot occur when the EXT extracts in the presence of this prefix. This shows that it must be linked to paN₂-.

(20) **Special Agreement: only with paN-**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Me</th>
<th>bokkoq=adam=i.</th>
<th>b. *Apa</th>
<th>me-bokkoq=o?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANT-bite=maybe=3</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>ANT-bite=2.ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Maybe it bites people.'</td>
<td>IM: 'What bit you?'</td>
<td>JT: 1.19.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Apa</th>
<th>mam-bokkoq=o?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.ABS</td>
<td>QI-bite=2.ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'What bit you?'</td>
<td>JT: 1.19.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Object Shift and Licensing

The following section presents an analysis of the quirky intransitive. I argue that the quirky intransitive prefix maN- decomposes into two parts: the voice_INTR <um> and the quirky intransitive v₀ paN₂-. The first fails to license the EXT. The second allows the INT to move to SPEC_vP and licenses it in this position. This process allows the EXT to interact with T₀ and undergo extraction.

This analysis captures a range of facts about the quirky intransitive construction. Moreover, it separates the surface morphology of this construction from the process of extraction entirely. On this view, the appearance of the prefix maN- does not reflect impoverishment or agreement with an extracted EXT. Rather, the appearance of this prefix is linked to vP-level factors.

---

10 Both approaches have been pursued for the parallel pattern in Mayan. See Coon et al. (2014) and Newman (2020).
5.1. Object Shift

The quirky intransitive construction forces its INT to leave the VP. Mandar has a process of pseudo-incorporation which makes this pattern clear. In Mandar, VP-internal material can be pseudo-incorporated into the verb (Brodkin 2020). When this occurs, the verb and incorporand form a single prosodic unit (Brodkin 2021). Only the antipassive allows its INT to pseudo-incorporate.

(21) Pseudo-Incorporation: Antipassive Objects Only

a. Mam-baluq balenga=nasang=bo=i a?  
   ANT-sell pot=all=again=3.ABS PRT 3.ERG-like 1.SG=really=1.ABS  
   ‘They’re all selling pots again, huh?’  
   NH: 6.18.152

b. *Na-oloqi yau=sannal(=aq).  
   IM: ‘He really likes me.’  
   NH: 6.18.154

When the EXT is extracted and the INT is an NP, the INT can undergo pseudo-incorporation (22b). When the INT is a DP this is impossible. Despite the presence of apparent antipassive morphology, the quirky intransitive construction bans pseudo-incorporation of its INT (22a).

(22) Pseudo-Incorporation: Antipassive Objects Only

a. *Innai maq-ita iqo=bomo(=o)?  
   who ANT-see 2.SG=again=2.ABS  
   IM: ‘Who saw you again?’  
   NH: 6.18.154

b. Yau min-jari iqo=bomo.  
   1.SG ANT-be 2.SG=again  
   ‘I’ll become you again.’  
   JT: 11.20.574

This constraint does not reflect an independent constraint on the pseudo-incorporation of definite material. This process can target regular demonstratives with a locative function (23a). Moreover, it can apply to a definite INT beneath the verb minjari ‘become.’

(23) Mandar permits D(P) Pseudo-Incorporation

a. Na-gereq iting=a=i bekkeq.  
   3.ERG-kill that=SUBJ=3.ABS goat  
   ‘Maybe they’ll kill the goat there.’  
   JT: 9.13.466

b. Min-jari iqo=bomo=aq.  
   ANT-be 2.SG=again=1.ABS  
   ‘I became you again (for Halloween).’  
   JT: 11.20.564

Rather, this pattern reflects a difference in structural height. The elements which cannot undergo pseudo-incorporation are exactly those which sit outside the VP. The behavior of adjuncts makes this clear: locative PPs can undergo this process, but temporal adjuncts, adjoined higher, cannot.

(24) Pseudo-Incorporation: Low Adjuncts Only

a. Ma-tindo di ranjang=banda=aq.  
   ITR-sleep in iron.bed=really=1.ABS  
   ‘I honestly sleep in an iron bed.’  
   Muthalib and Sangi (1991, 136)

b. *L-um-amba marondong=aq.  
   ITR-go tomorrow=1.ABS  
   IM: ‘I’ll go tomorrow.’  
   JT: 11.20.265

This pattern suggests that the quirky intransitive forces its INT to shift out of the VP. I link this property to the \( v^0 paN_2 \)-:: this morpheme, like the \( v_{TR} \), forces its INT to move into its specifier.
5.2. The Int Remains Low

These patterns raise a question about the syntax of quirky extraction. In the quirky intransitive construction, the INT escapes the VP and triggers agreement. Under normal circumstances, the INT only shows these properties when it moves to the subject position. If this step of movement occurs in the quirky intransitive construction, the process of quirky extraction would violate locality.

Three patterns suggest that the INT moves only to SPEC,VP in the quirky intransitive. The first involves quantifier float. The transitive INT can float a quantifier to a preverbal position. The quirky intransitive INT cannot (25). This fact suggests that the two do not sit in the same position.

(25) Quantifier Float: Different Pattern
   a. Sangning na-ita=o?
      all 3.erg-see=2.abs
      ‘He saw all of you?’ JT: 1.19.363
   b. *Innai sangning maq-ita=o?
      who all Q1-see=2.abs
      IM: ‘Who saw all you guys?’ JT: 7.15.18

Binding facts provide a second argument for this conclusion. In the transitive voice, the INT can bind into the EXT. In the quirky intransitive construction, it cannot. This pattern suggests that this construction does not allow its INT to move to a position above the EXT.

(26) Binding: Different Pattern
   a. Na-ita=aq alawe-u.
      3.erg-see=1.abs self-1.gen
      ‘Myself saw me.’ JT: 11.20.110
   b. *Alawe-u maq-ita=aq.
      self-1.gen Q1-see=1.abs

Agreement facts provide a final argument that the quirky intransitive INT does not interact with τ₀. The agreement which appears in this context sits in v⁰. Two patterns suggest this view. First, it is linked to the prefix paN₂. Second, it is verb-adjacent: it cannot be hosted by middle-field heads like negation (Brodkin 2021). This pattern sets it apart from the agreement in τ₀.

(27) Agreement: Different Position
   a. Indamm=i u-sajang.
      no.longer=3.abs 1.erg-love
      ‘I don’t love her anymore.’ JT: 9.8.5
   b. Innai indang mas-sajang=o?
      who neg Q1-love=2.abs
      ‘Who doesn’t love you?’ JT: 9.8.357

5.3. The Analysis

These patterns suggest two conclusions. First, they show that the quirky intransitive construction allows the INT to undergo a single step of definiteness-related movement to SPEC,VP. Second, they show that the INT can stay in this intermediate position when it triggers agreement on v⁰.

These conclusions provide evidence for the model of clause structure laid out above. In Mandar, I argue that the transitive INT is forced to raise to the subject position for reasons of licensing. Like other High Absolutive languages, Mandar lacks the means to license a definite INT in the VP (Bok-Bennema 1991). In other words, the transitive v⁰ cannot license its INT. As a result, the transitive INT is forced to interact with τ⁰. This process is what moves it to the subject position.
The quirky intransitive \( v^0 \) provides a means to call off this second step. This \( v^0 \) licenses its INT in SPEC,\( vP \). This process eliminates the need for the INT to interact with \( T^0 \). As a result, the EXT is free to do so and move to the subject position. This step allows quirky extraction to occur.

The following trees illustrate this split. I argue that both the transitive and the quirky intransitive \( v^0 \)'s trigger movement of the INT to SPEC,\( vP \). This process does not place the INT in a position above the EXT, which merges in SPEC,\( voiceP \) (Harley 2013). The quirky intransitive \( v^0 \) bears a \( \phi \)-probe which targets and licenses its INT. The transitive \( v^0 \) does not.

(27) **Transitive vs. Quirky Intransitive: the \( vP \)**

\[\text{a. Transitive: INT Moves; Is Not Licensed} \quad \text{b. Q.Intransitive: INT Moves; Is Licensed}\]

The two derivations diverge further above the \( voiceP \) domain. The quirky intransitive \( v^0 \) is selected by the intransitive \( voice^0 <um> \). The transitive \( v^0 \) is selected by the transitive \( voice^0 \). The former \( voice^0 \) cannot agree with and license its EXT. The latter \( voice^0 \) can.

This licensing split has consequences for movement into subject position. In the quirky intransitive construction, the INT is licensed in the \( voiceP \) and the EXT is not. This schema forces the EXT to interact with \( T^0 \) and move to SPEC,TP. The transitive shows the opposite situation: the EXT is licensed in the \( voiceP \) but the INT is not. As such, this configuration forces the INT to move.

(28) **Transitive vs. Quirky Intransitive: the \( TP \)**

\[\text{a. Transitive: } T \text{ Licenses the INT} \quad \text{b. Q.Intransitive: } T \text{ Licenses the EXT}\]
This analysis accounts for the central property of the quirky intransitive: it allows a definite INT to be licensed without disrupting agent extraction. This morpheme, though surface-identical to the canonical antipassive, triggers movement of its INT to SPEC,vP and licenses it in this position. These properties allow the object to be licensed when it cannot interact with T^0.

This proposal extends to other languages which show irregular behavior in the context of quirky extraction. Many Austronesian languages show divergent patterns of case-marking in this context: Tagalog and Squilq Atayal, for instance, allow the INT of an apparent agent-voice verb to be marked with dative and absolutive case, respectively (Tagalog sa, Atayal qu). The present account predicts that these constructions show quirky intransitive syntax as well.

6. The Quirky Intransitive and Control

The approach above treats the quirky intransitive as the solution to a puzzle of locality. On this view, the INT is typically forced to move twice when definite: first to SPEC,vP to escape the domain of existential closure and second to SPEC,TP to be licensed. This second step blocks extraction of the EXT. The quirky intransitive v^0 allows it to be called off when the EXT is to extract.

This approach posits no special connection between the quirky intransitive and the process of A'-extraction. The quirky intransitive prefix paN^- does not reflect the reflex of impoverishment triggered by the extraction of the EXT. In the same vein, it does not directly trigger extraction of the EXT (via push-movement) or subcategorize for an EXT earmarked for A'-extraction. Rather, it appears as a last resort whenever a definite INT cannot be licensed by T^0.

The following section presents a further argument for this proposal. This comes from a context where the quirky intransitive v^0 appears in the absence of extraction: in the small clause complements of control verbs. These small clauses show a familiar problem of licensing: they do not contain a T^0 which can interact with the INT. As a result, they require an exceptional means to license this argument. That they recruit the quirky intransitive v^0 is predicted on this account.

6.1. The Alternative Perspective

Mandar is not the only High Absolutive language which requires special morphology in the context of quirky extraction. Rather, many Mayan languages recruit a special construction with the exact profile of the quirky intransitive in this context: they show intransitive verbal morphology, a special v^0, and an absolutive enclitic which indexes the INT (Coon, Pedro, and Preminger 2014).

The Mayan literature has proposed a range of analyses for this construction. Some of these approaches make direct reference to A'-extraction. On one view, the v^0 QI subcategorizes for an EXT with A'-features (Coon, Baier, and Levin 2020). On another, the quirky intransitive spells out the derivational consequence of the presence of A'-features on the EXT (Newman 2020).

These approaches predict that the quirky intransitive should be unavailable in clauses without extraction of the EXT. The following subsection illustrates that this view is too restrictive.

6.2. Control

The alternative approaches above cannot account for the full distribution of the quirky intransitive. There is another context where Mandar employs this v^0: in small clause complements of control verbs. When the EXT controls into a small clause and the INT is definite, the embedded verb bears the ‘antipassive’ prefix maN^-.

Nevertheless, the INT triggers agreement and gains the ability to
associates with the floated quantifier *nasang*. These patterns suggest the presence of the \(v^0_{QI}\).

(29) **Mandar: Quirky Intransitive under Control**

a. Mario manini kindoq- \( \text{maq}-\text{ita}=\text{nasang}=i \) appo-na.
   \( \text{happy} \text{ later mother-1.Gen QI-see=PL}=3.ABS \text{ grandchild-3.Gen} \)
   ‘My mother will be happy later to see all of her grandchildren.’ Sikki et al. (1987, 806)

This construction involves the quirky intransitive \(v^0\). Two patterns illustrate this fact. First, the agreement pattern above cannot occur in a small clause whose \(INT\) is an \(NP\). Second, it cannot occur in small clauses which do not contain the prefix *maN*2-.

(30) **Agreement under Control: DP objects + maN-**

a. Malussur=aq maq-\(\text{ita}=(*i)\) \(\text{jamang}\).  
   *lazy*=1.ABS \(\text{ANT-look.for}=3\) \(\text{work}\)  
   ‘I’m too lazy to look for a job.’
   JT: 11.5.20

b. Meloq=i \(\text{si-sara}=(*i)\) i\(\text{Kacoq}\).
   *want*=3.ABS \(\text{COM-split}=3\) \(\text{NAME}\)  
   ‘She wants to divorce Kacoq.’
   JT: 11.20.421

Second, this construction shows evidence that the \(INT\) moves to \(\text{SPEC,VP}\). Small clauses generally permit pseudo-incorporation of the \(INT\). This process is impossible, however, when the embedded verb bears the prefix *maN*2- and shows agreement with the \(INT\).

(31) **Control: Agreement requires Object Shift**

a. Meloq=\(qo\) \(\text{min-jari} \text{ yau}=\text{bomo}\)?  
   *want*=2.ABS \(\text{ANT-be} \text{ 1.SG}=\text{again}\)  
   ‘Do you want to be me again?’
   JT: 11.20.214

b. *Meloq=aq \(\text{maq-\(\text{ita}\)}=\text{iqo}=\text{bo}=(\text{qo})\)  
   \(\text{want}=1.ABS \text{ QI-see} \text{ 2.SG}=\text{again}=2\)  
   IM: ‘I want to see you again.’
   JT: 11.20.317

Moreover, related languages show quirky intransitive morphology in this context. Makassarese, like Konjo, has a quirky intransitive prefix *an-* which does not trigger nasal substitution on the following stem. This prefix appears in small clause complements to control verbs which contain a definite \(INT\). The following example illustrates: the verb *ero* ‘want’ embeds a clause which contains a verb whose stem begins with a voiceless stop. The antipassive prefix *an.N-* triggers nasal suppletion in this context. The prefix which appears here does not. Moreover, it triggers agreement with the \(INT\). These patterns demonstrate the presence of the quirky intransitive \(v^0\).

(32) **Makassarese: Quirky Intransitive under Control**

a. ... \(\text{Punna taena na}=\text{ero'}\) \(\text{[am-pinawang}=i \text{ ero'-na Arumpone?]}\)
   \(\text{if \ 3.ABS}=\text{want} \text{ QI-follow}=3.ABS \text{ desire-3.Gen NAME}\)
   (How long will it be until all of the people of Maros are killed) ‘if I do not want to [ obey the desire of the King of Bone]?’
   Jukes (2006, 357)

These patterns show that the quirky intransitive \(v^0\) has no inherent link to \(A'-\)extraction in Mandar and its relatives. Rather, this head is merged only when an \(INT\) is forced to shift out of the \(VP\) but cannot be licensed by \(T^0\). The link between extraction and the \(v^0_{QI}\) is indirect: it arises from a constraint on locality which forces the \(\text{EXT}\) to interact with \(T^0\) in the context of quirky extraction.
7. Conclusion

This paper has argued that Mandar does not show agent voice syntax in clauses where the EXT extracts in the presence of a definite INT. Like many WMP languages, Mandar requires what resembles an agent voice prefix in this context: maN-. The resultant construction, however, allows the INT to trigger agreement and move to SPEC,vP. These patterns suggest the presence of a distinct head which shares the surface shape of the antipassive v0: the quirky intransitive v0 paN2-.

This v0 appears when the INT must shift out from the VP but cannot be licensed by T0. This problem arises in two contexts. The first involves quirky extraction. Like other WMP languages, Mandar shows a locality constraint on A'-extraction: the EXT can only be extracted if it sits in SPEC,TP. As a result, clauses which show extraction of the EXT do not allow the INT to interact with T0. The small clause complements of control verbs show the same problem: these lack T0.

On the Mandar-internal level, this paper establishes two conclusions. First, transitive (patent voice) clauses in this language show two steps of movement: the INT first shifts to SPEC,vP in a step of definiteness-related movement and then later moves to SPEC,TP to be licensed. Second, the quirky intransitive construction allows the first step but not the second. This can be seen from the properties of the INT: it triggers agreement on v0, associates with one type of floated quantifier, and cannot undergo a process of pseudo-incorporation which targets VP-internal material, but cannot associate with other floated quantifiers and cannot bind into the EXT.

On the comparative level, this paper suggests that many Western Austronesian languages share a similar construction. The languages of this region typically appear to require agent voice morphology in clauses where the EXT is extracted and the INT is definite. Nevertheless, Squliq Atayal and many languages of the Philippines allow the INT to show case-marking unavailable under the typical agent voice in this context. Like Mandar, these languages likely employ a quirky intransitive v0 syncretic with the antipassive v0 in this context: a morpheme which allows the INT to shift out from the VP and nevertheless be licensed without interacting with T0.

On the theoretical level, this paper pushes toward a specific analysis of Philippine-type voice. In Mandar, the voice morphology cannot be linked directly to extraction. The appearance of the intransitive voice0 in the context of EXT extraction does not reflect agreement or impoverishment: rather, it provides a means to satisfy a constraint on locality. The existence of the quirky intransitive v0 provides evidence that there is more to voice than simple indexing. The approaches which link voice to agreement with a privileged argument cannot predict the appearance of a distinct v0 which allows the INT to escape the VP in the set of contexts where it cannot interact with T0. The transitivity-based approach developed here, however, predicts that this must occur. As such, the existence of this v0 provides evidence for a TRANSITIVITY-based analysis of the voice alternation in Mandar. Its presence in other languages would provide evidence for the same.
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