0.1 The Fundamental Question

- Many 'ergative' languages show restrictions on extraction.
  - The ergative extraction constraint (Aissen 2017): no extracting the erg.
  - The subjects-only extraction constraint (Keenan 1976): no extracting anything but abs.
- Fundamental question: why?
  - Extraction constraints reduce to problems with licensing.' Coon et al. 2014; Erlewine et al. 2017
  - Extraction constraints reduce to problems of case or category’ Deal 2016, Polinsky 2017
  - Extraction constraints involve locality Aldridge 2004 et seq; Coon et al. 2020
- The Locality Approach
  - Syntactic ergativity = locality of extraction.
    - Extraction targets only the highest dp.
    - Formally: the extraction probe relativized to d.
  - Prediction: sx.ergativity = being high abs
    - Transitive clause: abs > erg
    - This configuration: the int is closer to c.

0.2 The Prediction

- 'Ergative' languages should show a tension between extraction and argument structure alternations.
  - The high abs configuration: the int typically moves to a position above the ext.
  - Extraction of the ext: requires the ext to remain highest.
- The problem: object shift.
  - Many ergative languages allow the ext to extract when the int is an np.
    - Extraction of the ext frequently recruits antipassive morphology (Polinsky 2017)
    - Locality approach: extraction of ext unproblematic when the int remains low.
  - The problem scenario: extraction of the ext when the int is a dp.
    - The int leaves the vp when definite: Diesing 1992, Rackowski 2002
    - This movement: plausibly connected to case-licensing: Vergnaud 1977, Legate 2008
- Problem: in High Absolutive languages, this step places the int over the ext

0.3 The Observation

- The Austronesian-Mayan connection:
  - Both families contain High-Abs languages.
  - Mayan: famously funny syntax in this construction.
    - Agent Focus: ext extracts; int a dp.
  - Today’s talk: Agent Focus in South Sulawesi.
    - Austronesian languages show agent focus too.
- The locality analysis: predicts a common problem.
- Here: a common solution.

0.4 Roadmap

1. Background: Voice and Extraction
2. The Problem: Quirky Extraction
3. The Resolution: Agent Focus
4. Analysis: licensing within the vp.
5. Extension: control.
1 Mandar: Voice and Object Shift

1.1 Background

- **Mandar**: Austronesian, South Sulawesi Subfamily; 400,000 speakers in West Sulawesi, Indonesia.\(^{12}\)
  - **Word Order**: verb initial, vos-vso alternations
  - **Alignment**: ergative-absolutive agreement system\(^{3}\)
  - **Nominals**: pro-drop; no morphological case; no number marking

(2) **Typical Mandar Sentences**
   a. U-ita=\(\text{o}\) leq!
      1\(\text{ERg-see=2ABS\ PRT}\)
      'I see you, obviously.'
   b. Na-corq=\(i\) eskrım-u iting manuq!
      3\(\text{ERg-steal=3ABS\ ICE.CREAM-1\text{GEN}}\text{ THAT\ BIRD}\)
      'That bird stole my ice cream!'

1.2 High Absolutive

- Mandar is a High Abs language

1. Linear Position
   - **ABS**: second-position
   - **ERG**: verb-adjacent

2. Temporal Adjunct Clauses: **ERG, "ABS**
   - **VP** nominalization; no aspectual modifiers

3. Control Complement Clauses: **ERG, "ABS**
   - Smaller than **TP**: no temporal modification

1.3 Argument positions

- The absolutive c-commands the ergative.

  - **Condition A**:
    * Condition-A anaphor: alawe-gen
    * Possible in both **ERG** and **ABS** positions.

  - **Condition B**:
    * Quantified ABS arguments bind into **ERG**.
    * Common pattern across WMP (Pearson 2001)

  - **Condition C**: precedence interferes.

---

\(^{1}\) The data here comes from two sources: texts and elicitation with two speakers who I have worked with since 2018. \(<c> = /\tilde{\nu}/, <\gamma> = /\tilde{i}/.\)

\(^{2}\) Abbreviations: **ABS**: absolutive, **AF**: agent focus, **ANT**: antipassive, **D**: determiner, **ERG**: ergative, **EXT**: external argument, **GEN**: genitive, **IM**: intended meaning, **INT**: internal argument, **INV**: involuntary, **ITR**: intransitive, **NEG**: negation, **PASS**: passive, **PI**: plural, **PRT**: particle, **REC**: reciprocal, **SG**: singular, **TR**: transitive

\(^{3}\) Four arguments that the abs clitics represent agreement: (**i**) coarseness: they index person but not number (Preminger 2011); (**ii**) tense-variance: they show distinct irrealis forms (Nevins 2011); (**iii**) referentiality: they index anaphors and quantified arguments (Baker & Kramer 2016); (**iv**) position: they surface in 2p (Bošković 2016). Doubled clitics typically lack these properties. (**i**) & (**iii**) also hold for the **ERG** prefixes.
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(7) **Condition A Anaphors: Absolutive or Ergative**

a. "Pole=i/aq **alawe-u.**
   come\(=3/1\text{ABS self-1GEN} \)
   INT: ‘Myself arrived.’

b. **U**-ita=i **alawe-u.**
   1\text{ERG-see}=3\text{ABS self-1GEN}
   ‘I saw myself.’

c. **Na**-ita=aq **alawe-u.**
   3\text{ERG-see}=1\text{ABS self-1GEN}
   ‘Myself saw me.’

(8) **Condition B: The Absolutive C-Commands the Ergative**

a. **Na-salili=i**
   3\text{ERG-miss}=3\text{ABS mother-3GEN}
   every student
   ‘His mother misses every student.’

1.4 **The Voice Alternation**

- Two "voice" frames: the transitive and antipassive.

  a. The **Transitive**:
     - \text{ERG} prefix; \text{ABS enclitic}.
     - \text{INT} = \text{ABS}.
     - Required when the object is a \text{DP}.

  b. The **Antipassive**
     - \text{ANT} prefix; \text{ABS enclitic}.
     - \text{EXT} = \text{ABS}.
     - Typical when the object is an \text{NP}.

1.5 **Object Shift**

- Object definiteness determines voice. Schachter 1976
  - \text{DP objects} \rightarrow \text{transitive}.

- The voice alternation = object shift.
  - The \text{INT} must leave \text{VP} if it is a \text{DP}.
  - This process requires a \text{v}^0 to attract it.
  - \text{v}_\text{tr} attracts the \text{INT}; \text{v}_\text{ANT} does not.

- Camp: the ‘Ergativist’ Approach Aldridge 2004
  - One of many approaches to Austronesian voice.
  - Claim: voice alternations linked to transitivity.
    - \text{The agent voice} = a type of antipassive.
    - \text{The patient voice} = canonical transitive.
    - Austronesian: ergative syntax, high \text{ABS}

- An Alternative: Voice as Agreement Chung 1998
  - Fundamental nom/acc alignment.
  - Voice morphemes spell out subject agreement.
  - The case of the subject \rightarrow the shape of voice.
  - Voice in c (Chen 2017) or \tau (Rackowski 2002)
  - For Mayan: status suffix in c; \text{-i} if \text{SUBJ} is \text{nom...}
1.6 The Anatomy of Voice

- Mandar voice is bimorphemic.
  - The antipassive: *maN-
    * voice\(^0\): -\(\text{um-}\) ‘itr’
    * \(\nu\): \(\text{paN-}\) ‘ant’
  - The transitive:
    * voice\(^0\): \(\text{ERG-}\ \emptyset \emptyset\)
    * \(\nu\): \(\emptyset \ \emptyset\)
    - voice\(^0\) selects \(\nu\); no mismatch.

- Transitive \(\rightarrow\) object shift.
- The locus of ERG: voice\(^0\)
  - Not restricted to thematic agents: experiencers.
  - Cannot occur inside the causative like other \(\nu\)s

1.7 The Licensing Situation

- Functional heads \(\rightarrow\) abstract licensing
  - Argument DPs need licensing Vergnaud 1977
  - Link: overt agreement.
    1. Finite \(T\): hosts ABS
    2. voice\(_{\text{tn}}\): hosts ERG

- The Licensing Schema:
  - The antipassive:
    * Only the ext requires licensing.
    * voice\(_{\text{int}}/\nu_{\text{ant}}\): no licensing.
    * Result: \(T\) licenses the ext
  - The transitive:
    * Both the int & ext require licensing.
    * voice\(_{\text{tn}}\) shows agreement; licenses ext
    * Result: \(T\) licenses the int

- Structural Results
  - INT > EXT when it interacts with \(T\)
    * High Abs agreement pattern
    * INT binds into EXT
  - voice determines which DP is HIGH.
    * Antipassive: ext
    * Transitive: int
  - Austro-Asian \(=\) high abs Mayan.
2 The Extraction Problem

2.1 The Restriction

- Only the ABS argument can extract.
  - Mandar shows the EEC Aissen 2017.
  - ... but this is part of a broader picture.
  - No extracting:
    * The antipassive object cf: Mayan
    * The reciprocal object.
    * The psych verb object.
  - The problem is not the ergative.

(16) The Ergative Extraction Constraint

a. Na-iti+3esRg-look.for=2abs dad
   'Dad’s looking for you.'

b. Iqo na-iti+3esRg-look.for dad
   'Dad’s looking for you.'

c. *Kamaq na-iti+3esRg=1abs
   dad 3ERG-look.for=2ABS
   INT 'Dad’s looking for you.'

(17) The Antipassive: Objects not Extractable

a. Mas-saka=i manuq.
   3SG ANT-catch bird
   'He’s catching birds.'

b. Fa mas-saka manuq.
   ANT-catch=3ABS bird
   'He is catching birds.'

c. *Manuq mas-saka=i.
   bird ANT-catch=3ABS
   INT: 'He’s catching birds.'

(18) The Reciprocal: Objects not Extractable

a. Si-issang=aq iting Kacoq.
   1ABS rec-know=1ABS that NAME
   'I’m acquainted with Kacoq.'

b. Yau si-issang iting Kacoq.
   1SG rec-know that NAME
   'I’m acquainted with Kacoq.'

c. *Iting Kacoq si-issang=aq.
   that NAME rec-know=1ABS
   INT: 'I know that Kacoq.'

(19) Psych Predicates: Objects not Extractable

   scared=1ABS dad-3.GEN
   'I’m scared of her dad.'

b. Yau marakkeq kamaq-na.
   1SG scared dad-3.GEN
   'I am scared of her dad.'

   dad-3.GEN scared=1ABS
   INT: 'I’m scared of her dad.'

2.2 The Locality Analysis

- Only the highest argument can extract.

  - High ABS language:
    * High linear position of ABS
    * Binding facts: ABS > ERG

- The transitive frame:
  - The INT shifts out from the VP.
  - This puts it in a position above the ERG.

- The other voices:
  - No object shift; the external argument is highest.
  - Result: this is the only thing that can extract.

- All High ABS languages: EEC = locality.
  - Austronesian + Mayan: same constraint.
2.3 The Prediction

- **No Agent Extraction over DP Objects**
  - Recap: *antipassive & transitive voice.*
  - Neither allows both extraction of ext & dp int.
    1. Antipassive: no dp object.
    2. Transitive: no agent extraction.

- **Terminology: Quirky Extraction**

2.4 This Problem Recurs

- **Mayan: High-Abs langs have the same problem.**
  - Transitive: the int raises above the ext.
  - Evidence: abs height; binding patterns (Royer 2020)
  - Parallel: no extraction of the agent in the transitive.
    * cf: the antipassive; extraction of ext ok.

- **The Q'anjob'al solution: Agent Focus**
  - Two-way Philippine voice system
    1. Incorporation Antipassive
    2. Transitive
  - Neither voice allows quirky extraction.
    * Inc.antipassive: int cannot be a dp.
    * Transitive: no extraction of the ext
  - **Result: Agent Focus**
    * The verb: morphologically intransitive.
    * Ext looks like it should be abs.
    * Int does something funny.

2.5 A Subtle Austronesian Analogue

- **Tagalog, Atayal**
  - Central Philippines, Formosan
  - Antipassive: object can’t bear DAT / ABS.
  - Agent extraction \(\rightarrow\) antipassive morphology.
  - Quirky extraction: the object can be DAT / ABS!

- **Agent Focus Checklist:**
  1. Morphologically intransitive v: ✔
  2. Ext should be abs: ✔
  3. Int does something funny: ✔

(26) *Tagalog: DOM with Quirky Extraction*

a. B-um-ili **ang** babae **ng/*sa** kotse
   \(\text{ANT-buy ABS woman GEN/DAT car}\)
   ‘The woman bought a car.’

b. Sino ang **b-um-ili** sa kotse?
   who REL ANT-buy DAT car
   ‘Who bought the car?’ (see: Kaufman 2020)

(27) *Atayal: ABS Object with Quirky Extraction*

a. Cyux **m-aniq** (*qu*) sehuy qasa **qu** Yuraw.
   \(\text{AUX ANT-eat ABS taro that ABS NAME}\)
   ‘Yuraw is eating taro.’

b. **Ima** wal **m-aniq** **qu** sehuy qasa?
   who AUX ANT-cook ABS taro that
   ‘who ate that taro?’ (Erlewine 2016)
3 Agent Focus in South Sulawesi

3.1 Covert Agent Focus

- **Mandar: Agreement Reversal**
  - Quirky extraction $\rightarrow$ antipassive prefix.
  - But: the int triggers abs agreement!
    * N.b.: impossible with the antipassive

- **Agent Focus Checklist:**
  1. Morphologically intransitive v:
  2. ext should be abs:
  3. int does something funny:

3.2 Overt Agent Focus

- **Coastal Konjo: Distinct Morphology**
  - Antipassive: $aN.N$-
    * Triggers nasal substitution
    * Possible without extraction.
  - Quirky Extraction: $aN$-
    * No substitution.
    * Exclusively with quirky extraction.

(30) **Konjo: No Substitution with Quirky Extraction**

a. Amir ang-nganre loka.
   name ANT-eat banana
   ‘Amir is eating bananas.’

b. Innai ang-kranre=i lamejaha-ku?
   who ex-eat=3ABS sweet.potato-2GEN
   ‘Who ate my sweet potato?’ Friberg 1996:143-146

3.3 The Agreement Reversal

- **Key pattern: Agreement Reversal.**
  - Extraction disrupts abs agreement (??).
  - Regular extraction: no agreement
  - Quirky Extraction: reversal
    * ABS indexes INT.

- **Plural agreement: same**
  - Antipassive: PL tracks EXT
  - Quirky Extraction: PL tracks INT

- **Schema:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Antipassive</th>
<th>Ext Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>EXT</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUR</td>
<td>EXT</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(28) **Mandar: Quirky Extraction**

a. *Maq*-urung=i=(o) iqo?
   ANT-kiss=3ABS=2ABS 2SG
   int: ‘She kissed you?’

b. Innai maq-urung=o iqo?
   who ex-kiss=2ABS 2SG
   ‘Who kissed you?’

c. U-sosoqi to maq-urung=o.
   1ERG=ENVY REL EX-kiss=2.ABS
   ‘I envy the guy who kissed you.’

(29) **Konjo: Antipassive triggers Substitution**

a. Ang-nganre=i Amir loka.
   name ANT-eat banana
   ‘Amir is eating bananas.’

b. Apa na-kanre ri eleq-na?
   what 3ERG-eat in morning-3GEN
   ‘What does he eat in the am?’
   Friberg 1996: 143-146

c. Mas-sajang=nasang=i posa.
   ANT-love=PL=3.ABS cat
   ‘They love cats’ (‘he...’)

d. Innai mas-sajang=nasang=o?
   who ex-love=PL=2ABS
   ‘Who loves you guys?’

Friberg 1996:143-146
3.4 There is an AF Head

• The patterns above involve a $v_{Af}$.
  - Agreement reversal: only with $paN_2$.
  - Other extraction frames: no reversal
    * Ditransitives: goal extraction $\rightarrow$ no
    * Reciprocals: ext extraction $\rightarrow$ no
    * Psych Verbs: exp extraction $\rightarrow$ no

• Result: requires $v_{Af}$ pace Newman 2020
  - Reversal not the invariant result of A'-extraction.

3.5 The Anatomy of Agent Focus

• The AF prefix: $v_{af} + \text{voice}_{itr}$
  - The $v_{af}$: $paN_2$.
    * Mandarin: antipassive $v^0 paN_1$.
      * Obligatory when $\text{voice}_{itr}$ takes an INT.
      * Never surfaces in other voice frames.
      * Visible in imperatives, nominalizations.
    * Agent Focus: $v_{af} = paN_2$.
      * Appears exclusively with quirky extraction.
      * Konjo: surface-distinct from ANT.
      * Mandarin: opaque morphophonemics
  - The $\text{voice}_{itr}$: $<um>$
    - Infixes into the ANT and AF prefixes.
      1. $\text{voice}_{itr} + v_{Ant} \rightarrow maN_1$ - ANT
      2. $\text{voice}_{itr} + v_{af} \rightarrow maN_2$ - AF
  - Result: AF verbs are intransitive.

3.6 Interim Summary

• High Abs $\rightarrow$ Quirky extraction problem.
  - Austronesian: on the ergativist analysis.
  - Mayan: the high abs languages.

(36) Quirky Extraction: The Problem

3.4 Ditransitives: no Reversal

a. Na-gattungang=$aq$ sara-nna. $3\text{erg-hang.on}=1\text{abs thing-def}$
   ‘They’ll hang the matter on me.’

b. Yau na-gattungang sara-nna $1\text{sg} 3\text{erg-hang.on thing-def}$
   ‘They’ll hang the matter on me.’

c. Yau na-gattungang=$nasang=i$ $1\text{sg} 3\text{erg-hang.on}=\text{pl}=3\text{abs}$
   int: ‘They’ll hang it all on me.’

3.5 Anatomy of AF:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MANDAR</th>
<th>KONJO</th>
<th>CHUJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$v_{Ant}$</td>
<td>$paN_1$</td>
<td>$N-$</td>
<td>$-w$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{Af}$</td>
<td>$paN_2$</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>$-on$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{voice}_{itr}$</td>
<td>$-um$</td>
<td>$aN$</td>
<td>$-i$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 <Um> and $paN_1$

a. Umm-ande=$aq$ (‘NP)
   $itr$-eat=$1\text{abs}$ int
   ‘I’m eating (‘something).’

b. M-aq-ande=$aq$ bau
   $itr$-ANT-eat=$1\text{abs}$ fish
   ‘I’m eating fish.’

3.5 Bare $paN_1$: Imperatives

a. Naung mai, $paq$-ita=0!
   down to here, ANT-look=$2\text{abs}$
   ‘C’mere, look!’

3.6 Quirky Extraction: The Problem

3.6 Comparative Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MANDAR</th>
<th>CHUJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$v_{Af}$</td>
<td>$paN_2$</td>
<td>$-on$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{voice}_{itr}$</td>
<td>$-um$</td>
<td>$-i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{abs}$</td>
<td>$\text{int}$</td>
<td>$\text{int}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Analysis: Low Licensing

4.1 Argument Licensing

- No agreement \(\rightarrow\) no \(1/2\pi\)
  - Psych predicates:
    * No agreement with INT
    * The INT cannot be \(1/2\pi\)
  - Challenge: licensing the INT.
    1. Transitive: the INT licensed by T.
    2. Elsewhere: no T \(\rightarrow\) INT in a PP, etc.
      - Antipassive, Psych verb: T licenses the EXT

4.2 The Licensing Problem

- Licensing the INT on T \(\rightarrow\) EEC
  - Transitive: INT to Spec,TP; c-commands EXT.
  - Problem: this makes it impossible to extract EXT.
- Prediction: AF licenses INT below T.
  - The AF construction allows EXT to extract.
  - Locality approach: EXT must be above INT.
- Result: the INT cannot interact with T.
  - Goal: prove this point.

4.3 Quantifier Float: Not in Spec,TP

- Mandar: ABS can float Q.
  - Connection: elements in Spec,TP.
  - INT interacts with T \(\rightarrow\) QF OK.
- AF: INT cannot float Q.
- Result: INT not in Spec,TP.

4.4 Agreement: No Interaction with T

- Normal ABS: follows the first AUX.
- AF ABS: verb-adjacent.
  - Movement to 2P: impossible.
  - Claim: ABS located on \(v_{AP}\)
- Result: INT does not Agree with T.
5 Agent Focus is not about Extraction

5.1 The Connection

- Mayan literature: AF linked to extraction.
  - Coon et al. 2020: $v_{\text{AF}}$ subcats for A’-EXT.
  - Newman 2020: $v_{\text{AF}}$ the result of A’-movement.
- South Sulawesi: AF does appear with extraction.
  - Makassar subgroup: distinct morphology
  - The whole family: agreement reversal.

5.2 The Separation

- South Sulawesi: AF with complement control.
  - Mandar: complement clauses show reversal.
    - The INT = NP → no reversal; antipassive
    - The INT = DP → reversal; agent focus.
- Makassar Subgroup: distinct AF morphology

(44) Makassar: Agent Focus Morphology with Control

a. ... Punna taena na=ero’ am-pinawang=i ero’-na Arumpone?
   ‘How long will it be until the people of Maros are killed,
   if I do not want to follow the wish of the Arumpone?’
   Jukes 2006:357.

b. ... Ero’=j=aq an-ruppa=i kana-ngku kasa’ba janji-ngku.
   want=FOC=1.ABS AF-follow=3ABS word-1Gen because promise-1Gen
   He said to his son: ‘We promised each other that our kids would get married. Now, even though her
daughter is a goat, I want to follow my word because I made a promise.’

5.3 The Proposal

- AF licenses the INT when T is unavailable.
  - Extraction of EXT: INT must remain below EXT.
    * HIGH ABS: interacting with T → INT > EXT
    * Locality: INT > EXT rules out extraction of EXT
  - Control: complement clauses lack T.
    * The complement clause: a voiceP (i think)
    * The INT cannot be licensed by T.
    * Must be licensed within the VP → AF.
- Extraction of EXT: not fundamental.
  - Control: not movement (especially not A’-).
  - AF: not a derivation result of extraction.
- For next time: constraining its distribution.