1 First Puzzle: Extraction Constraints in Austronesian and Beyond

1.1 Austronesian Basics

- **Austronesian**: family of 1,200 languages spoken across Taiwan, the Philippines, Indonesia, and the Pacific (Blust 2013)
- **Typological Focus**: ‘Philippine-Type’ languages (Ross 2002)
  - Geographically: the languages of Taiwan, the Philippines, certain parts of Indonesia
  - Not a genetic unit; various primary branches of both **an** and western malayo-polynesian (Smith 2018)
- **The Voice system**:
  - The syntactic ‘subject’ of the clause can originate in any core thematic position.
    - External argument, internal argument, benefactor, location, instrument (Chen 2017)
  - This argument shows various ‘special’ morphological properties:
    - Triggers distinct verbal morphology (Across the family)
    - Special case-marking (The Philippines, Taiwan; rare elsewhere)
    - Special agreement (Sulawesi)

(1) *Austronesian Voice Alternations*  
Tagalog

a. **K-un-ain ng daga sa pinggan para sa aso ang pusa.**  
   AV-eat GEN rat OBL plate for PBL dog NOM cat  
   *The cat ate a rat on a plate for the dog.*  
   Kaufman 2009:2

b. Kinain-Ø ng pusa **ang daga** sa pinggan para sa aso.  
   ate-PV GEN cat NOM rat OBL plate for PBL dog  
   *The rat was eaten by a cat on a plate for the dog.*

c. Kinain-an ng pusa ng daga **ang pinggan** para sa aso.  
   ate-LV GEN cat GEN rat NOM plate for PBL dog  
   *The plate was rat-eaten on by a cat for the dog.*

d. I-kinain ng pusa ng daga sa pinggan **ang** aso.  
   CV-ate GEN cat GEN rat OBL plate NOM dog  
   *The dog was rat-eaten for on a plate by a cat.*
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• Previous Approaches

   - Voice indexes case-features of the subject (not thematic roles: Rackowski 2002)
   - Spells out agreement located on: c (Chung), t (R&R), or v, appl, or a combination of all of these (Chen)

2. **nominalization** *(Starosta, Pawley & Reid 1982; Kaufman 2009)*
   - The modern voice markers historically derive from nominalizing morphology used in embedded clauses.
   - Synchronically still true: 'voice markers' are really thematic nominalizers (cf. English -er, -ee)
   - Verbal clauses are really copular; 'it was stole-\textit{en}' is really 'it was a steal-\textit{ee}'.

3. **ergativity** *(Payne 1982; Aldridge 2004 et seq)*
   - Austronesian languages really just ergative; additional voices involve applicatives (Aldridge 2004)
   - Patient voice: The apparent 'passive' is just the basic transitive; agent not demoted.
   - Agent voice: The 'active' is really an antipassive; the object is demoted or incorporated.

• Universal agreement: the subject is the structurally 'highest' argument in the clause.

1.2 **The Extraction Constraint**

• **family-level restriction:** the subject \textit{alone} can undergo A'-extraction.
  - Wh-movement, clefting, and relativization only available to the argument singled out by voice.
  - Non-subjects cannot undergo any of these processes.

(2) **The Austronesian Extraction Restriction**

\textbf{Tagalog}

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Sino ang b-\textit{um}-ili ng tela? \quad c. Ano ang binili-\textbf{Ø} ng babae?
    \textit{who ABS AV-buy GEN cloth} \quad \textit{what ABS buy-PV GEN woman}
    \textit{‘Who bought the cloth?’} \quad \textit{‘What was bought by the woman?’}
  \item b. *Sino ang \textit{binili-Ø ang} tela?
    \textit{who ABS buy-PV NOM cloth}
    \textit{INT: ‘Who was it bought by?’}
  \item d. Ano ang b-\textit{um}-ili \textit{ang} babae?
    \textit{what ABS AV-buy NOM woman}
    \textit{INT: ‘What did the woman buy?’}
\end{itemize}

• Mandar (South Sulawesi): fewer voices; same restriction
  - Mandar (South Sulawesi): two-way contrast between \textit{transitive} and \textit{antipassive} voices.
  - Subject: identified by ABS agreement; no case-marking or special linear position.
  - Restriction: only the transitive object and antipassive subject can undergo extraction.

(3) **Mandar Transitive**

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Transitive Frame: \quad b. o-Extraction: \quad c. A-Extraction:
    \begin{align*}
      \text{\textit{Tattaq=0 na-itai}} & \quad \text{\textit{Iqo tattaq na-itai}} & \quad \text{\textit{‘Kamaq tattaq=0}} \\
      \text{\textit{ASP=2.ABS 3.ERG-look.for}} & \quad \text{\textit{you ASP 3A-look.for}} & \quad \text{\textit{dad ASP=2.ABS}} \\
      \text{\textit{kamaq.}} & \quad \text{\textit{kamaq.}} & \quad \text{\textit{na-itai.}} \\
      \text{\textit{dad}} & \quad \text{\textit{dad}} & \quad \text{\textit{3.ERG-look.for}}
    \end{align*}
    \textit{‘Dad’s still looking for you.’} \quad \textit{‘Dad’s still looking for you.’} \quad \textit{‘Dad’s still looking for you.’}
\end{itemize}

(4) **Mandar Antipassive**
a. Antipassive Frame:
   Mat-tappas=aq  
   ANTIP-wash=1.ABS  
   carecare.  
   clothes  
   'I’m washing clothes.'

b. A-Extraction:
   Yau mat-tappas carecare.  
   ANTIP-wash=clothes  
   i  
   'I’m washing clothes.'

c. o-Extraction:
   Carecare clothes  
   antip-wash=1.abs  
   car care.  
   clothes  
   'I’m washing clothes.'

- The first half of this restriction parallels ergative extraction constraints cross-linguistically (Aissen 2017).
  - Many languages restrict the extraction of transitive agents (Dixon 1994, Manning 1996, Deal 2016)
  - Mayan: the ergative cannot undergo wh-movement, relativization, or clefting (Larsen & Norman 1979).
  - Repair: Ergative extraction requires special 'AGENT FOCUS' morphology on the verb

(5) Q’anjob’al: Extraction ok for S, O; not A

Coon et al 2014:28-29

a. Maktxel max way-i?
   who ASP sleep-ITV  
   'Who slept?'

b. Maktxel max y-il-a’?
   who ASP 3A-see-TV  
   'Who did she see?'

c. Maktxel max-ach
   who ASP-2B  
   'Who saw you?'

(6) Q’anjob’al: Ergative Extraction forces Agent Focus

Coon et al. 2014:30

a. Maktxel max-ach il-on-i?
   who ASP-2B see-AF-TV  
   'Who saw you?'

b. Ix ix max-ach
   D woman ASP-2B  
   il-on-i.  
   see-AF-TV  
   'The woman who saw you'

c. A ix Malin max-ach iloni.
   F D NAME ASP-2B see.AF  
   il-on-i.  
   see-AF-TV  
   'it was Maria that saw you.'

- QUESTION 1: Where does the extraction constraint come from?

1.3 Ergative Extraction: Previous Approaches

- The constraint against ergative extraction has been explained in three ways:

1. The Accessibility Approach

- SUMMARY: ergative arguments cannot extract because they are invisible to the relevant probes.
  - Displacement parasitic on AGREE (Chomsky 2000); extraction possible iff a probe can target a DP.
  - Probes permit CASE-DISCRIMINATION; only agree with goals bearing certain cases (Bobaljik 2008).
  - ERGATIVE case frequently inaccessible (Otsuka 2006); ergatives invisible to key probes (Deal 2016).
  - RESULT: Extraction probes which discriminate for case cannot target ergative arguments.

(7) The Accessibility Hierarchy

Moravesik 1974, Bobaljik 2008

UNMARKED CASE > DEPENDENT CASE > LEXICAL/OBLIQUE CASE  
NOM, ABS > ACC, ERG > DAT, INST, COM

(8) The Accessibility Approach:

EECS arise when A’-probes can only target unmarked cases.

Otsuka 2006, Deal 2016

- ALTERNATIVE: ergative arguments embedded in (covert) prepositional phrases (Polinsky 2018)
  - RESULT: no ergative movement in constructions which ban PP-movement or P-stranding.
2. **The Licensing Approach**

- **summary**: Ergative extraction creates a fatal case-licensing problem.
  
  - **starting point**: Nominal arguments must interact with a probe to be licensed (Vergnaud 1977).
    - Typically: ergatives licensed via agree with \( v^0 \); absolutes via agree with \( t \) (Ordonez 1995)
    - **result**: the object has to undergo movement above the subject to be licensed.

(9) **Licensing Schema: Object Moves to Interact with \( T \)**

```
TP
  \( T \)
    \( VP \)
      \( DP_{OBJECT} \)
        \( DP_{AGENT} \)
          \( V \)
            \( VP \)
              \( V \)
                \( DP_{OBJECT} \)
```

- **eec**: object movement creates a locality problem which blocks ergative extraction.
  
  - \( \lambda' \)-probes sensitive to intervention-based locality; attract only the closest thing (Rizzi 1990)
  
  - Syntactic Ergativity: arises when \( \lambda' \)-probes are ‘relativized to \( d \)’ (Aldridge 2004)

(10) **The Licensing Approach: Two Ingredients**

a. **relativized minimality**: the probe on \( c \) can only interact with the highest \( dp \). *Aldridge 2004*

b. **case-driven movement**: the object must shift to a position above the agent.

- **result**: Ergative extraction can only proceed in a configuration where the object remains low.
  
  - The ergative has to remain structurally above the object to be targeted by probes on \( c \).
  
  - **but**: this configuration does not allow the object to receive case; cannot be licensed.
  
  - This licensing failure rules out the derivation entirely; impossible for the ergative to remain high.

3. **The Intervention Approach**

- **summary**: the eec arises through intervention-based locality constraints alone.
  
  - Ergative extraction problematic for the same two reasons stated above:
    (a) **relativized minimality**: the probe on \( c \) can only interact with the highest \( dp \). *Aldridge 2004*
    (b) **object shift**: the object moves to a position above the agent.

- **however**: The locality problem arises for reasons independent of case.
  
  
  - Certain objects still move to a position above the agent- but this step has nothing to do with case.
  
  - **instead**: Object shift forced by a ban on definite objects within the \( vp \) (Diesing 1992)
  
  - **result**: \( dp \) objects invariably stand above the agent in certain ergative languages.
4. **Critical Review:**

(a) The Accessibility Approach:
- **SUMMARY:** The EEC reduces to some inherent problem with ergative arguments.
- No syntactic explanation; the ergative extraction constraint delinked from case and locality.
- **RESULT:** regardless of configuration, ergative arguments should *never* be able to extract.
- **PROBLEM:** obviously not true in e.g. Mayan languages; lacks explanatory insight.

(b) The Licensing Approach:
- **SUMMARY:** The EEC comes down to a problem with case-licensing the object.
- **RESULT:** if the object can be licensed in some other way, ergatives should be able to extract.
- **PROBLEM:** looks wrong for Mayan; O-licensing available with ergative extraction (Coon et al. 2020)

(c) The Pure Locality Approach:
- **SUMMARY:** The EEC comes down to the presence or absence of general object shift.
- **RESULT:** constructions where the object does not shift should permit ergative extraction.

1.4 **Austronesian Extraction: A Critical Review**

- The Austronesian lit. generally presupposes the locality approach to explain the restriction (Aldridge 2004).
  - Exception: Erlewine (2017); the Mitchoverse espouses the licensing approach; flirts with antilocality.
  - Cf. Chung (1998) & related approaches: voice is in c; voice selection triggered by extraction.

- General properties of Austronesian languages make other approaches difficult to maintain.
  - Licensing: objects regularly receive default (genitive) case alongside ergative arguments (1)
  - Discrimination: not just ergatives which can’t extract; all obliques generally cannot.

- The transitive-antipassive split can be understood through object shift (Rackowski 2002)
  - Antipassive objects must be NPs; cannot be DPs or pronouns; 12
  - Antipassive objects take obligatory low scope; cannot bind floated quantifiers: 13-14
  - Antipassive objects cannot trigger agreement: 15.
  - This cluster of properties can be derived from a ban on object shift in the antipassive.

(12) *Antipassive verbs take NP Objects; Transitive verbs take DP Objects*
(13) *Antipassive objects cannot be dp's; must scope low.*

a. Na-/Mas-saka=pa=i bau.
   3.pv/av-catch=yet=3 fish
   ‘He’s still catching fish.’

b. Na-cinnoq=bando=0 iqo?
   3.pv-kiss=really=2 you
   ‘Did he really kiss you?’

(14) *Antipassive objects cannot bind quantifiers.*

a. Na-oloqi=nasang=i 3.pv-like=all=3 k-drama
   ‘She likes all those k-dramas.’
   Trans: O ‘My cats are all chasing mice.’
   Antip: A ‘my cat chases all mice.’
   Not: ‘There was one specific rice cooker...’

b. Mac-cinnoq=bandi=i 3.pv-kiss=really=3 you
   ‘Did he really kiss you?’

(15) *Antipassive objects cannot trigger agreement.*

a. Indang=aq mam-baluq balenga genaq.
   neg=1 AV-sell rice.cooker earlier
   ok: ‘I didn’t sell any rice cookers earlier.’
   Not: ‘There was one specific rice cooker...’

b. Iqda=aq neg=1 mu-pessangi.
   2.pv-care.for 1 cat
   ‘You don’t care for me.’
   Int: ‘I’m looking for a cat.’

Pelenkahu et al. 1987: 2.14

Muthalib & Sangi 1991: A362

*Binding patterns support the story.*

– The locality approach holds that transitive clauses require object shift to a position above the agent.
– Mandar: the transitive object can bind into the agent; the agent behaves like an absolutive object.
– Identical patterns reported across Indonesia (Balinese: Arka; Batak: Cole & Hermon 2008)

(16) *Transitive objects bind ergative anaphors.*

   3.erg-see self-3.gen prs=n gp=mirror
   ‘Himself saw Adi in the mirror.’

b. I=Adi na-ita alawe-na di=jaramming.
   prs=name 3.erg-see self-3.gen gp=mirror
   ‘Himself saw Adi in the mirror.’

1.5 *Interim conclusions.*

– Mandar/Austronesian shows an extraction restriction like the ERGATIVE EXTRACTION CONSTRAINT (Aissen 2017)
– Locality seems like the right way to explain it; only the structurally highest argument can extract.
– Open question: what about transitive clauses where object shift should apply?

2 *Agent Extraction: the Repair.*

2.1 *Mayan: Agent Focus.*

– Mayan languages have a special way to circumvent the extraction constraint (6).
– AGENT FOCUS: lets the transitive agent extract over the object in wh-questions, clefts...
• **Previous Approaches:**
  - Licensing World: the af suffix allows the object to be case-licensed low (Coon et al. 2014)
  - Functional Alternative: af morpheme disambiguates alignment (Stiebels 2006)

• **Agent Focus and Intervention:**
  - Only one way to circumvent the EEC in the intervention world: keep the agent highest.
  - Result: the af construction must allow the object to remain beneath the agent.

• **Mayan Typology:**
  - The various forms of af across Mayan basically accomplish this goal.
  - The Antipassive Strategy:
    * Some languages use an object-demoting antipassive to get around the eec: Q’eqchi’, Mam (Aissen 2017:10)
    * Others permit object-demotion alongside a dedicated agent focus: Tzutujil (Dayley 1985);... Tsotsil...
    * And some (i think) permit agent extraction from np-incorporating antipassives, but contrast this with an agent focus construction for agent extraction with fully-transitive predicates (Q’anjob’alan?)
  - The Agent Focus Strategy:
    * The interesting construction involves ergative extraction over non-demoted dp objects.
    * Here: af morphology allows agent extraction alongside dp objects which should shift.

(17) *Agent Focus Constructions in Q’anjob’alan; K’ichean*

a. Maktxel max-ach il-on-i? who ASP-2B see-AF-TV
   ‘Who saw you?’
   Q’anjob’al; Coon et al. 2014:10

b. In x-in-il-ow le achi.
   1 PFV-1b-see-AF D man
   ‘I saw the man.’
   K’iche; Davies & Sam-Colop 1990:523

(18) *The AF Solution: Two Logical Possibilities*

a. The af construction systematically lacks object shift (Q’anjob’alan: Coon et al. 2020:34-37)

b. The af construction allows object shift but allows it to target a position beneath the agent (K’ichean: *ibid*;37-40)

(19) *Special Object Shift with Agent Focus*

a. **Transitive: Object Shift above the Agent**

b. **Agent Focus: Object Shift below the Agent**
2.2 The Austronesian Analogue

- Mandar recruits the antipassive for transitive agent extraction; the general Austronesian pattern.
- Nevertheless: clauses with agent extraction do not look like typical antipassives.
  - Typical antipassive objects must be NP; cannot bind floated quantifiers; control agreement.
  - Extracted-over antipassive objects:
    1. can be DPs; can even be pronouns!
    2. bind floating quantifiers obligatorily.
    3. control agreement.
  - Observation: these ‘antipassive’ objects can undergo object shift.

\[ (20) \text{Agent Extraction allows AV objects to be specific, trigger agreement, associate with quantifiers.} \]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Masa, \text{ i=Ciciq mac-cinnoq=o iko?} \text{ no.way, prs=n AV-kiss=2 you?} 'No way, Sita kissed you?'
  \item b. Yau maq-itai=nasang=i sola-u. \text{ AV-look.for=all=3 friend-1.} \text{ 'I'm the one who's looking for all my friends'}
\end{itemize}

- Object Agreement requires Shift
  - Object agreement cannot occur with predicates that ban object shift.
  - \text{Min-jari 'become': forces objects to undergo pseudo-incorporation (21); bans movement.}

\[ (21) \text{Copular Verbs Ban Object Shift} \]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Na=min-jari=guru=aq. \text{ fut=AV-become-teacher=1} \text{ 'I'll became a teacher.'}
  \item b. *Na=min-jari=aq to=Indonesia. \text{ fut=AV-become=1 PERSON=PLACE} \text{ 'I'll become an Indonesian citizen.'}
\end{itemize}

- Extraction context: this verb bans object agreement; other copular verbs follow suit (22).
- Claim: object agreement arises only when objects shift.

\[ (22) \text{Copular Verbs Ban Object Agreement under Agent Extraction} \]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Mang-ippi=aq \text{ you min-jari('=o) iko. AV-dream=1 I AV-become=2 you} \text{ 'I dreamt that I became you.'}
  \item b. Nah, \text{ yau tania('=o) iko, tapi... PRT I EQ.NEG=2 you but} \text{ 'Well, I'm not you, but...'}
\end{itemize}

- Applicative constructions: another argument for Shift.
  - The applicative -ang cannot cannot co-occur with the regular ANTIPASSIVE (Pearson 2001)
  - This morphology can only surface when its object can shift: e.g. in pv (23a).

\[ (23) \text{No Applicatives with Regular AV} \]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. \text{ Mam-be-ngang=aq sola-u doiq. AV-give-APPL=1} \text{ friend-1 money} \text{ 'I gave my friend money.}
  \item b. Mane \text{ na-be-ngang=aq you doiq. just.now 3.pv-give-APPL=1 I money} \text{ 'He just gave me some money.'}
\end{itemize}

- Extraction: the applicative can co-occur with the extraction antipassive (24).

\[ (24) \text{Agent Extraction allows AV Applicatives} \]
a. Yau mas-sola-ngang=i dio  
   I AV-accompany-APPL=3 there
   di=ramasakiq. in=hospital
   'I went with him to the hospital.'
Friberg & Jerniati 2000: Ex.170

b. Na-sio=aq pro1 lamba mang-alli-ang=i
   3.PV-tell=1 pro go AV-buy-APPL=3
   buku. book
   'She made me go buy him a book.'
Friberg & Jerniati 2000: Ex.248

c. Applicatives Shift when Agents Extract
   voicep
   DP.BEN APPLP
   DP.BEN VP

• Proposal: these constructions involve mouse: Movement of Objects Under Subject Extraction.

• The mouse construction involves a head syntactically distinct from the regular antipassive.
  – The Makassar Subgroup (South Sulawesi; close relatives): distinct mouse prefix (Friberg 1996).
  – Coastal Konjo: The regular AV morpheme aN(N)- triggers nasal suppletion (25).

(25) Konjo: Agent Voice triggers Nasal Suppletion

a. Apa na-kanre ri eleq-na?
   what 3.PV-eat in morning-3
   'What does he eat in the mornings?'
Coastal Konjo; Friberg 1996:143-146

b. Ang-nganre=i Amir loka.
   AV-eat=3 N banana
   'Amir is eating bananas.'

• Mouse Contexts: Distinct Morphology
  – Regular AV morphology occurs when agents extract over nonspecific objects (26a).
  – Mouse Context: a distinct prefix aN- which triggers no nasal suppletion (26b).

(26) Mouse Constructions shows Distinct Morphology

   N AV-eat banana
   'AMIR is eating bananas.'

   N MOUSE-eat=3 sweet.potato-2
   'ALI ate your sweet potato.'

2.3 Modeling Mouse

• Mouse poses a problem for the intervention-based approach to extraction restrictions.
  – Locality constraint: only the highest argument can undergo A'-extraction (in Austronesian, Mayan...)
  – Object shift: places the object above the transitive agent; should ban agent extraction.
  – Puzzle: what's going on?

• One approach: Non-Highest Extraction
  – Mouse involves transitive syntax; the object shifts above the agent.
  – Mouse morphemes would be surface allomorphs of regular transitive.
  – Result: c would attract the agent non-locally; the intervention account would be abandoned.
Example: Newman (2020) proposes this schema for Mayan; Boskovic (2011) could also do it.

- **The alternative:** Special Object Shift
  - MOUSE involves a special kind of object shift which puts the object below the agent.
  - RESULT: intervention-based account of extraction restrictions can be preserved.
  - PUZZLE: formal implementation remains mysterious; send help.

\[ (27) \text{ PV Approach: Mouse involves PV} \]
\[ (28) \text{ Alternative: Mouse distinct from PV} \]

- **Mandar-internal evidence:** we want approach 2.
  - **Pattern:** the MOUSE object stops showing subject properties above voicep.
    - **Significance:** the PV approach predicts that it should behave as a typical subject; it does not.
  - **Preverbal Quantifiers**
    - The preverbal quantifier sangning ‘all’ strictly associates with the subject (29a).
    - This quantifier cannot associate with non-subjects in either AV or PV (29b).

\[ (29) \text{ Preverbal Quantifiers associate with the Subject} \]

\[ a. \textbf{Sangning me}-ca\text{-cawa}=1 \textbf{maq}-\text{ita kedo-na}. \]
\[ \text{all AV-laugh}=3 \text{ AV-see} \text{ act-3} \]
\[ \text{‘They all laughed seeing what he did.’} \]
\[ \text{Sikki et al. 1987; B17} \]

\[ b. \textbf{Sangning na}-\text{ita}=o \text{ kanneq-mu?} \]
\[ \text{all 3.pv-see}=2 \text{ grandparent-2} \]
\[ \text{‘Did your grandfather see all of you?’} \]
\[ \text{NOT: ‘Did you see all of your grandparents?’} \]

- **MOUSE context:** sangning strictly associates with the extracted agent, not the object (cf. PV; 29b).

\[ (30) \text{ Preverbal Quantifiers cannot associate with the Mouse Object} \]

\[ a. \textbf{Innai sangning maq}-ita=o? \]
\[ \text{who all AV-see}=2 \]
\[ \text{‘Who PLUR saw you sg?’} \]
\[ \text{NOT: ‘Who saw you guys?’} \]

\[ b. \textbf{Sola}-u \textbf{sangning map}-pecawai-aq. \]
\[ \text{friend-1 all AV-laugh.at}=1 \]
\[ \text{‘My friends all laughed at me.’} \]
\[ \text{NOT: ‘My friend laughed at all of us.’} \]

- **Second-Position Agreement**
  - The regular subject agreement probe sits in Fin8; agreement clitics strictly move to 2P.
  - The clitics form a cluster with other 2P elements after the highest aux (31b),

\[ (31) \text{ Subject clitics move to 2P, form a clitic cluster} \]
a. Indang=aq meloq maq-ellong ae!
   neg=1 want go.up AV-sing PRT
   'Hey, I don’t want to go up and sing!'

b. Pura=tongang=i u-tumae i=Cicciq e!
   already=truly AV-propose PRS=N PRT
   'Hey, I really already proposed to Sita!'

- **Mouse context:** object agreement is verb-adjacent, not 2P (cf. PV; 31b).
- **Proposal:** the probe behind the mouse agreement is on voice\(^b\), not Fin\(^a\).

(32) *Mouse Clitics are verb-adjacent; cannot move to 2P*

a. Yau indang meloq mat-tuyuq=o e!
   I neg want AV-tie=2 PRT
   'Ok, I don’t want to marry you!'

b. ‘Yau indang=o meloq mat-tuyuq e!

(33) *Patient Voice: Merge A, then Probe o*

(34) *Mouse: Probe o, then Merge A*

2.4 **Analysis: Low Object Shift**

- **Proposal:** the mouse construction involves a voice\(_{mouse}\) which triggers low object shift (34).
  - Like voice\(_{av}\): voice\(_{mouse}\) keeps the external argument highest in the voice\(_{p}\) phase.
  - But: v\(_{mouse}\) forces the agent to extract and bears an epp feature which triggers object shift.

- **Implementation** (Complete stipulation; explanation in progress)
  - **Feature Ordering** (Heck & Müeller 2007) to derive a tucking-in pattern (Richards 1997).
    - Two relevant features: trigger MERGE [\* F∗] and PROBE ["F"]\(^{epp}\)
    - voice\(_{pv}\): ["D"]\(^{epp}\) > [\* D∗]
    - voice\(_{mouse}\): [\* D∗] > ["]\(^{epp}\)
  - **Result:** voice\(_{pv}\) triggers shift above the agent; voice\(_{mouse}\) trigger shift below it.

3 **Conclusion**

3.1 **Summary: Mice in Mandar**

- **Pattern:** Mandar provides evidence that AV clauses with agent extraction allow object shift.
  - The extraction antipassive takes DP objects; enforces no specificity restrictions
  - The extraction antipassive lets objects trigger agreement parasitic on object shift (22)
  - The extraction antipassive can take morphology which forces object shift, etc.

- **Significance:** Intervention-based accounts of the extraction restriction cannot allow regular object shift.
Object shift targets a position above the agent in regular \textit{pv} clauses (Rackowski 2002).

Thus clauses with object shift should not allow agents to extract.

\textbf{Solution:} \textit{MOUSE} involves a distinct \textit{voice_{MOUSE}} which triggers low object shift and forces agent extraction.

- Mandar: \textit{MOUSE} objects don’t look like antipassive or transitive objects:
  - \textit{Unlike AP Objects}: no antispecificity, control agreement, undergo some movement.
  - \textit{Unlike Tr Objects}: no preverbal quantifiers (30), no 2\textit{p} agreement (32).
  - They trigger agreement on \textit{voice}; clitics surface on the verb, not in 2\textit{p} (32).

- Makassar, Konjo: \textit{voice_{MOUSE}} morphologically distinct from \textit{voice_{av}}.

\textbf{Key Point:} this analysis saves the intervention approach to extraction restrictions.

\textbf{Looking Forward:} \textit{Desiderata}

- Really need a theory of specifier ordering; constraints on movement paths.
- Mouse Schema: object shift can’t tuck in, \textit{unless} it’s under an argument which will \textit{A’}-move.
- Reformulation: external merge has to be (before/after) internal merge unless \textit{A’}-features get involved?

\subsection*{3.2 The Family Picture}

\textbf{Generality:} many \textit{WMP} languages appear to show \textit{MOUSE} patterns.

- Tagalog: specificity constraints on \textit{av} objects lift when agents extract (Mcfarland 1978).
- Squliq Atayal: \textit{av} objects can surface with absolutive marking when agents displace (Erlewine 2016).
- South Sulawesi: the Mandar agreement pattern recurs across the subfamily (Kaufman 2008).
- Pamona (Pamona-Kaili, Central Sulawesi), Padoe (Bungku-Tolaki; Southeast Sulawesi): object pronouns surface in the absolutive case when agents extract (Vuorinen 1995, Mead 2002).

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{Atayal (Atayalic): Mouse Objects can take ABS case}
    \begin{enumerate}
      \item \textit{a}. \textit{Cyux m-aniq sehuy qu} Yuraw.
      \textit{AUX AV-eat taro ABS Yuraw}
      \textit{‘Yuraw is eating taro.’}
      
      \item \textit{b}. \textit{Ima wal m-aniq qu} sehuy qasa?
      \textit{who AUX AV-eat ABS taro that}
      \textit{‘Who ate that taro?’}
      
      \textit{Squliq Atayal; Erlewine 2016: 2-3}
    \end{enumerate}
  \item \textit{Padoe (Bungku-Tolaki): Mouse Pronominal Objects require ABS Case.}
    \begin{enumerate}
      \item \textit{a}. \textit{Mo-nahu=aku=to} inehu.
      \textit{um-cook=1.abs=pfv vegetable}
      \textit{‘I cooked vegetables.’}
      
      \item \textit{b}. \textit{Iiko 2.abs kaa t-um-o’ori=aku kee?}
      \textit{2.abs emph um-know=1.abs q}
      \textit{‘Do you know me?’}
      
      \textit{Pamona: Vuorinen 1995:105-110}
    \end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

\subsection*{3.3 Key Result: Explains Quirky Extraction}

- Some languages permit agents to extract across surface \textit{pv} morphology.
  \begin{itemize}
    \item Selayarese (South Sulawesi): Finer & Basri 1987; (37).
    \item Tagalog: certain idiolects permit agents to extract over \textit{pv} morphology (Pizarro-Guevara 2020).
  \end{itemize}

\textbf{Problem:} this looks even worse for the intervention-based account of extraction restrictions!

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{Selayarese: Agent Extraction over Specific Patients forces PV morphology.}
\end{enumerate}
a. **Ang**-alle=i doiq i=Basoq.  
   AV-take=3 money PRS=N  
   ‘Baso’ took (some) money.’

b. i=Basoq la-alle=i doiq-injo.  
   PRS=N 3.pv-take=3 money-the  
   ‘Baso’ took the money.’

Finer & Basri 1987: 142-143

(38) Tagalog Idiolects allow Agent Extraction with PV.

a. **Hotshots** g-in-ulpi ang Picanto.  
   TEAM PV-beat ABS TEAM  
   ‘The Hotshots beat Picanto in a landslide.’

Pizarro-Guevara (2020); cited from the online sports magazine Philstar.

b. Ang 7% ng mga kabataan ay k-in-ain ang  
   ABS NUM GEN PL youth AY PV-EAT ABS  
   i-ni-re-rekomenda=ng dalawa o higit  
   CV-ASP-ASP-recommend=1 two or more  
   pa=ng mga servings ng prutas kada araw.  
   too=1 PL servings GEN fruit each day.  
   ‘As for 7% of the younger people, they eat the recommended 2+ servings of fruit each day.’

Pizarro-Guevara (2020); cited from Prutas: Ang bagong cookie (‘fruits: the new cookie’) on the website ‘Just Be Beauty.’

- **Solution**: These constructions involve voice\textsubscript{MOUSE} spelled out as morphologically indistinct from pv.
  - **Prediction**: the objects in these constructions should behave like their Mandar analogues.
- **Upshot**: the voice\textsubscript{MOUSE} analysis defuses threats to the intervention approach to extraction restrictions.
  - The mouse analysis allows us to rule out constructions like (39).
  - Agent extraction contexts with specific objects involve the structure in (40) in Mandar; likely elsewhere.
  - Surface voice puzzles (e.g. Tagalog) reduce entirely to morphological puzzles in spelling out voice\textsubscript{MOUSE}.

(39) **Impossible: Non-Local Extraction**  

(40) **Mouse Construction: Low Object Shift**