

Simple Sentences in Malagasy

Charles Randriamasimanana

《語言暨語言學》專刊外編之五
《百川匯海：李壬癸先生七秩壽慶論文集》
張永利 黃美金 何大安 / 編輯
中央研究院語言學研究所

LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS MONOGRAPH SERIES NUMBER W-5

STREAMS CONVERGING INTO AN OCEAN:

Festschrift in Honor of Professor Paul Jen-kuei Li on His 70th Birthday

Edited by Henry Y. Chang, Lillian M. Huang, and Dah-an Ho

Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan

2006

Simple Sentences in Malagasy*

Charles Randriamasimanana
University of Oxford

This paper examines the notion of Control and how it contributes to our understanding of the make-up of a typical Malagasy sentence in terms of a core as well as a periphery, two rather distinct zones. Its main purpose is to explore the importance of this specific feature for the distinction between an argument and an adjunct. In the process, it will shed some light on what type of constituent is likely to undergo the process of incorporation, which one is not and how a typical adjunct can resort to a switch type mechanism and migrate from one zone to the other.

Key words: Control, argument, adjunct, incorporation

1. Introduction: Malagasy sentence core & periphery

My main purpose in this paper is to explore the crucial importance of the notion of Control and its contribution to the distinction between an argument and an adjunct in a simple Malagasy sentence, in addition to the traditional division of a clause into a core and a periphery. In what follows, it will transpire that in Malagasy the core of an active voice sentence may typically¹ comprise objects, i.e. a direct object (DO) and an indirect object (IO), as illustrated in section 2; whereas from among potential preposition

* This paper is offered to Professor Paul Jen-kuei Li of Academia Sinica on the occasion of his 70th birthday. It was made possible partially by ESRC Project RES-000-23-0505 Verb-initial grammars: A multilingual/parallel perspective. University of Oxford.

¹ This assumption is based on the following type of rather widespread Malagasy data, where an overt subject is missing from an active voice sentence:

Nanambady tamin'ny 1938.
N- ana(n>m)-(v>b)ady t-amin'ny 1938.
past-anana- vady past-on the 1938
past-root.have spouse in 1938
'Married in 1938.'

From Rajaona (1969:13) *Takelaka Notsongaina* (Selected Texts), a Malagasy literature anthology used in Malagasy literature classes throughout Madagascar.

phrases, a Time-Oblique as illustrated in (39) appears to be a typical adjunct lying outside the core and inside the periphery. Between those two distinct zones, lies a fuzzy area where an Instrument-Oblique, as described in section 3, is an argument of the governing verb since the latter necessarily contains the feature [+CONTROL]; by contrast, there seems to be more variability with the case of Location-Oblique, as shown in section 4, depending among other things on the presence or absence of the feature [+CONTROL] inside the relevant verb. Bridging the gap between core and periphery is incorporation, as envisaged in Randriamasimanana (2004a) and described in section 7 and which hinges on the compatibility of the set of inherent features inside a head verb with the feature [+CONTROL], as illustrated in sections 5, 6 and 7.

2. Objects in Malagasy

As already shown in Randriamasimanana (1986:655-661), there is a clear distinction in Malagasy between a direct object (DO) and an indirect object (IO). It will become apparent that at least one type of DO can be ‘fronted’, despite claims to the contrary found, for instance, in Paul (2000:37, ex. 24a), Paul (2002), Paul & Potsdam (2004:248, ex. 11a) and Potsdam (2005, ex. 40), apparently based on data initially released in Keenan (1976:268, ex. 55a).

2.1 Distinction between DO and IO

There is little doubt that in Malagasy both a DO and an IO can be ‘promoted’ to grammatical subject, thus triggering passive morphology on the verb, as already reported, for example, in Keenan (1976) and Randriamasimanana (1986). What has been obscured for the last several years is the simple fact that in this language, at least one type of DO can be ‘fronted’ despite its being governed by a verb which remains in the active voice and provided that certain conditions are met. In general, this seems to relate to quantification and the data contradicts the claim made about DO in Paul (2000:37). On the other hand, ‘fronting’ is absolutely ruled out for an IO.

2.1.1 Direct object

Despite the fact that a DO and an IO are part of the core in Malagasy, there is a sharp difference in behaviour between the two, as will be illustrated immediately below. A non-definite type of DO as illustrated in (5) can be ‘fronted’ in this language -contra Keenan (1976:268, ex. 55a) -- and the governing verb remains in the active voice, as shown in (3); in addition, this kind of construction brings with it a partitive reading, as

seen in (4). By contrast, as will be shown in the next section, an IO simply cannot be ‘fronted’ in the same manner, as this invariably renders the sequence irretrievably ungrammatical.

- (1) Namaky (an’) ilay kitay i Paoly.
 N-a(n>m)-(v)aky (an’) ilay kitay i Paoly.
 past-pref.an-root.broken (acc.) DX².sg wood D².sg Paul
 ‘Paul was chopping the (previous mention) wood.’
- (2) Novakin’i Paoly ilay kitay.
 No-vak(i)-in(a) i Paoly ilay kitay.
 Pass.past-stem.be.broken-ina³ D.sg Paul DX.sg wood
 ‘The (previous mention) wood was chopped by Paul.’
- (3) Ny kitay i Paoly no namaky betsaka.
 Ny kitay i Paoly no n-a(n>m)-(v)aky betsaka.
 Topic wood D.sg Paul focus past-pref.an-root³.broken a.lot
 ‘As far as wood is concerned, Paul was chopping a lot of it.’
- (4) Ny kitay i Paoly no namaky.
 Ny⁴ kitay i Paoly no n-a(n>m)-(v)aky.
 Topic wood D.sg Paul focus past-pref.an-root.broken
 ‘As far as wood is concerned, Paul was chopping some.’

² There are three types of determiner in Malagasy based on their case-assignment properties: A first subtype, D.singular here ‘i’ accompanies a proper name requires \emptyset case-marker for nominative, but necessitates the particle ‘an’ for the accusative. Det ‘ny’ ‘(all) the’ represents a second subtype, which goes on common nouns and which remains invariant since it canNOT be accompanied by particle ‘an’ even in the accusative case. DX.singular ilay ‘the previously mentioned’ is the third subtype, which accepts case-marker \emptyset for the nominative, optionally takes ‘an’ in the accusative and can go with either a proper name or a common noun.

³ The distinction between a root and a stem is crucial in Malagasy as, in addition to a difference in meaning, the first does not involve a stress shift while the second does. Thus in (3) vaky ‘be accidentally broken’ is a root and the main stress falls on the first syllable. Compare that with stem vaki ‘be deliberately broken’ in (2), with stress on the second syllable as it requires a stress shift because of suffixation with passive voice affix ‘ina’.

⁴ Topic ny ‘as for’ is different from Determiner ny ‘all the (members of a given set)’ in that the latter presupposes that all members of the set in question are properly identified and that all of them without any exception are being referred to. This is definitely not the case for Topic ny ‘as for’.

- (5) Namaky kitay betsaka i Paoly.
N-a(n>m)-(v)aky kitay betsaka i Paoly.
Past-pref.an-root.broken wood a lot D.sg Paul
'Paul was chopping a lot of wood.'

Note that the DO in (5) is not definite and that the verb in both (3) and (4) remains in the active voice and that in both instances, the VP has a partitive reading, the kind of interpretation to be attributed to example (55a) in Keenan (1976): There is very little doubt that (55a) originally marked as 'ungrammatical' is indeed 'grammatical', but with this other meaning. This situation is very different for (1), where the DO is definite and in (2) this definite DO has been 'promoted' to subject, with the correlate that the VP does not carry any partitive reading at all.

The phenomenon just described was already illustrated in Randriamasimanana (1986:659, ex. 182) and very briefly outlined in Randriamasimanana (1994:25). The grammaticality of sequences (3) and (4) along with that of (55a) in Keenan (1976) contradicts a crucial claim⁵ made in Paul (2000:37, ex. 24a) as well as in Potsdam (2005, ex. 40), for example.

- (6) Ny akoho no n-ividy i Bao.
Topic chicken focus root.buy Bao
'It's the chicken that Bao bought.'

⁵ Here is a piece of authentic Malagasy data from a Malagasy language forum, adapted from the website www.wanadoo.mg/forums/read.php? Re: Voyage en Inde, Par: lalaiko, Date: 28 septembre 2005 - 10:58, which shows that a non-definite DO can definitely be fronted while the verb remains in the active voice.

Ny sakafo afaka mifidy: Balinais, japonais, français, indien ...

Ny sakafo afaka m-i-fidy --- : Balinais, japonais, français, indien ...

Topic food can pres-pref.i-root.choose : Balinese, Japanese, French, Indian...

Literally: 'As for food, --- can choose: Balinese, Japanese, French, Indian...'

English: 'As far as food is concerned, (we) can choose: Balinese, Japanese, French, Indian...'

Note the missing subject 'we', as predicted by the assumption made in Footnote 1. The verb 'm-i-fidy' 'present-root.choose' is in the active voice form; the corresponding Object-to-Subject passive form will be: Ø-fid(i)-ina 'passive.present-stem.be.chosen-suffix.ina', 'is-being-chosen' or 'is-usually-chosen'; the corresponding Oblique-to-Subject passive form is: Ø-ifidian-ana 'passive.present-stem.ifidian-suffix.ana', '(the-circumstances-under-which-someone/something)-is-chosen'.

Indeed it is true that sentence (6) does not mean ‘It’s the chicken that Bao bought’. However it is definitely a fully grammatical Malagasy sequence and it has the following reading: ‘As far as chickens are concerned, Bao bought some’, with the non-definite object ‘akoko’ ‘chickens’ in the plural in front and the verb ‘n-i-vidy’ ‘pst-pref.i-root.buy in the active voice. The item ‘ny’ is to be glossed not as definite article ‘ny’, which means something like ‘(all) the (members of a given set without exception)’, but rather as ‘topic’ ‘ny’ ‘as far as a number of members of a set are concerned’. The same crucial problem arises in a whole series of papers, to include but not restricted to Paul & Potsdam (2004) as well as Paul (2002).

2.1.2 Indirect object

An IO, as illustrated in (7), can be ‘promoted’ to subject as in (9), just like its DO counterpart in (8). However, a non-definite DO can be ‘fronted’, as in (10), but an IO as shown in (11) simply can NOT, as this yields an ungrammatical sentence.

- (7) Nanome (an’) ilay boky an’ i Paoly i Jeanne.
 N-an-ome (acc.) Dx.sg book prep D.sg Paul D.sg Jeanne.
 Past-pref.an-root.given the book belong.to Paul Jeanne
 ‘Jeanne gave the (previous mention) book to Paul.’
- (8) Nomen’ i Jeanne an’ i Paoly ilay boky.
 N(o)-ome-n(a) D.sg Jeanne prep D.sg Paul DX.sg book.
 Pass.past-stem.be.given-by Jeanne belong.to Paul the book
 ‘The (previous mention) book was given by Jeanne to Paul.’
- (9) Nomen’ i Jeanne (an’) ilay boky i Paoly.
 N(o)-ome-n(a) D.sg Jeanne (acc) DX.sg book D.sg Paul.
 Pass.past-stem.be.given-by Jeanne the book Paul
 ‘Paul was given the (previous mention) book by Jeanne.’
- (10) Ny boky no nanome an’ i Paoly i Jeanne.
 Ny boky no n-an-ome an’ i Paoly i Jeanne.
 Topic book focus past-pref.an-root.given prep D.sg Paul D.sg Jeanne
 ‘As far as books are concerned, Jeanne gave Paul some.’
- (11)>(*An’) i Paoly no nanome boky i Jeanne.
 (*Prep) D.sg Paul focus past-give book D.sg Jeanne
 ‘To Paul, Jeanne gave a book/books.’

There exist specific tests to distinguish between a DO and an IO, as detailed in Randriamasimanana (1986:655-661). In example (7), a Binary Branching analysis is

adopted, where the second occurrence of ‘an’ with a di-transitive verb is analysed as a preposition, i.e. part of a non-verbal predicate. At any rate, this detail will not affect the conclusions reached in this paper.

3. Instrument-Oblique

In Malagasy, although it is not strictly speaking part of the initial core of a simple sentence, an Instrument-Oblique is an argument since the head verb which licenses the relevant PP necessarily contains the feature [+CONTROL]; without this positively valued feature, there would simply not be an Instrument-Oblique, in the first place. This, of course, raises questions about the grammaticality judgment shown in Keenan (1976:269, ex. 57), and casts doubts on the claim made in Paul (2000:38, ex. 26a & ex. 26b), repeated in Pearson (2001:142, ex. 138a & ex. 138b). The ‘circumstantial’ passive voice indeed encodes the ‘promotion’ of an argument Oblique to Subject and the so-called ‘circumstantial’ or ‘relative’ voice form usually has the shape ‘an...ana’ or ‘i...ana’, depending on the relevant stem of the verb.

3.1 Fronted & non-fronted Instrument-PP in Malagasy

In Malagasy, an Instrument-Oblique can be expressed either in an active voice sequence as a non-fronted preposition phrase (PP) with ‘Ø-amina’ ‘non-perfective-with’ governed by a [+CONTROL] verb, as in (12), or as the grammatical subject of a verb in the ‘circumstantial’ passive voice, as in (13) or (14); this suggests that an Instrument-Oblique is and remains an argument of the verb independently of whether the verb is in the active or in the passive voice. In addition, of course, the subject can optionally be ‘fronted’. Thus, in (12), the Instrument-Oblique has not yet been ‘fronted’, whereas in (13) and (14), it has already been fronted. One further difference is that in (13), the preposition ‘Ø-amin(a)’ ‘non-perfective-with’ has disappeared, but the verb shows ‘circumstantial’ voice morphology with ‘an...ana’ surrounding the verbal stem; in (14), on the other hand, the preposition ‘Ø-amin(a)’ persists and at the same time, ‘circumstantial’ voice morphology appears on the verb.

For lack of space, consideration of the version of (13) will be left out, where the determiner ‘ny’ does not appear within the sentence although this is definitely a possibility. Sequence (15) below is an ‘authentic’ piece of data displaying this very feature, adapted from an on-line Malagasy website. Likewise, the alternative sequence to (13) will not be discussed, where the constituent ‘ny famaky’ ‘the axe’ has not been fronted and which according to a claim found in Paul (2000:37) should not exist, but which is a perfectly grammatical sentence in Malagasy. Indeed in (15) the derived

subject encoding an initial Instrument-Oblique has not been fronted; only the ‘circumstantial voice morphology on the verb ‘prefix.a(n>m)-stem.(v)oaah-suffix.ana’, i.e. ‘amoahana’ tells us that this constituent used to be an argument Instrument-Oblique in the active voice counterpart to (15).

- (12) Mamaky kitay (betsaka) amina famaky i Paoly.
 M-a(n>m)-(v)aky kitay (betsaka) Ø-amina famaky i Paoly.
 pres-pref.an-root.broken wood (a.lot) nonperf-with axe D.sg Paul
 ‘Paul is chopping (a lot of) wood with an axe.’
- (13) Ny famaky no amakian’i Paoly kitay.
 Ny⁶ famaky no Ø-a(n>m)-(v)aki-an(a) i
 Det axe focus pass.pres-an-stem.be.broken-suff.ana.by D.sg
 Paoly kitay.
 Paul wood
 Either ‘It is the axe that is being used by Paul to chop (some) wood’
 or ‘It is the axe that is habitually used by Paul to chop wood.’
- (14) Amin’ny famaky no amakian’i Paoly kitay.
 Ø-amin’ ny famaky no Ø-a(n>m)-(v)aki-an(a)
 nonperf-with Det axe foc pass.pres-an-stem.be.broken-ana.by
 i P. kitay.
 D.sg P. wood
 Either ‘It is with the axe that Paul is chopping wood’
 or ‘It is with the axe that habitually Paul is chopping (some) wood.’

Both (13) and (14) involving a ‘fronted’ Instrument-Oblique show that the so-called ‘circumstantial’ passive voice is mandatory in Malagasy. But even if the Instrument-Oblique PP was not ‘fronted’, as in (15) adapted from <http://www.haisoratra.org/>, the verb must still be in the circumstantial passive voice with the circumfix ‘an...ana’, as is quite evident around the verbal stem ‘voah(a)’ ‘be.opened’. Therefore, what is absolutely crucial is the co-occurrence of the ‘promotion’ of an argument of the verb, here an Instrument-Oblique ‘promoted’ to Subject, i.e. ‘ny Poezia’ ‘(the) Poetry’ and at the same time the critically important appearance of circumstantial passive morphology ‘an...ana’ surrounding the stem of the verb.

⁶ Det ny ‘(all) the (members of a given set)’ in this case refers to a set made up of one single member, who has already been properly identified either previously in the discourse or contextually.

- (15) Amoahan'ny mpanoratra ny hevitra amam-pihetseham-po.
 A(n>m)-(v)oa(h)a-an' ny mpanoratra ny hevitra
 an-stem.be.opened-an(a) Det mpanoratra Topic hevitra
 used to express by Det writers Topic ideas
 amam-pihetseham-po ao anatiny koa anefa ny Poezia...
 amam-pihetseham-po ao anati-ny koa anefa ny Poezia...
 as well as feelings there inside-of.them also however Det poetry
 Literally: 'Is also used by writers to express ideas as well as feelings inside
 them Poetry however.'
 English: 'Poetry is however also used by writers to express ideas as well as
 feelings inside them.'
- (16) Mamoaka ny hevitra amam-pihetseham-po ao anatiny.
 M-a(n>m)-(v)oa(h)a ny hevitra amam-pihetseham-po ao
 Pres-an-root.open Topic ideas as.well.as.feelings there
 anati-ny koa anefa ny mpanoratra amin' ny alàlan'ny Poezia.
 inside-of.them also however Det writers by-way.of Det poetry
 '(All) Writers express ideas as well as feelings they have inside them in the
 form of poetry.'

In sequence (15), we have the original statement whereas sentence (16) shows an intermediate structure provided in order to facilitate comprehension and comprising an Instrument-Oblique, 'amin' ny alàlan'ny Poezia' 'by way of poetry', with the preposition amin(a) overtly expressed alongside an active voice verb. A comparison shows that in (15), the preposition 'Ø-amin(a)' 'non-perfective-with' has apparently simply been 'absorbed' but the verb is in the circumstantial passive voice: the form 'an...ana' surrounds the passive verbal stem 'voah'. This contrasts with the root voaka for the active voice form of the same verb in sequence (16).

Last but not least, consider the following sequence involving an Instrument-Oblique from this excerpt shown in (17) adapted from on-line *Midi Madagascar*:

- (17) Io moa no nitifirany intelo ilay karana tompon'ny tsena.
 Io moa no n-i-tifir-an(a)-ny
 This indeed focus past-pref.i-stem.be.fired.on.with-suff.ana-by.him
 Intelo ilay karana tompo-n' ny tsena.
 three.times DX.sg (p.m.) Indian owner-of Det shop
 'It was this which was used by him to fire three times upon the Indian owner
 of the shop.'

- (18) Nitifitra (an') ilay karana tompo-n' ny tsena intelo tamin'io moa izy.
 N-i-tifitra (an') ilay karana tompo-n' ny tsena
 Past-pref.i-root.fire.on (acc) DX.sg Indian owner-of. the shop
 Intelo t-amin' io moa izy.
 three.times Perf-with this indeed s/he
 'He fired three times on the (previous mention) Indian owner of the shop
 with this.'

Once again, the Instrument-Oblique, 't-amin'io' 'perfective-with this', is overtly expressed in the active voice sequence (18) with the verb 'nitifitra' 'past-fire.on', and crucially the latter contains the positively valued feature [+CONTROL]. This presence makes the PP an argument of the verb. This Instrument-Oblique PP has been 'promoted' to subject in (17), losing its preposition 't-amin(a)' 'perfective-aspect-with' in the process and at the same time, as expected, this loss is compensated by 'circumstantial' voice morphology on the verbal stem with the circumfix 'i...ana' surrounding the verbal stem 'tifer'. In addition, there appears to be a very strong preference for 'fronting'.

3.2 Instrument-Oblique and published literature

There has been an unfortunate confusion in the published literature as to the argument status of Instrument-Oblique, probably due to a large extent to sentence (19) reproduced below. Initially, sequence (19) was released in Keenan (1976:269, ex. 57), which was re-interpreted as a typical Instrument-Oblique construction, and therefore emulated in (20), with slightly adapted glosses, from Paul (2000:103, ex. 21c), later repeated in Paul (2001) as well as in Pearson (2001:142, ex. 138a) and recently re-analysed in Law (2005:178, ex. 3). Nevertheless, a typical Instrument-Oblique involving passive voice was already available in Randriamasimanana (1986:466, ex. 63) and further explanations were provided in Randriamasimanana (2004b:271-280) along the lines sketched above in section 3.1.

- (19) Amin'ity savony ity no manasa lamba ny vehivavy.
 Ø-amin' ity savony ity no m-an-(s)asa
 Nonpast-with DX.sg soap DX.sg focus pres-an-root.wash
 lamba ny vehivavy.
 linen Det woman
 Intended reading: 'It is with this soap that Rasoa is washing clothes.'
 Actual reading: 'Hey, you women, with THIS soap, go and wash linen!'

- (20) Amin'ny penina no manoratra aho.
Ø-amin(a) ny penina no m-an-(s)oratra aho.
Nonperf-with Det pen focus pres-pref.an-root.write I
Intended reading: 'It is with the pen that I write.'

Sequence (20) where the Instrument-Oblique has been 'fronted' and where the verb is still in the active voice is simply not Malagasy: this preposition phrase is an argument of the verb *manoratra* 'to write', as the latter clearly describes a DELIBERATE kind of ACTIVITY; in other words, this verb does quite clearly contain the inherent feature [+CONTROL], as argued for in Randriamasimanana (1999:522-524) and the preposition phrase 'Ø-amin'ny penina' 'non-perfective-with the pen' is certainly NOT an adjunct, as claimed in Paul (2000:103). At any rate, (20) cannot receive an interpretation such as the one which may be allocated to (19), provided the latter is given an appropriate context and a special intonation.

Indeed, an Instrument-Oblique reading along the lines sketched in section 3.1 is simply impossible for (20), as that interpretation requires a circumstantial voice form 'an...ana' to surround a stem 'sorat'. On the other hand, it is possible with the relevant intonation to re-analyse the PP 'amin'ity savony ity' 'with this soap' in (19) as an adjunct to the active voice verb *manasa* 'to wash': The PP will bear a rising intonation while the rest of the sentence will carry another rising intonation, thereby giving rise to a double rise peak. One crucial consequence of this special intonation pattern is that the PP 'Ø-amin'ity savony ity' in (19) will be analysed as comprising a zero morpheme symbolised by Ø and representing a non-past tense, i.e. in this case, the present tense. The same type of double peak rise is totally impossible in (20). Furthermore, note the presence of a third person subject 'ny vehivavy' 'the women' in (19) the active voice verb 'manasa', which is ambiguous between a mere description of the event being referred to and an exhortation to carry out an activity: It is well-known that an active voice verb in Malagasy typically refers to the inception of the activity being described, as reported in Randriamasimanana (1999:513), and as a result can mean something like 'please start doing + the activity described by the verb'. Thus, with the exhortative reading the PP 'amin'ity savony ity' in (19) can be construed as an adjunct to the verb, hence the 'nonpast' gloss for the zero morpheme on 'Ø-amin(a)'. Last, the third person subject in (19) can then be re-construed as the addressee of a request for action given the scenario depicted above – along lines sketched in Randriamasimanana (1985). Only this interpretation is available to native speakers of Malagasy for sequence (19); the non-contextual Instrument-Oblique reading indicated in the intended meaning is definitely NOT possible.

(25) *Nandrahoan' ny lehilahy ny trondro ny vehivavy.

*N-an-(h)andraho-an(a) ny lehilahy ny trondro
 past-pref.an-stem.be.cooked.for-suff.ana the man the fish
 ny vehivavy
 the woman

Intended reading: 'The woman was cooked-for fish by the man.'

First note that in (25) the prefix an and the first syllable 'an' within the verbal stem '(h)andraho' fuse together via haplology, but the 'an...ana' circumstantial passive form is still quite apparent; in (24) the relevant form is 'i...ana' surrounding stem 'vidian'. Second, the definite article in front of both 'chicken' in (24) and 'fish' in (25) has been discreetly dropped from the English translation. In fact, to make the sentences in (24) and (25) perfectly grammatical, all we need to do is simply drop the definite article 'ny' in front of the DO 'akoho' 'chicken' in one and in front of DO 'trondro' 'fish', in the other. The reason why this is crucial is straightforward: The physical presence of a non-definite object will erase the DURATIVE feature associated with both verbal morphemes 'an...ana' and 'i...ana' when the head merges with its complement; this is very important given the specifier-head relation outlined earlier. To see how this type of feature erasure could be implemented, consult Randriamasimanana (2004b); for constructions very similar to the ones analysed above, see among others Sabel (2002), Sabel (2003) and Potsdam (2005).

4. Location-Oblique

Thus, in Malagasy an Instrument-Oblique is an argument of the verb since the latter necessarily comprises [+CONTROL] as part of its set of features. However the situation with a Location-Oblique is much more complicated, as already described and illustrated in Randriamasimanana (1999:515-516, ex. 8, 9, 10): First, a great deal depends on whether the relevant PP is governed by a [+CONTROL] verb, in which case it is an argument of the verb, whereas when the accompanying verb contains the negative valued feature [-CONTROL], then the PP is an adjunct; second, verbal aspect also seems to play a very important part in the process.

Randriamasimanana (1999:510, ex. 1) and (1999:515, ex. 8 & 9) shows that in a declarative statement with an active voice verb like 'go', a PP denoting a Oblique-Location is necessarily an argument of the verb which definitely contains the inherent feature [+CONTROL] whereas the situation is more complex with intransitive verbs like 'mipetraka' 'to sit down', which may have two totally different readings: On the one hand, there may be some kind of Control involved if the event being described

means something like ‘to take the action of deliberately sitting down’ as opposed to the other purely stative meaning, ‘to live, to stay’, in the sense of ‘to happen to be living (somewhere), to happen to be staying (somewhere)’, which does not seem to involve any Control whatsoever. In what follows, we consider questions involving a motion verb, which one expects would be a rather characteristic [+CONTROL] type of verb and contrast the situation of Wh-questions with that of Echo questions.

4.1 Wh-question

With Wh-questions involving a Location-Oblique in focus, a verb containing the inherent feature [+CONTROL] must be in the ‘circumstantial’ passive voice. This clearly contradicts one claim made in Sabel (2003:232, ex. 6a) as well as in Potsdam (2004:246, ex. 5a). At any rate in the case of sequence (26), the a-passive form is the relevant morpheme since we are dealing with a motion verb. What is absolutely crucial here is that with this type of non-Echo question, there is only one intonation peak that rises steadily from the beginning of the utterance to its very end. In addition, it is worth noting that sequence (26) can appear discourse-initially.

- (26) Taiza no nalehanareo?⁸
 T-aiza no n-a-leha-nareo?
 Perf-where focus past-a.pass-root.go-by.you.plural
 Literally: ‘Where is gone-to by you (all)?’
 ‘Where did you (all) go?’

In (26) the governing verb is in the a-passive voice and the morpheme *t-* is analysed as a perfective aspect-marker; this indicates that this PP is an argument of the verb and that the latter has to be in the passive voice: The verb *mandeha* ‘pres-go’ contains the inherent feature [+CONTROL].

One interesting characteristic of a motion verb like the one in (26) is that it shows that the feature [+CONTROL] can accommodate either DURATIVE or PUNCTUAL

⁸ Here is one non-Wh-question example of a ‘fronted’ Location-Oblique PP involving a non-motion verb in the DURATIVE aspect & the circumstantial passive circumfix ‘an...ana’:
 From <http://www.taratramada.com/>, 23 November 2005

Tany amin’ny Cap d’Antibes, Cote d’Azur no nanaovana ny fakana sary azy ireo.
 T-any amin’ny Cap d’Antibes, Cote d’Azur no n-an-(t)aov-ana
 perf-there at Cap d’Antibes, Cote d’Azur focus past-an-stem.be.done-ana
 ny fakana sary azy ireo.
 Nom. Taking picture them
 ‘It was at Cap d’Antibes, Cote d’Azur where the taking of their pictures was done.’

aspect, a distinction already introduced in section 3.3. Indeed, on the one hand, the combination of PUNCTUAL with [+CONTROL] will materialise as the passive circumfix ‘no...ina’, as in (21); on the other hand, the combination of DURATIVE with [+CONTROL] will yield the passive circumfix ‘an...ana’, as in (15) or ‘i...ana’, as in (17). If we now add INCEPTIVE as a feature to the initial combination [+CONTROL] & PUNCTUAL, then typically this latest combination will be encoded as a-passive, as in (26), especially when reference is made to the INITIAL IMPULSE of whatever is described by the verb. The above piece of Malagasy data suggests that a-passive subsystem is midway between the ‘no...ina’ type (DO> Subject) and the ‘an...ana’ or ‘i...ana’ type (Oblique>Subject).

4.2 Echo question

In an Echo-type question involving a motion verb, as in (27) and (28) below, we note a special intonation whereby the portion ‘taiza ianareo’ ‘t-aiza ianareo’ ‘past-where you.plural’ in (27) bears an intonation rise and the rest, ‘no nandeha’ ‘focus past-go’, has a second intonation rise as well. The same holds true of (28), where ‘taiza’ has an intonation rise and so will ‘nandeha ianareo’. This practically means that as used here the verb mandeha ‘pres-go’ contains the feature [-CONTROL]. In addition, (27) and (28) are appropriate as requests for confirmation, hence the label ‘Echo questions’ since literally the speaker is quoting from a previous statement in the relevant adjacent pair of utterances. This means an appropriate context⁹ is required.

- (27) Taiza ianareo no nandeha?
 T-aiza ianareo no n-an-(l>d)eha?
 Past-where you.plur focus past-pref.an-root.go
 ‘Where did you say YOU went?’

⁹ Here is a similar, but authentic echo-type question from website <http://www.serasera.com/mpandefa> (sender): Herimiasina 21-09-2005 21:42:20

Taiza ianao no nahita omby mifoka sigara, mirevy, na misotro cafe?
 T-aiza ianao no n-ahita omby m-ifoka sigara, m-irevy,
 past-where you focus past-root.see cows pres.root.smoke cigars, prs-rt.dream,
 na m-isotro cafe?
 or prs-rt.drink coffee?

‘Where have you (ever) seen cows that smoke cigars, dream or drink coffee?’

Note the verb ‘n-ahita’ ‘past-root.see’ in the active voice with the ‘fronted’ ‘t-aiza’. This is NOT a question at all, as the writer is certainly not expecting an answer. He is chiding his interlocutor.

- (28) Taiza no nandeha ianareo?
 T-aiza no n-an-(l>d)eha ianareo?
 Past-where focus past-pref.an-root.go you.plural
 ‘Where did you say you went?’

In both (27) and (28) the verb is in the active voice and the morpheme *t-* is analysed as a past tense-marker and not as an aspect-marker; this signals that the PP ‘*t-aiza*’ ‘past-where’ is an adjunct to the verb. In general, neither is appropriate discourse-initially and always presupposes a previous initial statement involving a location. Prototypically this type of Echo-question features copying a portion of the relevant initial statement, which usually corresponds to the verb; in other words, the verb ‘*nandeha*’ ‘past-go’ is a quote from an earlier utterance within the discourse and that (27) and (28) are the second utterances of two adjacent pairs.

5. Argument vs adjunct

As demonstrated in section 3.2 the notion of Control plays a crucial role in determining the argument as opposed to the adjunct status of a given constituent, in particular, where a PP is concerned. A PP governed by a typically transitive verb and involving Control defined as some activity to be carried out intentionally and in a deliberate manner is more likely to be an argument. By way of contrast, a PP accompanying a STATIVE intransitive verb characterised by absence of Control, i.e. not intentionally as shown in (33) section 5.2, is more likely to be an adjunct. In this connection, note that in Randriamasimanana (1986:29-74), a whole section is indeed devoted to this notion of Control, which brings with it a number of properties.

5.1 Argument PP, typically transitive V & control

In (29) we have a typical active voice sequence with an Instrument-Oblique PP, *tamin’ny antsy* ‘with the knife’, whereas in (30) the verb has the circumstantial voice ‘*an...ana*’ morpheme along with the ‘fronted’ PP. By contrast, in both (31) adapted from Paul (2000:38, ex. 26b) and (32) adapted from Pearson (2003, ex. 14a), the verb is in the active voice and both sequences are irretrievably ungrammatical.

- (29) Nandidy hena tamin’ny antsy i Bakoly.
 N-an-didy hena t-amin’ ny antsy i Bakoly.
 Past-pref.an-root.cut meat perf-with Det knife D.sg Bakoly
 ‘Bakoly was cutting meat with the knife.’

- (30) Tamin'ny antsy no nandidian'i Bakoly hena.
 T-amin(a) ny antsy no n-an-didi-an(a)¹⁰ i Bakoly hena.
 Perf-with Det knife focus past-an-stem.be.cut-ana D.sg Bakoly meat
 'It was with the knife that meat was being cut by Bakoly.'
- (31) *Tamin'ny antsy no nandidy hena i Bakoly.
 T-amin(a) ny antsy no n-an-didy hena i Bakoly.
 Perf-with Det knife focus past-an-root.cut meat D.sg Bakoly
 Intended reading: 'It was with the knife that meat was cut by Bakoly.'
- (32) *Amin'ny antsy no mamono ny akoho ny mpamboly.
 Ø-amin(a) ny antsy no m-a(n>m)-(v)ono ny akoho
 Non-perf-with Det knife focus pres-an-root.kill Det chicken
 ny mpamboly.
 Det farmer
 Intended reading: 'It is with the knife that the farmers kill the chickens.'

The reason for the ungrammaticality of (31) and (32) is straightforward: The verb *nandidy* 'was cutting' or *mamono* 'is killing' describes a DELIBERATE kind of ACTIVITY and as a direct result of this contains the feature [+CONTROL]; as a further result, the PP 'tamin'ny antsy' is automatically an argument of the verb and the verb must have the circumstantial voice morphology 'an...ana' surrounding the verbal stem 'didi' for the first and 'vono' for the second. Furthermore, as the action of cutting in (29) is DURATIVE in nature, it is the 'an...ana' form of circumstantial passive encoding DURATION, which is used.

5.2 Adjunct PP, typically intransitive V & absence of control

We now consider the case of sequence (33) involving a typical STATIVE intransitive kind of verb, *mirofotra* 'to explode' with a non-fronted PP, adapted from Rabenilaina (1985) and its counterpart (34) with a fronted PP, adapted from Randria-

¹⁰ In Paul (2000:27, ex. 12b), the claim is made that the a-passive typically promotes an instrument to subject. However as noted in section 4.1 a-passive includes INCEPTIVE among its features.

A-didy ny hena ny antsy
 a.pass-root.cut Det meat Det knife
 'The knife is used to cut the meat'.

It has to be noted that this sequence is only acceptable if what is being referred to here is an electric knife. However the overwhelming majority of Malagasy speakers simply do not have access to one.

masimanana (1998). It is certainly significant that this typical verb simply does not have a passive voice form of any kind at all in the entire grammar of Malagasy.

- (33) Nirofotra teo amin'ny tarehin'i Soa ny mony.
 N-i-rofotra t-eo amin'ny tarehi-n' i Soa ny mony.
 Past-pref.i-root.explode past-there on Det face-of D.sg Soa Det pimples
 'Pimples exploded on Soa's face.'
- (34) Teo amin'ny tarehin'i Soa no nirofotra ny mony.
 T-eo amin'ny tarehi-n' i Soa no n-i-rofotra
 Past-there on the face-of D.sg Soa focus past-pref.i-root.explode
 ny mony.
 Det pimples
 'It was on Soa's face that pimples exploded.'

The verb *nirofotra* 'to explode' does NOT describe a DELIBERATE kind of ACTIVITY and is a STATIVE verb. It contains a negative feature [-CONTROL]; as a result, in (33) the PP 't-eo amin'ny tarehi-n'i Soa' 'past-there on the face of Soa' is an adjunct: This is made obvious via the pattern 'past-tense' on the verb and 'past-tense' on the PP itself. When an adjunct is 'fronted', this does not require passive voice morphology on the verb. In fact, in (34), the verb remains in the active voice; and interestingly enough, no special intonation of the kind outlined earlier is necessary. For further illustrations of the distinction between argument & adjunct in Malagasy, consult Randriamasimanana (1999:509-528).

6. Focus phrase with 'no', fronting of argument vs fronting of adjunct

In addition to prototypical arguments, as discussed in section 5.1 and proto-typical adjuncts, as outlined in section 5.2, there exist cases where one verb may contain either feature [+CONTROL] or [-CONTROL] depending on their usage. Here as before, the fact remains that the [+CONTROL] usage of a verb will force an accompanying PP-Location to be considered as an argument, whereas the inherent feature [-CONTROL] usage of the verb will take the accompanying PP-Location only as an adjunct. Once again, when an argument is 'fronted' circumstantial passive voice morphology must appear on the verb, whereas when an adjunct is 'fronted', the verb remains in the active voice.

6.1 Verbs with an optional feature [+CONTROL] or [-CONTROL]

The verb *mianatra* ‘pres-pref.i-anatra’ ‘to study’ in sequence (35) is a typical verb, which may contain either inherent feature [+CONTROL] with a positive value or [-CONTROL] with a negative value, depending on its usage. Depending on which value of the feature is relevant, the sequence may mean one thing, i.e. the first reading provided below or another, i.e. the second interpretation given.

- (35) *Mianatra ao an-davarangana i Soa.*
 M-i-anatra Ø-ao an-(l>d)avarangana i Soa.
 Pres-pref.i-root.study nonperf/nonpast-there at-balcony D.sg Soa
 Either ‘Soa is studying on the balcony’
 or ‘(Please) Soa, go and study on the balcony.’

In fact, (35) is ambiguous between a [+CONTROL] reading and a [-CONTROL] interpretation. In its [+CONTROL] reading, a somewhat elaborate context is required as the sequence receives three different and somewhat rising intonation peaks from beginning to end: Thus there is a first peak on head verb ‘*mianatra*’ ‘to study’, then follows a second peak on the Location PP ‘*ao an-davarangana*’ ‘on the balcony’ and a third peak on the subject ‘*i Soa*.’

By contrast, in its [-CONTROL] interpretation, the utterance has one steadily falling intonation from beginning to end; we may take this to be the unmarked reading for this verb, which after all is an intransitive verb. In other words, the [+CONTROL] reading is something like ‘(Please) Soa, go and study on the balcony’, whereas the other purely descriptive one, i.e. [-CONTROL] interpretation can be translated as ‘Soa is studying on the balcony.’ In the [+CONTROL] reading, the Location PP ‘*ao an-davarangana*’ ‘on the balcony’ is an argument of the verb and the zero morpheme Ø on the preposition ‘Ø-ao’ is analysed as a non-perfective aspect-marker; by contrast, in its [-CONTROL] interpretation, the Location-Oblique PP ‘*ao an-davarangana*’ ‘on the balcony’ is an adjunct to the verb and the zero morpheme Ø on the preposition ‘Ø-ao’ is analysed as a non-past tense-marker. Recall that the hallmark of an adjunction in Malagasy is the parallel between two tense-markers, one on the verb and the other on the accompanying PP.

6.2 Fronting of adjunct

Consider the [-CONTROL] reading of (35) first: the PP ‘Ø-ao an-davaran-gana’ ‘on the balcony’ is an adjunct to the verb, the zero morpheme Ø being analysed as ‘non-

past' tense and when it is 'fronted', the verb remains in the active voice, as shown in (36).

- (36) Ao an-davarangana no mianatra i Soa.
 Ø-ao an-davarangana no m-i-anatra i Soa.
 nonpast-there on-balcony focus pres-prf.i-root.study D.sg Soa
 'It is on the balcony that Soa (usually) studies.'

Sequence (36) features the verb 'mianatra' 'to study' in its [-CONTROL] meaning, i.e. a mere description and contrary to the situation in (37), certainly not an injunction nor a request for action. Note the parallel between two tense-markers within the sentence, i.e. 'Ø-ao' 'non-past tense-marker' on PP and 'present tense-marker' on the verb 'mianatra' 'to study', the hallmark of adjunction in Malagasy.

6.3 Fronting of argument

Now consider the [+CONTROL] interpretation of (35), which has been adapted from Randriamasimanana (1998) repeated as (37) below: The PP 'Ø-ao an-davarangana' 'on the balcony' is an argument of the verb, the zero morpheme Ø being analysed as 'non-perfective' aspect-marker and when this PP is 'fronted', the verb must take the circumstantial voice with the circumfix 'i...ana' surrounding the verbal stem 'anar', as shown in (38).

- (37) Mianatra ao an-davarangana i Soa.
 M-i-anatra Ø-ao an-davarangana i Soa.
 Pres-prf.i-root.study nonperf-there on-balcony D.sg Soa
 'Soa, (go and) study on the balcony!'
- (38) Ao an-davarangana no ianaran'i Soa.
 Ø-ao an-davarangana no i- anar- an(a) i Soa.
 nonperf-there on-balcony focus i-pass-stem.be.studied-ana D.sg Soa
 'Soa, (go) on the balcony and study there!'

Recall that given the special intonation described in section 6.1, sequence (37) is either an injunction or a request. The verb 'mianatra' 'to study' as used here contains the inherent feature [+CONTROL], which automatically makes the accompanying PP an argument.

7. Incorporation

One prototypical adjunct within a Malagasy sentence is Time-Oblique. But even this kind of Oblique adjunct can optionally be incorporated, i.e. ‘turned’ into a proper argument first and thus made part of the initial core of the clause. This process seems to be related to verbal aspect and crucially depends on the compatibility of the set of features accompanying a head verb with [+CONTROL]. This process is missing in considerations of typical adjuncts in Paul (2000:91-130), who claims that an ‘adjunct can be promoted directly to subject’ and this is somehow echoed in Pearson (2001:141-149). While such a claim may be able to accommodate data such as (41) below with a circumstantial voice passive ‘i..ana’ form, it would be rather difficult to explain why certain verbs such as *mirofotra* ‘to explode’ in (33) and (34) above simply do not have any passive form of any kind at all.

7.1 Initial adjunct PP

A prototypical Malagasy adjunct is Time-Oblique, such as the PP ‘*t-amin’ny herin’ny sabotsy lasa*’ ‘past-on the return of the Saturday before last’ ‘the Saturday before last’ found in (39).

- (39) *Niala teto Rabe tamin’ny herin’ny sabotsy lasa.*
 N-i-ala t-eto Rabe t-amin’ny herin(a)’ ny
 Past-pref.i-root.leave perf-here past-on the return-of Det
sabotsy lasa.
 Saturday gone
 ‘The Saturday before last, Rabe left here.’

One interesting feature of a typical adjunct PP is that it is usually located to the right of the grammatical subject, in the case of (39) ‘*Rabe*’ and is part of a steadily falling intonation pattern from the beginning to the end of the utterance, with only a slight pause in front of ‘*tamin(a)*’: Thus in (39), *Rabe* is the subject and the relevant PP ‘*t-amin’ny herin’ny sabotsy lasa*’ ‘the Saturday before last’ shows up after the subject ‘*Rabe*’; also note that the morpheme *t-* on the preposition ‘*amin(a)*’ is a past tense-marker, not a perfective aspect-marker.

7.2 Intermediate structure

The sequence in (39) is the unmarked version of the utterance, while (40) is its marked counterpart, as it involves a first big pause after the Time-Oblique ‘teto’ ‘perf-here’ and a second big pause after the verb ‘lasa’ ‘gone’.

- (40) Niala teto tamin’ny herin’ny sabotsy lasa Rabe.
 N-i-ala t-eto t-amin(a) ny herin(a) ny sabotsy
 Past-pref.i-root.leave perf-here past-on the return-of. Det Saturday
 lasa Rabe.
 gone Rabe
 ‘Rabe left here the Saturday before last.’

As (40) shows, it is possible to have the Time-Oblique PP ‘tamin’ny herin’ny sabotsy lasa’ ‘the Saturday before last’ immediately to the left of the grammatical subject ‘Rabe’. This now makes such a displaced PP eligible for incorporation into the adjacent VP headed by the verb ‘niala’ ‘past-leave’, once the ‘past-tense’ feature for morpheme ‘t-’ has been switched to ‘perfective aspect’ feature; this is a plausible move since morpheme ‘t-’ is ambiguous between those two values just referred to. For a justification of the necessity of adjacency in Malagasy, consult Randriamasimanana (2004a).

7.3 Fronting after incorporation

One crucial detail apparently associated with incorporation of a Time-Oblique is that such a process is invariably accompanied by ‘fronting’ of the incorporated PP, in this case, the Time-Oblique ‘tamin’ny herin’ny sabotsy lasa’ ‘the Saturday before last’, as shown in (41). A non-fronted PP in (41) would make it ungrammatical.

- (41) Tamin’ny herin’ny sabotsy lasa no nialan-dRabe teto.
 T-amin(a)’ ny herin(a)’ ny sabotsy lasa no
 Perf-on Det return-of the Saturday gone focus
 n- i- al(a)- an(a)-d- Rabe t-eto.
 past-pref.i-stem.be.left-ana-epenthetic.d-Rabe perf-here
 ‘It was on the Saturday before last that Rabe was leaving here.’

In (41) the PP ‘tamin’ny herin’ny sabotsy’ is a derived argument of the verb and that now DURATIVE circumstantial voice morphology indicated by the circumfix ‘i...ana’

is obligatory around the verbal stem ‘ala’. With this example, the verb ‘nialana’ is in the circumstantial passive and we have a case of so-called internal viewing perspective and the verb contains the feature [+CONTROL].

7.4 Fronting without incorporation

On the other hand, in sequence (42) the PP ‘tamin’ny herin’ny sabotsy’ is an adjunct to the verb and as a consequence, ‘fronting’ it does not require passive morphology at all. And, of course, the adjunct can be left non-fronted, as in (39).

- (42) Tamin’ny herin’ny sabotsy lasa no niala teto Rabe.
T-amin(a) ny herin(a) ny sabotsy lasa no n-i-ala
Past-on the return-of the Saturday gone focus past-i-root.leave
t-eto Rabe.
perf-here Rabe
‘It was on the Saturday before last that Rabe left.’

Here the verb niala ‘past-leave’ ‘left.PUNCTUAL aspect’, contains the negatively valued feature [-CONTROL] and we have a case of the so-called external viewing perspective indicated in English by the use of the non-progressive aspect. For further details on Malagasy incorporation, consult Randriamasimanana (2004a:421-422).

8. Conclusions

In this paper, it has been shown that simple Malagasy sentences may typically comprise a core as well as a periphery. Thus core will comprise a DO in the case of a transitive verb as in (1) and an IO in that of a di-transitive verb as in (7) at least, in an active voice sequence whereas periphery will include typical adjuncts such as Time-Oblique, for instance, as shown in (39). In-between those two quite distinct and well-defined zones, we have a rather fuzzy area where optionality of a given constituent is possible but where an Instrument-Oblique as in (29) always behaves like an argument as such a PP is typically constituent-selected by a [+CONTROL] verb. Likewise, with a Location-Oblique, pretty much depends on the type of verb involved and whether the latter contains the positively valued feature [+CONTROL] or not: When a given PP is selected by a [+CONTROL] predicate, the PP is an argument, as in (26); whereas if the PP is accompanied by a negatively valued [-CONTROL] predicate, the PP is only an adjunct, as in (27) or (28). This confirms results already reported in Randriamasimanana (1999) with respect to motion verbs and Location-Oblique PPs in declarative

statements. However certain verbs like *mianatra* ‘to study’ in (35) may have a positively valued feature or a negatively valued feature depending on their wider context of use, as reflected in the intonation pattern of the entire utterance.

At any rate, even though it is not part of the core but rather inside the so-called fuzzy area alluded to in section 1, an Instrument-Oblique is a ‘derived’ argument of its governing verb, which necessarily contains the feature [+CONTROL]. In fact, neglect of this feature has led to consequences described in section 3.2. The situation is slightly more complex with a Location-Oblique: This type of PP is not part of the core either and is also located inside the same fuzzy area; however, in this case, here either [+CONTROL] with a motion verb, as shown in section 4.1 is plausible just like [-CONTROL] with a STATIVE verb, as illustrated in section 5.2. This means that a Location-Oblique can be an argument with a [+CONTROL] verb, as in (26) but an adjunct with a negatively valued feature [-CONTROL] verb, as in (33). Above and beyond this, it is a fact that the passive voice system in Malagasy presents a tripartite division into a ‘no...ina’ passive, on the one hand and an ‘an/i...ana’ passive on the other; between those two subareas lies another ‘fuzzy’ zone, where the quintessential characteristic feature of a-passive manifests itself.

As outlined in section 3.3 verbal aspect does play a major role in the grammar of this language and this is most evident in the passive voice system. Thus it seems that the feature [+/-CONTROL] inside a verb determines to a large extent whether an accompanying PP is likely to be an argument, as in (12) or an adjunct, as in (33), whether the verb is in the active or the passive voice. Furthermore if one additional feature, i.e. INCEPTIVE, a significant characteristic of a-passive, is added to either PUNCTUAL or DURATIVE, as suggested relative to (26), then it becomes possible to switch from one subsystem of passive, i.e. ‘(no)...ina’ form, as in (21), involving promotion of a DO to Subject to the other subsystem, i.e. ‘i/an...ana’ form, as in (23), involving promotion of an Oblique to Subject.

Somehow linked to quantification and therefore related to the contrast between PUNCTUAL and DURATIVE verbal aspects is the selection between the two values of Malagasy ‘ny’ -- assuming a type of specifier-head relation between verbal inflections and the grammatical subject as envisaged in section 3.3: In its Det value, ‘ny’ may refer to all members of a given set, as in (13) -- where it just so happens that here the set only comprises one member -- whereas in its Topic value, ‘ny’ designates only some members NOT all, of a given set, as illustrated in (3), (4) and (6). This will go some way towards explaining why in Malagasy it is possible to front a non-definite DO even though the verb remains in the active voice, a fact which is being denied in the published literature so far, as discussed in section 2.1.1.

In addition, it is also worth noting that even typical adjuncts like Time-Oblique may find their set of inherent features compatible with [+CONTROL], and resort to incorporation, thereby undergoing a switch. Nevertheless it must be emphasised that this possibility rests with the head verb and that not all verbs can undergo this process; and precisely this is where the feature [+CONTROL] makes a crucial difference, as apparently a prototypically STATIVE verb like *mirofotra* ‘present-explode’ is fundamentally incompatible with this feature.

Last but not least, it is to be hoped that a number of issues raised in this paper, such as the correlation between the [+CONTROL] feature and *wh*-questions will help shed some light on the Malagasy data proposed in numerous papers on this language, to include Potsdam (2004), Potsdam (2005), Sabel (2002) and Sabel (2003). However an in-depth study of the intricacies involved in the myriad aspects of all the phenomena evoked here lies beyond the scope of a short paper like this one and will have to await further research.

References

- Keenan, Edward L. 1976. Remarkable subjects in Malagasy. *Subject and Topic*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 303-334. New York: Academic Press.
- Law, Paul. 2005. Questions and clefts in Malagasy. *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics* 12: *Proceedings of AFLA-12*, ed. by Jeffrey Heinz and Dimitris Ntelitheos, 195-209. Los Angeles: UCLA.
- Paul, Ileana, and Eric Potsdam. 2004. How to sluice in the wh-in-situ language Malagasy. Paper presented at the 40th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Paul, Ileana. 2000. *Malagasy Clause Structure*. Montréal: McGill University dissertation.
- Paul, Ileana. 2001. Concealed pseudo-clefts. *Lingua* 111.10:707-727.
- Paul, Ileana. 2002. An explanation of extraction asymmetries in Malagasy. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 2.1:99-122. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pearson, Matthew. 2001. *The Clause Structure of Malagasy: A Minimalist Approach*. Los Angeles: UCLA dissertation.
- Pearson, Matthew. 2003. Malagasy voice morphology and agreement. AFLA-10 handout. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Potsdam, Eric. 2003. Ellipsis identity and Malagasy sluicing. Paper presented at AFLA-10. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Potsdam, Eric. 2004. Wh-questions in Malagasy. *Proceedings of AFLA-11*, ed. by Paul Law. Berlin: ZAS.
- Potsdam, Eric. 2005. The clausal typing hypothesis and optional wh-movement in Malagasy. Colloque de Syntaxe et Sémantique handout. Paris: Université Paris VI.
- Rabenilaina, Roger-Bruno. 1985. *Lexique-Grammaire du Malgache*. Paris: Université Paris VII dissertation.
- Rajaona, Siméon. 1969. *Takelaka Notsongaina*, Vol. 2: *Lahatsoratra Tsotra*. Fianarantsoa: Ambozontany.
- Randriamasimanana, Charles. 1985. Tense/aspect and locatability in Malagasy. *University of Melbourne Working Papers in Linguistics* 11, 109-136. Melbourne: University of Melbourne.
- Randriamasimanana, Charles. 1986. *The Causatives of Malagasy*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 21. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Randriamasimanana, Charles. 1994. Malagasy and universal grammar. *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. by Cecilia Odé and Wim Stokhof, 483-496. Leiden: Leiden University.
- Randriamasimanana, Charles. 1998. Passive as incorporation in Malayo-Polynesian Languages. Invited talk to AFLA-5. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

- Randriamasimanana, Charles. 1999. Clausal architecture and movement verbs in Malagasy. *Selected Papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. by Elizabeth Zeitoun and Paul Jen-kuei Li, 509-527. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Randriamasimanana, Charles. 2002. Binary branching and null subjects in Malagasy. *Language and Linguistics* 3.1:43-78.
- Randriamasimanana, Charles. 2004a. Malagasy and Formosan languages: a comparison. *Language and Linguistics* 5.2:409-431.
- Randriamasimanana, Charles. 2004b. Relation tête-spécifieur et analyses en traits pertinents en malgache. *Faits de Langues — Les langues austronésiennes*, No. 23-24, ed. by Elizabeth Zeitoun, 271-280. Gap: Ophrys.
- Sabel, Joachim. 2002. Wh-questions and extraction asymmetries in Malagasy. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 44: *Proceedings of AFLA-8*, ed. by A. Rackowski and N. Richards, 309-323. Cambridge: MITWPL.
- Sabel, Joachim. 2003. Malagasy as an optional multiple wh-fronting language. *Multiple Wh-fronting*, ed. by Cedric Boeckx and Kleantes Grohman, 229-254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- <http://www.haisoratra.org/> *Ny Haisoratra Malagasy on-line* (Malagasy Arts & Letters on-line), Thursday 6 March 2003, put on-line by Hajanolalaina.
- <http://www.midi-madagasikara.mg/> *Midi Madagascar*, dated 21 October 2005.
- <http://www.serasera.com/> 21-09-2005 21:42:20.
- <http://www.taratramada.com/> 23 November 2005.
- <http://www.wanadoo.mg/forums/read.php?> Re: Voyage en Inde, Par: lalaiko, Date: 28 Septembre 2005 - 10:58.

LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS is a department of the INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS, ACADEMIA SINICA. It furthers the Institute's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing pioneering articles and monographs in Linguistics and other related fields. All publications have been reviewed rigorously according to academic standards.

Copyright © 2006 by INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS, ACADEMIA SINICA
128, Sec. 2, Academia Road, Nankang, Taipei 11529, Taiwan, R. O. C.
<http://www.ling.sinica.edu.tw>
All rights reserved.

LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS MONOGRAPH SERIES NUMBER W-5

Henry Y. Chang, Lillian M. Huang, and Dah-an Ho (Editors):

STREAMS CONVERGING INTO AN OCEAN: FESTSCHRIFT IN HONOR OF PROFESSOR PAUL JEN-KUEI LI ON HIS 70TH BIRTHDAY

《語言暨語言學》

《語言暨語言學》隸屬於中央研究院語言學研究所，以出版語言學及相關領域之最新研究成果為宗旨。所有出版品均經過嚴格學術審查。

《語言暨語言學》專刊外編之五

百川匯海：李壬癸先生七秩壽慶論文集

編輯：張永利 黃美金 何大安

出版及發行：中央研究院 語言學研究所
115 台北市 南港區 研究院路 2 段 128 號
<http://www.ling.sinica.edu.tw>
版權所有 翻印必究

印刷：文盛彩藝事業有限公司
初版：中華民國九十五年十月 [2006]
定價：新台幣900元／US\$50

ISBN-13: 978-986-00-6784-2 (精裝)

ISBN-10: 986-00-6784-8 (精裝)

GPN: 1009502736