



In this talk I would like to investigate the nature of sprouting, in particular, why it seems not to apply to a group of Austronesian languages.

## 2.0 Conditions on Tagalog

It is clear that certain licensing conditions must be met for sluicing to occur, however the precise nature however of those conditions has been greatly debated.

*Semantic entailment* (Merchant 2001): The antecedent clause entails the deleted portion and vice versa.

*Feature matching* (Chung 2005): Every morpheme in the deleted part of the sluice must be present in the antecedent clause whether semantically contentful or not.

The latter is clearly the stronger condition and can be seen to prevent such ungrammatical sentences as the following:

(5) \*Someone arrested Alex, but we don't know [by who \_]. (Merchant 2001:35)

(6) ??Pära ufan-ma-gächa', lao ti in-tingu' [hayi \_]. (Chung 2005 ex.44)  
FUT AGR-PASS-catch but not AGR-know who?  
 (They'll be caught, but we don't know who [will catch them].)

But certain featural mismatches must be countenanced by the *feature matching* condition. The Chamorro antipassive (*man-*) in the antecedent clause need not correspond to a morphological antipassive in the deleted portion since extraction necessitates what Chung considers to be *wh*-agreement. This is taken to be inflectional morphology *not* (derivational) voice morphology and thus irrelevant for feature matching. Thus (7) is licensed despite the fact that the verbal morphology of the deleted verb must differ in the two clauses as shown in (8) (Chung 2005, ex.10).

(7) K<um>ékuentus pälu finu' China na linguahi,  
<AGR> speak.PROG some language China LNK language  
 'He speaks some Asian language,

lao ti ta-tungu' [hafa na klasi-n linguahi \_].  
but not AGR-know what LNK type-LNK language  
 but we don't know what kind of language.' (Chung 2005, ex.11)

(8) Hafa na linguahi kuentótos-ña / \*kumékuentus?  
what LNK language WH[obl].speak-AGR.PROG / AGR.speak.PROG  
 'What language does he speak?'

Sentences like (9) on the other hand (Chung 2005,ex.15) are marked because they are derived from a structure as in (10) (Chung 2005,ex.36). Here it is claimed that in (10) a null preposition © is stranded in the deleted portion of the sentence and does not have a counterpart in the antecedent clause.

- (9) ??Man-préprensa si Dolores, lao ti hu-tungu' [hafa \_].  
AGR.AP-iron.PROG Dolores but not AGR-know what?  
 (Dolores is ironing, but I don't know what.)

- (10) Man-préprensa si Dolores, lao ti hu-tungu' [hafa [man-préprensa si Dolores © --]]  
AGR.AP-iron.PROG Dolores but not AGR-know what? AGR.AP-iron.PROG Dolores

I'd like to show here that, whether or not a stranded null element in the deleted portion is relevant in Chamorro, the pattern in (9) is the norm in Philippine-type languages and absent in those Austronesian languages which have lost the full voice system. Furthermore, the ungrammaticality exists in languages which clearly do not strand a null case marker in the sluice.

### 3.0 Sluicing in Tagalog

Tagalog may sluice any argument via “merger”, that is, when it is introduced in the antecedent clause by an indefinite np. this applies to both agents of non-AV verbs (11) and patients of AV verbs (12).

- (11) S<in>ulat ito ng isa sa mga bata pero hindi ko alam kung sino.  
PV.PRF-write this.NOM GEN one OBL PL child but NEG 1S.GEN know COMP who.NOM  
 ‘This was written by one of the children but I don't know who.’

- (12) Nag-basa ng tula si Danilo pero hindi ko alam kung alin.  
AV.PRF-read GEN poem P.NOM D. but NEG 1S.GEN know COMP which  
 ‘Danilo read a poem but I don't know which.’

Sluicing may also take place freely with adjuncts (13) and with implicit goals (14).

- (13) Nag-pa-kasal daw si Ligaya, hula-an mo kung kailan/bakit/saan/paano.  
AV.PRF-study RPRT P.NOM L. guess-LV.INF 2S.GEN COMP when/why/where/how  
 ‘They say Ligaya got married, guess when/why/where/how.’

- (14) Nag-bigay sila ng pera pero hindi ko alam kung kanino.  
AV.PRF-give 3p.NOM GEN money but NEG 1S.GEN know COMP to.whom  
 ‘They gave money but I don't know to whom.’

Sluicing is not well-attested in Tagalog with an implicit (*ng* case) argument of an AV-verb in the antecedent clause and totally ungrammatical with an implicit (*ng* case) argument of a non-AV verb.

- (15) \*S<in>ulat ito pero hindi ko alam kung sino.  
PV.PRF-write this.NOM but NEG 1S.GEN know COMP who.NOM  
 (‘This was written but I don't know who.’)

- (16) ??K<um>a-kanta si Migs pero hindi ko alam kung ano.  
 AV-PROG-sing P.NOM M. but NEG 1S.GEN know COMP what  
 ('Migs is singing but I don't know what')
- (17) ??Gusto ko siyang ipag-luto pero hindi ko alam kung ano.  
 want 1S.GEN 3S.NOM.LNK BNF-cook but NEG 1S.GEN know COMP what  
 ('I want to cook Ø for her but I don't know what.')

*Notes:*

- a. There is no preposition stranding in Tagalog nor is there evidence for a null preposition, making it difficult to apply Chung's analysis for Chamorro to these facts.
- b. These facts cannot fall directly out of an argument adjunct distinction neither under an ergative analysis nor an accusative analysis. While an ergative analysis might correctly exclude (16) since objects of antipassives are demoted, it doesn't exclude (15) since the agent of a non-actor voice is a bona-fide argument under this view.

The sluicing facts suggest a treatment of Tagalog verbs as ambitransitive, with the presence or absence of *ng* (GEN) marked arguments determining the valency of a verb. If absent, then no argument is projected, neither semantically nor syntactically.

These facts may be compared with the following pairs of English sentences. (18)-(19) display an often discussed valency alternations. Once the clause is completed without an object, the intransitive meaning is fixed and an implicit object reading is unavailable. Thus, the verb cannot be deleted in the sluice as a transitive if it does not contain an overt object in the antecedent.

- (18)a. She bathed someone but I'm not sure who(m).  
 b. \*She bathed Ø, but I'm not sure who(m).
- (19)a. He smells something but we don't know what.  
 b. \*He smells Ø but we don't know what.

The same holds true for dative shift verbs, as in (20).

- (20)a. She gave someone money but I'm not sure who.  
 b. \*She gave Ø money but I'm not sure who.

The claim here is that what underlies the ungrammaticality in (18)-(20) is also what underlies the ungrammaticality in the Tagalog (15)-(17).

#### 4.0 Patient voice versus passive

If demoted arguments do not project the structure necessary to antecede sluices why do languages with real passives allow sentences like (21)?

(21) He was beaten but he wouldn't tell us by whom.

The answer is that the demoted agent in English is expressed by a genuine adjunct and is thus predicted to behave like other adjuncts (e.g. *where*, *why*, *when*). It is licensed as a prepositional phrase and is thus freer.

In Tagalog on the other hand these arguments are not adjuncts but rather *case marked* arguments which crucially depend on the argument structure of the predicate for their licensing.

Furthermore, although non-AV forms in Tagalog and similar languages do not *inherently* demote or background the agent, they *are also* used for that purpose in conjunction with ellipsis as Tagalog lacks a real agent demoting passive.

The above also correctly predicts that Indonesian passive agents, which are introduced by the prepositional phrase *oleh* should also be good sluice remnants as in English.

(22) Ternyata dia di-bunuh tapi kita gak tahu oleh siapa.  
apparently 3S PASS-kill but 1p NEG know by who  
'Apparently he was killed but we don't know by who.'

#### 5.0 "Sprouting" as a transitivity related property

Many Austronesian languages deviate from the Tagalog pattern. one common deviation is shown by the following group of languages<sup>2</sup> which are similar to Tagalog in all relevant respects except in freely allowing sluices from implicit objects of AV verbs, i.e. "sprouting".

(23) *Malagasy* Ni-hira Raso fa tsy fantatro hoe inona.  
AV.PST-sing R. but NEG know.1s COMP what  
'Raso sang but I don't what.'

(24) *Malay*<sup>3</sup> Terasa ingin ber-cerita tapi tak tahu apa  
feel want AV-story but NEG know what  
'I feel like narrating but I don't know what.'

(25) Nak tulis tapi tak tahu apa.  
want write but NEG know what  
'I want to write but I don't know what.'

<sup>2</sup> All Malagasy data comes from discussion with Ileana Paul.

<sup>3</sup> Several Indonesian speakers felt that such examples were not possible. However, Malaysian appears to be more liberal in allowing this type of sluice. Examples (24) and (25) are from internet texts.

Crucially, both Malagasy and Malay allow definite objects in AV which is a necessary (but probably insufficient) condition to allow this type of object sluicing.

- (26) *Malagasy* Na-noratra ity boky ity aho  
AV.PST-write this book this 1sg.NOM  
 ‘I wrote this book.’
- (27) *Malay* Saya menulis buku ini.  
1sg AV.write book this  
 ‘I wrote this book.’
- (28) *Tagalog* \*?Nag-sulat ako ng librong ito.  
AV.PRF-write 1sg.NOM GEN book-LNK this  
 (‘I wrote this book.’)
- (29) *Chamorro* \*Man-änaitai gui’ i libro.  
AGR.AP-read.PROG he the book  
 (‘He’s reading the book.’)

Sprouting may thus be considered one step towards accusativity as it takes place primarily in languages that have lost the individuation restriction on the objects of actor voice verbs. This locates sprouting as a transitivity property along the lines of those explored by Hopper and Thompson (1980).

#### 4.0 Null object anaphors

A further step away from the ambitransitivity of the Philippine system and towards full transitivity includes allowing null object anaphors (see Naylor 1975 *et. seq.* for voice-anaphora interactions in Tagalog, van den Berg 1996 for differing object properties in Sulawesi languages). The following *non-Philippine* type languages all show null object anaphors in regular actor voice/transitive clauses:

- (30) *Taba* Yak kamot Ø do  
yak k=ha-mot do  
1sg 1sg=CAUS-die REAL  
 ‘I’ve turned it off.’ (Bowden 2001)
- (31) *Pamona* Ma-wela karama=mu, bara asu ma-mama Ø  
ADJ-wound finger=2s.GEN maybe dog TR-bite  
 ‘Your finger is wounded, did a dog bite it?’ (Adriani 1931:175)
- (31’) *Tagalog* \*Na-sugat-an ang daliri mo, baka k<um>agat ang aso Ø  
NONV.RL-wound-LV NOM finger 2s.GEN maybe <AV.INF>bite NOM dog
- (32) *Balantak* Bo dolo’-on=ku kalu man-tausi=mo i ya’a pakuli’  
for get-GF.IRR=1s.GEN if AV.IRR-obtain=CMP PM that medicine  
 ‘I will come back and get them if I find the medicine.’

- (33) To-rumpak=mo tanga' iloa', sia-sian=na-po nan-tausi Ø  
 NVOL-got=CMP middle day REDP-NEG-INTS-INC AF.REAL-obtain  
 'Goodness, it has gotten to be midday and I still haven't gotten it!  
 (Friberg 1990)
- (34) *Da'a* Na-geromo babe=ku pade daa=pa na-loga aku mom-paka-belo Ø  
 STA.RL-broke machete=1sg.GEN and NEG=yet AV.RL-chance 1sg.NOM AV.IRR-CAU-good  
 'My machete is broken and I haven't had time to fix it yet.'  
 (Abas & Friberg 1989:102)
- (34') *Tagalog* \*Sira ang itak ko at hindi pa ako naka-pag-pa-ayos Ø  
 broken NOM machete 1S.GEN and NEG yet 1S.NOM AV.PRF.ABIL-TR-CAU-order  
 ('My machete is broken and I couldn't fix it yet.')
- (35) *Samoan* Tu: atu loa lea 'o Sina tago 'i le lupe titina Ø, togi Ø 'i fafo.  
 stand DIR then that PRES Sina take.hold LD ART pigeon strangle throw LD out  
 'Sina stood up, took hold of the pigeon, strangled it, and then threw it outside.'  
 (Mosel & Hovdhaugen:1992:446, ex. 9.190)
- (36) *Keo* Kau lita ka wéké mbéghu mama ghako Ø.  
 2sg cry COND then mum carry  
 'If you cry then mum will carry you.' (Baird 2002:151 ex.#38)

Tukang Besi, which appears to preserve the definiteness related features of the Philippine voice system albeit in a very different manifestation, does not freely allow null object anaphora.

- (36) *Tukang Besi* So when the monkey arrived at the top he peeled the bananas  
 %...maka o-manga Ø.  
 then 3R-eat  
 'and then he ate it.' (Donohue p.c.)
- (37) *Tukang Besi* \*No=maña toka mbeka ku=dahani te paira.  
 3R=eat but NEG 1R=know CORE what  
 ('He ate but I don't know what.') (Donohue p.c.)

## References

- Abas, Husen, and Barbara Friberg. 1989. *Tesa-tesa eo-eo ri ara basa Daa*. Palu: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Adriani, N. 1931. *Spraakkunst der Bare'e-Taal* (Grammar of the Bare'e language). (Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, 70.) Bandoeng: Nix.
- Barr, Donald F. 1988. Focus and mood in Da'a discourse. In Steinhauer (ed.), 1988, pp. 77–129.
- Lousie Baird. 2002. *A grammar of Keo*. Ph.D. dissertation. Australian National University, Canberra.
- Berg, René van den. 1996. The demise of focus and the spread of conjugated verbs in Sulawesi. *Papers in Austronesian linguistics* 3, ed. by Hein Steinhauer, 89–114. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Bowden, John. 2001. *Taba: Description of a South Halmahera language*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Chung, Sandra. 1998. *The Design of Agreement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chung, Sandra. 2005. Sluicing and the Lexicon: The Point of No Return. *Proceedings of the BLS*.
- Cooreman, Ann. 1988. The antipassive in Chamorro: variations on the theme of transitivity. *Passive and voice* (Typological Studies in Language, 16), edited by Masayoshi Shibatani, 561–593. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Friberg, Barbara. 1990. *Sulawesi Language Texts*. Dallas: SIL.
- Hopper, Paul and Sandra Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language*, 56(2):251–299.
- Merchant, Jason: 2001, *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*, Oxford: OUP.
- Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and Ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27: 661–738, 2004.
- Mosel, Ulrike, and Even Hovdhaugen. 1992. *Samoan reference grammar*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Naylor, Paz Buenaventura. 1975. Topic, Focus and emphasis in the Tagalog verbal clause. *Oceanic Linguistics* 14. pp.12-79
- Ross, John R. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Ph.D. dissertation. MIT.