

## Extrapolation in Malagasy

Eric Potsdam & Dan Edmiston  
University of Florida

**Introduction.** Malagasy is typically described as a language with rigid subject-final, VOS word order (Keenan 1976). There are two well-known exceptions to this generalization. Various XPs may optionally appear after the subject, (1), and CPs must appear after the subject, (2) (Keenan 1976, Pearson 2001).

- (1) a. Tsy mandamina ny trano (matetika) Rakoto (matetika)  
NEG arrange DET house often Rakoto often  
'Rakoto generally does not put the house in order.'
- b. Nanoratra taratasy (tany am-pianarana) ny zazavavy (tany am-pianarana)  
write letter LOC OBL-school DET girl LOC OBL-school  
'The girl wrote a letter in school.'
- (2) Manantena (\*fa hahomby ny zaza) Rasoana (fa hahomby ny zaza)  
hope that succeed DET child Rasoana that succeed DET child  
'Rasoana hopes that her child will succeed.'

This paper analyzes such instances of extrapolation, arguing that (1) and (2) instantiate distinct phenomena. Extrapolation (EX) in (1) is a syntactic operation that backgrounds the extraposed constituent. CP Extrapolation (CPEX) in (2), in contrast, is a phonological operation that has no syntactic or semantic consequences. Our analysis supports Manetta's (2012) conclusion regarding Hindi that rightward extrapolation is not a unified phenomenon, even in a single language.

**Analysis.** We analyze EX as movement of an XP to the right of the subject. EX has the function of backgrounding the extraposed phrase, marking it as presupposed (Paul & Rabaovololona 1998, Pearson 2001, Kalin 2006). In (3a), the PP 'in the garden' is inside the VP and is in the scope of the question operator. In (3b), the PP is extraposed and is presupposed in the question. The backgrounding function of EX is further demonstrated by the impossibility of wh-phrases and focused phrases in this position (not shown).

- (3) a. Namaky boky **tany an-tokotany** ve i Tenda?  
read book LOC OBL-garden Q Tenda  
'Was Tenda reading a book in the garden?'  
'Was reading a book in the garden what Tenda was doing?'
- b. Namaky boky ve i Tenda **tany an-tokotany**  
read book Q Tenda LOC OBL-garden  
'Was reading a book what Tenda was doing in the garden?' (Pearson 2001:180)

Nevertheless, we analyze EX as movement. It shows a range of reconstruction effects: scope, variable binding, Condition C, idioms, subcategorization, and NPI licensing. For example, the NPI *n'iza n'iza* 'anyone' in the extraposed position in (4) must reconstruct inside the predicate in order to be c-commanded by negation.

- (4) Tsy nandroso vary (tamin' n'iza n'iza) i Sahondra (tamin' n'iza n'iza)  
 NEG serve rice PREP anyone Sahondra PREP anyone  
 'Sahondra didn't serve rice to anyone.'

In contrast to EX, CPEX is obligatory, (2), and has no semantic consequences. Unlike EX constituents, extraposed CPs are not necessarily backgrounded/presupposed; they can serve as the answer to a question, (5).

- (5) a. Inona no lazainy?                      b. Nilaza izy [fa tokony hividy omby aho]  
 what FOC say.3SG                              say 3SG that should buy ox 1SG  
 'What did he say?'                              'He said that I should buy an ox.'

CPEX also show reconstruction effects (Law 2007:778-780). For example, the subject can bind a pronoun in the embedded clause and can trigger a Condition C violation.

We analyze the obligatoriness of CPEX as movement at PF for phonological reasons (Manetta 2012), following a suggestion in Law 2007. CPs must constitute their own intonational phrases. If the CP were to remain inside the VP, one intonational phrase would embed a second, in violation of recursivity: intonational phrases are not recursive (Selkirk 1984). The CP extraposes at PF to satisfy intonational phrasing requirements.

**Conclusion.** A number of constituents in Malagasy can or must extrapose to a clause-final position. We argue that this is not unified phenomenon. Some constituents extrapose for discourse purposes while others extrapose for phonological reasons. The analysis is in line with Manetta's (2012) conclusions about Hindi-Urdu. The right periphery is less well investigated cross-linguistically, for both theoretical and empirical reasons, but such data indicate that it also deserves investigation, in addition to the better-studied left periphery.

## References

- Kalin, L. 2009. News about the *no*-phrase: Specificational pseudoclefts in Malagasy. *ALFA* 16. [http://westernlinguistics.ca/afla/meetings/afla16/papers\\_afla\\_16/Kalin.pdf](http://westernlinguistics.ca/afla/meetings/afla16/papers_afla_16/Kalin.pdf).
- Keenan, E. L. 1976. Remarkable subjects in Malagasy. In *Subject and topic*, C. N. Li (ed.), 247-301. New York: Academic Press.
- Law, P. 2007. The syntactic structure of the cleft construction in Malagasy. *NLLT* 25, 765-823.
- Manetta, E. 2012. Reconsidering rightward scrambling: Postverbal constituents in Hindi-Urdu. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43, 43-74.
- Pearson, M. 2001. The clause structure of Malagasy: A Minimalist approach. PhD dissertation, UCLA.
- Selkirk, Lisa. 1984. *Phonology and syntax: The relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge, Ma.: MIT Press.
- Zribi-Hertz, A., and L. Mbolatianavalona. 1999. Towards a modular theory of linguistic deficiency: Evidence from Malagasy personal pronouns. *NLLT* 17, 161-218.