

On the other hand, nominal *wh*-phrases will be interpreted by unselective binding and get wide scope, and therefore we expect no island effects. For instance, *apa* ‘what’ takes matrix scope from within a complement clause in (6) and within a syntactic island in (10), as shown above. In contrast, on the neighboring island of Java, Javanese, Sundanese and Madurese allow both nominal **and** adverbial *wh*-phrases to occur in situ (or fully/partially moved, depending on the language). Sentence-final *kapan* ‘when’ in (11) and *dha'ramma* ‘how’ in (12) contrast with (1) and (5) in Balinese, respectively. These facts suggest that the unselective binding account is appropriate for Javanese, Madurese, and Sundanese adverbial *wh*-phrases.

(11) Javanese

✓**kapan** awakmu masak ✓**kapan**?
 when you cook when
 ‘When did you cook?’

(12) Madurese (Davies 2010: p.459, (79a,b), (81))

✗**dha'ramma** Guru-na ngera ✓**dha'ramma** mored-da nyoper motor ✓**dha'ramma**?
 how teacher-DEF AV.think how student-DEF AV.drive car how
 ‘How did the teacher think her student drove the car?’

As a result of employing unselective binding rather than overt movement, *wh*-adverbials in Madurese, Sundanese and Javanese are correctly predicted to scope out of the embedded clause and be insensitive to islands (Cole et al. 1999, Davies 2010).

Extreme Locality: Movement of Balinese *wh*-adverbials is further distinguished from standard *wh*-movement in that it cannot cross clausal boundaries. For example, *pidan* ‘when’ in (5) cannot be extracted sentence initially. We attribute this to “extreme locality”, which is attested in Madurese and Sundanese (Davies 2003, Davies et al. 2009). Madurese and Sundanese ban long distance extraction of *wh*-phrases and exhibit extreme locality: *wh* can only move in its own clause. We show Balinese shares the property of extreme locality, and since *wh*-adverbials in Balinese have to move overtly and cannot be interpreted via unselective binding we can only get embedded question interpretations in (5). As we shall discuss in the paper, the languages we examine are divided into two groups depending on the presence/absence of the extreme locality restriction. Similar variation patterns among languages are attested in other language families like Bantu (Zentz 2016).

References

- Arka, I. W. (2003) *Balinese morphosyntax: A lexical-functional approach*. Pacific Linguistics.
- Cole, P., E. Jonczyk and J. Lilley (1999) ‘A note on extraction from object in Javanese and other Javanic languages’ In *Proceedings of AFLA VI*: 87-93.
- Cole, P. and G. Hermon (1998) ‘The typology of *wh*-movement: *Wh*-questions in Malay’ In *Syntax* 1(3): 221-258.
- Davies, W. D (2010) *A Grammar of Madurese*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Davies, W. D (2003) ‘Extreme Locality in Madurese *wh*-questions’ *Syntax* 6:237-259.
- Davies, W. D. and E. Kurniawan (2009) ‘Movement and locality in Sundanese *wh*-questions’ In *Proceedings of AFLA XVI*: 17-28.
- Gumilar, D. (2009) ‘Kalimat pertanyaan Bahasa Sunda: Sebuah analisis awal dari perspektif minimalism’ In *Linguistik Indonesia* 27(1): 53-67
- Zentz, J. A. (2016) *Forming Wh-Questions in Shona: A Comparative Bantu Perspective*. PhD thesis, Yale University.