

**Definiteness Restrictions and Extraction** Philippine-type languages famously lift definiteness restriction on non-pivot objects in contexts of agent extraction. Tagalog, for instance, typically requires indefinite or non-specific interpretations for bare objects of AGENT-VOICE (AV) verbs but permits definite readings when agents extract (McFarland 1978). Two types of explanation have been proposed for this pattern: pragmatic accounts which derive the pattern from the disappearance of competition effects (Gärtner 2004, Collins 2016) and syntactic accounts which hold that non-pivot objects can exceptionally raise to higher positions in these contexts which license definite interpretations (Rackowski and Richards 2005). Parallel patterns in Mandar, a verb-initial language of West Sulawesi, provide evidence for the latter: in agent-extraction contexts, this language permits a range of locality-sensitive processes to exceptionally target non-pivot objects. These patterns suggest that object shift (OS) of non-pivot objects into the middle field to SPEC,VOICEP can obtain when pivot agents extract, parallel to patterns of OS in Scandinavian only possible when accompanied by movement of other material (Holmberg 1986). A unified account of the obviation of non-pivot definiteness restrictions in agent extraction contexts can be derived from the model of PF-rescue of island violations proposed in Bošković (2011).

**Voice and Object Shift in Mandar** Mandar (South Sulawesi Subgroup) shows a complex voice system which indexes the structurally highest argument in a clause in a variety of ways. Like Tagalog, Mandar requires definite objects to undergo a process of OS tied to the appearance of PATIENT VOICE (PV) morphology on the verb. Following Aldridge (2005), I treat the AV and PV morphemes as *voice*<sup>0</sup>s with different selectional requirements: the former selects a *v*<sup>0</sup> which lacks EPP features and hosts only an agent in its specifier, while the latter selects a *v*<sup>0</sup> bearing EPP features which trigger OS to a higher specifier than that which hosts the agent. Under this view, the pivot occupies the highest position of all nominals in the clause outside of extraction contexts: agents merge in SPEC,vP and nothing shifts above them in AV; in PV, objects do so, and both *voice*<sup>0</sup>s bear [EPP] features forcing the highest argument beneath them to raise further to SPEC,VOICEP. From this position, pivots show properties which reflect their structural prominence: while non-pivot objects show definiteness restrictions and no morphological indexation, pivots can be definite (1a)-(1b), coindexed with clitic adverbials like *nasang* 'all' and *tappaq* 'only' (2a)-(2b), and indexed by ABS clitics generated in T (shown by their unavailability in non-finite clauses, which permit ERG clitics created by a probe on *v*<sup>0</sup>: (3)). These properties are not afforded to non-pivot objects of AV verbs.

- (1) a. \***Mac**-cippoq=**i i**qo a?  
 AV-kiss=3.ABS 2 PRT  
 Intended: 'She kissed you<sub>(NON-PVT)</sub>?'  
 b. **Na-Ø**-cippoq=**o** iqo a?  
 3.ERG-PV-kiss=2.ABS 2 PRT  
 'She kissed you<sub>(PVT)</sub> ?'
- (2) a. \***Me**-ita=**nasang=i** gedung.  
 AV-see=all=3.ABS building.  
 Intended: 'He saw all the buildings<sub>(NON-PVT)</sub>.'  
 b. **Na-Ø**-ita=**nasang=i** gedung.  
 3.ERG-PV-see=all=3.ABS building.  
 'He saw all the buildings<sub>(PVT)</sub>.'
- (3) [<sub>NFC</sub> Ururu u-Ø-ita-**mu**/\*=**o**,] tappa mongeq=aq mating!  
 at.first 1.ERG-PV-see-2.GEN/=2.ABS, suddenly sick=1.ABS to.you  
 'When I first saw you, I fell in love straightaway!'

**Emergent Agreement under Agent Extraction** Non-pivot objects take on all the properties above when agents extract. In this context, AV verbs permit objects to be definite, modified by clitic adverbs, and coindexed with 'emergent' absolutive clitics (4a)-(4b) (see Coon et al. 2019 for parallels in Mayan). Ditransitive constructions show that emergent agreement respects locality: when the suffix *-an* 'BEN' introduces an applied argument above the direct object, emergent ABS-clitics can only coindex the former (5).

- (4) a. **Yau** na=**me**-patei=**nasang** diqo paccoroq!  
 1.SG FUT=AV-kill=all that thief  
 'I'll kill all of those thieves!'  
 b. **Innai mac**-cippoq=**o** iqo, kandiq?  
 who AV-kiss=2.ABS 2.SG brother  
 'Who kissed you, bro?'
- (5) **Yau** na=**mak**-kiring-an=**no**/\*=**ni** mating lima-p-pulo kilo soklat.  
 1 FUT=AV-send-BEN=2.ABS/3.ABS to.you five-LNK-ten kilogram chocolate  
 'I'll send you fifty kilograms of chocolate.'

**Emergent Agreement involves Object Shift** Three patterns suggest the emergent agreement effects above to involve OS to a position outside the VP. First, emergent agreement targets only definite DPs (6a)-(6b); assuming that processes like agreement cannot differentiate between definite and indefinite NPs (Preminger 2019), these splits must involve differences in the structural heights of goals. Second, agent-extraction contexts permit non-pivot pronominal objects (1b), despite the fact that these undergo obligatory OS in normal circumstances and can never remain inside the VP for semantic reasons which should not lift beneath extraction (Diesing 1997; (1a)-(1b)). Third, the agreement probe targeting non-pivot objects here sits in T (3), suggesting that definite objects must move high to reach a sufficiently local position for Agree. These patterns suggest that non-pivot objects raise minimally to SPEC,VOICEP to satisfy its [EPP] feature.

- (6) a. Ia=pa      maq-itai= $\emptyset$  baine.  
       3.SG=IPFV AV-look lady  
       ‘He’s still looking for a wife.’
- b. Ia=pa      maq-itai=**i**      **diqo** baine=**o**.  
       3.SG=IPFV AV-look=3.ABS that lady=DEF  
       ‘He’s still looking for that lady there.’

**Locality Violations and Copy Movement** The amelioration of locality violations under extraction can be captured with a reworking of assumptions about copy-movement. The discussion above raises a locality problem: the AV *voice*<sup>0</sup> selects a *v*<sup>0</sup> which lacks the [EPP] feature triggering OS, forcing the agent to occupy a higher structural position than the object. Should a VP-internal object raise to SPEC,VOICE to satisfy its [EPP], the resultant movement would cross over the agent and incur a locality violation. This movement does not lead to certain doom- the consequences of an ordinarily impossible movement are obviated by subsequent A'-movement of the intervener, as with object shift in Scandinavian (Holmberg 1986)- but under the standard copy-theory of movement it is unclear why this should be the case. Since Chomsky (1972), the standard assumption has been that locality-violating movement operations assign \*s to crossed interveners: here, for instance, OS of non-pivot objects to SPEC,VOICEP places a \* on the intervening agent in SPEC,v. Should any \*-marked element reach PF, the derivation will crash, leading to a strong prediction: so long as copy-movement copies \*s, as argued by Merchant (2008), neither A'-extraction nor anything short of PF-suppression of the intervener can ameliorate the situation. As such, we need an alternative.

**Movement Chains and \*-Copying** The empirical pattern can be captured with a reanalysis of the conditions governing \*s copy under movement. Bošković (2011) presents one such approach where interveners marked with \*s from one type of locality violation only transfer these \*s onto higher copies of themselves when they undergo the same type of movement which incurred the original violation. More concretely, Bošković (2011) argues that when non-closest A-movement incurs a \* on an intervener, subsequent A-movement of the intervener will result in transfer of the \* onto the its higher copy (yielding no improvement) but A'-movement of the same will not copy the \*. In the latter case, once chain reduction erases the lower \*-marked copy of the intervener at PF, no \*-marked arguments are visible at PF and the derivation can converge.

**Extension to Mandar and Beyond** Emergent Agreement patterns in Mandar suggest that non-pivot objects can exceptionally undergo OS to (SPEC,VOICEP) in this language, and the analysis above makes correct empirical predictions for Mandar and other philippine-type languages. Non-pivot objects can only undergo exceptional OS in agent extraction contexts because the locality violations which this raising incurs are obviated when intervening agents undergo A'-extraction. Moreover, this object shift account blocks non-pivot extraction through the same mechanism (without the additional assumption of preferential agreement with foci in *v*: Rackowski and Richards 2005): even though non-pivot objects can become the structurally highest arguments in the clause, only pivot agents can be grammatically targeted by A'-probes relativized for [+WH/+FOC] because leaving \*-marked agents in-situ in these contexts would cause the derivation at PF. The object shift and intervener-extraction approach outlined here thus allows for a unified characterization of the obviation of definiteness restrictions in agent-extraction contexts across the family.

**Citations**

• Aldridge, Edith. "Phase theory account of Absolutive Extraction in Tagalog." MIT working papers in linguistics 49 (2005): 1-28. • Bošković, Željko. "Rescue by PF deletion, traces as (non) interveners, and the that-trace effect." Linguistic inquiry 42.1 (2011): 1-44. • Coon, Jessica, Nico Baier, and Theodore Levin. "Mayan agent focus and the ergative extraction constraint: Facts and fictions revisited." Ms., McGill University (2019). • Chomsky, Noam. Some empirical issues in the theory of transformational grammar. In Goals of linguistic theory, ed. by Stanley Peters, 63-130. Englewood Cliffs, NJ (1972). • Collins, James N. "Definiteness and implicature in Tagalog." Berkeley Linguistics Society (BLS) 42 (2016): 273-292. • Diesing, Molly. "Yiddish VP order and the typology of object movement in Germanic." Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 15.2 (1997): 369-427. Gärtner, Hans-Martin. "On the Optimality Theoretic status of "Unambiguous Encoding".". In Optimality theory and pragmatics, ed. Reinhard Blunter and Henk Zeevat. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan (2004). • Holmberg, Anders. Word order and syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English. Stockholm: Department of General Linguistics, University of Stockholm, 1986. • McFarland, Curtis D. Definite objects and subject selection in Philippine languages &. Studies in Philippine Linguistics 2 (1978): 139-182. • Merchant, Jason. "Variable island repair under ellipsis." Topics in ellipsis 1174 (2008): 132-153. • Rackowski, Andrea. The structure of Tagalog: Specificity, voice, and the distribution of arguments. Diss. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2002). • Rackowski, Andrea, and Norvin Richards. "Phase edge and extraction: A Tagalog case study." Linguistic Inquiry 36:565-599 (2005).