

Madagassisch: Syntax I
SS 2015

Craig Thiersch
C_THIERSCH@ALUM.MIT.EDU

Was ist ein Subjekt?

- (1) Urgeschichte:
- Relational Grammar, Arc-Pair Grammer (LFG): Basisbegriffe = subjekt, object
 - GB und Nachfolger: Basisbegriffe = NP/DP, die direkt dominiert von S/IP wird; NP/DP, die direct dominiert von VP wird; usw.
 - Traditionelle Grammatik: wird bestimmt durch morfologischer Markierung. (Funktioniert dies fürs Chinesische?)

Deutsch

- (2) a. Der Junge schlug den Hund.
b. Den Hund schlug der Junge.
- (3) a. Gestern hat der Junge einen Hund geschlagen.
b. Gestern hat den Hund ein böser Junge geschlagen.
- (4) a. Weil die Krankenschwester dem Patienten geholfen hat, ...
b. Weil dem Fritz ein Fehler unterlaufen ist, ... (unmarkiert/Lenerz)
- (5) Reis (1982): Die nominative NP/DP (evtl.: die mit dem Verb übereinstimmt).

Warlpiri /Walbiri (s. 1.Handout)

- (6) a. Ngarrka-ngku ka wawirri panti-rni
man-ERG PI kangaroo spear-Npast
“The man is spearing the kangaroo” PI=PresImpf
- b. Wawirri ka pantirni ngarrkangu
- c. Pantirni ka ngarrkangu wawirri
- d. *Wawirri pantirni ka ngarrkangu
- e. *Pantirni ngarrkangu wawirri ka
- f. Ngarrka-ngku ka wawirri panti-rni mali/(-ngki)
man-ERG PI kangaroo spear-Npast small+ \emptyset /(+ERG)
“The man is spearing the small kangaroo” bzw. “The small man ...”
- (7) Ngarrka ka wawiiri-ngki wajili-pi-nyi
man PI kangaroo+ERG chase-Npast
“The kangaroo is chasing the man”
- (8) a. Ngarrka ka wangka-mi
man PI speak-Nonpast
“(The/a) man is speaking”
- b. walya-ngka-jala ka ngarrka wangka-mi
ground-Loc-actually PI man speak-Nonpast
“There is a man speaking (down there) on the ground”
- (9) a. Kurdu junta ka yarda-yula-mi
child one PI again-cry-Npast
“Again, some child is crying”

- b. Ngarrka mali-ngki ka wawirri pantirni
 man small+ERG PI kangaroo spear-Npast
 = (6f)
- (10) a. Nya-ngu-**rna**-ngku
 see-past-1sg.Subj-2sg.Obj
 “I saw you”
- b. Nya-ngu-**npa-ju**
 see-past-2sg.Subj-1sg.Obj
 “You saw me”
- c. Parnka-ja-**rna**
 run-past-1sg.Subj
 “I am running”

Some Subjekt Tests (from Anderson (1976))

- (11) Controller of Reflexive
- Fred saw himself (in the mirror)
 - ? Fred was seen by himself¹
 - * Himself was seen by Fred
 - Fred expected himself to be elected
- (12) Controlled PRO
- John_i wants PRO_i to laugh
 - John_i wants PRO_i to stop violence
 - John_i wants Susan to tickle *PRO_i / \surd him
- (13) Raising (to Subject):
- Henry_i seems e_i to be laughing
 - Henry_i seemed e_i to have gotten the job
 - * Henry_i seemed for something to be bothering e_i
 - Helen seems to have been tattooed by a Dayak
- (14) Object Raising / “Tough-movement”
- Fred_i is hard PRO_{arb} to catch e_i
 - Harry is tough PRO_{arb} to write letters to e_i
 - Metaphysics is difficult for people to think about e_i in bars
 - * John is tough e_i to laugh
 - * Bill is difficult (for) e_i to convince John
- (15) *Aber: Controller kann Matrixsubjekt oder -objekt sein*
- Fred_i promised Sam [PRO_i to leave]
 - Fred persuaded Sam_j [PRO_j to leave]
 - Fred persuaded Sam_j [PRO_j to be examined]
 - * Fred persuaded Sam_j [for us/PRO_{arb} to examine PRO_j]
 - Fred_i is too smart PRO_{arb} to catch e_i / PRO_i to catch aids.
 - Fred_i is too smart PRO_{arb} to believe we could catch e_i

¹Vgl. \surd “The only man shaved by himself was Figaro” Pollard & Sag (1994)

- g. Fred_i is too smart PRO_i to believe we could catch him

“Agent” ≠ Subject

- (16) a. Fred feared sincerity
b. Sincerity frightens Fred.

EPP: the Extended Projection Principle

- (17) Chomsky’s early hypothesis: all sentences must have a “subject”.
(18) Problems:
a. Italian etc. → existence of *pro*-subjects.
b. German:
i. Es wurde gestern getanzt / Gestern wurde den ganzen Abend getanzt.
ii. Mir ist kalt. / Mich friert.

Relation zwischen Kasus und Thetarollen

- (19) Unterschiedlich realisiert:
a. Englisch: She taught French to the students.
b. Deutsch: Sie hat ihm die französische Sprache gelehrt.
c. Russisch: Она научила его французскому языку.
Ona nauchila ego frantsuskomu jazyku.
she-NOM taught him-ACC french-DAT language-DAT

Tagalog

- (20) Philippinische Sprache, related to Madagassisch, “änliche” Syntax
(21) Beispiele von verbale Diathese (A=“actor”, G= “goal”, D=“dative”, B=“benefactor”, T=“trigger”)
a. *Mag-aalis* *ang* babae *ng* bigas sa sako para sa bata
AT-will-take-out T woman G rice D sack for B child
“The woman will take the/some rice out of a/the sack for a/the child”
b. *Aalis-in* *ng* babae *ang* bigas sa sako para sa bata
GT-will-take-out1 A woman T rice D sack for B child
“A/the woman will take the rice out of a/the sack for a/the child”
c. *Aalis-an* *ng* babae *ng* bigas *ang* sako para sa bata
DT-will-take-out A woman G rice T sack for B child
“A/the woman will take the/some rice out of the sack for a/the child”
d. *Ipag-aalis* *ng* babae *ng* bigas sa sako *ang* bata
BT-will-take-out A woman G rice D sack T child
“A/the woman will take the/some rice out of a/the sack for the child”
e. *Ipag-guguhit* *ng* bata *ang* tsok
InstT-will.draw A child T chalk
“A/the child will draw with the chalk”
(22) *Note bene*:
a. Freie Reihenfolge von Argumenten nach dem Verb!

- b. Die *ang*-Phrase wird verpflichtet als definit interpretiert (vgl. Übersetzungen oben)
 c. Ist aber nicht notwendigerweise “what the sentence is about”; dafür (genau wie im Madegassischen) benutzt man andere Konstruktionen

(23) Pronomen:

Singular:	<i>ang</i> -form	<i>ng</i> -form	<i>sa</i> -form	Plural:	<i>ang</i> -form	<i>ng</i> -form	<i>sa</i> -form
1st pers.	ako	ko	akin	1st.pers.excl.	kami	namin	amin
				1st.pers.incl.	tayo	natin	atin
2nd pers.	ka/kaw	mo	iyo	2nd pers.	kayo	ninyo	inyo
3rd pers.	siya	niya	kaniya	3rd pers	silá	nila	kanila

Argumente für Topic = Subject

(24) (Alle) Sätze müssen einen Topic haben² (EPP!):

- a. Abogado ang lalaki
 lawyer T man
 “The man is a lawyer”
 b. (Vermutlich “*Abogado ng lalaki” -CT)

(25) Accessibility Hierarchy (Keenan and Comrie 1977):

- a. Subj ≥ DO ≥ IO ≥ OPrep ≥ Poss-P ≥ O-Comp.-Particle
 b. Was kann relativiziert werden? Antwort: “If a language allows only one thing to be relativized, it must be the subject?”
 c. Schachter: “in Philippine languages, only topics can be relativized”
 d. Beispiele
- i. Bumasa ang lalaki ng diyaryo
 AT-read T man G newspaper
 “The man read a newspaper”
 - ii. Binasa ng lalaki ang diyaryo
 GT-read A man T newspaper
 “A/the man read the newspaper”
 - iii. Matalino ang lalaki-ng bumasa ng diyaryo
 intelligent T man-LI AT-read G newspaper
 “The man who is reading a newspaper is intelligent” LI=Linker (rel.)
 - iv. Interessante ang diyaryo-ng binasa ng lalaki
 interesting T newspaper-LI GT-read A man
 “The newspaper that a/the man read is interesting”
 - v. *Interessante ang diyaryong bumasa ang lalaki
 interesting T newspaper-LI AT-read T man
 - vi. *Matalino ang lalaking binasa ang diyaryo
 intelligent T man-LI GT-read T newspaper

(26) Behauptung von “Relational Grammar” (Perlmutter and Potsal 1983, Bell 1976):
 “Only ‘terms’ (subjects, objects, indirect objects) launch floated quantifiers”

- a. i. The demonstrators had all been arrested.
 ii. They gave the children 10 cents each.

²D.h., wenn möglich; es gibt eine Klasse Sätze ohne Topic; s. (28).

- iii. They (*all) searched (*all) in (all) the rooms (*all).
 - iv. They searched in each room (*the room(s) each).
 - b. i. Sumusulat lahat ang mga bata ng mga liham
 AT-write all T PL child G PL letter
 “All the children are writing letters”
 ≠ “The children are writing all the letters”
 - ii. Sinusulat lahat ng mga bata ang mga liham
 GT-write all A PL child T PL letter
 “The/Some children are writing all the letters” ≠ “All the children are writing the letters”
- (27) Grammatical agreement
- a. Keine Person/Numerus-Inflektion in Tagalog; in Kapampangan wohl.
 - b. Ausgedrückt durch ein Partikel, die übereinkommen muss mit dem Trigger
 - c. Beispiele
 - i. Manakit ya ng anak ing lalaki
 AT-saw TAP G child T-SG man
 “The man saw a child/some children” TAP = Trigger Agreement Particle
 - ii. Ikit na la ning lalaki ding anak
 GT-saw AAP TAP A-SG man T-PL child
 “A/The man saw the children” AAP = Actor Agreement Particle
 - d. Aber: wenn Actor nicht Trigger, (27c-ii), gibt es zusätzlich Actor-agreement!

Argumente gegen Topic = Subject

- (28) Es gibt einige (existentielle) Sätze die keinen Trigger haben (s. Fußnote 2):
- a. May liham (para sa iyo)
 Exist letter (for B you)
 “There’s a letter (for you)”
 - b. May dumarating
 Exist is-coming
 “There’s someone coming”
 - c. Warum können solche Sätze in Prinzip keinen Trigger haben?
- (29) Trigger muss definit sein; merkwürdige Eigenschaft für Subjekte.
- (30) Trigger kann reflexiv sein (echte Subjekte nicht); Antecedent ist Actor:
- a. Sinaktan ng babae ang kaniyang sarili
 DT-hurt A woman T_D her self
 “A/The woman hurt herself” (*Wörtlich*: *Herself hurt the woman)
 - b. Iniisip nila³ ang kanilang sarili
 DT-think-about A-they T_D their self
 “They think about themselves”
- (31) Weil Actor “kontrolliert” das Reflexivpronomen, ist Actor-trigger auch Grammatisch:
- Nag-iisip sila sa kanilang sarili
 AT-think-about T_A-they D their self
 “They think about themselves”

³Nicht *kanila!*

- (32) In Control-PRO Sätzen ist PRO immer Actor, und nicht Trigger:
- a. NB: Alte Terminologie auch bei Keenan, in EQUI Actor- statt Trigger-Tilgung
 - i. Damals: Fred tried < Fred > to leave
 - ii. Jetzt: Fred_i tried PRO_i to leave
 - b. Vgl. folgende Hauptsätze mit Nebensätze in (32c):
 - i. Hiniramin niya ang pera sa bangko
GT-borrow A-he T money D bank
 - ii. Hiniraman niya ng pera ang bangko
DT-borrow A-he G money T bank
 - iii. Humiram siya ng pera sa bangko
AT-borrow T-he G money D bank
 - c.
 - i. Nag-atubili siya_i-ng hiramín (PRO_i) ang pera sa bangko
AT-hesitated A-he-LI GT-borrow (A) T money D bank
“He hesitated to borrow the money from a/the bank”
 - ii. Nag-atubili siya-ng hiraman ng pera ang bangko
AT-hesitated A-he-LI DT-borrow G money T bank
“He hesitated to borrow money from the bank”
 - iii. Nag-atubili siya-ng humiram ng pera sa bangko
AT-hesitated A-he-LI AT-borrow G money D bank
“He hesitated to borrow money from a/the bank”

Argumente für Actor = Subjekt

- (33) Obwohl Actor Antecedent vom Reflexivpronomen sein kann (muss? -CT), vgl. (30)–(31), kann er selber nie reflexiv sein:
- a. *Iniisip sila ng kanilang sarili
DT-think-about T_D-they A their self
 - b. *Nag-iisip sa kanila ang akanilang sarili
AT-think-about D they T_A their self
- (34) Keenen (1976) dagegen fürs Madagassischen:
- a. “Control of reflexivization is largely limited to active subjects. [*Lies*: Active Trigger, -CT] Passive subjects [Trigger] never control reflexives.” [sein (39a-b)]
 - i. namóno tena Rabe
killed_{AT} self⁴_{Goal} Rabe_{T(A)}
“Rabe killed himself”
 - ii. *Novonón'(ny) tena-(ny) Rabe
killed_{TT}-(the) self-(his)_A Rabe_{T(Goal)}
“Rabe was killed by himself”
 - b. “...direct objects of active sentences cannot control the reflexivization of an active subject:” [sein (40)]
 - i. *namono an-dRabe ny tena-ny
killed_{AT} ACC-Rabe_{Goal} the self-his_{T(A)}
- (35) Aber: von Pearson (2001), sein (14), Kap.3, S.89; vgl. Handout 1:

⁴ *Tena* = lit. “body”

- a. Novonóin'ny lehilahy ny tenany
 PST-kill_{TT}-Det man_A the self-his_{T(Goal)}
 "The man killed himself"
- b. *Wörtlich*: "Himself was killed by the man." Also doch wie Tagalog, siehe (30).
 Vgl. auch sein (38a):
 Namonóan'ny lehilahy_i tena_i ny zaza-ny
 PST-kill_{CrcP}-the man_A self_G the child_{D-3d}
 "The man_i killed himself_i for his children"
- (36) Control PRO ist Actor: Vgl. (32c)–(32b) above.
- (37) Imperativ ist immer Actor:
- a. Magbigay ka sa kaniya ng kape
 AT-give T-you D him G coffee
 "Give him some coffee"
- b. Bigyan mo siya ng kape
 DT-give A-you T-him G coffee
- c. Ibigay mo sa kaniya ang kape
 GT-give A-you D him T coffee
 "Give him *the* coffee"
- (38) Ähnlich in anderen philippinischen Sprachen, z.B. Cebuano:
 Ibalik ang libro kanako
 GT-give-back T book D-me
 "Give me back the book"
- (39) NB: Agreement Data in (27) nicht ganz entscheidend; vgl. (27c-ii).
- (40) Wortstellung: obwohl im Tagalog frei, in anderen philippinischen Sprachen wie Pangasinan (und im Madagassischen -CT) nicht:
- a. Entweder "V DP_{do} DP_{dat} Trigger" oder "V DP_{act} (andere Argumenten) Trigger"
- b. Einfacher die Reihenfolge "Subj DO IO" als Basis-reihenfolge zu betrachten, und "Trigger" ist abgeleitet:

$$V_{voice2} \text{ arg}_1 \underbrace{(\text{arg}_2 \text{ arg}_3 \text{ arg}_2)}_{\uparrow}$$
- (41) "Actor" wird (fast) immer als IE Subjekt übersetzt, auch wenn nur Passiv gebraucht wird; vgl. Diskussion in Keenan und Polinsky (1998), S.581:
- a. Tsy ázoko ianao
 not understood+1.SG.GEN 2.SG.NOM
Lit. "You aren't/weren't understood by me" = (36a)
 Sense: "I don't/didn't understand you."
- b. azoázoko ny teninao
 understand(*redupl.*)+1.SG.GEN the word+2.SG.NOM
 "I understand you words somewhat" (37)

Argumente gegen Actor = Subjekt

- (42) Argumentiert, dass Subjekte in anderen Sprachen eine uniforme ("formally homogeneous") Klasse bilden
- a. In Tagalog müsste man sagen es gibt zwei Sorten: ang-Actor-Subjekte und ng-Actor-Subjekte

- b. Schwaches Argument, weil ergative Sprache gerade eine problematische Ausnahme wären, wie er selber in einer Fußnote bemerkt.
- (43) Einige Sätze haben keinen Actor, wohl aber einen Trigger:
- papawisan ang lalaki
GT/DT-will-sweat T man
“The man will sweat”
 - NB: Verb-morphologie; vgl. auch (24a), (28)
- (44) “Actor” zeigt auch übliche Subjekt-Eigenschaften nicht: z.B., nur relativisierbar wenn Trigger; kein Quelle für “floating” Quantoren. (s. oben)

Actor-Trigger = “Primary subject”

- (45) Schachter schlägt vor, dass man vielleicht Actor-Trigger als primäres Subjekt betrachten könnte (d.h., nicht abgeleitet); andre Triggers wären wohl abgeleitet.
- (46) Actor-Topic forms are basic in some sense. Evidence: Actor-Topic forms have distinctions not available in other forms:
- only Actor-Topic forms appear in the recent perfective; see Schachter and Otnes (1972)
 - only Actor-Topic forms can show plural agreement with topic (Ist dies richtig? Vgl. (27c-ii) -CT)
 - only Actor-Topic forms appear in social-verb formation, etc.
 - (vgl. Kausativen im Madigassischen? -CT)

Argumente gegen Actor-Trigger = “Primary subject”

- (47) Es bleiben doch die Konstruktionen ohne Subject (“not even underlyingly”): vgl. (43a): “Papawisan ang lalaki” (GT/DT morphology on verb)
- (48) Some Actor-Topic forms found only in relatives
- Tinakot ng lalaki ang bata
GT-frightened A man T child
A/the man frightened the child
 - *Tumakot ang lalaki ng bata
AT-frightened T man G child
 - Nasaan ang lalaking tumakot ng bata
where T man-li AT-frightened G child
Where is the man who frightened a child?
 - Nasaan ang tumakot ng bata
where T AT-frightened G child
Where is the one who frightened a child?
- (49) RELATIONAL ANNIHILATION LAW: If an NP_i assumes a grammatical relation *j* previously borne by NP_j, then NP_j ceases to bear any grammatical relation; it becomes a chômeur (French for “unemployed person”).
→ Aber Actor als nicht-Trigger ist kein Chômeur!

References

- Anderson, Stephen (1976) “On the notion of subject in ergative languages” in Li (1976)
- Bell, Sarah (1976) *Cebuano Subjects in Two Frameworks*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Doctoral dissertation.
- Keenan, Edward L. (1976) “Remarkable Subjects in Malagasy “ in Li (1976), 249–301
- & Comrie, Bernard (1977) “Noun Phrase Accessibility” *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.
- Li, Charles N., ed. (1976) *Subject and Topic*, New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Pearson, Matt (2001) *The clause structure of Malagasy: a minimalist approach* Ph.D. diss. Dept. of Linguistics, UCLA
- Perlmutter, David M. (1983) *Studies In Relational Grammar 1*: Chicago.
- Pollard, Carl & Ivan Sag (1994) *Head-driven phrase structure grammar*. Chicago: CSLI
- Reis, Marga (1982) “Zum Subjektbegriff im Deutschen”. In: Abraham, Werner (Hg.) *Satzglieder im Deutschen*, Tübingen: Narr. S.171–212.
- Schachter, Paul (1976) “The Subject in Philippine Languages: Topic, Actor, Actor-Topic, or None of the Above?” In Li (1976), 491–518.
- Schachter, Paul & Fe Otanes (1972) *A Tagalog reference grammar*. Los Angeles, UCLA Press