

Topicalisation and Extraction in Bikol

Lim Min Cheryl

An Honours Thesis submitted in part fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honours
in English Language

Department of English Language and Literature
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
National University of Singapore
Singapore

16 April 2018
AY 2017/18 Semester 2

This Honours Thesis represents my own work and due acknowledgement is given whenever information is derived from other sources. No part of this Honours Thesis has been or is being concurrently submitted for any other qualification at any other university.

Cheryl Lim

Lim Min Cheryl
16 April 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of several important groups of people. I am truly grateful for your presence in my life. In particular, I would like to thank:

Dr Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine, my supervisor and mentor. Thank you for your endless patience, guidance, enthusiasm, motivation and immense knowledge. I have gained so much from our discussions. Thank you for introducing me to fieldwork in Linguistics, and for all the opportunities you have given me to learn and grow as a linguist.

Dion, JJ, Wanyan and Keely, who have helped me tremendously in shaping my thesis. In particular, thank you Wanyan and Keely, for encouraging me to embark on this project.

My language consultants, who have been as involved in this project as I have been. Thank you for your patience during elicitations.

Yosuke-sensei, for introducing linguistics to me, and Leslie, for my first syntax module. Your inspiring classes were the start of my academic journey. I am also grateful for Naga and Ted for valuable input that has guided my fieldwork.

Morpheme Addicts: Keely, JJ, Wanyan, Hannah, Keith, Sikai, Helen. You have been my source of emotional support and tech support. More importantly, thank you for both the meaningful and utterly meaningless conversations I grew to love.

My ever-supportive friends, who have in one way or another given me encouragement and confidence: Lou, Gwen, Jin, Cordi, Rachel, Mel, Dickson, Yau, Colin, Junyi, Chotiga, Annette, Jolene, Priscilla, Andrea. I have always drawn strength from your words.

Most importantly, my family, who have been supporting me in every step of my life. Thank you for everything you have done for me. I love you.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iii
List of tables and figures	vi
Abbreviations	vii
Abstract.....	viii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Background	3
2.1 Case System in Bikol	3
2.2 Voice System in Bikol	6
2.3 The Extraction Restriction Across Austronesian Languages.....	8
2.4 Structural Description of Topicalisation and Clefts in Bikol.....	10
Chapter Three: Topicalisation in Bikol	14
3.1 Short Distance Topics	14
3.1.1 Short Distance Topics in Unmarked Constructions.....	14
3.1.2 Short Distance Topics in Double Nominative Constructions	17
3.1.3 Multiple Short Distance Topics	23
3.2 Long Distance Topics.....	28
3.2.1 Long Distance Topics in Unmarked Constructions	29
3.2.2 Long Distance Topics in Double Nominative Constructions.....	30
3.2.3 Multiple Long Distance Topics.....	34
3.2.4 Topics of Embedded clauses	36
Chapter Four: Cleft-Formation in Bikol.....	39
4.1 Short Distance Clefts.....	39
4.1.1 Short Distance Clefts in Unmarked Constructions	39
4.1.2 Short Distance Clefts in Double Nominative Constructions.....	43
4.2 Long Distance Clefts	46
4.2.1 Long Distance Clefts in Unmarked Constructions	46
4.2.2 Long Distance Clefts in Double Nominative Constructions	48

4.2.3	Multiple Long Distance Clefts	51
	Chapter Five: Summary of Observations	54
	Chapter Six: Islands.....	56
6.1	Island Constraints in Unmarked Constructions	57
6.2	Island Constraints in Double Nominative Constructions	59
	Chapter Seven: The Extraction Restriction and Bikol	64
7.1	Implication of Bikol on Current Literature.....	64
7.2	Proposed Analysis: Topicalisation as an Argument-Promotion Device.	65
	Chapter Eight: Further Discussion.....	72
	Chapter Nine: Conclusion.....	74
	References.....	76

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>
Table 1: Some Case Markers of Bikol	4

ABBREVIATIONS

AV	Actor Voice
COMP	Complementiser
CP	Complementiser Phrase
DAT	Dative Case
DP	Determiner Phrase
GEN	Genitive Case
PST	Past Tense
PV	Patient Voice
NOM	Nominative case
PERF	Perfective
Spec, CP	Specifier to CP
<i>t</i>	Italicised <i>t</i> represents the trace occupying the original position of a moved element
3SG	Third person singular
* <i>x</i>	The sentence is ungrammatical
*(<i>x</i>)	The sentence is ungrammatical when <i>x</i> is omitted
(<i>*x</i>)	The sentence is ungrammatical when <i>x</i> is included
< <i>x</i> >	<i>x</i> is the infix inflected on verb
<i>x</i> -verb	<i>x</i> is the prefix inflected on verb
<u><i>x</i></u>	An underlined <i>x</i> represents the element that is displaced
<i>x</i>	A bolded <i>x</i> represents the element that is displaced to a lower position when more than one element is displaced
<i>x</i> _{<i>i</i>} <i>y</i> _{<i>i</i>}	<i>x</i> and <i>y</i> are coindexed
,	when a comma follows an element, it represents a prosodic break

ABSTRACT

Many Austronesian languages, including Philippine languages, follow a Subject-Only Restriction, where the only DP argument that can undergo extraction is the subject. This paper looks at the Subject-Only Restriction in relation to topicalisation and cleft-formation in Bikol. While this paper provides data to illustrate strong syntactic evidence for the Subject-Only Restriction in Bikol, more interesting are the apparent exceptions to this generalisation, also described in this paper. This paper suggests that the Subject-Only Restriction is an over-specification caused by the association of subjecthood with nominative case, and instead proposes that the extraction generalisation be extended to any nominative-marked argument. Motivated by Bikol data, this paper assumes an existing framework by Aldridge (2004, 2008, 2017) for the extraction generalisation and adapts it to account for the exceptions described, proposing that Bikol uses topicalisation as a “promotion device” to base generate non-subjects high to facilitate non-subject extraction.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Subject-Only Restriction, where extraction is restricted to the subject argument (Keenan and Comrie, 1977) has been documented in many Austronesian languages. While this generalisation is observed in Bikol, a Central-Philippine language in the Austronesian family (Mcfarland 1974: 43), there are some exceptions. In particular, I present evidence, constructions such as topicalisation and cleft-formation, to show that extraction is not limited to subjects. In light of these new data, I propose a modification to the Subject-Only Restriction generalisation so as to account for both the observations about Subject-Only Restriction in the literature and the data I present in this paper.

In this paper, I refer closely to Tagalog, another Central-Philippine language, as the languages are related and are syntactically similar (Mcfarland 1974: 102). Note that the data in this paper reflects a dialect of Bikol, spoken in the town of Virac in the Southern Catanduanes province. This Southern Catanduanese dialect is considered a part of Standard Bikol, along with four other dialects, namely Naga, Legazpi, Partido and Daet (Mcfarland 1974: 11).

A brief background of Bikol, including its case and voice systems, is provided in Chapter 2. The exceptions to the Subject-Only Restriction are carefully presented in Chapters 3 to 6. I describe non-subject topicalisation and cleft-formation via

extraction in both short and long distance environments, and document the interactions of resumptive pronouns with these constructions. I also discuss the interaction of topics and cleft constructions with islands in Chapter 6, and conclude that clefts are formed via extraction while topics are not. Finally, in Chapter 7, in the face of Bikol exceptions, I conclude that the Subject-Only Restriction is wrong as it inaccurately predicts that non-subjects cannot undergo extraction. Instead I propose that the extraction generalisation should be extended to include any nominative arguments, and not just restricted to nominative subject, therefore proposing the Nominative-Only Restriction. This is motivated by the overwhelming evidence in Bikol showing that anything nominative, not just the subject, can undergo extraction. I then adopt an existing analysis by Aldridge (2004, 2008, 2017) for the Subject-Only Restriction and adopt it to account for the non-subject clefts in Bikol described in this paper. In addition, I propose that in Bikol, topicalisation is a mechanism used to generate non-subject topics, which bear nominative case. These nominative non-subject topics are therefore made available for extraction. In Chapter 8, I propose future directions for the Nominative-Only Restriction and conclude this paper in Chapter 9.

CHAPTER TWO

BACKGROUND

2.1 Case System in Bikol

Philippine-type languages generally exhibit verb-initial basic word order and require structural morphological case on all core arguments. While previous work have described Philippine case as morphologically and syntactically ergative (De Guzman, 1988), I choose to adopt the terms nominative, genitive, and the dative. (See Erlewine, Levin and van Urk 2015; Foley 2008 for discussions about the Ergativity Hypothesis.) A table of the relevant case markers used in this paper is found in Table 1 below. The nominative case marks the grammatical subject of the clause, while the genitive case marks non-subject themes and actors in the actor and patient voices respectively. I refer to core arguments that the verb does not cross-reference as the subject as non-subjects. In transitive clauses, there are two core arguments, and optionally oblique arguments. Dative or other cases can be found on these oblique arguments. The common noun and personal name markers, as presented in Table 1 below, are proclitics, i.e. they precede the verb, and personal pronouns are verbal enclitics, but I will follow conventional orthography in presenting them as independent words.

Table 1: Some Case Markers of Bikol

	NOM	GEN
Common noun markers	su	kaso (definite) ning (indefinite)
Personal name markers	si	ni
Personal pronouns (3SG)	siya	niya
Demonstrative pronouns	ito	kaito

(1) shows a transitive sentence that involves the nominative, genitive and dative morphological case markers.

(1) Su babayi nag-kaon ning keso sa harong.

NOM woman AV.PST-eat GEN cheese DAT house

‘The woman ate cheese in the house.’

Case distinctions, namely nominative and genitive cases, can also be found in the personal pronouns and demonstrative pronouns in Bikol. In addition, these personal pronouns mark person and number. Personal pronouns are usually used only for animate human arguments (Fincke 2002: 81), while demonstrative pronouns, which are also distinct in case, can be used to refer to animate and inanimate nonhuman antecedents. Genitive marked arguments and pronouns that follow an argument may also mark possession, as shown in (2).

(2) Nag-hiling su [tugang ning babayi] ning lalaki.

AV.PST-look NOM sibling GEN woman GEN man

‘The woman’s sibling looked at a man.’

(2) exemplifies two possible uses of the genitive case marker. The DP *tugang* ‘sibling’ precedes the DP *babayi* ‘woman’ that is marked with the genitive marker, indicating that they are nouns in a possessor relationship where the head, the possessor, precedes the possessed, resulting in the subject DP *su tugang ning babayi* ‘the woman’s sibling’. The clause also consists of another genitive-marked argument, *ning lalaki* ‘man’, which is the non-subject argument of the clause. In contrast, the reading ‘the man’s sibling looked at a woman’ cannot be derived, therefore demonstrating that the possessed argument must immediately follow the nominative DP.

The genitive pronoun, *niya* ‘him/her’, can also be interpreted as a possessive pronoun as seen below in (3). Again, the noun that precedes the genitive pronoun is the possessum.

(3) Nag-bakal su mama niya ning mansanas.

AV.PST-buy NOM mother 3SG.GEN GEN apple

‘His mother bought an apple.’

2.2 Voice System in Bikol

Apart from their case system, Philippine-type languages are also known for their verbal voice system (Lobel, 2013: 150), where a single DP is marked with the nominative case, and the voice-marking affixes on the verb reflect the thematic role of the DP (Kroeger, 1993).

It is generally claimed that, in Philippine languages, each verbal clause can only contain one nominative argument (Kroeger 1993: 14), and this sole nominative argument is known as the subject (or pivot) (Rackowski and Richards, 2005). This nominative DP is privileged and is cross-referenced by the verb as the grammatical subject. The voice affixes on the verb also encode various semantic information like tense, aspect and mood (Mattes 2014: 21). While there are other voices, this paper discusses two voices in particular, namely the Actor and the Patient voices, and concentrates heavily on the latter. I analyse Bikol as having a symmetrical voice system, where both Actor Voice (AV) and Patient Voice (PV) clauses comprise transitive verb forms that head different kinds of transitive constructions (Foley 2008: 22) and take different arguments as the grammatical subject. Brief descriptions of the Actor Voice and the Patient Voice are provided below.

In a basic, unmarked transitive clause with the actor as the subject, the actor bears nominative case and the verb has AV morphology to indicate that the agent is the nominative subject. As a result, the *nag-* prefix appears on the verb, as seen in (4). The non-subject theme *keso* ‘cheese’ bears the genitive case marker *ning*.

Actor Voice (AV):

- (4) Nag-kaon su babayi ning keso.
AV.PST-eat NOM woman GEN cheese
‘The woman ate the cheese.’

On the other hand, in a basic transitive clause with the theme argument as the subject, the theme bears nominative case and the verb has a PV affix. The *-in-* infix appears on the verb in (5), and is enclosed in angle brackets <>. The non-subject actor *babayi* ‘woman’ bears the genitive case *kas*.

Patient Voice (PV):

- (5) K<in>aon su keso kaso babayi.
PV.PST-eat NOM cheese GEN woman
‘The woman ate the cheese.’

There are several other PV voice morphemes which are also used in this paper. In particular, *na-* and *pig-* are also PV affixes but vary mostly in terms of their

volitionality. They do not affect grammaticality judgements for the topic of interest here, and therefore I use some of the PV affixes interchangeably.

2.3 The Extraction Restriction Across Austronesian Languages

The voice system identified above serves to reflect the choice of a single privileged argument as the subject, by using a verbal affix on the voice. In addition, a number of Austronesian languages, including Philippine-type languages like Tagalog, independently display a restriction where the only DP that can undergo extraction is the unique nominative DP (the grammatical subject) in the clause (Aldridge, 2002). Extraction in these languages extends to constructions that involve A'-movement like *wh*-movement, topicalisation under a movement analysis, relativisation and cleft-formation (Rackowski and Richards, 2005). On the other hand, the non-nominative marked DP, identified as the non-subject in this paper, is not eligible to undergo displacement before the verb. Thus it is noted that the subject is syntactically privileged, giving rise to the extraction generalisation is known as the Subject-Only Restriction. The Subject-Only Restriction is reflected in the Tagalog examples (6-8) by Aldridge (2002) below.

Extraction in Tagalog (Aldridge 2002):

Patient Extraction from PV Clause:

- (6) Ano ang b<in>abasa ni Maria t?
What NOM PV.PERF-read GEN Maria
'What is Maria reading?'

Agent Extraction from PV Clause:

(7) *Sino ang b<in>abasa ang libro t?

Who NOM PV.PERF-read NOM book

Intended: ‘Who is reading the book?’

Aldridge (2002) also notes that in order for the agent extraction to be licensed, the agent must first be the subject of an antipassive clause, referred to in this paper as the Actor Voice, where the agent argument is the subject of the clause. The *wh*-question in (8) therefore shows that once the agent has been “promoted” to the sole nominative subject of the clause, it can undergo extraction. These observations illustrate that the subject of any transitive clause.

Agent Extraction from AV Clause:

(8) Sino ang b<um>abasa ng libro t?

Who NOM AV.PERF-read DAT book

‘Who is reading the book?’

Previous work by Rackowski and Richards (2005) and Aldridge (2002, 2004,) have ascribed the nominative DP subject’s privilege to the position of the argument. The nominative DP is the highest internal argument, and therefore, the only argument that can be extracted. This is based on the common assumption that extraction only occurs from the edge of the phase (Chomsky, 2000). Rackowski and Richards (2005) posit that Tagalog subjects are DPs that have been

“promoted”, that is, raised to the edge of the phase to value nominative case, triggering case agreement morphology on the verb. Their raised position therefore allows them to be available for extraction. Note that this account for the Subject-Only Restriction only addresses dislocation under a movement analysis. In Chapter 7, I will adopt a similar analysis to account for Bikol data.

Similar to Tagalog and many other Austronesian languages, Bikol also shows the unique subject privilege in topicalisation and cleft-formation, where only the unique nominative subject DP argument can be displaced to the left periphery of the sentence. This will be illustrated in the next section. Additionally, even though *wh*-questions in Bikol are not systematically documented in this paper, since *wh*-questions in Philippine languages are often analysed to be formed via cleft formation (Aldridge 2017: 7), as seen in the Tagalog examples (6-8), it would not be surprising if this Subject-Only Restriction also extends to *wh*-questions in Bikol, as well as other A’ phenomena, like relativisation.

2.4 Structural Description of Topicalisation and Clefts in Bikol

While topicalised and cleft constructions differ from their verb-initial constructions, which I refer to as ‘baseline’ in this paper, the truth-conditional meaning remain unaltered. I will not be distinguishing the two in terms of translation as it is not relevant to the discussion pursued in this paper. Instead, the free translations of topicalised and cleft constructions will not differ from the baseline sentences, unless indicated otherwise.

Structurally, the two constructions differ in several ways. Using (9) as the baseline sentence before topicalisation or cleft-formation occurs, I illustrate these differences with a minimal pair of long distance topicalisation (10) and long distance cleft-formation (11) below.

Baseline:

- (9) Pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan su eskwela ning
 PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill NOM student GEN
lalaki.
 man
 ‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

For topicalisation, the argument *su eskwela* ‘the student’ is fronted to become the topic, and no morphological marker follows the topic, as seen in (10). The fronted arguments are underlined in the free translation. Instead, an intonation break, orthographically represented with a comma, usually follows the topicalised subject argument. Intonation break patterns differ across different topicalisation patterns, and will be discussed in Chapter 3 on topicalisation.

Topic:

(10) Su eskwela, pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan ning
NOM student PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill GEN
lalaki.

man

‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

For cleft-formation, the argument *su eskwela* ‘the student’ is fronted, and an obligatory marker *su* immediately follows the clefted argument, as seen in (11). This obligatory marker takes the same form as the morphological nominative common noun marker used to mark subjects in Bikol. This nominative case marker also appears in *wh*-questions, where it follows the *wh*-word. Examples of *wh*-questions in Bikol will be provided in Section 4.1.1 as a comparison with short distance clefts in Bikol. In addition, there is no intonation break after the clefted argument, or after the nominative marker following the clefted argument.

Cleft:

(11) Su eskwela(*,) su(*,) pig-balita ning radyo na
NOM student NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP
g<in>adan ning lalaki.

PV.PST-kill GEN man

‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

These two displacement phenomena possibly involve movement, although an alternative mechanism to base-generate the topic high instead of extracting it is possible. Since topics in Bikol are not sensitive to islands, as shown later in Chapter 6, I concluded that topics in Bikol are base-generated high and not derived by movement. This is similar to left dislocation, which involves base-generating a topic at Spec,CP, with a resumptive pronoun in the following CP. On the other hand, clefts are formed via movement.

The next three chapters illustrate in further detail topicalisation and cleft-formation in the Patient Voice, and only make some references to the Actor Voice in Bikol to illustrate contrasts. I refer to the theme argument in the translation as the subject, and the agent argument as the non-subject. In the free translation, the underlined argument is the topic or clefted DP.

CHAPTER THREE

TOPICALISATION IN BIKOL

3.1 Short Distance Topics

In this section, short distance topics are discussed in detail. First, Section 3.1.1 presents Bikol data that supports the Subject-Only Restriction, where only the nominative subject can be preverbal. Section 3.1.2 illustrates the exceptions to the Subject-Only Restriction, found in marked constructions descriptively known as double-nominative constructions. In these examples, both subject and non-subject arguments can be topicalised, as long as the topicalised argument bears nominative case. However, the former only can be topicalised if it is resumed by a nominative pronoun, while the latter has a choice of having an optional genitive pronoun. Section 3.1.3 shows that multiple short distance topics are possible.

3.1.1 Short Distance Topics in Unmarked Constructions

As mentioned in Chapter 2, Bikol seems to obey the same Subject-Only Restriction observed in many Austronesian languages. In Philippine-type languages, predicate-initial word order is canonical (Reid and Liao 2004: 436) and Bikol is not exceptional in this regard. In these verb-initial constructions, there is freedom in the order of DPs following the verb, as seen in (12-13). Postverbally, the positions of the nominative subject *su keso* ‘the cheese’ before the genitive non-subject *kaso babayi* ‘the woman’ and vice versa are allowed.

(12) K<in>aon su keso kaso babayi.

PV.PST-eat NOM cheese GEN woman

‘The woman ate the cheese.’

(13) K<in>aon kaso babayi su keso.

PV.PST-eat GEN woman NOM cheese

‘The woman ate the cheese.’

Typical of the privileged subject facts in Austronesian languages, only the nominative marked DP, the subject, can be displaced to a preverbal position, as seen in (14), where the nominative subject *su keso* ‘the cheese’, precedes the verb. In these short distance topics, an intonation break after the topicalised argument is not allowed.

(14) Su keso(*,) k<in>aon kaso babayi.

NOM cheese PV.PST-eat GEN woman

‘The woman ate the cheese.’

On the other hand, the genitive non-subject DP in the clause, *kasobabayi* ‘the woman’ cannot be displaced to a preverbal position, as shown in (15). This contrast shows that subjects are privileged in their word order freedom.

- (15) *kaso babayi k<in>aon su keso.
 GEN woman PV.PST-eat NOM cheese
 Intended: ‘The woman ate the cheese.’

Multiple topicalisation of both the nominative subject argument and the genitive non-subject argument is also not permitted, as seen in (16-17), where all arguments precede the verb. This is predicted by the Subject-Only Restriction, where the only argument that can be fronted is the subject.

- (16) *Kaso babayi su keso k<in>aon.
 GEN woman NOM cheese PV.PST-eat
 Intended: ‘The woman ate the cheese.’

- (17) Su keso kaso babayi k<in>aon.
 NOM cheese GEN woman PV.PST-eat
 ‘The woman’s cheese was eaten.’
 Not possible: ‘The woman ate the cheese.’

Notice that while (17) has a grammatical parse, its meaning differs from its untopicalised counterpart (12). The grammaticality of (17) is possible because of two things. First, the genitive argument *kaso babayi* ‘the woman’ is interpreted as a possessor. Second, in Bikol, verbs in the passive voice take an optional agent. In (17), *kaso babayi* ‘the woman’ is not the non-subject argument that comes before

the verb, but instead a modifier that follows the subject *su keso* ‘the cheese’. Thus, this allows the interpretation where the theme subject DP of the agentless sentence in (17) to be *su keso kaso babayi* ‘the woman’s cheese’, rather than the expected interpretation where the theme subject DP of the transitive sentence is *su keso* ‘the cheese’ and the agent is *kasu babayi* ‘the woman’. The above data therefore show that the Subject-Only Restriction is observed in Bikol.

3.1.2 Short Distance Topics in Double Nominative Constructions

There are, however, some exceptions where the non-subject can appear in a preverbal position in Bikol. This section describes the environments wherein these exceptions occur. These exceptions result in a ‘double nominative construction’, where both the subject and non-subject arguments are nominative. Note that these constructions are marked, as compared to the canonical transitive clause which has a nominative subject and a genitive non-subject. If topicalisation in Bikol involves movement, then the data below contradicts the Subject-Only Restriction. (18) illustrates that a non-subject topic construction is well-formed when it bears a nominative case *su* instead of a genitive case.

- (18) Su babayi(*,) k<in>aon su keso.
 NOM woman PV.PST-eat NOM cheese
 ‘The woman ate the cheese.’
 Not possible: ‘The cheese ate the woman.’

Notice that while the actor argument *woman* is now marked with the nominative case, the theme argument *su keso* ‘the cheese’, is not ‘demoted’ in terms of case. This is atypical from the viewpoint where the actor argument must first be promoted to the sole nominative subject of the verb, which also triggers a change in its verbal affix, to license actor extraction. The double nominative construction (18) is however not ambiguous, nor has the verbal morpheme on the verb changed to cross-reference the actor as the subject. Recall that the patient voice affixes on verbs mark the thematic role of the nominative subject. If the preverbal nominative DP were the true subject, either the verbal morpheme for the actor voice, potentially the *nag* prefix, should have been used, or the meaning of the sentence would have changed to a sentence like ‘*The cheese ate the woman*’, reflecting the preverbal nominative argument as the theme subject of the sentence. This is, however, not grammatical, as seen in (19).

- (19) *Su babayi nag-kaon su keso.
 NOM woman AV.PST-eat NOM cheese
 Intended: ‘The woman ate the cheese.’

Therefore, as the morpheme for the theme voice is retained in the construction, and the truth-conditional meaning of the sentence remains unchanged, I conclude that the word order of the sentence requires the non-subject to be preverbal but nominative, and the true subject to be post-verbal.

In addition, in these double nominative constructions, the nominative non-subject DP cannot occur postverbally, as seen in (20) and (22). Instead, there is a rigid order where the nominative non-subject actor is preverbal while the nominative subject is post-verbal, as shown in (21). The ill-formedness of the construction in (20) cannot be attributed to a mere surface constraint that disallows two adjacent nominative DPs, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (22). (21-22) thus show that the presence of two postverbal nominative elements results in ungrammaticality.

(20) *k<in>aon su babayi su keso.
 PV.PST-eat NOM woman NOM cheese
 Intended: ‘The woman ate the cheese.’

(21) Su babayi k<in>aon sa harong su keso.
 NOM woman PV.PST-eat DAT house NOM cheese
 ‘The woman ate the cheese in the house.’

(22) *k<in>aon su babayi sa harong su keso.
 PV.PST-eat NOM woman DAT house NOM cheese
 Intended: ‘The woman ate the cheese in the house.’

In addition, the data below also shows that a topicalised non-subject argument can be resumed by a genitive pronoun *niya* ‘him/her’ that coindexes the non-subject.

This “resumptive” pronoun appears in its canonical argument position (Potsdam and Polinsky, 2011), and therefore cannot appear before the verb. In addition, for double nominative constructions which include a resumptive pronoun, like (23), the preverbal DP must be followed by an intonation break, represented with a comma.

- (23) Su babayi *(,) k<in>aon niya_i su keso.
 NOM woman PV.PST-eat 3SG.GEN NOM cheese
 ‘The woman ate the cheese.’
 Not possible: ‘The cheese ate the woman.’

This is in contrast with (18), where having an intonation break results in ungrammaticality. This suggests that double nominative constructions without resumptive pronouns are different constructions than those with resumptive pronouns, rather than a single topicalisation construction with an optionally pronounced resumptive pronoun and an optional prosodic break. The presence of a resumptive pronoun during the displacement of a DP is characteristic of topicalisation in other Philippine languages (Reid and Liao 2004: 448). In these topicalised constructions where a resumptive pronoun is inserted, an intonation break obligatorily follows the topicalised argument (Reid and Liao 2004: 447).

In contrast, the nominative pronoun *siya* cannot occur post-verbally to be coindexed with a preverbal nominative subject, as shown in (24). It is highly likely

that the ungrammaticality is attributed to the presence of two nominative elements in a preverbal position. As a result, the theme subject cannot be topicalised in a double nominative construction using the presence of a corresponding nominative resumptive pronoun. This is not surprising, as I have established that the presence of two postverbal nominative elements results in ungrammaticality.

- (24) *Su babayi, k<in>aon siya_i su keso.
 NOM woman PV.PST-eat 3SG.NOM NOM cheese
 Intended: ‘The woman ate the cheese.’

Instead, the resumptive pronoun only occurs when the displaced DP is the theme subject, as shown in (26), although topicalisation of the subject does not require a resumptive pronoun in the unmarked construction, as seen in (25). This is cross-linguistically not unusual in many Philippine languages, where a resumptive clitic nominative pronoun following the verb is required when a nominative element is topicalised (Reid and Liao 2004: 447). In addition, personal pronouns are usually used only with human antecedents, and thus (26) has a slightly unusual interpretation in which the cheese is presented as animate.

- (25) Su keso k<in>aon kaso babayi.
 NOM cheese PV.PST-eat GEN woman
 ‘The woman ate the cheese.’

(26) Su keso_i, k<in>aon siya_i kaso babayi.

NOM cheese PV.PST-eat 3SG.NOM GEN woman

‘The woman ate the cheese.’

Remark: The cheese is animate.

Instead of using a nominative personal pronoun, a nominative demonstrative pronoun can also resume the inanimate non-subject, resulting in a more natural reading. This is shown below in (27).

(27) Su keso, k<in>aon ito_i kaso babayi.

NOM cheese PV.PST-eat DIST.3SG.NOM GEN woman

‘The woman ate that cheese.’

While the above examples are better with a nominative demonstrative pronoun, the examples below, which involve two human arguments, illustrate how personal pronouns can be used to resume human antecedents. (28) is the original, verb-initial sentence. Topicalisation of a non-subject agent involves an optionally pronounced genitive pronoun (29-30) while topicalisation of a subject argument involves an obligatorily-pronounced nominative pronoun, as seen in (31).

Baseline:

(28) G<in>adan su lalaki ning/kaso eskwela.

PV.PST-kill NOM man GEN student

‘A/ the student killed the man.’

(29) Su eskwela g<in>adan su lalaki.

NOM student PV.PST-kill NOM man

‘The student killed the man.’

(30) Su eskwela_i, g<in>adan niya_i su lalaki.

NOM student PV.PST-kill 3SG.GEN NOM man

‘The student killed the man.’

(31) Su eskwela_i, g<in>adan siya_i ning/kaso lalaki.

NOM student PV.PST-kill 3SG.NOM GEN man

‘A/ the man killed the student.’

3.1.3 Multiple Short Distance Topics

In addition to non-subject topics, multiple topics are also possible. This is exceptional as the Subject-Only Restriction, which claims that only subjects can be fronted, predicts that multiple fronted arguments will result in ungrammaticality. This is not the case in Bikol, as multiple topics are allowed, resulting in verb-final constructions like (32). These multiple topic constructions exhibit a requirement

that only the higher topic is separated with an intonation pause, represented with a comma. For all constructions involved multiple fronted arguments, the higher fronted argument is underlined in the free translation, while the lower fronted argument is bolded.

(32) Si Pedro, su babayi g<in>adan.

NOM Pedro NOM woman PV.PST-kill

'Pedro killed the **woman**.'

Not possible: 'The **woman** killed Pedro.'

In multiple-topic constructions like (32), the highest topicalised argument is always unambiguously interpreted as the non-subject. The nominative resumptive pronoun *niya* 'him', which coindexes the highest nominative DP, may optionally be found after the verb, as shown in (33). Comparing the meanings in (32) and (33), it seems that *niya* 'him' is optional and does not change the meaning of the sentence in (32).

(33) Si Pedro_i, su babayi g<in>adan niya_i.

NOM Pedro NOM woman PV.PST-kill 3SG.GEN

'Pedro killed **the woman**.'

Not possible: 'The **woman** killed Pedro.'

Unlike the short distance topic constructions such as (24), however, the nominative pronoun *siya* ‘he’ can also occur postverbally to coindex a preverbal nominative subject as seen below. This results in an interpretation where the highest topicalised argument is the subject. Notice that the insertion of the nominative pronoun *siya* in (34) changes the meaning of the sentence in (32).

- (34) Si Pedro_i, su babayi g<in>adan siya_i.
 NOM Pedro NOM woman PV.PST-kill 3SG.NOM
 ‘The woman killed Pedro.’
 Not possible: ‘Pedro killed the woman.’

It is noted that in constructions with multiple topics, the intonation break requirement, where only the highest topic is phonologically separated by a pause, is consistent regardless of the presence or absence of a resumptive pronoun, unlike in the cases with a single short distance topic. If there are no intonation breaks, or if an intonation break only follows the second DP, the resulting sentences become ungrammatical, as seen in (35) and (36) respectively. This is in contrast to the grammatical sentence (32), showing that prosodic break has to appear in a specific position.

- (35) *Si Pedro su babayi g<in>adan.
 NOM Pedro NOM woman PV.PST-kill
 Intended: ‘Pedro killed the woman.’

(36) *Si Pedro su babayi, g<in>adan.

NOM Pedro NOM woman PV.PST-kill

Intended: 'Pedro killed the woman.'

In addition, if a comma accompanies both nominative DPs, as seen in (37-38) then only a listing interpretation where the comma represents 'and' is available, and the readings 'Pedro killed the woman' or 'the woman killed Pedro' cannot be derived. (37-38) also shows that in cases which include pronouns, having an intonation break after each topicalised DP will also lead to a listing interpretation. Thus, the preference for an intonation break only after the highest topic, no matter the thematic role, suggests that the higher and the lower topic rely on different mechanisms for topicalisation. Recall that the genitive pronoun *niya* 'him/her' and nominative pronoun *siya* 'he/she' have been used to resume a fronted antecedent in previous examples. This is not the case for (37-38), where a prosodic break follows each topic. The pronouns do not coindex any antecedents, hence resulting in the listing interpretations.

(37) Si Pedro, su babayi, g<in>adan (niya).

NOM Pedro NOM woman PV.PST-kill 3SG.GEN

'Pedro and the woman were killed (by him/ her).' (listing)

- (38) Si Pedro, su babayi, g<in>adan siya.
 NOM Pedro NOM woman PV.PST-kill 3SG.NOM
 ‘Pedro and the woman both killed him/ her.’ (listing)

Additionally, since the resumptive pronouns *niya* ‘him/her’ and *siya* ‘he/she’ correspond to different argument positions, it would not be surprising to find both pronouns resuming the each topic simultaneously. Indeed, in these multiple topic constructions, both *niya* ‘him/her’ and *siya* ‘he/she’ can co-occur after the verb to resume each of the topicalised nominative DPs that occur in front of the verb, as exemplified in (39-40). Again, an intonation break only follows the highest DP topic.

- (39) Su babayi*(,) si Pedro_j g<in>adan niya_j siya_i.
 NOM woman NOM Pedro PV.PST-kill 3SG.GEN 3SG.NOM
 ‘**Pedro** killed the woman.’

Not possible: ‘The woman killed **Pedro**.’

- (40) Su babayi*(,) si Pedro_j g<in>adan siya_j niya_i.
 NOM woman NOM Pedro PV.PST-kill 3SG.NOM 3SG.GEN
 ‘The woman killed **Pedro**.’

Not possible: ‘**Pedro** killed the woman.’

The multiple topics examples show that subjects can be preverbal in a marked construction if the postverbal resumptive pronoun *siya* is present, and if there is no other nominative element following the verb. Given the sentence structure in (39), where there are two topicalised arguments and two resumptive pronouns, one might expect an ambiguous sentence where two readings are possible.

However, this is not the case. The same observation is made in (40). This, and the strict distribution pattern of the intonation break and position of postverbal resumptive pronouns, provides more evidence that these two topics are derived differently. This is unlike basic verb-initial sentences, where the positions of a nominative subject and genitive non-subject does not affect the truth-conditional meaning of the sentence.

3.2 Long Distance Topics

In this section, long distance topics are discussed in detail. Firstly, 3.2.1 presents Bikol data that supports the Subject-Only Restriction, where only the nominative subject can be displaced across a higher verb. Section 3.2.2 illustrates the exceptions to the Subject-Only Restriction. Similar to short distance topics, both subject and non-subject arguments can be topicalised, as long as the topicalised arguments bear nominative case. Subject topics are possible only if it is resumed by a nominative pronoun, while non-subject topics have the option of being resumed by a genitive pronoun. Section 3.2.3 shows that long distance multiple topics are possible only if the higher topic is resumed by a pronoun. This is different from short distance multiple topics, where multiple topics are possible

even without any resumptive pronouns. Finally in Section 3.2.4, I show that a local topic can occur simultaneously with a long distance topic.

3.2.1 Long Distance Topics in Unmarked Constructions

Long distance topicalisation in Bikol is also possible. In long-distance topicalisation, an argument in an embedded clause is displaced to the left periphery of the sentence, across a higher verb. For long distance topicalisation, the intonation break is obligatory regardless of the presence or absence of a resumptive pronoun. As illustrated below, the Subject-Only Restriction holds for long distance topicalisation (41-43) in unmarked constructions. Subjects are privileged, as only the subject DP, *su lalaki* ‘the man’ can be displaced long-distance to the sentence-initial position, as seen in (42).

Baseline:

- (41) Pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan ning eskwela su
PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill GEN student NOM
lalaki.
man
‘The radio reported that the student killed the man.’

(42) Su lalaki*(,) pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan ning
 NOM man PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill GEN
 eskwela.
 student
 ‘The radio reported that the student killed the man.’

Displacement of the genitive non-subject *ning eskwela* ‘the student’ to a preverbal position results in ungrammaticality, as seen in (43).

(43) *Ning eskwela, pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan su
 GEN student PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill NOM
 lalaki.
 man
 Intended: ‘The radio reported that the student killed the man.’

3.2.2 Long Distance Topics in Double Nominative Constructions

Non-subjects of an embedded verb can also be displaced long distance to a position before a higher verb if it is marked with a nominative case marker. This is shown in (44). Again, this results in a marked double nominative construction, where both the non-subject *eskwela* ‘the student’, now displaced, and the embedded subject *lalaki* ‘the man’ are marked in nominative case *su*. An intonation break must follow the long distance topic.

(44) Su eskwela, pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan su
 NOM student PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill NOM
 lalaki.
 man

‘The radio reported that the student killed the man.’

The resulting construction (44) is not ambiguous in its denotative meaning. Nor did the verb change in voice morphology to cross-reference the topicalised actor *su eskwela* ‘the student’ as subject. In addition, (45) shows that while both arguments can be displaced to preverbal positions, one preceding the matrix verb, and the other preceding the embedded verb, only the non-subject argument *su eskwela* ‘the student’ can be displaced long distance. This can be derived from the fact that (45) is unambiguous, where the higher DP is the non-subject argument.

(45) Su eskwela, pig-balita ning radyo na su lalaki
 NOM student PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP NOM man
 g<in>adan.
 PV.PST-kill

‘The radio reported that the student killed **the man**.’

Not possible: ‘The radio reported that **the man** killed the student.’

From the unambiguity of (44-45), where the DP topicalised to the left periphery of the sentence is the non-subject argument, I conclude that, in a marked

construction without resumptive pronouns, only the non-subject DP of the embedded clause, and not the subject DP, can be topicalised to the left periphery of the sentence.

Unsurprisingly, in these marked constructions, non-subject DPs cannot occur postverbally if they are marked with a nominative case, as seen in (46) This is unlike topicalisation in the unmarked construction (44), where the non-subject that occurs postverbally is marked with genitive case, suggesting again that nominative case appears on the non-subject argument only when it is displaced to a preverbal position.

(46) *Pig-balita ning reporter na g<in>adan su eskwela su
PV.PST-report GEN reporter COMP PV.PST-kill NOM student NOM
lalaki.
man

Intended: ‘The radio reported that the student killed the man.’ Or
‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

Finally, the non-subject topic can be optionally resumed by a genitive pronoun *niya* ‘him/her’, as seen in (47). The insertion of the pronoun does not change the meaning of (44).

(47) Su eskwela_i, pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
 NOM student PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
 niya_i su lalaki.
 3SG.GEN NOM man

‘The radio reported that the student killed the man.’

Unlike their short distance counterparts, subjects can be long-distance topicalised in a marked construction if they are resumed by an obligatory nominative pronoun *siya*. The pronoun *siya* ‘he’ and the subject argument *su lalaki* ‘the man’ are coindexed, and the pronoun appears after the verb, as seen in (48). The word order of the embedded clause is rigid. The non-subject *su eskwela* ‘the student’ is immediately preverbal and the pronoun that the subject, *su lalaki* ‘the man’, coindexes is immediately postverbal in the embedded clause.

(48) Su lalaki_i, pig-balita ning radyo na su eskwela g<in>adan
 NOM man PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP NOM student PV.PST-kill
 siya_i.
 3SG.NOM

‘The radio reported that the student killed the man.’

Not possible: ‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

Consistent with the existing data, a nominative non-subject argument results in an ill-formed construction like (49).

(49) *Su lalaki, pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan su eskwela
 NOM man PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill NOM student
 siya_i.
 3SG.NOM

Intended: ‘The radio reported that the student killed the man.’

3.2.3 Multiple Long Distance Topics

Long distance multiple topics are also possible. Multiple topic constructions are only licensed if there is at least one resumptive pronoun in the embedded clause from which the topics originate and if the first DP and only the first DP is followed by an intonation break. This is unlike the multiple topic data in short distance environments, where a sentence with multiple topics is licensed even without the insertion of any resumptive pronoun, suggesting that the mechanism for short and long distance topics differ. The lack of resumptive pronouns in the embedded clause results in an ill-formed construction like (50), while the other two examples (51-52) show that the presence of resumptive pronouns are crucial for well-formed multiple long distance topics.

(50) *Si Pedro, su babayi pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan.
 NOM Pedro NOM woman PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill

Intended: ‘The radio reported that Pedro killed **the woman**.’ or

‘The radio reported that **the woman** killed Pedro.’

(51) Si Pedro_i, su babayi pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
NOM Pedro NOM woman PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
niya_i.

3SG.GEN

‘The radio reported that Pedro killed **the woman**.’

Not possible: ‘The radio reported that **the woman** killed Pedro.’

(52) Si Pedro_i, su babayi pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
NOM Pedro NOM woman PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
siya_i.

3SG.NOM

‘The radio reported that **the woman** killed Pedro.’

Not possible: ‘The radio reported that Pedro killed **the woman**.’

Note that (51-52) are not ambiguous. The highest DP topic, *Pedro*, always coindexes the overt resumptive pronoun, suggesting that there is a correlation between the intonation break and the resumptive pronoun.

Unfortunately, the grammaticality judgements of multiple long distance topics, where each topic is resumed by a corresponding pronoun, has not been consistent and therefore will be excluded in this paper.

3.2.4 Topics of Embedded clauses

Unlike proposed accounts of topicalisation in some literature, topicalisation in Bikol is not restricted to the matrix CPs. Instead, topics can be displaced to the left periphery of embedded clauses as well. This is illustrated in (53), where an example involving a long distance non-subject topic *su eskwela* ‘the student’ as well as a local topicalised subject *su lalaki* ‘the man’ is well-formed. Notice that, unlike short distance topics, the local topic of an embedded clause does not allow require an intonation break regardless of whether it is resumed by a pronoun. In addition, having the genitive pronoun *niya* ‘him’ does not change the meaning of the sentence without any pronouns.

(53) Su eskwela_i, pig-balita ning radyo na su lalaki(*,)

NOM student PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP NOM man

g<in>adan (niya_i).

PV.PST-kill 3SG.GEN

‘The radio reported that the student killed **the man**.’

Not possible: ‘The radio reported that **the man** killed the student.’

In contrast, having the nominative pronoun *siya* ‘he’ changes the meaning of the sentence, as shown in (54).

(54) Su eskwela_i, pig-balita ning radyo na su lalaki(*.)

NOM student PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP NOM man

g<in>adan siya_i.

PV.PST-kill 3SG.NOM

‘The radio reported that **the man** killed the student.’

Not possible: ‘The radio reported that the student killed **the man**.’

On the other hand, a genitive argument cannot be locally topicalised in the embedded clause, reflecting the Subject-Only Restriction in Bikol where genitive non-subjects cannot be displaced preverbally. This is seen in (55).

(55) *Su eskwela, pig-balita ning radyo na ning lalaki g<in>adan.

NOM student PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP GEN man PV.PST-kill

Intended: ‘The radio reported that **the man** killed the student.’

Multiple topics in embedded clauses are also possible. Similar to multiple short distance topics, an intonation gap must follow only the highest topicalised nominative DP. (56) shows a double nominative construction with multiple topics in the embedded clause. In (56), the highest non-subject topic *Pedro* can optionally be resumed by a genitive pronoun. This is parallel to the observation of multiple topics in short distances, where a resumptive pronoun is not required for a well-formed sentence.

- (56) Pig-balita ning radyo na si Pedro_i*(,) su babayi*(,)
 PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP NOM Pedro NOM woman
 g<in>adan (niya_i).
 PV.PST-kill 3SG.GEN
 ‘The radio reported that Pedro killed **the woman**.’

Additionally, the highest DP can also be resumed by a nominative pronoun *siya* ‘he/she’, as seen in (57). This however, changes the denotative meaning of the sentence.

- (57) Pig-balita ning radyo na si Pedro_i, su babayi
 PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP NOM Pedro NOM woman
 g<in>adan siya_i
 PV.PST-kill 3SG.NOM
 ‘The radio reported that **the woman** killed Pedro.’

In Section 7.2, I elaborate on how this data on embedded topics is possibly crucial in accounting for the exceptions to the Subject-Only Restriction in Austronesian languages.

CHAPTER FOUR

CLEFT-FORMATION IN BIKOL

4.1 Short Distance Clefts

In this section, short distance clefts are discussed in further detail. Firstly, Section 4.1.1 will present Bikol data that supports the Subject-Only Restriction, where only the nominative subject can form clefts. Contrary to short distance topics however, short distance clefts do not allow resumptive pronouns in argument positions. Section 4.1.2 illustrates short distance clefts in marked constructions. In these examples, neither subject nor non-subject arguments can form clefts. This is unlike the short distance topics in Bikol. The addition of resumptive pronouns does not affect the grammaticality of these badly-formed short distance clefts.

4.1.1 Short Distance Clefts in Unmarked Constructions

Typical of the privileged subject facts in Austronesian languages, only the nominative marked DP, the subject, can be clefted, as illustrated below. Only the unique nominative marked DP, the subject, can form clefts, as noted in (58). In contrast, the genitive non-subject DP cannot form clefts, as seen in (59).

(58) Su lalaki su g<in>adan kaso eskwela.

NOM man NOM PV.PST-kill GEN student

‘The student killed the man.’

(59) *kaso eskwela su g<in>adan su lalaki.

GEN student NOM PV.PST-kill NOM man

Intended: ‘The student killed the man.’

Unlike topicalisation, the insertion of a postverbal resumptive pronoun is not licensed, as seen in (60). The presence of an intonation break after the clefted construction does not improve the grammaticality of the construction. In fact, as it is observed in later examples, intonation breaks are never licensed in any cleft constructions. Instead, the resulting constructions are remarked to be ‘incomplete’, and can be ‘complete’ sentences if the verb *natakdag* ‘fell’ was added, resulting in the well-formed sentence (61). The nominative marker *su* following clefted arguments appears to act as a relative complementiser as well. In addition, the position of the resumptive pronoun in unmarked constructions does not affect grammaticality. Whether the pronoun immediately follows the verb, as in (60-61), or is sentence-final, as in (62-63), the grammaticality does not change.

(60) Su lalaki_i(,) su g<in>adan kaso eskwela siya_i (incomplete)

NOM man NOM PV.PST-kill GEN student 3SG.NOM

‘The man that was killed by the student...’

Not possible: ‘The student killed the man.’

(61) Su lalaki_i su g<in>adan kaso eskwela siya_i na-takdag.

NOM man NOM PV.PST-kill GEN student 3SG.NOM PV.PST-fall

‘The man that was killed by the student fell.’

(62) Su lalaki_i su g<in>adan siya_i kaso eskwela (incomplete)

NOM man NOM PV.PST-kill 3SG.NOM GEN student

‘The man that was killed by the student...’

Not possible: ‘The student killed the man.’

(63) Su lalaki_i su g<in>adan siya_i kaso eskwela na-takdag.

NOM man NOM PV.PST-kill 3SG.NOM GEN student PV.PST-fall

‘The man that was killed by the student fell.’

Here, it should be noted that Bikol, like many other Austronesian languages, forms *wh*-questions by forming clefts (Rackowski and Richards 2005: 587), and therefore observations about cleft formation in Bikol naturally extend to *wh*-question formation as well. An example of a typical *wh*-question in Bikol is provided below:

(64) Ano su pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan ning
 who NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill GEN
 lalaki?
 man
 ‘Who did the radio report that the man killed?’

A typical *wh*-construction is headed by a *wh*-word predicate, followed by a headless relative clause that is marked with a nominative case marker (Aldridge 2004, 2017; Potsdam and Polinsky 2011: 126). This is structurally very similar to cleft constructions in Bikol, as seen in (65).

(65) Su eskwela su pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
 NOM student NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
 ning lalaki.
 GEN man
 ‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

Aside from structural similarity, cleft constructions and *wh*-questions display the same sensitivity to islands. This suggests that both constructions rely on the same extraction mechanism, as will be discussed in more detail in Section 6.2.

Therefore, while *wh*-questions have not been examined closely in this paper, I predict that *wh*-questions will mirror the observations made about cleft constructions in Bikol.

4.1.2 Short Distance Clefts in Double Nominative Constructions

In marked, double nominative constructions, short distance clefts are always ungrammatical as they are remarked to be ‘incomplete’, regardless of whether the clefted argument is the subject or the non-subject. This is shown in (66).

(66) Su lalaki su g<in>adan su eskwela (incomplete)

NOM man NOM PV.PST-kill NOM student

‘The man that killed the student...’

Not possible: ‘The man killed the student.’

Again, (66) elicits an intuition that the sentence is incomplete unless the verb in the passive voice *natakdag* is inserted, as shown in (67). (67) is again unambiguous; the non-subject DP is the argument that is relativised.

(67) Su lalaki su g<in>adan su eskwela na-takdag.

NOM man NOM PV.PST-kill NOM student PV.PST-fall

‘The man that killed the student fell.’

Interestingly, complete sentences like (67) are structurally similar to the relative clause construction in Bikol shown in (68).

(68) Su lalaki [na g<in>adan su eskwela] na-takdag.

NOM man COMP PV.PST-kill NOM student PV.PST-fall

‘The man that killed the student fell.’

This presence of the double nominative relative clause construction contradicts existing subject-only relativisation facts discussed by Keenan and Comrie (1997) and other authors. Examples from Foley and Van Valin (1984) attribute the ungrammaticality of non-subject relativisation to the overt nominative DP within the relative clause, showing that the relativized position (gap) corresponds to a non-nominative argument and is therefore ungrammatical. In addition, Keenan and Comrie (1977) also note that in Philippine-type languages in general, the head of a relative clause can carry any thematic role with respect to the embedded verb, but it must always be the nominative argument, as reflected by the voice-marking on the verb. In other words, the nominative-marked subject DP of any clause is the only argument that can be relativised. Thus, while relativisation in Bikol has not been thoroughly examined, the above data can also be seen as exceptions to the Subject-Only Restriction independently observed in other Austronesian/Philippine-type languages. Furthermore, the data also challenges the claim where relativisation of the genitive agent in a transitive sentence is not allowed in any Philippine language (Reid and Liao 2004: 482).

Note that the ungrammaticality of the short distance clauses like (66) cannot be attributed to the lack of resumptive pronouns. As seen in (69-70), insertion of a

resumptive pronoun in an argument position does not license the marked short distance cleft construction. The resulting construction (69) is still incomplete, and the genitive pronoun is interpreted to be a possessive pronoun. In (70), the construction is also ungrammatical, but this is not surprising as it has been consistently observed that there can only be one nominative element in a post-verbal position.

(69) Su lalaki_i su g<in>adan su eskwela niya_i
 NOM man NOM PV.PST-kill NOM student 3SG.GEN

‘The man that killed his student...’

Not possible: ‘The man killed the student.’

(70) Su lalaki_i su g<in>adan su eskwela siya_i
 NOM man NOM PV.PST-kill NOM student 3SG.NOM

‘The man that killed his student...’

Not possible: ‘The student killed the man.’

Thus, short distance cleft-formation in both unmarked constructions and marked double nominative constructions are not possible in Bikol, regardless of whether the clefted argument is the subject or non-subject.

4.2 Long Distance Clefts

In this section, long distance clefts are discussed in detail. Firstly, Section 4.2.1 will present Bikol data that supports the Subject-Only Restriction, where only the nominative subject can form long distance clefts. Section 4.2.2 illustrates long distance clefts in marked constructions. Similar to topics in marked constructions, both subject and non-subject arguments can form clefts, as long as the clefted arguments bear nominative case. This is unlike the pattern of short distance clefts in Bikol. In addition, resumptive pronouns do not affect the grammaticality of these well-formed long distance clefts. Section 4.2.3 illustrates the ill-formedness of multiple clefts in Bikol. However, topicalisation of a local topic and a long-distance cleft are simultaneously licensed. This shows that embedded topics are possible in constructions with either a long distance topic or a long distance cleft.

4.2.1 Long Distance Clefts in Unmarked Constructions

Unlike in short distance environments, cleft-formation is licensed in long distance environments. In these cleft constructions, the predicate appears preverbally, followed by a nominative marker. (72-73) reflect the Subject-Only Restriction, where only the nominative subject can form preverbal clefts in long distance. Cleft constructions, like topicalised constructions, differ from their non-cleft counterparts only in pragmatic meaning (Kroeger 1993: 10), and not propositional content, and thus the denotative meaning is the same as the baseline in (71).

(71) Pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan su eskwela ning
 PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill NOM student GEN
 lalaki.
 man
 ‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

(72) Su eskwela su pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
 NOM student NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
 ning lalaki.
 GEN man
 ‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

By contrast, a genitive non-subject cleft results in an ill-formed construction, as seen in (73).

(73) *Ning lalaki su pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
 GEN man NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
 su eskwela.
 NOM student
 Intended: ‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

In addition, as mentioned briefly in Chapter 1, clefts do not allow intonation breaks, unlike topicalisation in long distance environments. In (74), when an

intonation break is inserted immediately after the clefted argument, the resulting sentence is ungrammatical.

(74) *Su eskwela, su pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
 NOM student NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
 ning lalaki.
 GEN man

Intended: ‘The radio reported that a man killed the student.’

Similarly, in (75), when an intonation break is inserted after the nominative marker following the clefted construction, it results in an ill-formed sentence.

(75) *Su eskwela su, pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
 NOM student NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
 ning lalaki.
 GEN man

Intended: ‘The radio reported that a man killed the student.’

4.2.2 Long Distance Clefts in Double Nominative Constructions

While non-subjects cannot form clefts with their original genitive marker, they can, however, form preverbal clefts in long distance environments if they are marked with the nominative case. In marked double nominative constructions

like (76), the denotative meaning is unambiguous, where the clefted argument is the non-subject actor.

(76) Su lalaki su pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
 NOM man NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
 su eskwela.
 NOM student

‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

In addition, the verbal morpheme on the verb has not changed to cross-reference the semantic actor role with the preverbal nominative DP. As seen in (77), the presence of a genitive resumptive pronoun in the argument position is also licensed, as long as the genitive pronoun is in the argument position of the embedded verb. This contrasts with unmarked short distance subject clefts where resumptive pronouns do not license the cleft constructions.

(77) Su lalaki_i su pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
 NOM man NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
 niya_i su eskwela.
 3SG.GEN NOM student

‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

Not possible: ‘The radio reported that the student killed the man.’

In contrast, a preverbal genitive pronoun will result in ungrammaticality, as seen in (78).

(78) *Su lalaki_i su pig-balita ning radyo na niya_i
 NOM man NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP 3SG.GEN
 g<in>adan su eskwela.
 PV.PST-kill NOM student

Intended: 'The radio reported that the man killed the student.'

The subject can also form clefts in these marked double nominative long distance environments. This is shown in (79) where the nominative subject *su lalaki* 'the man' is coindexed with the nominative pronoun *siya* 'he/she' and forms a cleft. Again, the construction is not unambiguous, signalling that there is strict word order in the embedded clause, where the nominative non-subject actor is preverbal while the nominative pronoun that resumes the subject has to occur post-verbally.

(79) Su lalaki_i su pig-balita ning radyo na su eskwela
 NOM man NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP NOM student
 g<in>adan siya_i.
 PV.PST-kill 3SG.NOM

'The radio reported that the student killed the man.'

Unsurprisingly, the presence of a nominative non-subject argument in a postverbal position results in an ungrammatical sentence like (80).

(80) *Su lalaki su pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
 NOM man NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
 su eskwela siya.
 NOM student 3SG.NOM

Intended: ‘The radio reported that the student killed the man.’

4.2.3 Multiple Long Distance Clefts

While Bikol allows for multiple long distance topics, it does not allow multiple long distance clefts. (81) shows that multiple long distance clefts results in ungrammaticality.

(81) *Si Pedro_i su su babayi pig-balita ning radyo na
 NOM Pedro NOM NOM woman PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP
 g<in>adan (niya_i).
 PV.PST-kill 3SG.GEN

This is not particularly surprising as clefts are known to form islands, as has been noted by Cinque (1990). Thus, as clefts in Bikol are sensitive to islands, extracting a DP from a cleft to form another cleft is not possible.

However, a long distance topic can occur simultaneously with a local cleft, as shown in (82). This suggests that the topic *su babayi* ‘the woman’ is base-generated high, and is not instead extracted from within the cleft island.

(82) Si Pedro_i*(,) pig-balita ning radyo na su babayi
 NOM Pedro PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP NOM woman
 su g<in>adan (niya_i).
 NOM PV.PST-kill 3SG.GEN

‘The radio reported that Pedro killed the girl.’

However, (82) is unusual as it involves a short distance cleft. Since I have established in the Section 4.2.1 that short distance clefts are ungrammatical, long-distance topics occurring with local short distance clefts are incorrectly predicted to be ungrammatical as well.

Leaving the contradiction that (82) implies aside, it is also observed that a local topicalisation of the thematic subject of the embedded verb can also simultaneously occur with a long-distance cleft, resulting in a construction like (83). This reiterates the fact that topics can occur within embedded clauses, and are not restricted to the highest CP. This construction is unambiguous, where the clefted constituent is the non-subject actor of the embedded verb.

(83) Su lalaki su pig-balita ning radyo na su eskwela
NOM man NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP NOM student
g<in>adan.

PV.PST-kill

‘The radio reported that the man killed **the student**.’

This particular piece of data is crucial in understanding the mechanism behind the availability of extraction of the non-subject, as discussed in more detail in Chapter

7.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS

In this chapter, I provide a summary of the observations regarding topicalisation and cleft-formation in Bikol.

General distribution:

- A. In all unmarked constructions (clauses with only one nominative DP - the subject), subjects are privileged: only subjects can be topicalised and form clefts.
- B. PV clauses can have both core arguments in nominative case. However, nominative non-subjects cannot appear postverbally.
- C. In PV transitive clauses with two nominative arguments, topicalisation of subjects or non-subjects is possible short distance, while cleft-formation of subjects or non-subjects is not licensed short distance.
- D. The presence of a genitive resumptive pronoun does not affect the meaning of the original sentence without the pronoun, while the presence of a nominative resumptive pronoun affects the meaning of the original sentence without the pronoun.
- E. Multiple topics are allowed, but multiple clefts are not allowed.
- F. Local topicalisation can occur simultaneously with a long distance topic.
- G. A local cleft can occur simultaneously with a long distance topic.
- H. Local topicalisation can occur simultaneously with a long distance cleft.

- I. Local cleft cannot occur simultaneously with a long distance cleft.
- J. Intonation Breaks:
 - a. Intonation breaks are disallowed in clefts.
 - b. Intonation breaks after a short distance topic is licensed only if there is no resumptive pronoun inserted.
 - c. If an embedded clause only has one topic, that topic does not require an intonation break regardless of the presence or absence of a resumptive pronoun. If both arguments are topicalised to the edge of the embedded clause, only the higher DP bears an intonation break.
 - d. In multiple topics at the same clause edge, an intonation break immediately follows only the higher topic, regardless of the presence or absence of a resumptive pronoun.

In the next chapter, topics and cleft constructions are subjected to islands to test for island-constraints, as evidence for movement.

CHAPTER SIX

ISLANDS

In this section, topicalisation and cleft-formation, the two displacement phenomena that possibly involve movement, are subjected to adjunct island conditions. Islands are characteristically known to result in ill-formed constructions, when movement crosses islands (Ross, 1967). Therefore ungrammaticality can be seen as evidence for movement, while well-formed island constructions refute a movement analysis. It is noted that the mechanism of topicalisation is language-dependent; some languages base-generate topics high, while others show that topicalisation occurs via movement (Aissen, 1992).

Long distance movement from both canonical constructions and marked double nominative constructions are subjected to adjunct island conditions. In previous literature involving Tagalog extraction, it has been observed that in long distance extraction, embedded clauses must first be the subject of higher verbs in order to license extraction out of them (Richards and Rackowski, 2005). To circumvent potential interference from arguments of the matrix verb, the weather verb *rain* is used. This is because Bikol, like many other Philippine-type languages, allows some ‘subjectless’ constructions where, unlike in English counterparts, no expletive element is required (Reid and Liao 2004: 440). One of these constructions involve weather verbs like *rain*. Furthermore, the patient voice, which can take a single core argument and an optional actor argument, is used

instead of the actor voice, which typically requires two core arguments. This results in a matrix clause construction *piguran* ‘it rained.’ that is structurally void of arguments.

Section 6.1 shows that topicalisation is island-insensitive, with or without resumptive pronouns, whereas all clefts are island-sensitive.

6.1 Island Constraints in Unmarked Constructions

In the examples below, the two displacement phenomena in unmarked constructions are subject to adjunct islands. Topicalisation of subjects in an adjunct island environment results in (85), where the truth conditional meaning is identical to the baseline (84).

Baseline:

- (84) Pig-uran bagu pig-hiling su babayi ni Andrew.
PV.PST-rain before PV.PST-look NOM woman GEN Andrew
‘It rained before Andrew looked at the woman.’

Topic:

- (85) Su babayi, pig-uran bagu pig-hiling ni Andrew.
NOM woman PV.PST-rain before PV.PST-look GEN Andrew
‘It rained before Andrew looked at the woman.’

In contrast, when a cleft is formed in constructions with an adjunct island, it does not result in a meaning identical to the unclefted original sentence. Instead, the clefted argument *su babayi* ‘the woman’ is the common argument for both clauses, suggesting that cleft-formation is local, rather than out of the island, showing that clefts are island-sensitive. This is shown in (86).

Cleft:

- (86) Su babayi su pig-uran bagu pig-hiling ni Andrew.
 NOM woman NOM PV.PST-rain before PV.PST-look GEN Andrew
 ‘It rained on the woman before Andrew looked at her.’
 Not possible: ‘It rained before Andrew looked at the woman.’

The presence of a resumptive pronoun does not affect island sensitivity. The pattern above holds for subject topics and clefts that involve a resumptive nominative pronoun. (87) shows that topics are insensitive to islands, while (88) shows that clefts are island-sensitive. Non-subject clefts in unmarked constructions are not subjected to islands as they are ungrammatical.

Topic:

(87) Su babayi_i, pig-uran bagu pig-hiling siya_i ni
NOM woman PV.PST-rain before PV.PST-look 3SG.NOM GEN

Andrew.

Andrew

‘It rained before Andrew looked at the woman.’

Cleft:

(88) Su babayi_i su pig-uran bagu pig-hiling siya_i ni
NOM woman NOM PV.PST-rain before PV.PST-look 3SG.NOM GEN

Andrew.

Andrew

‘It rained on the woman before Andrew looked at her.’

Not possible: ‘It rained before Andrew looked at the woman.’

6.2 Island Constraints in Double Nominative Constructions

Topicalisation and cleft-formation in marked double nominative constructions are also subject to island conditions. Just as in the movement of the subject from an unmarked construction above, topics are not sensitive to islands, while clefts are. The topicalised sentence (89) has the same denotative meaning as the baseline sentence (84), which is ‘it rained before Andrew looked at the woman’. On the other hand, the clefted sentence (90) differs from the baseline sentence, and it is

reinterpreted as a short distance cleft. In addition, (89-90) are unambiguous; only the non-subject argument can be topicalised or form a cleft.

Topic:

- (89) Si Andrew, pig-uran bagu pig-hiling su babayi.
NOM Andrew PV.PST-rain before PV.PST-look NOM woman
'It rained before Andrew looked at the woman.'

Cleft:

- (90) Si Andrew su pig-uran bagu pig-hiling su babayi.
NOM Andrew NOM PV.PST-rain before PV.PST-look NOM woman
'It rained on Andrew before he saw the woman.'
- Not possible: 'It rained before Andrew looked at the woman.'

The presence of resumptive pronouns does not affect the sensitivity of islands. Topics remain free from island effects, as shown in (91), while clefts are still sensitive to islands, as seen in (92).

Topic:

- (91) Si Andrew_i, pig-uran bagu pig-hiling niya_i su babayi.
NOM Andrew PV.PST-rain before PV.PST-look 3SG.GEN NOM woman
'It rained before Andrew looked at the woman.'

Cleft:

(92) Si Andrew_i su pig-uran bagu pig-hiling niya_i su
NOM Andrew NOM PV.PST-rain before PV.PST-look 3SG.GEN NOM

babayi.

woman

‘It rained on Andrew before he saw the woman.’

Not possible: ‘It rained before Andrew looked at the woman.’

This is again consistent with subject topics and clefts, as illustrated in (93) and (94) respectively.

Topic:

(93) Su babayi_i, pig-uran bagu si Andrew pig-hiling siya_i_L
NOM woman PV.PST-rain before NOM Andrew PV.PST-look 3SG.NOM

‘It rained before Andrew looked at the woman.’

Cleft:

(94) Su babayi_i su pig-uran bagu si Andrew pig-hiling
NOM woman NOM PV.PST-rain before NOM Andrew PV.PST-look

siya_i.

3SG.NOM

‘It rained on the woman before Andrew looked at her.’

Not possible: ‘It rained before Andrew looked at the woman.’

In addition, *wh*-questions formed via cleft-formation are also subject to island conditions, as seen in (99). The results mirror that of cleft constructions, where extraction is interpreted as local rather than from within the embedded clause.

Patient Extraction from PV Clause:

(95) Sisay su pig-uran bagu pig-hiling ni Andrew?

Who NOM PV.PST-rain before PV.PST-look GEN Andrew

‘Who was rained on before Andrew looked (at him/ her)?’

Not possible: ‘It rained before Andrew looked at who?’

Topics and cleft constructions are expected to differ only in pragmatic effects but not in their truth-conditional meaning of the original construction from which they are derived, as seen from Chapters 3 and 4, therefore the unavailability of the original propositional content for the cleft constructions subject to islands shows that cleft-type constructions are sensitive to islands, thus a movement analysis must be employed. On the other hand, as topicalised constructions do not display any island violations, a movement analysis is not applicable to them. Instead, following Aissen’s account of topics in Mayan, topics in Bikol are linked to their corresponding pronouns in the island clause (Aissen 1992: 69) via coreferencing. These results are parallel with Mayan languages with topicalised and focused (cleft) constructions, where topics do not result in ill-formed constructions while

cleft constructions do. Furthermore, the insertion of resumptive pronouns does not affect the grammaticality or island-sensitivity of the above sentences.

In conclusion, a syntactic account for these two displacement phenomena should thus be faithful to their island-sensitivity; that is, topicalisation should be analysed as not involving movement, while cleft-formation should be analysed as involving movement. Following this conclusion, while topicalisation of non-subjects may not be counterexamples to the Subject-Only extraction restriction, non-subject clefts are clearly exceptions to this generalisation.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE EXTRACTION RESTRICTION AND BIKOL

7.1 Implication of Bikol on Current Literature

While previous literature has described the Subject-Only Restriction in basic unmarked constructions in great detail, where a transitive clause has one unique nominative subject and one genitive subject, not much has been said about double nominative constructions as described in this paper. As shown in this paper, although Bikol does seem to obey the Subject-Only Extraction generalisation held across many Austronesian languages, there are also apparent exceptions to this generalisation. Ultimately, the extraction observations in Bikol show that anything nominative-marked in a transitive clause is licensed to undergo extraction in long-distance environments, regardless of whether or not it is the argument cross-referenced by the verb as the subject. This suggests that the Subject-Only Restriction as discussed by Keenan and Comrie (1977) and many other works might in fact be an over-specification from the association of nominative case and subjecthood in such voice systems, and from equating the syntactic properties of nominative arguments with subjecthood. Perhaps a closer look at topicalisation and other displacement phenomena in other Austronesian languages will yield the same observations as what was described in this paper, where any nominative-marked argument, regardless of whether or not it is the subject, can undergo extraction. Therefore, in place of the Subject-Only Restriction, which is challenged by the Bikol data presented in this paper, I

dissociate subjecthood with nominative syntactic properties, and propose a more accurate label for the extraction generalisation observed – the Nominative-Only Restriction. This resolves the over-specificity problem that inaccurately predicts that arguments which are not subjects cannot be extracted. The Nominative-Only Restriction can thus capture the syntactic privilege of unique nominative subjects in unmarked transitive clauses, and additionally, account for the extraction of non-subjects in marked clauses as well. In the next section, I describe how existing analyses of the extraction generalisation can be used to explain the data in Bikol.

7.2 Proposed Analysis: Topicalisation as an Argument-Promotion Device

In the previous chapter, I presented island evidence to show that topicalisation in Bikol does not require extraction, while cleft-formation does. As a result, non-subject cleft-formation in Bikol, where licensed, presents a counter-example to the Subject-Only Restriction, which posits that the unique argument that can undergo A'-movement is the nominative subject. I now turn to an existing account for the extraction restriction as provided by Aldridge (2004, 2008, 2017) which attributes the unique syntactic extraction property of the subject in Tagalog to its syntactically high position of the subject (at phase edge). Following the Phase Impenetrability Constraint (Chomsky, 2001), non-subjects are trapped in the ν P, which is a phase, and are thus unable to undergo extraction, while subjects, being the highest DP in the edge of ν P, are the only eligible constituents eligible for extraction (Rackowski and Richards, 2005: 566). This accurately predicts the pattern found in canonical cleft formations, i.e. sentences with a nominative

subject and a genitive non-subject DP in Bikol. Since topics are not analysed under a movement (extraction) analysis, they are not counterexamples to the Subject-Only Restriction. However, under Aldridge's account, the non-subject cleft examples in Bikol remain unexplained as they are predicted to be trapped in the ν P and cannot form clefts.

The topicalisation data described above may shed some light on the non-subject extraction facts in Bikol. Crucially, the well-formedness of local non-subject topics and long distance non-subject clefts suggest that topicalisation acts as a device that "promotes" the non-subject to a syntactically higher position, feeding movement higher up. As observed in marked short distance constructions, there are two types of topics in Bikol. One of them involves both a prosodic break and a resumptive pronoun, while the other involves neither a prosodic break nor a resumptive pronoun. In a construction with both arguments in a transitive sentence topicalised, the highest DP is the one that bears the prosodic break and is resumed by a pronoun. The lower topic does not bear the prosodic break and is not resumed by a pronoun. These two topics in Bikol are similar to Aissen (1992)'s external and internal topics respectively, where arguments can be displaced to a position at Spec,CP or a position outside CP, crucially out of a phase. These two positions are different, therefore predicting the possibility of multiple preverbal DP fronting occurring in several Mayan languages. This is in fact borne out in multiple topic constructions like in Bikol. The availability of two topic positions at the edge of the phase, and the presence of a topicalisation mechanism that can

“promote” arguments to a position that allows for further extraction, could be a way of analysing long-distance cleft-formation of nominative non-subjects. Recall that nominative case appears on the non-subject argument only when it is displaced to a preverbal position, while genitive case appears on the non-subject argument only when it is postverbal. This contrast suggests that topicalisation of a genitive non-subject to a higher position results in the appearance of a nominative case, where the nominative case is the topic marker. This is not a novel idea, and is in fact observed in Tagalog as well (Richards 2000; Schachter and Otones, 1972). This analysis is also possible because topics in Bikol do not form islands, as seen in the multiple topics data, and therefore extraction of the topicalised non-subject to form a cleft is allowed.

Below, I show the relevant data points motivating my proposal of topicalisation as a device for base generating non-subjects high to feed long-distance extraction. The data below shows a possible logical order of the displacement (movement or otherwise) of both the subject and non-subject arguments, resulting in a long distance non-subject cleft construction. (96) shows the verb-initial embedded clause, which is the canonical sentence.

- (96) Pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan kaso lalaki su eskwela.
 PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill GEN man NOM student
 ‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

The genitive non-subject *kasu lalaki* ‘the man’ is “promoted” to a high topic position as posited by Aissen (1992), via topicalisation, resulting in (97). Now, there is a prosodic break after the local non-subject topic *su lalaki* ‘the man’, and the resumptive pronoun *niya* ‘him/her’ in argument position is optional. Notice that the case marker on the non-subject argument *lalaki* ‘the man’ has changed from the genitive *kasu* to the nominative marker *su*, which I claim to be the topic marker. Here, I assume that when an argument is topicalised, the topic marker, and not the case it bears, is pronounced.

- (97) *Pig-balita ning radyo na su lalaki_i*(.), g<in>adan (niya_i)*
 PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP NOM man PV.PST-kill 3SG.GEN
su eskwela.
 NOM student
 ‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

In contrast, it is not possible to displace the non-subject argument without topicalisation. This is evident from the ungrammatical sentence (98). Notice that the genitive case marker *kasu* on the non-subject argument *lalaki* ‘man’ is retained, rather than being changed to the topic marker *su*, therefore signalling that topicalisation did not occur.

(98) *Pig-balita ning radyo na kaso lalaki,(,) g<in>adan (niya_i)
 PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP GEN man PV.PST-kill 3SG.GEN
 su eskwela.
 NOM student

Intended: ‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

Finally, the topicalised non-subject argument *su lalaki* ‘the man’ can be extracted from the high topic position to form a cleft at the left periphery of the sentence, resulting in (99). (99) is well-formed, and the clefted non-subject retains its topic marker *su*.

(99) Su lalaki_i su pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
 NOM man NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kill
 (niya_i) su eskwela.
 3SG.GEN NOM student

‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

In contrast, the extraction of a genitive non-subject to form a cleft is not licensed as it has not been topicalised prior to clefting, hence it does not bear the topic marker. (100) shows that the extraction of a genitive non-subject *kaso lalaki* ‘the man’ to form a long distance cleft results in ungrammaticality. A genitive pronoun *niya* ‘him’, enclosed in brackets in (100), does not improve this sentence either.

(100) *Kaso lalaki su pig-balita ning radyo na g<in>adan
 GEN man NOM PV.PST-report GEN radio COMP PV.PST-kil
 (niya_i) su eskwela.
 3SG.GEN NOM student

Intended: ‘The radio reported that the man killed the student.’

The aforementioned data serves to show a possible way topicalisation in Bikol can be used to “promote” a non-subject argument into a structural subject position for cleft-formation via extraction. Since Bikol has a mechanism to base-generate non-subjects topic high, resulting in a nominative non-subject topic, non-subject extraction is possible. The consistent nominative topic marker that appears with displaced non-subject arguments is also explained under this account, accounting for how, in Bikol, anything nominative-marked is available for extraction.

This analysis can also address an asymmetry observed in the grammaticality of short distance clefts and short distance topics. I have established, from the discussion on embedded multiple topics, that there are two positions for topics to occur in, and that arguments in these positions can thus be extracted to form clefts in long distance environments. Under the analysis where, in marked constructions, topicalisation is the device required for arguments to be further extracted, I posit that clefts lack topic positions, and are smaller than full CPs, therefore in a single clause, arguments cannot be topicalised to a higher position to be extracted to form short distance clefts. This also explains why short distance

subject clefts in unmarked constructions are possible. Subjects in Bikol are already in a position high enough to be extracted to form clefts, and do not need to be first topicalised to a higher position prior to cleft-formation.

Finally, recall that there are two types of topics observed in short distance clefts, the internal topic and the external topic. In Aissen's account, the internal topic is moved, while the external topic is base-generated high and coindexes a resumptive pronoun. Adopting this account, I predict that only external topics can be found in constructions with islands. This is however not the case, as the absence of resumptive pronouns, which tracks internal topics, does not affect island-sensitivity of long distance topic constructions. In addition, the topicalised argument in such examples bears a prosodic break. This suggests that the topics are in fact internal topics that are arguments that have been moved out of an island, which is surprising. This contradiction can be side-stepped if we assume resumptive pronouns can be optionally pronounced in long distance external topic constructions. The observation made in Section 3.2 where prosodic breaks are obligatory in all long distance topics still hold.

CHAPTER EIGHT

FURTHER DISCUSSION

The above account is by no means complete, but offers a first attempt to adapt an existing account of the Subject-Only Restriction to accommodate apparent exceptions in Bikol. The generalisations about topicalisation in Bikol seem to suggest that there are two topic structures available in Bikol. Since my proposed analysis relies on topicalisation as a promotion device, a more careful distinction between the two topics structures could be explored in further detail.

I also briefly mentioned the contradiction posed by ungrammatical clefts formed to the left periphery of a clause and grammatical local clefts, i.e. clefts to the left periphery of embedded clauses in Section 4.2.3. Future research could be done to look closely at the mechanism of these two types of short distance clefts.

In addition, I have briefly touched on the other exceptions for the Subject-Only Restriction, where a non-subject is available to undergo *wh*-extraction as well as relativisation, resulting in more double nominative constructions. The latter finding is significant, as work on the Accessibility Hierarchy is based on relative clauses of Austronesian languages (Keenan and Comrie, 1977). Furthermore, the grammaticality of short distance relative clauses as compared to the ungrammaticality of short distance clefts is surprising and worth looking at in

more detail, as it is commonly believed that relative clauses are built off clefts (Potsdam and Polinsky, 2007).

CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have shown that while topics and clefts in Bikol provide evidence for the Subject-Only Restriction, there are several exceptions to this generalisation. The environments wherein these exceptions exist were carefully described, and generalisations about these exceptions were made. Ultimately, in Bikol, anything nominative can undergo extraction, proving the Subject-Only Restriction wrong. Works discussing the Subject-Only Restriction premised on the assumptions that only subjects are nominative, and only nominative arguments can be extracted. However, since Bikol has a mechanism for generating non-subject topics which are nominative, non-subjects can undergo extraction as well. Therefore, I conclude that the Subject-Only Restriction is over-specific because of the strict association of subjecthood and case marking. Instead, this generalisation should extend to any nominative-marked construction to fully describe the topicalisation and extraction facts in Bikol, and therefore I proposed the Nominative-Only Restriction, in place of the Subject-Only Restriction.

Motivated by the data, particularly that of embedded topics, an existing account for the Subject-Only Restriction was adopted and adapted to account for the non-subject extraction data presented by non-subject clefts in Bikol. I posited that Bikol makes use of topicalisation as a mechanism to generate non-subject topics

which are nominative, and therefore made available for extraction. This also accounts for some of the other asymmetries described in this paper.

REFERENCES

- Aissen, Judith L. 1992. Topic and Focus in Mayan. *Language* 68,1. 43-80.
- Aldridge, Edith. 2002. Nominalization and wh-movement in Seediq and Tagalog. *Language and Linguistics* 3,2. 393-426.
- Aldridge, Edith. 2004. *Ergativity and word order in Austronesian languages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University dissertation.
- Aldridge, Edith. 2008. Phase-based account of extraction in Indonesian. *Lingua* 118, 10. 1440-1469.
- Aldridge, Edith. 2012. Antipassive and ergativity in Tagalog. *Lingua* 122, 3. 192-203.
- Aldridge, Edith. 2017. Extraction Asymmetries in Ergative and Accusative Languages. *Proceedings of GLOW in Asia XI*, ed. by Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine, 1-20. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. *In Step by step: Essays on minimalist synt in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, Juan Uriagereka and Samuel Jay Keyser, 89-1. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. *In Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. by Michael Kens, 1-52. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A⁻-dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- De Guzman, Videia P. 1988. Ergative analysis for Philippine languages: An analysis. *Studies in Austronesian linguistics*. 323-345.

- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka, Theodore Levin, and Coppe van Urk. 2015. Ergativity and Austronesian-type voice systems. *The Oxford handbook of ergativity*, ed. by Jessica Coon, Diane Massam, and Lisa deMena Travis, 373-96. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fincke, Steven C. 2002. *Sto. Domingo Bikol verbal portmanteau morphemes: Transitivity in conversation*. Santa Barbara, CA: USCB dissertation.
- Foley, William A., and Van Valin Robert D. Jr, 1984. Functional syntax and universal grammar. *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, William A. 2008. The place of Philippine languages in a typology of voice systems. *Voice and grammatical relations in Austronesian languages*. 22-44.
- Keenan, Edward L., and Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic inquiry* 8, 1. 63-99.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language (CSLI) dissertation.
- Lobel, Jason William. 2013. *Philippine and North Bornean languages: Issues in description, subgrouping, and reconstruction*. Honolulu, HI: UH dissertation.
- Mattes, Veronika. 2014. Types of reduplication: A case study of Bikol. *Studia Typologica* 16. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH.
- McFarland, Curtis D. 1974. *The Dialects of the Bikol Area*. New Haven, CT: YU dissertation.
- Potsdam, Eric, and Maria Polinsky. 2007. Missing complement clause subjects in Malagasy. *Oceanic Linguistics* 46, 1. 277-303.

- Potsdam, Eric, and Maria Polinsky. 2011. Questions and word order in Polynesian. *Topics in Oceanic morphosyntax*. 121-153.
- Rackowski, Andrea, and Norvin Richards. 2005. Phase edge and extraction: A Tagalog case study. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, 4. 565-599.
- Reid, Lawrence A., and Hsiu-chuan Liao. 2004. A brief syntactic typology of Philippine languages. *Language and Linguistics* 5,2. 433-490.
- Richards, Norvin. 2000. Another look at Tagalog subjects. *Formal issues in Austronesian linguistics*, ed. by Richards, Norvin, Ileana Paul, Vivianne Phillips, and Lisa Travis, 105–16. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
- Schachter, Paul and Fe T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.