The syntax of heavy NP shift in Siwkolan Amis and its implications for Ā-extraction

In this talk, we investigate the syntax of heavy NP shift (HNPS) with special reference to general restrictions on movement in Siwkolan Amis (henceforth Amis), one of the dialects of Amis, an Austronesian language spoken in Taiwan. Similar to other Philippine-type Austronesian languages, a syntactic object can be Ā-extracted if it agrees with a verbal voice affix on a verb for a thematic relation, theorized as the subject-only restriction (Keenan and Comrie 1977), the Austronesian Extraction Restriction hypothesis (Erlewine, Levin and van Urk 2017) and Aldridge's (2004b) Absolutive Extraction Restriction. This restriction applies to relativization and topicalization created via Ā-extraction taking place at overt syntax. Nonetheless, it is not clear whether this restriction can be generalized to HNPS, a phenomenon where a prosodically 'heavy' NP (in today's parlance, DP) is displaced to the right of its canonical position (Ross 1967). Though right dislocation of NP is permitted in Amis, whether the right-dislocated NP can be analyzed on a par with HNPS is called into question, as is challenged by two varieties of syntactic wording in Amis (Pereltsvaig 2012, Wu 2016, etc.), where VSO or VOS are allowed. Liu (1999) and Liu (2003) have observed that the clause with Agent Voice (AV) permits VSO and VOS, while that with Patient Voice (PV) only tolerates VOS. Li (2008) further argues that VSO is preferred in the AV construction, while VOS is for the non-AV construction without articulating any principle underpinning the distinction, if there is. Thus, it remains a missing piece of the jigsaw as to whether VSO and VOS in the AV construction are derivationally related or represent a free word ordering alternation, and why HNPS is absent in the PV construction. (1)a illustrates the run-of-the-mill word order where the AV-inflected verb *komaen* 'eat' in the sentence-initial position is followed by the subject (S) and then the object (O). Nevertheless, it is observed when S represents a complex NP consisting of several modifiers connected by the re-occurring occurrence of the linker *a*, S is preferably situated on the right periphery of the clause. This alternation raises two thought-provoking questions. <u>First</u>, whether (1)a and (1)b are derivationally related has not been addressed. Curiously, if VSO in (1)a exemplifies the canonical word order, is (1)b the derived one that involves dislocation of S? <u>Second</u>, given that (1)b involves right dislocation of S, is this operation a syntactic construct or a prosodic one that feeds phrasal prominence at the level of prosody (Zubizarreta 1998)? In light of several syntactic diagnostics, it is argued in this talk that HNPS in Amis is <u>a syntactic construct</u> that targets the NP constituent containing a number of phonological materials. This line of argumentation suggests that two varieties of syntactic wording in Amis do not represent a free alternation, and, instead, are syntactically derived.

(1) VSO in (1)a and VOS in (1)b

   a.   k<om>aen   [kora   lima a   ma-so^so-ay   a   fafahiyan   a   wawa]s

         <AV>eat   that.NOM five LNK AV-fat-AY   LNK girl   LNK kid

        [to   konga]o.   **[VSO in the AV construction]**

        OBL   sweet.potato   'These five fat girls eat sweet potatoes.'

   b.   k<om>aen **t**s   [to   konga]o   [**kora**   **lima a**   **ma-so^so-ay a**

        fafahiyan   **a**   **wawa**]s.   **[VOS in the AV construction]**

Data 1: HNPS is a syntactic construct: First, HNPS respects strict locality in the sense that the target heavy NP (S) cannot be extracted out of a finite clause, as shown in (2)a, where S, though right-dislocated, is situated within the clause selected by the saying verb *saan*. In contrast, the violation of locality occurs when S is extracted out of the embedded clause in (2)b. **Second**, HNPS is subject to the subject-only restriction (Keenan and Comrie 1977, Chang 2017, among others), according to which only the nominative-marked subject that has a thematic relation with the voice-marked verb is

legible to Ā-extraction. As in (3)b, though O is the heavy NP, it cannot undergo HNPS, due to the subject-only restriction and its O status in the PV construction. Both (2) and (3) prove that HNPS is sensitive to the subject-only restriction (a structural restriction) and is qualified as a syntactic construct.

(2) a. [k<om>aen-ay   t_S   to   konga   [kora   lima   a   ma-so^so-ay
        eat<AV>-AY   OBL sweet.potato that.NOM five   LNK AV-fat-AY
        a   fafahiyan]s   saan   ci   ina.   'The mother says that these five fat girls eat
        LNK girl   SAAN   NOM mother   sweet potatoes.'

    b. *[k<om>aen-ay   t_S   to   konga]   saan ci   ina [kora   lima   a
        ma-so^so-ay   a   fafahiyan a   wawa]s.

(3) a. ma-kaen-ay   [nora   lima a   ma-so^so-ay   a   fafahiyan a   wawa]o
        PV-eat-AY   that.GEN five LNK AV-fat-AY   LNK girl   LNK child
        [ko   konga]s.   'These five fat girls ate the sweet potatos.'
        NOM   sweet.potato   [VOS in the PV construction]

    b. *ma-kaen-ay t_O [ko konga]s [nora   lima   a   ma-so^so-ay   a
        fafahiyan   a   wawa]o.   [*VSO in the PV construction]

Data 2: HNPS is informationally sensitive. As is evident in the YES-NO question pairs in (4), the heavy NP mentioned in the question bears old information and is displaced on the right periphery of the clause in (4)a, or undergoes topicalization in (4)c rather than remains in-situ in (4)b. This suggests that HNPS does not occur to feed any prosodic need.

(4) Question: k<om>aen   [kora   lima a   ma-so^so-ay   a   fafahiyan   a
              <AV>eat   that.NOM five LNK AV-fat-AY   LNK girl   LNK
              wawa]   to   konga   haw?   'Do these five fat girls eat sweet
              kid   OBL   sweet.potato Q.SFP.   potatoes?'

    a. hay, k<om>aen   t_S [to konga]o   [kora   lima   a   ma- so^so-ay
       yes   <AV>eat   OBL sweet.potato that.NOM five   LNK AV-fat-AY
       a   fafahiyan   a   wawa]s.
       LNK woman   LNK kid

    b. #hay, k<om>aen   [kora   lima a ma-so^so-ay a fafahiyan   a wawa]s [to   konga]o.

    c. hay, [ora lima a ma-so^so-ay a fafahiyan   a wawa]s, k<om>aen   t_S [to   konga]o.

Conclusion and implications. In this talk, we have argued that HNPS of the subject in VOS is a syntactic construct, and, as a result, VOS is the derived word order in the AV construction. In addition, the absence of HNPS in the PV construction arises from the subject-only restriction, whereby the heavy O is resistant to extraction, as the S, if heavy, is already on the right edge of the clause. These two lines of thinking provide a more principled explanation for the observations made in Liu (1999), Liu (2003) and Li (2008). What is more, HNPS, as a sub-type of extraction, can be subsumed within the subject-only restriction, as only S can be the target of extraction, which, in turn, proves that this restriction is structural rather than prosodic. Several issues involved in dealing with HNPS and the varieties of word ordering in Amis and other Formosan languages will be discussed.

[Selected references]
Li, Paul Jen-Kuei. 2008. The great diversity of Formosan languages. Language and Linguistics 9:523-546. Liu, Dorinda Tsai-hsiu. 1999. Cleft Constructions in Amis. MA thesis, National Taiwan University. Liu, En-Hsin. 2003. Conjunction and Modification in Amis. MA thesis, National Tsing Hua University. Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2012. Languages of the world: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Wu, Jing-lan Joy. 2016. *Ameiyu yufa gailun* (An introduction to Amis grammar) (2nd edition). Taipei: Council of Indigenous Peoples. [In Chinese]. Chang, Henry Yungli. 2017. The AV-only restriction and locality in Formosan Languages. *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies* 47(2): 231 – 254.