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1. Introduction

During the course ‘Vorm en Betekenis’ we investigated wh-in-situ. There are languages that have wh-words (question words) that do not move, the word (or phrase) stays in situ yet it is fully interpreted, and there are languages that do not allow wh-words in situ. There are also languages, like French, which have a mixture. Wh-in situ is seen in (1) in English and in Chinese too; the in-situ phrases are in bold face:

(1) a. Who bought \textbf{what}? \\
b. 
\begin{verbatim}
  Hufei mai-le \textbf{shenme}?
  Hufei buy-PERF what
\end{verbatim}
‘What did Hufei buy?’

We, the students, had to choose an interesting language with respect to wh-in-situ; I picked out Bahasa Indonesia (BI) a language that belongs to the Austronesian language group. This paper is a report on the findings I did regarding wh-phrases in BI. After I point out a few grammar basics of BI in the next section and evidence of wh-is-situ in section 3, I concentrate on structural consequences of wh-movement. Section 4 identifies the different kinds of wh-movement and restrictions on such movement. It will appear that movement of a wh-phrase has three effects: something happens to verbs, a relative appears and the interpretation of the whole sentence may change. I flesh out these consequences in sections 5, 6, 7 respectively and doing so, I will try to give an account for the appearance of the mentioned relative. Conclusions are summed up in section 8, while references are found in the last section.

Typical terms that will emerge in this paper are arguments, adjuncts, Spec,CP and C0. Without scrutinizing these expressions I will explain them briefly. Arguments in syntax are constituents that get a thematic role from the verb they belong to; subjects and objects. Argument positions are e.g. Spec,IP (subject) and complement of V0. Adjuncts are phrases that can modify a (part of) a sentence. Within X-bar theory (bluntly, how to draw a structure of constituents such as Intentional Phrase (IP) and Verbal Phrase (VP) by means of binary branching) a Complementizer Phrase (CP) can host several functional projections. Using the following English sentences I will show the above mentioned positions.

(2) a. Bill bought this book. \\
b. Who bought this book?
The theory I make use of, holds (among other things) that arguments get their thematic roles within a VP. This has been proposed as the VP-internal subject hypothesis: every sentence starts out within a VP, which is assumed to be at Deep Structure. After the subject has received a thematic role, typically ‘agentive’, it is assigned case by Spec-Head-Agreement: while the head of IP (‘past tense’ in the trees above) takes care of the inflection of the verb the subject moves to Spec,IP (indicated by $t_i$ here). The object, being a complement of $V^0$, is assigned accusative case under government of the verb. A C-projection (CP) is in use in cases of focus (among other cases as I will show below). Since it is assumed that wh-words have inherent focus, they somehow make use of this projection: one theory for example holds that $C^0$ has an operator that attracts question words. Moved wh-phrases have their ultimate position in Spec,CP, because of this attraction, whereas wh-in-situ phrases stay where they are generated having a long distance connection with this operator. Who in (2b') is a subject, however, it is a wh-word that is moved: its ultimate position is Spec,CP. The ultimate state of the derivation -what is shown in the tree drawings- is called Surface Structure.

Within the sentences in (3) embedded clauses can be observed. In (3a) it is the relative clause ‘who builds houses in London’, while in (3b) it is the complement clause ‘that Bill danced at the party’. The crucial difference between these two is that the latter is, structurally speaking, sister to a head. By looking at the tree drawings this is easy to establish. Note again that CP’s are in use and more importantly, the wh-word has its positions in Spec,CP whereas the relative is in $C^0$. At last, as promised, both sentences in (3) contain adjuncts.

(3)  a. The man who builds houses in London bought a book.
    b. The news that Bill danced at the party surprised Tom.
Equipped with this knowledge we are ready to take a look into BI.
2. **Bahasa Grammar Basics**

2.1 *The Sentence*

Similar to English BI is an SVO language. It lacks however agreement for person, number or gender on the verb. Also, there is absence of copula as we see in (1).

(1)  
*Saya se- orang guru.*  
I one- COUNT teacher  
‘I am a teacher.’

Numbers and measure words precede the noun they refer to, adjectives however follow their antecedent as shown in (2), which is a sentence with an embedded clause. *Jahat* is the adjective that follows *orang*.

(2)  
*Dia men- gira saya orang jahat.*  
he TR- think I person malicious  
‘He thought me a malicious person.’

Notable is that the determiner *itu* meaning ‘the, this, that’ is rather a modifier/adjective and hence follows the noun it refers to. The assumption is that BI is a left headed language. If *itu* is the head of a DP it should precede its noun. Consider (3).

(3)  
*Saya mem- baca buku itu dengan teliti.*  
I TR- read book the with care  
‘I read the book carefully.’

Nothing can intervene between object and verb; objects must follow their head immediately. The same holds for nouns that follow a preposition as we see in (4).

(4)  
*a. John telah mem- beli buku itu di kedai semalam.*  
John has TR- buy book the at shop yesterday  
b. *John telah mem- beli semalam buku itu di kedai.*  
‘John has bought the book at the shop yesterday.’

Negation is established by *tidak* (or sometimes *tak*, *tiada*); if it has scope over the whole predicate it precedes all items of the predicate, if it only modifies a specific item it is preposed to that item.

(5)  
*a. Ia tidak harus pergi*  
he not must go  
‘He does not have to go.’  
b. *Ia harus tidak pergi*  
‘He must not go.’
Since there is no inflection on the verb modifiers are sometimes added to indicate, for example, past tense. *Sudah* ‘already’ is such a modifier. However, it cannot be modified itself by *tidak*; *belum* is in use then as we observe (6).

(6)  
   a.  *Dia sudah pergi*  
      he already go  
      ‘He went.’  
   b.  *Dia *sudah/belum* pergi  
      he already/not yet go  
      ‘He has not gone yet; he did not go, but it is expected he will.’  

Other sentence order is possible by means of focus; we assume *-lah* to be a focus marker but is not obligatory as we see in (7).

(7)  
      *Pulang(-lah) Siti*  
      go home Siti  
      ‘Siti went home.’  

The focus marker *-lah* can introduce the relative *yang*, yielding two clauses:

(8)  
      *Saya- lah yang perg*  
      I- FOC that go  
      ‘It was I who went.’

In later sections we take a closer look at *yang* and focus constructions as we will see that some wh-phrases make use of the same construction as in (8).

2.2 Some Verb Morphology

The BI verb distinguishes three types of voice: active, passive and reciprocal (1994a). I will only attend to the first two. Active voice may be denoted by the prefix *meN*- whereas *di-* may indicate passive. What is puzzling is that the prefixes can disappear in particular configurations, yielding ambiguity. In the table below we see that *meN*- does not necessarily refer to transitivity; it depends in part on the origin of the base.¹

---

¹ Depending on the source I gloss *meN-* either transitive or active.
Term Paper

Prefix meN- on noun  →  intransitive verb  
Prefix meN- on numerical  →  intransitive verb  
Prefix meN- on verb base  →  transitive verb  
but also intransitive:  
Prefix meN- on adjective  →  intransitive verb  

Affixes meN- and -kan, -i see (7) below.

Table 1. Active affixes.

In (9) we see a ditransitive setting.

(9)  
Saya akan mem- beli -kan Siti buku itu. (Ross 1976)  
I will TR- buy- DITR Siti book that  
‘I am going to buy that book for Siti.’

Passive is marked by prefix di- on the verb and the preposition oleh ‘by’ is optional. Consider 10.

(10)  
a. Dia mem- beli buku itu (Ross 1976)  
he TR- buy book that  
‘He bought the book.’

b. Buku itu di- beli oleh dia  
book that PASS- buy by (the agency of) he

c. Buku itu di- beli oleh- nya 
book that PASS- buy by (the agency of) he.CLITIC

d. Buku itu di- beli- nya 
book that PASS- buy he.CLITIC

‘The book was bought by him.’

The word order can also be like this:

e. Dibeli oleh dia buku itu
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f. Dibeli olehnya buku itu

g. Dibeli dia buku itu

h. Dibelinya buku itu

i. Dibeli buku itu oleh dia

j. Oleh dia buku itu dibeli

k. Oleh dia dibeli buku itu

Also di- can be deleted:

l. Buku itu dia beli

Chung (1976), Sie (1989) and Voskuil (distinguish three types of passive in BI: subjective passive, canonical passive without the agentive preposition oleh ‘by’, and the canonical passive with the agentive preposition oleh. For convenience I list the characteristics below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Word order</th>
<th>Verb morph.</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subj. passive</td>
<td>Theme-Agent-Verb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>is pronoun, clitic or proper name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can. passive</td>
<td>Theme-di-Verb-Agent</td>
<td>prefix di-</td>
<td>follows verb immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can. passive oleh</td>
<td>Theme-di-Verb-(oleh-Agent)</td>
<td>prefix di-</td>
<td>is object of oleh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Passive in BI.

(11), (12), and (13)² show the properties listed in Table 2.

Subjective passive


dog the Ali/ 1.SG.PRONOUN/ 1.SG.CLITIC hit

‘The dog was hit by Ali/me.’

b. * Anjing itu lekaki itu pukul

dog the boy the hit

int: ‘The dog was hit by the boy.’

Canonical passive

(12) a. Uang itu di- kirim kepada Tomo Ali (Guilfoyle et al. 1992)

money the PASS- send to Tomo Ali

b. Uang itu di- kirim Ali kepada Tomo

money the pass- send Ali to Tomo

‘The money was sent to Tomo by Ali.’

---

² Guilfoyle et al. make use of examples from Chung and Sie.
Canonical passive oleh

(13) a.  Buku itu di- baca. (Guilfoyle et al. 1992)
book the PASS- read
‘The book was read.’

b.  Buku itu di- baca oleh Ali/ lekaki itu
book the PASS- read by Ali/ boy the
‘The book was read by Ali/the boy.’

From the diagnostics in (10) we miss an account for (10e-k) in which either the verb or the agent is at the beginning of the sentence. We have to conclude that within at least two types of canonical passive the word order is relatively free.

2.3 Embedded Clauses

As we already have seen in (8) a relative clause in BI is usually introduced by yang. (14) and (15) are other examples in which this relative is heading the second clause.

(14) Kadang-kadang kita melihat kera yang pendek ekor- nya. (Ross 1976)
sometimes we see monkey that short tail- 3.SG.POSS
‘From time to time we see a monkey whose tail is short.’

(15) Mereka meng-anggap saya yang tersenior. (Ross 1976)
they TR- consider I that officer
‘They considered me to be the senior officer.’

Descriptively, “yang must always serve as the subject or topic of the clause which it introduces” (Ross, 1976), hence we could assume that it is typically in Spec,CP of the subordinate clause. Future question in this paper will be whether yang is possible in (16).

(16) Dia men- gira saya (yang?) orang jahat. (Ross 1976)
he TR- think I person malicious
‘He thought me a malicious person.’

Complement clauses are optionally introduced by bahwa ‘that’ if the subordinate clause is the object of the verb of the matrix sentence. However, if the clause is functioning as subject it is obligatory. In (17) we see an example an object clause.

(17) Ali meng-anggap (bahwa) soal itu beres. (Ross 1976)
Ali TR- consider that problem the settle
‘Ali considered (that) the problem was settled.’

We could assume that bahwa occupies the C0 position structurally. Yang and bahwa are items that we we will encounter again when we are going to investigate Wh-phrases.
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3. **Wh-in-situ**

This section gives insight into how wh-in-situ in BI is manifested. First we will attend to arguments, then we will see that not all adjuncts can stay in situ.

3.1 Arguments

3.1.1 Subject

As BI is an SOV language (18) is an example of a sentence in which the wh-subject is in situ.

(18) *Siapa men- cintai Sally?*  
who TR- love Sally  
‘Who loves Sally?’

The subject can get focus by means of *yang*. Note that it is glossed as focus particle here and not as relative.

(19) *Siapa yang men- cintai Sally?*  
who FOC TR- love Sally  
‘Who does Sally love?’

In section 6 we will take a closer look at the focus particle *yang*. For now we leave it with the notion that (18) is one clause and that (19) consists of two clauses. Literally (19) would mean: ‘Who is it that loves Sally.’

3.1.2 Object

In (20) we see an wh-object in situ.

(20) *Sally men- cintai siapa?*  
Sally TR- love who  
‘Who does Sally love?’

Just as the subject can get focus the object can: it moves to the front where it is followed by *yang*.

(21) *Siapa yang Sally cintai?*  
who FOC Sally love  
‘Who does Sally love?’

(20) contrasts (21): the verb has lost the transitive or active marker in (21), further, the subject always precedes the verb in BI (unless the verb is in focus position as we saw in (7) above). In section
5 and 6 we are going to explore these phenomena. In section 4 we will see that argument-wh-in-situ is possible in embedded clauses.

3.2 Adjuncts

BI distinguishes nominal adjuncts from adverbial adjuncts in that the former can remain in situ. The latter must undergo movement to the front of the sentence. A nominal adjunct should contain an NP (which is not always visible as we will see below) whereas an adverbial adjunct is rather an adverb. In English it would be the difference between ‘for what reason’, in which ‘reason’ is an NP, and ‘why’.

(22) a.  Kenapa Fatimah menangis? (Cole & Hermon 1998)
    why Fatimah cry

b.  *Fatinah menangis kenapa?
    Fatimah cry why
    ‘Why did Fatimah cry?’

    in which (place) Ali TR- buy condominium

b.  Ali mem- beli pangapsapuri di mana?
    Ali TR- buy condominium in which (place)
    ‘Where did Ali buy the condominium?’

Instead of the NP-requirement we could also assume that it is the appearance of a preposition in a wh-phrase that can account for the in situ optionality. It is the NP that does not need to be visible, contrary to the preposition. Further, the verb remains to have the transitivity marker and yang doesn’t appear right after the fronted wh-phrase.

4. Wh-movement

We have seen that wh-phrases can either stay in situ or can undergo movement. It will appear that in some cases argument wh-phrases can have more positions in a sentence, than the positions we have seen so far. In this section we are going to find out what positions these are and what the restrictions are on wh-movement. Consequences for the interpretation due to movement are dealt with in section 7.

In (24) below we see that a wh-word can be extracted from an embedded question and can move to the front of the sentence (24b) or can take an intermediate position, that is, partially move. In (24c) siapa, together with yang, is heading the embedded clause.
(24) a.  *Bill tahu Tom men-cintai siapa.*  
  Bill knows Tom who loves

b.  *Siapa yang Bill tahu Tom cintai.*  
  who FOC Bill knows Tom loves

c.  *Bill tahu siapa yang Tom cintai.*  
  Bill knows who FOC Tom loves

‘Bill knows who Tom loves.’

Tahu can optionally take the complementizer *bahwa*. Partial movement is still possible, but an argument wh-phrase cannot pass this complementizer.

  Bill knows that Tom who loves

b.  *Siapa yang Bill tahu bahwa Tom cintai.*  
  who FOC Bill knows that Tom loves

c.  *Bill tahu bahwa siapa yang Tom cintai.*  
  Bill knows that who FOC Tom loves

‘Bill knows who Tom loves.’

While bahwa marks an embedded clause overtly, there are other constituents that function as islands albeit covertly. Typically wh-islands, complex NP islands, subject islands and adjunct islands prevent wh-words to move. (26-29) illustrate these island effects; brackets indicate the islands.

**Wh-Island**

(26) a.  *Apa, yang kamu katakan [kita beli t, dimana]??*  
  what FOC you mention we buy where

b.  *Kamu katakan [kita mem-beli apa dimana]??*  
  you mention we TR- buy what where

‘What did you mention where we bought?’

**Complex NP Island**

(27) a.  *Siapa, yang kamu suka [cerita yang mengeritik t, itu]??*  
  who FOC you like stories that criticize the

b.  *Kamu suka [cerita yang mengeritik siapa itu]??*  
  you like stories that criticize who the

‘Who do you like the stories that criticized?’

**Subject Island**

(28) a.  *Siapa, yang kamu kira [gambar t,] dijual?*  
  who FOC you think pictures sell

b.  *Kamu meng-gira [gambar siapa] dijual?*  
  you TR- think pictures who sell

‘Who do you think pictures of were sold?’

---
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Adjunct Island

(29)  a. *Dengan siapa, yang kamu cemburui Bill [karena saya berbicara t]?
     (Saddy 1991)
      with who FOC you be jealous of Bill because I spoke
     b. Kamu men-cemburui Bill [karena saya berbicara dengan siapa]?
      you be jealous of Bill because I speak with who
      ‘Who did you get jealous of Bill because I spoke with?’

Contrary to bahwa-islands, subject and object wh-phrases cannot move within complex NP- and adjunct islands as we will see below. Note that it is possible for non-wh arguments to move within such islands (32) and (35).

Wh-subject movement within a Complex NP Island

(30) a. *Kamu kira (bahwa) [cerita bahwa siapa, yang t, mengeritik Jon itu] dijual?
     (Saddy 1991)
      you think (that) story that who FOC criticized John the be sold
     b. Kamu kira (bahwa) [cerita bahwa siapa mengeritik Jon itu] dijual?
      you think (that) story that who criticized John the be sold
      ‘Who do you think that the story that criticized Jon was sold?’

Wh-object movement within a Complex NP Island

(31) a. *Kamu kira (bahwa) [cerita bahwa siapa, yang Jon mengeritik t, itu] dijual?
     (Saddy 1991)
      you think (that) story that who FOC criticized John the be sold
     b. Kamu kira (bahwa) [cerita bahwa Jon mengeritik siapa itu] dijual?
      you think (that) story that John criticized who the be sold
      ‘Who do you think that the story that Jon criticized was sold?’

Object movement within a Complex NP Island

(32) Kamu kira (bahwa) [cerita bahwa Tom, yang Jon mengeritik t, itu] dijual
     (Saddy 1991)
      you think (that) story that Tom FOC John criticized the be sold
      ‘You think that the story that Tom John criticized was sold.’

Wh-subject movement within an Adjunct Island

(33) a. *Kamu men-cemburui Bill [karena siapa, yang t, berbicara dengan Tom]?
     (Saddy 1991)
      you be jealous of Bill because who FOC speak with Tom
     b. Kamu men-cemburui Bill [karena siapa berbicara dengan Tom]?
      you be jealous of Bill because who speak with Tom
      ‘Who did you get jealous of Bill because spoke with Tom?’

Wh-object movement within an Adjunct Island

(34) a. *Kamu men-cemburui Bill [karena dengan siapa, yang saya berbicara t]?
     (Saddy 1991)
      you be jealous of Bill because with who FOC I speak
     b. Kamu men-cemburui Bill [karena saya berbicara dengan siapa]?
      you be jealous of Bill because I speak with who
      ‘Who did you get jealous of Bill because spoke with Tom?’
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Object movement within an Adjunct Island

(35) \[ \text{Kamu men-cembrurui Bill \quad [karena dengan \quad Tom, yang saya berbicara \quad tij] \quad (Saddy 1991)} \]

you be jealous of Bill because with Tom FOC I speak

‘You are jealous of Bill because with Tom I spoke.’

In cases where partial movement is possible, adding negation to the matrix verb has the effect that the sentences become ungrammatical if wh-phrases move to an intermediate position. Negation does not have this effect on in situ phrases as we see in (y).

(36) a. \[ \text{Tom meng-harap apa, yang Mary beli \quad tij?} \quad \text{(Saddy 1991)} \]
Tom TR expect what FOC Mary buy

‘What does Tom expect that Mary bought?’

b. \[ * \text{Tom tidak meng-harap apa, yang Mary beli \quad tij?} \]
Tom not TR expect what FOC Mary buy

c. \[ \text{Tom tidak meng-harap Mary mem- beli apa?} \]
Tom not TR expect Mary TR buy what

‘What doesn’t Tom expect Mary bought?’

Movement of argument-wh-phrases, if possible, has three substantial consequences. First of all, the transitivity marker of verbs that are passed are removed, secondly, the relative \textit{yang} appears and seems to be a focus marker. Last but not least, sentences get a different interpretation. Before we analyze \textit{yang} and the interpretation differences, we will take a closer look at BI verb morphology.

5. Movement & Verb Morphology

As we have already encountered, in some way the verbal prefix \textit{meN} disappears when the wh-object is fronted. This object doesn’t necessarily need to be the argument of the matrix verb. In (37) we see that it doesn’t matter how many verbs the object crosses: they all lose their active or transitivity marker.

(37) a. \[ \text{Bill meng-gira Tom meng- harap Fred men- cintai siapa?} \quad \text{(Hornstein et al. 2005a)} \]
Bill TR think Tom TR expects Fred TR love who

‘Who did Bill think (that) Tom expects (that) Fred loves?’

b. \[ \text{Siapa yang Bill \quad \O\- kira Tom \quad \O\- harap Fred \quad \O\- cintai.} \]
who FOC Bill think Tom expect Fred love

If a wh-subject moves, the matrix verb keeps its active/transitivity marker. However, if it is a subject that is moved from an embedded clause we see the same phenomenon.
Hornstein et al. (2005a) suggest that the dropping of the prefix “may be taken as a morphological reflex of the wh-movement”. We have to find out what verbs look like when non-wh objects are fronted. Maybe the movement of wh-objects can be taken on par with passive constructions.

In an attempt to account for the typology of passive voice (see section 2 above) and word order facts in Austronesian languages, Guilfoyle et al. (1992) propose that subject-sensitive properties may be split between Spec,VP and Spec,IP. The first is linked with theta properties, the latter with structure properties such as extraction and quantifier float. This proposal fits within the VP-internal hypothesis mentioned in the introduction and might help us to better understand the phenomenon described above.

Guilfoyle et al. start their proposal by posing that in Malagasy (an Austronesian language) markers on verbs are related to the position of subjects, having an agent role, and objects which they consider to have a thematic role. In the Malagasy sentences below we clearly see this. Topics are underlined.

Agent topic marker (AT), subject in Spec,IP

(39)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{M-an-sasa (manasa)} & \quad \text{ny lamba} & \quad \text{amin’ny savony} & \quad \text{ny sasavy.} \\
\text{AT-wash} & \quad \text{the clothes} & \quad \text{with the soap} & \quad \text{the girl} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘The girl washed the clothes with the soap.’
Theme topic marker (tt), subject in Spec,VP

(40)  
\[ \text{Sasa-na (sasan')} \quad \text{ny zazavavy} \quad \text{amin'ny savony} \quad \text{ny lamba.} \]

\[ \text{wash-tt} \quad \text{the girl} \quad \text{with the soap} \quad \text{the clothes} \]

‘The clothes are washed with the soap by the girl.’

(40')

Non-agent, non-theme marker: Circumstantial topic marker, subject in Spec,VP

(41)  
\[ \text{An-sasa-na (anasan')} \quad \text{ny zazavavy} \quad \text{ny lamba} \quad \text{ny savony.} \]

\[ \text{xt-wash} \quad \text{the girl} \quad \text{the clothes} \quad \text{the soap} \]

‘The soap was washed (with) the clothes by the girl.’

(41')
Case assignment is established firstly under government; all phrases that lack case are assigned case by Spec-Head-Agreement. Guilefoyle et al. assume that the verb markers are heads of IPs just as tense marking in the English sentences explained in section 1 above. Further, their assumption is that the verb moves to INFL (I$^0$ = head of IP). A little bit confusing is that, for example, the agent topic marker in (39) is assumed to assign case to the theme, however, the title agent is linked to the movement to Spec,IP, that is, it is linked to the topic.

It is possible to account for the different verb markers in BI using this proposal. Guilefoyle et al. show that the verbal prefix men- can be considered on par with the agent topic marker in Malagasy. In active constructions the verb doesn’t move to INFL, whereas it does in passive constructions according to the authors.

(42)  
\textbf{Ali/ Saya/Lekaki itu} mem- baca buku itu dengan teliti.  

\textit{Ali/ I/ the boy the read book the with care}  

‘Ali/I/the boy read the book carefully.’

(42')

If we then take a look at the passive constructions it is important that the following assumption is made: “(...) NPs are, in fact, dominated by DP, the maximal projection of the functional category DET, and that the Case-marking relation between a DP and V$^0$ may be created by the movement of the head of DP to a V in in INFL.” Following this, the passive marker \textit{di-} is a D$^0$ originally. Two arguments are given: \textit{di} could well be \textit{dia}, that is, a personal pronoun (3.SG) and in formal BI the agent in \textit{di-} passive constructions is 3.SG. In the subjective passive, however a D$^0$ can only be a pronoun, clitic or proper name, as we have seen in table 2 in section 2. Since we don’t find \textit{di-} verbs involved in wh-movement we take a closer look at subjective passive.
do the Ali/ 1.sg hit
‘The dog was hit by Ali/me.’

The derivation should be clear by now, albeit that the ‘visible’ agent is merged with the verb and end up in I\textsuperscript{0}; in this kind of passive we end up with an object-subject-verb order. It is therefore tempting to transfer this analysis to argument-wh-movement, since we see the same order there. But first we look into yang.

6. Movement & Yang

We have seen that every time a wh-phrase is moved, whether partially or fully, yang, meaning ‘that’ or ‘which’, is in use. As a consequence the fronted phrase has focus. As noted in section 3.1.1 two clauses arise out of one when the subject gets focus. I repeat the data here:

(18) Siapa men- cintai Sally? (Saddy 1991)
who TR- love Sally
‘Who loves Sally?’

(19) Siapa yang men- cintai Sally? (Saddy 1991)
who FOC TR- love Sally
‘Who loves Sally?’

Some sources I have employed consider yang a focus marker (Fanselow, 2006; Saddy, 1991), another gloss it as COMP (complementizer) (Cole et al., 2005c) or just as ‘that’ (Cole & Hermon, 1998; Ross, 1976; Sato, Y. & Yuliani, 2007). Davies (2003) considers the Madurese (another Austronesian language) yang counterparts se and sing as true relatives, also, he is the only one who speaks of cleft questions: (19) above literally conveys ‘Who is it that loves Sally?’ Guilefoyle et al. (1992) assume that the wh-phrase in such cases is extracted, which is rather a description of cleft.
The issue here is, I think, that there are two ways to treat yang. If it is a focus marker we should assume it to have operator qualities, hence we could assume that it is a head, that is, in this case, in C₀. If it is a relative it should introduce a relative clause just as it does in relative clause settings as in (14-15) in section 2.3, hence it is assumed to be in SpecCP. While yang typically occurs in argument focus constructions and hence legitimates its focus marking property, there are, I think, two arguments in favor of an account in which yang is just a relative.

First of all BI has an interrogative focus marker that is optionally available: the enclitic-kah, which could well be originate in C₀. Just as its declarative counterpart -lah (see (8) section 2.1) it can occur together with yang.

(44) Apa- kah yang saudara cari? (Ross 1976)
what FOC that you.VOC look
‘What is it you are looking for?’

(45) Di mana- kah dia pergi ke sekolah?
at where she go to school?
‘Where did she go to school?’

Of course this doesn’t necessarily exclude yang from having the same property, the crucial difference is that yang is only used with wh-arguments, whereas -kah is freely attached to whatever constituent in focus. Then again we could assume it to be a focus marker for arguments exclusively, yet the hypothesis -the second argument- that the wh-phrase in cases like (21) is extracted rather than moved supports my point in several ways.

Within an extraction analysis we could assume that siapa in (20) is extracted first yielding two bare sentences. I assume this to be at Deep Structure. (20) has a Deep Structure as in (20’), (21) however, as in (21’).

(20) Sally men- cintai siapa? (Saddy 1991)
Sally TR- love who
‘Who does Sally love?’

(21) Siapa yang Sally cintai? (Saddy 1991)
who FOC Sally love
‘Who does Sally love?’

(20’) VP
Sally V’
cintai siapa
(21’)
VP1
V’
(cop) DP
siapa VP2
Sally V’
cintai yang

Wh-phrases in Bahasa Indonesia
I assume here that *siapa* forms a VP (VP1) by itself, being the argument of an absent copula, that is, an ergative setting, while the second VP will be derived as the relative clause of *siapa*. *Siapa* then could be assigned case under government of V⁰; the whole DP should move to an uppermost Spec,CP in the end. *Yang*, being the object of *cintai*, moves to Spec,CP of the relative clause, while *Sally* is incorporated in I⁰, just as we saw in subjective passive constructions: the theme becomes topic. *Cintai* then is lacking a transitive/active marker, since the object *yang* is moved. In other words, I assume that the wh-phrase is *extracted* and that it is the relative that is *moved*. After all, the complete *siapa*-DP should move to Spec,CP. Here is the complete derivation of (21).

\[ (21'') \]

At last the focus marker -*kah* can be adjoined to *siapa*, but it isn’t obligatory. It should be noted that in all sentences, such as (21) above, I have found so far the subjects of the relative clauses are either a pronoun, clitic or proper name. This matches with the stipulation of subjective passive. Future research could help to confirm this by presenting sentences to native speakers such as ‘What is it that
people buy for Christmas?’, in which ‘people’ should be translated by *orang*³, that is, an NP without a D⁰-status. My prediction is that *yang* is impossible in (16) that we considered in section 2.3. As indicated, I assume that the *siapa*-DP moves upwards. It might not move when *bawha* is occupying C⁰ (instead of -kah): the clause is a complement clause. The question is, whether *bawha* and -kah can occur at the same time in sentences such as (25c) repeated here.⁴

(25) c.  
*Bill tahu bawha siapa (-kah?) yang Tom cintai.*

\textit{Bill knows that who FOC Tom loves}

‘Bill knows who Tom loves.’

Pursuing this proposal further, I assume that if a subject wh-phrase is extracted, *yang* originates in Spec,VP; the relative clause will be derived as an active construction as in (42’) seen in section 5, hence the verb bears a form of meN. Striking is that this analysis neatly predicts the absence of *yang* and the possible presence of -kah in cases where adjuncts are fronted in order to get a focus position. Adjuncts, adjoined to a VP originally, cannot be by a relative clause, after they are extracted. If an adjunct is cleft, only a complement clause can follow as we see for example in English: ‘Where is it that you bought this book?’ As we have seen in BI a complement clause is optionally headed by *bawha*.

Even the multiple clause type like (37b) could be accounted for: *yang* moves step by step. Every step in the derivation *yang* is a complement of a verb that is incorporated in I⁰ with the subject once *yang* moves further up. Also, partial movement could be considered as extraction: the cleft phrase could have an intermediate position. Closing this section I assume that wh-extraction obeys island constraints listed in section 4.

7. Movement & Interpretation

As mentioned in the introduction, the emphasis in this paper is on the structural consequences of wh-movement. This section shows some interpretational consequences, yet is far from complete.

We have seen that argument-wh-phrases in BI can have three positions: in situ, fully moved⁵ and partially moved. Consider again (24).

---

³ As we will see in section 7 *setiap orang* ‘every person’ can occur, since I assume the quantifier *setiap* the head of the DP that is able to include *orang* in the incorporation. Maybe it has to do with this quantificational property of *setiap*.

⁴ This something to test in the future. I developed this theory at a rather late stage.

⁵ Although I have given an alternative account I stick to the general accepted terminology.
It has become clear that the movement of a wh-phrase has to do with focus. In (24b-c) siapa has focus. It is however surprising that siapa in (46b) and the intermediate apa in (46c) can either have wide or narrow scope whereas in (46a) only a wide scope interpretation is available. It seems that the quantifier is the cause of this.

The same holds for subjects that are moved in constructions like this:

Further, it turns out that bahwa is a boundary: (48b) prefers an embedded interpretation, contrasting (48a) that is ambiguous.

(24)  
\( \text{Bill tahu siapa (Saddy 1991)} \)  
Bill knows who  
\( \text{Bill tahu siapa yang Bill tahu Tom cintai (Saddy 1991)} \)  
who  
\( \text{Bill tahu siapa yang Tom cintai (Saddy 1991)} \)  
who  
\( \text{Bill tahu siapa yang Tom cintai (Saddy 1991)} \)  
who

(46)  
\( \text{Setiap orang men-cintai siapa? (Saddy 1991)} \)  
every person loves who
\( \text{Setiap orang cintai? (ambiguous)} \)  
every person loves
\( \text{Setiap orang tahu apa yang Tom beli? (ambiguous)} \)  
every person knows what who

(47)  
\( \text{Setiap orang tahu siapa men-beli buku. (Saddy 1991)} \)  
every person know who buy book
\( \text{Setiap orang tahu siapa yang men-beli buku. (ambiguous)} \)  
every person know who buy book
\( \text{Setiap orang tahu siapa yang men-beli buku. (ambiguous)} \)  
every person know who buy book

(48)  
\( \text{Bill tahu siapa yang Tom cintai. (Saddy 1991)} \)  
Bill knows who  
\( \text{Bill tahu bahwa siapa yang Tom cintai. (Saddy 1991)} \)  
who  
\( \text{Bill tahu bahwa siapa yang Tom cintai. (Saddy 1991)} \)  
who

‘Bill knows who Tom loves.’
Saddy (1991) notes that if the matrix verb, such as *harap* in (49), cannot take a + wh complement the partially moved phrase “has matrix interrogative force”. Adding *baha* severely degrades the sentence.

(49)  a.  
Tom  meng-*harap* apa yang Mary mem-*beli*?  
     Tom  TR-  expect what FOC Mary TR-  buy

     ‘What did Tom expect that Mary bought?’

   b.  ?*Tom  meng-*harap* bahwa apa yang Mary mem-*beli*?
     Tom  TR-  expect that what FOC Mary TR-  buy

As we saw in section 4, adding negation to the matrix verb makes it impossible to interpret the partially moved wh-phrase, whereas the in situ phrase is, having a wide scope interpretation. Consider (50).

(50)  a.  Tom  tidak meng-*harap* Mary mem-*beli* apa?  (apa has wide scope)  (Saddy 1991)
     Tom  not  TR-  expect Mary TR-  buy what
     ‘What did Tom not expect that Mary bought?’

   b.  *Tom  tidak meng-*harap* apa yang Mary beli?
     Tom  not  TR-  expect what FOC Mary buy
     int:  ‘What did Tom not expect that Mary bought?’

Maybe the proposed analysis I suggest in section 6 can be of help to understand the phenomena described here and this might be a topic for another paper.

8. Conclusion

With this term paper I report my findings regarding wh-phrases in BI. I pay most attention to the structural consequences of wh-movement, instead of looking at wh-in-situ only. After I identify the different kinds of wh-movement and restrictions on such movement, I point out three effects: the presence or absence of verb markers, the appearance of the relative *yang* and difference in interpretation. It appears that wh-phrases in BI obey island constraints. By using a proposal that can account for the three kinds of passive and word order facts in Austronesian languages, I try to account for the first two effects in BI. I propose that argument-wh-phrases that are subject to movement, are extracted at Deep Structure yielding two clauses. Although *yang* seems to have focus marking quality, I consider it a true relative. Future exploration of these languages and languages that make use of the cleft strategy, is necessary to verify my theory. Also, interpretation differences might be better understood within this analysis.
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