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Wh-asymmetries Tagalog derive from the availability of a TP-internal A-bar Focus projection whose [focus] feature triggers attraction of an Absolutive DP argument. This raised argument creates an island for further A-bar movement out of a lower argument or adjunct position.

According to Chomsky (1995) and Collins (1997), economy conditions on derivational operations are strictly "local", in the sense that the choice of the most economical operation must be made at each step of a derivation. Under this view, the Minimal Link Condition (MLC) is part of the definition of Attract/Move. Based on wh-extraction asymmetries in Tagalog, Nakamura (1998) argues instead that economy conditions are "global"; that is, they apply to the output of convergent derivations, selecting the shortest one. Under this view, MLC is not part of the definition of Attract-F. Nakamura's reformulation of MLC is given in (1a-c), where the notions of interpretability and chain length play a crucial role.

1. a. Minimal Link Condition (MLC)
   Derivation D blocks derivation D' if there exist chain links CL ∈ D and CL' ∈ D' such that CL and CL' are comparable and CL is shorter than CL'.
   b. Chain Link Comparability
   Chains are comparable only if they are formed by raising elements with the same interpretable features to equivalent structural positions.
   c. Length of Chain Link
   Length L of chain link CL is the number of maximal projections that dominate the tail but not the head.

In this paper, I show that Tagalog wh-extraction asymmetries are not true evidence for the global nature of MLC. An alternative account of such asymmetries will be proposed, based on similar facts from Malagasy and Kirundi (a Bantu nominative language). Following Ndayiragije's (1999) analysis of Kirundi Inverse and Transitive Expletive Constructions, I argue that the existence of such wh-asymmetries in ergative languages (such Tagalog and Malagasy) and some nominative languages (such as Kirundi) derives from the availability of a TP-internal A-bar Focus projection (FP), whose [focus] feature triggers attraction of a DP argument which will be marked Absolutive. Under this view, the Absolutive Case is a feature of the head Focus, not T as standardly assumed in the literature on ergative languages. Furthermore, the A-bar raised DP constitutes an island for wh-movement of any lower argument or adjunct. This accounts for the wh-extraction asymmetries. Incidentally, I show that the [focus] feature associated with the head Focus is [weak] in Tagalog, but strong in Malagasy. This explains the word order contrast between the two ergative languages regarding the surface position of the Absolutive-marked argument. Finally, I argue that the existence of ergative languages is an
epiphenomenon derivable from a very simple parameter: T has no Case features in such languages.

1. Tagalog

1.1. Case alternations and agreement restrictions

A well-known property of ergative languages is that they permit an apparent free alternation in Absolutive Case-marking, which shows up in "active/passive" alternations (see notably Guilfoyle et al. 1992, Richards 1993, Macachlan & Nakamura 1994, among many others). Illustrations are given in (2a-c), from Tagalog. It is worth noting that Absolutive marking does not trigger word order variation in this language. Furthermore, only the Absolutive-marked DP argument agrees with the verb.

2. a. B-in-ili ni Juan ang isda para kay Mariya (Theme Topic) bought (TT) ERG-Juan ABS-fish for OBL-Maria 'Juan bought fish for Maria.'
b. B-um-ili si Juan ng isda para kay Mariya (Agent Topic) bought (AT) ABS-Juan INH-fish for OBL-Maria 'Juan bought fish for Maria.'
c. I-binili ni Juan ang isda si Mariya (Benefactive Topic) bought (BT) ERG-Juan INH-fish ABS-Maria 'Juan bought fish for Maria.'

To account for such Case alternations, Nakamura (1998) proposes the derivation (3) for (2a).

3. [TP the fish] bought (TT) [PP Juan [Pr [Asp P Asp [VP t₁ t₂ [PP for Maria]]]]]

(3) reads as follows. The external argument is generated in the Spec of Bower's (1993) Predicate Projection (PrP). The latter dominates an inner Aspectual Projection (Travis 1991) whose Spec is the locus of Ergative Case checking. For Nakamura, Asp in (3) is devoid of (structural) Ergative Case. The latter is assigned by Pr, and checked by the DP Agent in its Spec. In passing, note that such a checking configuration is not permitted within the MP, if [Spec,PrP] is a theta-position. Finally, the Theme argument, being definite in (2a), cannot get inherent Case from V. Therefore, the Theme covertly raises into the Spec of TP at LF, for Case reasons.

As for (2b), Nakamura proposes the derivation (4). He assumes that neither Asp nor Pr has Case feature in (4=2b). Therefore, the Agent argument covertly moves into [Spec,TP], for Case reasons, and the Theme is assigned an inherent Case in situ, by V.

4. [TP Juan] bought (AT) [PP t₁ [Pr [Asp P Asp [VP fish t₂ [PP for Maria]]]]]

Finally, (2c) is derived as in (5). Here, Nakamura introduces two more assumptions. First, Preposition Incorporation (PI) of the head of PP applies, due to
its affixal nature. Second, the trace left by PI is not capable of assigning Case. Therefore, the Benefactive argument covertly raises into [Spec,TP], to checked off its Case-feature.

5. \[ \text{TP María₁ for-bought (BT) [\text{Pr} \text{Juan [\text{Asp} \text{Asp} [\text{VP (the) fish} t₁ [\text{pp} t₁ i₁]]]]} \]

LF-raising of the Absolutive marked argument in (3-5) explains the agreement patterns in (2a-c). Yet, some problems arise from Nakamura's analysis. First, it is not clear why Pr and Asp heads are devoid of Case in some cases but not others. Second, it leaves unexplained the fact that the Theme argument must be definite in (2a), but not elsewhere. Finally, as pointed out by Nakamura himself (cf. his fn.6), Theme-raising in (3), as well as Benefactive-raising in (5), are not permitted under Chomsky's (1995) system. Both cases violate economy conditions (MLC) on A-movement. As I will show shortly, the same problem applies to Nakamura's view of MLC as a "global" economy condition. Before that, let us examine wh-extraction asymmetries.

1.2. Wh-asymmetries

Another well-known property of ergative languages is a Case-based wh-extraction restriction. As shown by Tagalog examples in (6-7), only Absolutive Case-marked DPs can be wh-moved (cf. (6a) vs. (7a), (6b*) vs. (7b)). I return to adjunct-extraction (6/7c) later.

6. a. Sino ang b-un-ili ng damit?
   who ANG bought (AT) INH-dress
   'Who is the one that bought the dress?'
   b.*Ano ang b-un-ili si Juan?
   what ANG bought (AT) ABS-Juan
   'What is the thing that Juan bought?'
   c. Saan ang b-un-ili si Juan ng damit?
      where ANG bought (AT) ABS-Juan INH-dress
      'Where did Juan buy a dress?'

7. a.*Sino ang b-in-ili ang damit?
   who ANG bought (TT) ABS-dress
   'Who is the one that bought the dress?'
   b. Ano ang b-in-ili ni Juan?
      what ANG bought (TT) ERG-Juan
      'What is the thing that Juan bought?'
   c. Saan ang b-in-ili ni Juan ang damit?
      where ANG bought (TT) ABS-Juan INH-dress
      'Where did Juan buy a dress?'

1.3. Nakamura's account

To account for such wh-extraction asymmetries, Nakamura proposes the derivations in (8a-b) for (6a) and (7a*), respectively. Following Richards (1991), he assumes that Tagalog wh-constructions consist of a wh-word predicate predicated onto a
headless relative clause involving a null operator movement to [Spec,CP], before Spell-Out.

8. a. \([CP\text{OP}_1 TP t_1 \text{ bought (AT)} [PrP t_2 [AspP [VP t_2 \text{ the dress}]]]] (6a)

b. *\([CP\text{OP}_1 TP \text{ the dress} \text{ bought (TT)} [PrP t_2 [AspP [VP t_2 t'_j ]]]] (7a)

Under the "global" view of MLC assumed in (1), (8a) blocks (8b*) since the \((OP_1, t_1')\) wh-chain in (8a), whose length is 1 (the maximal projection crossed is TP), is shorter than that in (8b), whose length is 2 (the maximal projections crossed are PrP and TP). Therefore, (8b*) is costlier than (8a), hence the ungrammaticality of (7a*) compared to (6a).

It should be pointed out that, within Nakamura's system, covert NP-movement of the null OP to [Spec,TP] for Absolutive Case-checking in (8a) does not count in the calculation of the "cost" at issue, for it does not have a comparable chain link to (8b*) due to the notion of chain link comparability in (1b) based on interpretable features.

Nakamura's account of such wh-extraction asymmetries faces two problems. First, if for chain link comparability, only [+interpretable] features of the reference set count, then the indefinite/definite distinction on the Theme in (2a-b) makes (8a) and (8b*) uncomparable. Second, if [-interpretable] features are ignorable in cost calculations for A-bar chains, they should be relevant at least for A-chains. If so, then the MLC, even within the global approach, is systematically violated in (2a) and (2c), under the corresponding derivations in (3) and (5), respectively.

1.4. Alternative account

The alternative analysis of wh-asymmetries I would like to pursue here intends to provide a unified account of three general questions: (a) Why do ergative languages exist at all? (b) Why do they display free Absolutive Case-marking alternations, and (c) why do wh-extraction asymmetries show up in ergative languages (such as Tagalog), but not in some nominative languages (such as English or French)?

To answer these questions, I propose the clause structure in (9) for Tagalog, coupled with the following assumptions. First, T in Tagalog (and presumably in other ergative languages) is devoid of Case. Second, the EPP-feature of T is weak. Third, the Absolutive Case-marking alternations in (2a-c) derive from the existence of the TP-internal A-bar Focus projection (FocP) in (9), whose [focus] feature is weak in Tagalog. Fourth, the Absolutive Case feature is always assigned by the head Focus to the DP whose FFs covertly raise to check the [focus] feature. Fifth, Ergative Case is an inherent feature assigned to the external argument in situ. Finally, V covertly raises to Foc, then to T.
(9) offers a straightforward account of the three questions above. First, under the strictly "local" nature of MLC, only the DP in (9) whose FFs covertly check the [focus] feature in FocP can be covertly attracted by the weak EPP-feature of T. Covert verb-raising to T, via Foc, accounts for verb-agreement with the DP bearing the Absolutive DP.

Furthermore, the focus position being an A'-position, any lower DP with a [focus] feature is a potential candidate for covert attraction to that position. This accounts for the free Absolutive Case-marking alternation in (2a-c). It also explains why there is no MLC violation in (2a) and (2c), where the Theme and the Benefactive are respectively marked with Absolutive Case, an indication that their FFs have covertly raises to T, over the Agent argument in [Spec,VP].

Finally, the Absolutive-marked DP (covertly) raised into the A'-Focus position in (9) constitutes an island for wh-extraction of any lower DP. The wh-extraction asymmetries in (6-7) follow straightforwardly. We also understand why these Case-based wh-asymmetries do not show up in English, since it lacks a TP-internal A-bar projection.

In the rest of the discussion, I show that the analysis in (9) finds empirical motivations in two other languages: Malagasy, an ergative language like Tagalog, and Kirundi, a Bantu nominative language.

2. Malagasy

Keenan (1976, 1993), Guilfoyle et al. (1992), and Pensalfini (1995) report five syntactic properties of Malagasy that lend empirical support to the analysis in (9).

First, like Tagalog, Malagasy displays a free Absolutive-Case alternation. However, there is a word order variation in Malagasy regarding the position of the Absolutive-marked DP. The latter, which agrees with the verb, is always clause-final, as illustrated in (10a-c).
10. a. Mividy ny vary ho an'ny ankizy ny lehilahy (VOXPS)
   AT-buy the-rice for the children the-man
   'The man buys the rice for the children.'

   b. Vidyin' ny lehilahy ho an'ny ankizy ny vary (VSXPO)
   TT-buy the-man for the children the-rice
   'The man buys the rice for the children.'

   c. Ividianan' ny lehilahy ny vary ny ankizy (VSOXP)
   XT-buy the-man the-rice the children
   'The man buys the rice for the children.'

Second, like Tagalog, Malagasy displays wh-asymmetries. Indeed, only the Absolutive DP can be wh-moved.

11. a.*Iza no mividy ny vary ny lehilahy (Benefactive-extraction)
   who C AT-buy the-rice the-man

   b.*Iza no vidin' ny lehilahy ny vary
   who C TT-buy the-man the-rice

   c. Iza no ividianan' ny lehilahy ny vary
   who C XT-buy the-man the-rice
   'For whom was bought rice by the man.'

Third, as reported by Keenan (1993), only the logical subject can bind a reflexive anaphor, irrespective of which argument is the clausal-final Topic/Absolutive.

12. a. Mamono tena_j hoan' ny zanaka [ny rayaman-dreny rehetra]_i
   AT-kill self for the children the parents all
   'All parents kill themselves for (their) children'

   b. Amonoran' [ny rayaman-dreny rehetra]_i tena_j ny zanaka
   XT-kill the parents all self the children
   'All parents kill themselves for (their) children.'

   c.** Amonoran' ny ray aman-dreny rehetra tena_j [ny zanaka]_i
   XT-kill the parents all self the children


13. a. Nodakan' i Paoly ... [tamin'ny lohany] ... [ho ao amin' ny but] ny baolina
   TT-kick D Paul with the his-head into the goal the ball
   'The ball, Paul kicked into the goal with his head.'

   b.*Nodakan' i Paoly ny baolina [tamin'ny lohany] [ho ao amin' ny but]
   TT-kick D Paul the ball with the his-head into the goal

   c.*Nodakan' i Paoly [tamin'ny lohany] ny baolina [ho ao amin' ny but]
   TT-kick D Paul with the his-head the ball into the goal
d. Tsy lasa [nianaka tamin'i Jaona] i Pauly [noho i Jeanne]
   Neg gone with D John D Paul because-of D Jeanne
   'Paul did not leave with John because of Jeanne.'
e.*Tsy lasa i Pauly [nianaka tamin'i Jaona] [noho i Jeanne]

Finally, Pensalfini (1995) reported an interesting wh-asymmetry among adjuncts: only TP adjuncts (such as 13d) are wh-extractable; VP adjuncts (such as 13a) are not.

All shown properties find a straightforward account under the analysis in (9), modulo the following parameter distinguishing Tagalog from Malagasy: the [focus] feature is weak in Tagalog, but strong in Malagasy. I propose the underlying clause structure in (14) for Malagasy, where [Spec, FocP] is at the right side of its head, a PF effect presumably related to prosodical properties of theme-rheme structure, as often observed cross-linguistically.

14.  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
T \\
T \\
V_k \\
\text{Foc} \\
\text{Foc} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{DP}_{ij} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{SU} \\
V_i \\
V \\
\text{OB} \\
\end{array}
\]

The strength of the [focus] feature in (14) triggers overt A'-movement of the Top/Absolutive DP to the rightward [Spec,FocP]. This accounts for the word order contrast between Malagasy and Tagalog. All other properties follow straightforwardly: only the A-bar moved DP in [Spec, FocP], which checks the strong [focus] feature, can covertly raise (actually its FFs) to check the weak EPP feature of T, thus agreeing with the covertly raised verb in T. Furthermore, only the A-bar moved DP may undergo wh-movement (11). Incidentally, the binding facts in (12) follow straightforwardly, with the prediction that a DP anaphor could never appear in [Spec, FocP], the latter being an intermediate step towards T, an A-position. Finally (14) accounts for the adjunct-ordering in (13), and more interestingly, the wh-extraction asymmetry among adjuncts: IP adjuncts, being generated in a position higher than FocP, are predicted to be wh-extractable, unlike VP adjuncts.
3. Kirundi

The final empirical support for the analysis in (9/14) comes from Kirundi, an SVO Nominative language which displays most of the syntactic properties observed above in Tagalog and Malagasy.

Consider first the SVO sentences in (15a-b). In (15a), the verbal morphology contains the subject-verb agreement marker followed by the tense marker, and the underlined marker -ra- which is called "anti-focus marker" in traditional grammars. The presence of this marker permits a neutral interpretation of (15a). Its absence triggers a focus reading on the postverbal object, not on the subject, as in (15b).

15. a. Yohani a-à-somye ibitabo. SVO
   John 3s-pst-AD-read-perf books
   'John read books.'

   b. Yohani a-à-somye ibitabo. SVO
      John 3p-pst-read:perf books
      'John read BOOKS.'

Consider now (16a-b). (16a) shows an OVS structure often called "Inverse", "Subject-Object Reversal", or "Antipassive" construction. Importantly, the verb agrees with the preverbal logical object. Furthermore, (16a) precludes the presence of the "anti-focus" marker -ra- of (15a), thus triggering a focus reading on the postverbal logical subject. (16b) is a Transitive Expletive Construction. The subject position, that is [Spec,TP], is filled by a null expletive which agrees in phi-features with the verb. Here too, the anti-focus marker -ra- is precluded, thus forcing a focus interpretation of the postverbal logical subject, not the raised object.

16. a. ibitabo bi-a-somye Yohani. OVS
    books 3p-pst-read:perf John
    'JOHN read books.'

   b. proha-à-somye ibitabo Yohani. TEC (=Expl-VSO)
      loc-pst-read:perf books John
      'JOHN read books.'

In Ndayiragije (1999), I proposed the derivation (17) for Kirundi Inverse/Antipassive (16a) and TEC (16b). The agreement marker on the verb in (17) corresponds to (16a).
The main feature of this unified analysis is the availability of a TP-internal A-bar Focus projection in Kirundi, whose [focus] feature is strong, as in Malagasy (cf. 14). The overt counterpart of the null focus head in (17) is filled by the anti-focus marker -ra- in (15a). The fact that this overt marker follows the past tense marker in (15a) clearly indicates that FocP is lower than TP. Finally, I assume that both Case- and EPP-features of T are strong in Kirundi. These two assumptions enable us to derive (16a-b) in a unified way.

Indeed, after A-bar movement of the external argument (SU) to [Spec,FocP] in (17), where it gets an Absolutive Case (the latter shows up in the pronominal system where only emphatic but not weak pronouns are allowed in the Spec-Focus position), either the internal argument overtly raises to [Spec, TP] to check off the strong Case- and EPP-features of T, thus forming an OVS construction (16a), or a (null) expletive is merged into [Spec,TP] for the same purposes, thus giving rise to a TEC (16b).

Several arguments supporting this unified analysis were presented in Ndayiragije (1999). Due to space limitations, only a few of them are repeated below. Let us begin with the rightward A-bar movement of focused phrases.

(18a) is an SVO sentence containing a VP-modifier, which follows the internal argument. Note that the verbal morphology in (18a) contains the anti-focus marker -ra-. Its absence in (18b), triggers a focus reading on the postverbal adverb, not on the object. For the latter to receive a focus reading, it must follows the VP-modifier, as illustrated by (18c). TP-adjuncts always follow the focused argument. (18d) is an OVS sentence, in which the VP-modifier precedes the postverbal focus subject. (18e), where the VP-modifier follows the focused subject, is ill-formed. We thus have a first parallelism between Kirundi and Malagasy regarding the ordering of adjuncts and focused phrases. As second one, which will not be illustrated here for space limitations, is the wh-extraction asymmetry among adjuncts. Kirundi TP-adjuncts are wh-extractable, VP-adjuncts are not. The analysis in (17) correctly predicts such an asymmetry.

18. a. Yohani a-à-m-o-ojeje imiduga néezá. (SVOAdv)
   John 3s-pst-AF-wash cars  well
   ‘John washed cars well.’
b. Yohani a-à-oğeje imiduga nåezá. (SVOAdv)
   John 3s-pst-wash cars well
   'John washed cars WELL.'

c. Yohani a-à-oğeje nåezá imiduga. (SVAdvO)
   John 3s-pst-AF-wash well cars
   'John washed CARS well.'

d. imiduga yi-à-oğeje nåezá Yohani. (OVAAdvS)
   cars 3pl-pst-wash well John
   'JOHN washed cars well.'

e. *imiduga yi-à-oğeje Yohani nåezá. (OVSAAdv)
   cars 3pl-pst-wash John well

It could be objected that the position of VP-modifiers in (18) is not a strong
argument for the rightward A-bar movement of focused phrases in (17). Indeed, (18b)
might be accounted for by assuming that the VP-modifier is left-adjoined to VP, and
that the postverbal focused argument gets its focus feature in-situ, that is in the
theta-position, either the complement position for the focused object in (18c), or the
[Spec,VP] for the focused subject in (18d). However, given that VP-modified can be
focused, as shown by (18b), one would wrongly predict (18e) to be well-formed,
with focus on the VP-modifier.

A second and more compelling argument for rightward A-bar movement in (17)
comes from the position of focused DPs in obligatory control constructions. Consider
(19), (19a) is an SVO neutral sentence, in which the PRO subject of the
embedded CP is controlled by the DP object. The latter is postponed in (19b), thus
receiving a focus reading. If the DP object in (19b) has not moved from its theta-
position, the availability of obligatory control of PRO in (19b) is unexpected. On
the other hand, if the position of the focused object in (19c) is the A-bar [Spec,FocP]
in (17), no problem arises regarding obligatory control of PRO in (19b), assuming
LF-reconstruction of the A-bar moved focused object. Finally, (19c) shows an OVS
variant of (19a). The postverbal focused subject must follow the embedded CP,
witness the ill-formedness of (19d). If the focused subject in (19c) has not moved
from its Spec-VP position, one must assume that the CP complement has overtly
moved over the external argument. Under this view, it would be hard to explain what
might be the trigger of such a movement as well as its landing site.

19. a. Yohani a-à-ma-zanye inka1 [CP PRO1 kurisha].
   John 3s-pst-AF-bring cows INF-graze
   'John brought cows to graze.'

b. Yohani a-à-ma-zanye [CP PRO1 kurisha] inka1.
   John 3s-pst-AF-bring INF-graze cows
   'John brought cows to graze.'

c. inka1 zi-à-zanye t1 t1 [CP PRO1 kurisha] Yohani;
   cows 3pl-pst-bring INF-graze John
   'JOHN (not Peter) brought cows to graze.'

d. *inka1 zi-à-zanye Yohani t1 [CP PRO1 kurisha].
   cows 3pl-pst-bring John INF-graze
The facts in (18-19) are enough to conclude for the A-bar movement of the DP focused subject in (17). In the following lines, I present some arguments for the second part of the analysis in (17), namely overt A-movement of the DP Object in inverse/antipassive (OVS) constructions.

First, the raised object in (20a) can undergo "pro-drop" (20b) or be right-dislocated (20c), two properties of A-chains. Note that Object right-dislocation in (20c) does not have any agreement change on the verb. The right-dislocated object still agrees with the verb, as shown in (20c), an indication that (20c) is not a TBC (compare with (16b)). The presence of a demonstrative determiner on the dislocated object is required by the well-known definiteness effect related to argument dislocation.

20. a. ibitabo bi-á-somye Yohani. (OVS)
   books 3pl-pst-read John
   'JOHN read books.'

b. probi-á-somye Yohani.
   3pl-pst-read John
   'JOHN read them.'

c. probi-á-somye Yohani, ivyo bitabo.
   3pl-pst-read John Dem books
   'Those books, JOHN read them.'

Second, OVS constructions appear in raising configurations, showing multiple agreement. (21a) illustrates an SVO raising construction. The raised subject agrees with both the thematic and raising verbs. The raised object of the OVS construction in (21b) displays the same agreement pattern. (21c) shows that wh-movement (relativization) of the DP object in (21a) does not trigger object-agreement. The verb rather agrees with the logical subject, as in (21a).

21.a. Abâna ba-á-riko ba-soma igitabo. (Subject-raising)
   children 3pl-pst-be 3pl-read book
   'Children were reading a book.'

b. Igitabo kl-á-riko ki-soma abâna.
   book 3s-pst-be 3s-read children
   [Litt: 'the book was reading children']
   'CHILDREN were reading a book.'

c.*Igitabo [Abâna kl-á-riko ki-soma t].... (Object-relativization)
   book children 3pl-pst-be 3pl-read
   'the book that children were reading ....'

Third, OVS constructions are permitted in embedded CPs, as illustrated by (22b), and must be "clause bounded", witness the ungrammaticality of (22c*).

22.a. Petero a-á-ense kló [tp abâna ba-ósoma igitabo]. (SVO)
   Peter 3s-pst-refuse C children 3pl-pres-read book
   'Peter refused that children read a book.'
b. Petero a-á-anse kó [tp igitabo ki-ọ-soma abána]. (OVS)
   Peter 3s-pst-refuse C book 3s-pres-read children
   'Peter refused that CHILDREN read book.'

c. *igitabo ki-á-anse kó [tp abána ba-ọ-soma Petero].
   book 3s-pst-refuse C children 3pl-pres-read Peter

Finally, there is no WCO effects in OVS, as shown by the ungrammaticality
of (23b), compared to (23a). This recalls binding restrictions in Malagasy (cf. 12).

23. a. umunyeshule weesej a-ọ-ra-kunda abarimu biweji. SVO
   student every 3s-pres-AF-like teachers of-him
   'Every student likes his teachers.'

b. *abarimu biweji ba-ọ-kunda umunyeshule weesej OVS
   teachers of-him 3pl-pres-like student every
   'EVERY STUDENT likes his teachers.'

4. Conclusion

The preceding discussion has shown strong similarities between Tagalog/Malagasy
and Kirundi that call for a unified analysis. I have argued that those similarities
follow straightforwardly from the availability of a TP-internal A-bar Focus
Projection (FocP), whose [focus] feature needs be checked off, for convergence. This
enables us to account for wh-extraction asymmetries in both languages, without
resorting to any ad hoc stipulations. Under this analysis, such asymmetries are not
true evidence for Nakamura’s (1998) view of MLC as a "global" economy condition.
Furthermore, the analysis enables us to explain why such wh-asymmetries show up
in some nominative languages, such as Kirundi, but not others, such as English or
French. Finally, I argued that the existence of ergative languages is an
epiphenomenon derivable from a simple parameter: T is devoid of Case in such
languages. Under this view, split-ergativity is a superficial property of languages
having a TP-internal Focus head, where T is specified for the Nominative Case
feature.
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