1. Introduction

Recent analyses of W[estern] A[ustronesian] clause structure within G[overnment]-B[inding] theory have attempted to characterize the syntax of WA languages, such as Malagasy and Tagalog, in terms of underlying structures that are essentially identical to those proposed for more widely studied European languages such as English and French. In this paper, I want to discuss some inadequacies of this kind of approach to the study of WA syntax, focusing on some problems that arise within the recently proposed framework of Guilfoyle, Hung & Travis 1992 ('GHT'). I will conclude that the notion of a fully-specified 'underlying structure' is unhelpful and creates more problems than it solves. Furthermore, the concomitant application of movement rules to derive the observable word order and constituency data fails to account for robustly observable structural contrasts between the WA languages considered here, namely, Malagasy, Tagalog and Toba Batak. Finally, I sketch an account of the clause structure of these three languages within the framework of H[ead-driven] P[hrase] S[tructure] G[rammar] (Pollard & Sag 1987, 1993) which does not appeal to any notion of 'underlying structure' and thereby avoids the unwanted side-effects that arise under the GB approach. I conclude that a theory which seeks to describe the universal properties of human language within the same general frames should be based on an enriched notion of lexical structure rather than on the postulation of universal 'underlying structures'.

2. Typical Properties of WA Clauses

Clause structure in WA languages is characterized by a number of distinctive properties. The large majority of WA languages (of those that have been well-studied, at least) are predicate-initial with one argument picked out via verbal morphology and/or nominal morphology and/or linear ordering as having a special grammatical prominence. This prominent argument has been variously identified as 'subject', 'topic', 'focus', or 'absolutive' amongst other labels, based on its properties in various WA languages. The correct choice of label for this argument is not an issue I will dwell on at length
here, except insofar as to mention that, as in Kroeger's LFG account of Tagalog (Kroeger 1991) and Davies' work on Javanese within Relational Grammar (Davies 1993), the HPSG analysis presented below defines this prominent argument as subject, so I will refer to it as 'subject' from now on.

The subject in WA languages is typically 'definite' or 'presupposed' and is usually the only argument available for grammatical processes, such as wh-movement, relativization and topicalization. Each language provides some system of voice morphology by the use of which a given argument can be promoted to subject and thus become available for the grammatical processes mentioned above. Finally, it is also typical of WA languages that so-called 'thematic roles' (or perhaps 'logical' grammatical relations), often more than surface grammatical relations, play an important part in the determination of conditions on semantically related phenomena, such as reflexive-binding and control. Any analysis of WA clause structure must provide some account of how these different properties are represented and how they interact in a particular language.

3. The GHT Account of WA Clause Structure

GHT posit a very orthodox D-structure for WA languages:

```
(1)  
    IP  
      |   
      I' Spec  
      |   
      Infl VP  
      |   
      Spec (Agent) V'  
      |   
      V NP  
      (Theme)  
    (GHT 379)  
```

They assume that voice marking already appears on the verb at D-structure, presumably via morphological rule. Depending on which voice marker appears on the verb, one argument is forced to move to [Spec, IP] to receive structural case from
Infl by S-structure. Oversimplifying somewhat, the idea is that 'active' voice case-marks the theme argument, while 'passive' voice case-marks the agent. The argument which does not receive case from V moves to [Spec, IP] to receive case and becomes the 'topic' (in GHT's terms; the 'subject' in the HPSG analysis presented below).

One of the principal goals of the GHT analysis is to account for the distribution of subject properties observed in WA languages. GHT adjudge that a 'split' in subject properties exists between two NPs, the 'topic' and the 'agent', on the basis of four properties; extractability, quantifier float, control of reflexives, and deletability in 'equi-NP' (or 'Control') constructions. As mentioned in the introduction, the subject (GHT's 'topic') is the only NP available for extraction and, in Philippines languages at least, it is the only NP available for quantifier float (Schachter 1976). By contrast, the agent, whether it is subject or not, appears to be the typical controller of reflexive pronouns. The status of NPs deleted under equi-NP is somewhat more unclear, but deleted NPs can apparently be either nonsubject agents or subjects.

GHT claim that their analysis provides a straightforward structural account of this 'split'. One position, [Spec, IP], is associated with extractability and quantifier float. The other position, [Spec, VP], in which a nonsubject agent remains in situ, is associated with control of reflexivization. However, it will be demonstrated below that the GHT analysis fails to account for the WA facts in at least two crucial ways. Firstly, there is clearly no absolute 'split' between [Spec, VP] and [Spec, IP] with respect to the properties that GHT discuss. This suggests that the positional [Spec, VP] / [Spec, IP] dichotomy is not the key to understanding the WA data. Secondly, even if there were such a split, the GHT analysis does not explain why or how some of these properties should be associated with one position rather than the other.1

4. The GHT Account Applied to Malagasy

The GHT analysis sketched above leads to the following general picture of clause structure in the VOS language, Malagasy. The three related sentences given in (2) provide illustration.

(2)a. M-an-asana lamba amin'ny savony ny zazavavy
pres-act-wash the clothes with the soap the girl
'The girl is washing the clothes with the soap'

(Active)
b. Sasa-\text{-N} \text{ ny zazavavvy amin' ny savony ny lamba}
\text{wash-PASS the girl with the soap the clothes}
\text{The clothes are being washed with the soap by the girl}'
(Passive)

c. AN-\text{-asa-N} \text{ ny zazavavvy ny lamba ny savony}
\text{CIRC-wash-CIRC the girl the clothes the soap}
\text{The soap is washing with the clothes by the girl}'
(Circumstantial)

The examples given above are each associated with an S-structure given in (3):

(3)a. (= (2)a)
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