Tough Movement and Subjects in Malagasy

Tough-Movement (TM), also known as Object-to-Subject Raising, relates the English translations in (1a) and (1b). This paper investigates the corresponding alternation in Malagasy, first discussed in Keenan 1976.

(1) a. Sarotra ny mamaky ity boky ity difficult DET read.ACT DEM book DEM lit. “Reading this book is difficult.”  
   ‘It is difficult to read this book.’  
   b. Sarotra vakina ity boky ity difficult read.PASS DEM book DEM  
   ‘This book is difficult to read.’

I show that Malagasy (1b) is parallel in its empirical behavior to English and should thus receive a similar analysis. In particular, in agreement with almost all analyses of TM since Chomsky 1977, there is A' movement of some element, shown as a null operator in (2), inside the complement clause:

(2) sarotra [\text{CP Op} [\text{TP vakina } \text{t}_i]] ity boky ity difficult read.PASS DEM book DEM

English and Malagasy differ in at least one salient respect however: TM cannot target subjects in English, (3) (see Hicks 2017, among others). In Malagasy, in contrast, subject-TM is licit. I argue that this contrast follows from basic differences in the nature of extraction in the two languages.

(3) a. *John is tough [__ to love Mary] (Hicks 2017:(39b))  
   b. *This book is difficult [__ to be read __]

Analysis. TM predicates in Malagasy include sarotra ‘difficult’, mafy ‘hard’, mora ‘easy’, tsara ‘good’, and mety ‘possible’. Keenan 1976 shows that in (1a), the TM predicate has an “infinitival” nominalization as its subject. This is confirmed by well-known subject diagnostics (Keenan 1976, 1995) such as fronting, relativization, and question particle placement. For example, the nominalization can be fronted using the focus cleft construction, (4).

(4) [Ny mamaky ity boky ity] no tena sarotra mihitsy (Keenan 1976:(126))  
   DET read.ACT DEM book DEM FOC very difficult indeed  
   ‘To read this book is very difficult indeed.’

The TM example in (1b), in contrast, has a structure in which only the final DP is the matrix subject, as subject diagnostics again clearly show. For example, focus clefting targets only the final DP:

(5) [Ity boky ity] no sarotra vakina (Keenan 1976:(127))  
   DEM book DEM FOC difficult read.PASS  
   ‘It’s this book that is difficult to read.’

I argue that the movement that takes place in the embedded clause is A’ movement, as in English. I argue against an analysis in which the movement is A movement in a restructuring context, as has been proposed for TM in German (Wurmbrand 2001), French (Authier & Reed 2009), and Malay (Selvanathan 2018). First, like English, and unlike the other languages, TM in Malagasy
is unbounded, (6). The verb forms in the embedded clause in (6) are those that are required in other long-distance extraction contexts (see Pearson 2005).

(6) a. Omby iza no sarotra [nandresena lahatra ny mpiompy hovarotana __]? cow which FOC difficult persuade CT DET farmer sell PASS
‘Which cow was difficult to persuade the farmer to sell ___?’

b. Valiny iza no sarotra [inoana [fa tsy fantasy __]]?
answer which FOC difficult believe PASS that NEG know PASS 3SG
‘Which answer is difficult to believe that he doesn’t know ___?’

Second, the embedded clause allows a range of clause-level markers such as tense, aspect, modality, and negation, (7), that are not expected in clause union contexts.

(7) Mety [tsy ho vetivety] izany possible NEG IRR be.quick DEM
lit. “That is possible not to come quickly.”, ‘It is possible that that may not come quickly.’

Malagasy thus behaves like English and does not distinguish any of the various TM analyses: long movement (Rothenbaum 1967, Postal 1974, Brody 1993), base generation of the matrix subject (Chomsky 1977, Keine & Poole 2017), or smuggling (Hicks 2009). For concreteness, I adopt Chomsky’s (1977) null operator analysis in (2).

Differences in English versus Malagasy grammar explain why subjects undergo TM in Malagasy, (9a) and examples (1b) and (7) above, but not English, (8a). (8a) is ungrammatical because the null operator shown in (8b) cannot be assigned case. PRO must occur in this position, (8c); however, there is then nothing to license the matrix subject since easy does not assign an external θ-role (Hicks 2017). In Malagasy, only subjects undergo A’ movement (Keenan 1976, others). If TM involves an A’ movement chain, then it is correctly predicted that TM will necessarily target subjects. Case is available for the null operator in (9b) since the complement clause is not infinitival.

(8) a. *The sheep are easy [__ to get lost].
   b. *The sheep are easy [CP OPi [TP t_i to [VP get lost]]]
   c. *The sheep are easy [PRO to get lost].

(9) a. Mora very ny ondry easy get.lost DET sheep
lit. “The sheep are easy to get lost.”, ‘It is easy for the sheep to get lost.’

b. Mora [CP OPi [TP very t_i]] ny ondry

**Conclusion.** This paper argues that Malagasy has an English-like TM construction involving A’ movement and not clause union. Differences between English and Malagasy follow from differences in the syntax of case in complement clauses and the grammar of extraction.