

## Cleft sentences in Indonesian and Kimaragang

Paul Kroeger, GIAL

The structure of focus constructions has been a topic of considerable recent debate in Austronesian syntax, particularly with respect to Malagasy, and the compositionality of semantic properties has been a major issue in that debate. In this paper I investigate these issues in two other Western Malayo-Polynesian languages. I argue that the “pseudo-cleft” analysis defended by Paul (2001, 2008) and Potsdam (2006a,b) for Malagasy is the correct analysis for Indonesian and Kimaragang Dusun. However, the semantic properties which Paul predicts should follow as an automatic consequence from this structure, hold only as tendencies and not as absolute requirements.

Fortin (2009) proposes a focus-movement analysis, in the spirit of Rizzi (1997), for Indonesian sentences like (1). Under her analysis, the focused NP is a subject that has moved up to [Spec, FocP]. The “pseudo-cleft” analysis, in contrast, claims that such sentences are base-generated equative structures in which the focused NP is the predicate nominal and the presupposed material is a headless relative clause functioning as subject.

- (1) Orang itu(=lah) yang mencuri dompet saya.  
person that=FOC REL steal wallet my  
'It was that person who stole my wallet.' [Sneddon 1996:292]

Evidence supporting the latter analysis for Indonesian includes the following: (a) *yang* is the normal relativizer for Indonesian relative clauses, both headed and headless, and *yang* is obligatory in sentences like (1). (b) Aside from the construction under discussion here, focus particles normally occur within the predicate phrase (Mashudi 1981; Cole et al. to appear). (c) There are two markers of clausal negation in Indonesian: *tidak* when the predicate is verbal or adjectival and *bukan* when the predicate is nominal. Only *bukan* can be used to negate sentences like (1), an unexpected result if (1) is derived from a basic verbal sentence by focus fronting.

The equative structure of clefts in Kimaragang is even more transparent. Both the focused constituent (the predicate) and the presupposed material (the subject) are marked for nominative case, confirming their status as NP/DPs. In addition, Kimaragang also has two markers of clausal negation (*amu* vs. *okon*), and only the nominal negator (*okon*) can be used to negate clefts.

Paul (2001) states that two of the core semantic properties of cleft sentences, existential presupposition and exhaustivity, follow from the pseudo-cleft structure that she proposes for Malagasy. These properties are typically but not necessarily present in Indonesian clefts. Indonesian allows INFORMATIVE-PRESUPPOSITION clefts (Prince 1978), in which the “presupposed” material is actually new to the hearer. It also allows clefts in which the focused constituent gets an inclusive/completive, rather than an exhaustive, reading. I argue that exhaustivity in Indonesian is best analyzed as a generalized conversational implicature, following Horn (1981), rather than a presupposition or entailment.

In Kimaragang the facts are somewhat different: the contrast between exhaustive vs. completive focus is determined by the choice of focus particle (*no* vs. *po*), as seen in (2). Moreover, negation takes scope over these particles, as seen in (3), suggesting that exhaustivity in Kimaragang is part of the propositional content of the cleft sentence, when *no* is present.

- (2) a. I Jim *no* ot minanakaw dit karabaw ku.  
 NOM Jim FOC NOM AV.PAST.steal ACC buffalo 1sg.GEN  
 ‘It was Jim (and no one else) who stole my water buffalo.’
- b. I Jim *po* ot minanakaw dit karabaw ku.  
 NOM Jim FOC NOM AV.PAST.steal ACC buffalo 1sg.GEN  
 ‘It was Jim (among others) who stole my water buffalo.’
- (3) a. Okon i Jim *no* o minanakaw di karabaw nu.  
 NEG NOM Jim FOC NOM AV.PAST.steal ACC buffalo 2sg.GEN  
 ‘It wasn’t (only) Jim who stole your buffalo(es).’ [Jim did steal, but he wasn’t alone]
- b. Okon i Jim *po* o minanakaw di karabaw nu.  
 NEG NOM Jim FOC NOM AV.PAST.steal ACC buffalo 2sg.GEN  
 ‘It wasn’t Jim who stole your buffalo(es).’ [Jim did not steal, it was someone else]