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As is the case in languages such as English, Madurese (Davies 2005), Malagasy (Flegg and Faul 2002) and Japanese (Takano 2003), Sundanese exemplifies the so-called prolepsis construction such as (1), in which a base-generated object in the matrix clause, i.e. Hasan, is coreferential with a thematic argument in the embedded clause, i.e. manéhna. In his investigation of Madurese, Davies (ibid.) claims that prolepsis constructions structurally differ from raising to object (henceforth RtoO) due to: (i) lack of thematic identity of the sentences with the DP in the matrix clause and those with the DP in the embedded clause; (ii) matrix DP needs not be complement subject; (iii) embedded idioms lose their idiomatic meaning with the DP in the matrix clause; (iv) adverbial clauses may participate; (v) the construction includes all predicates that take ‘finite’ complements; and (vi) the construction is immune to island conditions.

Davies argues that even though the foregoing properties do not necessarily preclude a raising analysis for the Madurese facts, they, taken as a group, serve as the distinguishing characteristics of prolepsis constructions. He then concludes that the purported RtoO constructions in Madurese should be analyzed as prolepsis constructions given the lack of positive evidence to keep RtoO and prolepsis distinct.

The present paper lays out Sundanese facts of RtoO/prolepsis constructions and investigates whether or not Sundanese grammar includes both RtoO and prolepsis. A careful examination at the Sundanese data reveals that Sundanese, unlike Madurese, instantiates both RtoO and prolepsis constructions, not unlike English. Arguments adduced in favor of this claim come from: (i) a complementizer is obligatorily absent in RtoO but obligatorily present in prolepsis (2); (ii) a resumptive pronoun is obligatorily absent in RtoO but the reverse is true of prolepsis (3); (iii) a complement non-subject element cannot serve as the raised element in RtoO but the same is not necessarily the case with prolepsis (4); (iv) RtoO evinces island effects, while prolepsis does not (5); and (v) epistemic adverbs are admissible only in proleptic complements (6). The summary of systematic differences between RtoO and prolepsis is exhibited in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RtoO</th>
<th>Prolepsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘complementizer’</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resumptive pronoun in</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matrix DP must be</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immunity to island</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epistemic adverbs in</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is apparent from the above table, RtoO and prolepsis are structurally distinct. This strongly suggests that, unlike Madurese, Sundanese instantiates both structures, just as English does. In other words, Davies’ proposal of Madurese RtoO as prolepsis cannot be maintained for Sundanese.

(1) Hasan di-sangka (ku) Ahmad yén manéhna nyitak duit palsu.
    H PV-suspect (by) A COMP he AV.print money fake
    ‘Ahmad suspected about Hasan that he printed forged bills.

(2) a. Hasan di-sangka (ku) Ahmad (*yén) nyitak duit palsu. RtoO
    H PV-suspect (by) A COMP AV.print money fake
       ‘Ahmad suspected that Hasan printed forged bills.
b. Hasan di-sangka (ku) Ahmad *(yén) manénha nyitak duit palsu. Prolipsis
H PV-suspect (by) A COMP he AV.print money fake
‘Ahmad suspected about Hasan that he printed forged bills.’

(3) a. Hasan di-sangka (ku) Ahmad *(manénha) nyitak duit palsu. RtoO
H PV-suspect (by) A he AV.print money fake
‘Ahmad suspected that Hasan printed forged bills.’

b. Hasan di-sangka (ku) Ahmad yén *(manénha) nyitak duit palsu. Prolipsis
H PV-suspect(by) A COMP he AV.print money fake
‘Ahmad suspected about Hasan that he printed forged bills.

(4) a. *Acéngi di-anggap (ku) Enéng treuk nabrak pamajikani. RtoO
A PV-assume by E truck AV.hit wife
‘Eneng assumed that the truck ran over Aceng’s wife.’

b. Acéngi di-anggap (ku) Enéng yén *treuk nabrak pamajikan manénhai.
H PV-assume by E COMP truck AV.hit wife he
‘Eneng assumed about Acengi that the truck ran over hisi wife.’

(5) a. *Hasani di-carita-keun (ku) Ahmad kamari tukang pos ngirim RtoO
H PV-tell-APPL by A yesterday laborer post AV.send
pakét jang Siti jeung pamajikani package for S and wife
‘Hasani was told by Ahmad yesterday the mail officer sent a package for Siti and hisi wife.’

b. Hasani di-carita-keun (ku) Ahmad yén kamari tukang pos ngirim Prolipsis
H PV-tell-APPL by A COMP yesterday laborer post AV.send
pakét jang Siti jeung pamajikan manénhai package for S and wife he
‘Hasani was told by Ahmad yesterday the mail officer sent a package for Siti and hisi wife.’

(6) a. *Acéng di-sangka (ku) Siti sigana rék munggah haji. RtoO
A PV-believe by S possibly will go pilgrimage
‘Aceng was suspected of having possibly gone on pilgrimage.’

b. Acéngi di-sangka (ku) Siti yén manénhai sigana rék munggah haji. Prolipsis
H PV-suspect by S COMP he possibly will go pilgrimage
‘Siti suspected about Acengi that he would possibly go on pilgrimage.’
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