

On the Structure of Tagalog Non-DP Extraction

OVERVIEW While much work has been done on the extraction patterns of Tagalog, most of this work has focused on extraction of DPs (i.e., clausal dependents marked nominative and genitive), and less has been said about that of non-DPs (i.e., oblique-marked and adjunctive clausal dependents). Furthermore, within non-DP extraction, nearly all discussion has been devoted to *wh*-questions, with little attention given to relative clauses. This paper thus addresses this gap in our understanding of Tagalog extraction by investigating the structure of non-DP relativization and non-DP questions. We will show that these two constructions are structurally distinct from their respective DP counterparts, and furthermore that they are derivationally distinct from each other. This paints a more complete picture of the syntactic processes underlying Tagalog, and raises interesting questions for the analysis of extraction phenomena in the language.

NON-DP EXTRACTION One dimension along which DP- and non-DP extraction in Tagalog are different is structure. This difference is apparent on the surface. Compare the non-DP examples in (1-2) to the DP examples in (3-4).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(1) Saan (*ang) [nakatira si Kim]?
 where NOM lives NOM Kim
 ‘Where does Kim live?’
 WhQ</p> | <p>(3) Sino ang [nakatira sa Naga]?
 who NOM lives OBL Naga
 ‘Who lives in Naga?’
 WhQ</p> |
| <p>(2) lugar kung saan [nakatira si Kim]
 place if where lives NOM Kim
 ‘place where Kim lives’
 RC</p> | <p>(4) doktor na [nakatira sa Naga]
 doctor LK lives OBL Naga
 ‘doctor who lives in Naga’
 RC</p> |

It is generally accepted that at least some of these distinctions reflect true structural differences. For example, it has been argued that questions of DPs (3) are different from those of non-DPs (1) (Aldridge 2002)—with the latter taking the form of the focus fronting construction (Gerassimova and Sells 2008). A major question given the current state of research is how the non-DP relative clauses fit in to the picture.

PROPOSAL This paper argues that non-DP relative clauses are structurally distinct not only from DP relative clauses (contra Otsuka and Tanaka 2016), but also from non-DP questions (despite both exhibiting overt *wh*-expressions). Specifically, it will be shown that the *wh*-expression can occupy a higher position on the clausal spine in non-DP relative clauses, but is restricted to a lower position in non-DP questions. Furthermore, I follow Aldridge (2002, 2004) in analyzing non-DP questions as involving A'-movement, but propose that non-DP relative clauses are the result of high base-generation of the *wh*-expression. This analysis is supported by two major types of data.

(A) Clitic Placement The placement of the second position clitics in Tagalog is known to be tied to certain phrasal boundaries, and can be used as a diagnostic for structure. Previous work has argued that non-DP questions are monoclausal, due to the fact that clitics obligatory appear after the *wh*-expression (Kroeger 1993, Aldridge 2002). This is shown in (5), with brackets indicating logically possible clitic positions. Non-DP relatives show a different pattern, whereby the clitic may appear in one of two positions (6).

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(5) Saan {ka} nakatira {*ka}?
 where you lives you
 ‘Where do you live?’
 WhQ</p> | <p>(6) lugar kung saan {ka} nakatira {ka}
 place if where you lives you
 ‘place where you live’
 RC</p> |
|---|--|

The optionality of clitic placement in (6) suggests two possible surface positions for the *wh*-expression in non-DP relatives. The post-*wh* clitic position corresponds to a low *wh*-position par-

allel to the position occupied by the question *wh*-expression, whereas the post-verbal clitic position corresponds to a higher *wh*-position. Such a characterization is also consistent with the clitic placement facts in DP questions, which are argued to be biclausal pseudoclefts, where the *wh*-expression surfaces completely outside an embedded headless relative clause (7).

- (7) Sino {*mo} ang binigyan {mo} ng regalo?
 who you NOM gave.LV you GEN gift
 ‘Who did you give a gift to?’

(B) Recent Perfective Clauses More supporting evidence comes from the behavior of extraction out of recent perfective (RP) clauses. It is argued that these clauses are in some sense reduced or defective, as their verbs lack recognizable voice or aspect morphology and they do not assign nominative to any dependent. Further evidence of this is the fact that they may not be negated. These facts are shown in (8).

- (8) (*Hindi) Kala~lagay lang ng pusa ng isda sa lamesa
 NEG RPFV~put only GEN can GEN fish OBL table
 ‘The cat has just put a fish on the table.’

This paper presents novel data showing the patterns of non-DP extraction from RP clauses. Non-DP relatives are possible with RP clauses (9). However *wh*-questions are ungrammatical whether they have the structure of non-DP questions (10) or of DP questions (11) (contra McGinn 1988).

- (9) lamesa kung saan {*lang} kala~lagay {lang} ng pusa ng isda
 table if where only RPFV~put only GEN cat GEN fish
 ‘table where the cat just put a fish’ RC
- (10) *Saan {*lang} kala~lagay {*lang} ng pusa ng isda?
 where only RPFV~put only GEN cat GEN fish
 Intended: ‘Where did the cat just put a fish?’ WhQ (non-DP structure)
- (11) *{Ano / Saan} ang kala~lagay lang ng pusa ng isda?
 what where NOM RPFV~put only GEN cat GEN fish
 Intended: ‘Where did the cat just put a fish?’ WhQ (DP structure)

Tying this behavior to the reduced nature of RP, we have further evidence for the difference in structural position of the *wh*-expression. Non-DP questions are impossible with RP clauses because its reduced nature results in the absence of the structural position normally occupied by the *wh*-expression. On the other hand, non-DP relatives remain possible because their *wh*-expression may occupy a higher position. Note also that this high position is consistent with the fact that the clitic *lang* may only appear following the verb in (9).

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Aldridge, E. 2002. Nominalization and *Wh*-movement in Seediq and Tagalog. *Language and Linguistics* 3.
 Aldridge, E. 2004. Ergativity and word order in Austronesian languages. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell U.
 Gerassimova, V, and P Sells. 2008. Long-dist. dependencies in Tagalog: The case for raising. In *WCCFL26*.
 Kroeger, P. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. CSLI.
 McGinn, R. 1988. Government and Case in Tagalog. In *Studies in Austronesian linguistics*. Ohio U.
 Otsuka, Y, and N Tanaka. 2016. Tagalog oblique relative clauses. *AFLA* 23 (Talk).