Raising applicatives in Tagalog

Problem. Locative Voice (LV) and Benefactive Voice (BV) constructions in Tagalog can express a wide range of thematic relations (Ramos 1974, Carrier-Duncan 1985, Latrouite 2011, Chen 2017). An LV pivot may be interpreted as a theme, location, source, goal, benefactive or external posessor. Similarly, BV pivots can express theme, instrument and benefactive relations. LV and BV can track both core and non-core arguments as pivots; thus there is no one-to-one correspondence between voice marking and an argument's thematic relation or apparent structural position. This indeterminacy is problematic for most approaches to Philippine-type voice morphology, including those which treat voice morphology as extraction marking (Chung 1994; Richards 2000; Pearson 2001, 2005; Rackowski 2002; Erlewine et al. 2017; Chen 2017) and those which treat LV and BV as thematic applicative heads, low and high, respectively (Aldridge 2004, Liao 2004).

Proposal. I propose that LV and BV in Tagalog are both raising applicatives (Georgala 2012), which license and move an argument they c-command but assign no thematic role. Thus an argument that merges but is not licensed in its thematic position can raise to the specifier of a raising applicative for licensing. (1) gives the proposed extended projection of the verb. A goal, source or external possessor originates as a thematic low applicative and raises to the specifier of LV. A benefactive or instrument originates as a thematic high applicative and raises to the specifier of BV.

(1) [Voice [BV [HighAppl [LV [V [LowAppl]]]]]]

A consequence of this proposal is that argument introduction is divorced from argument licensing. Non-core arguments are introduced by thematic low and high applicatives (Pylkkänen 2008) but must be licensed by a higher projection in Tagalog. Even some themes appear to be licensed not in their base position but by a higher projection (2). This hybrid thematic + raising applicative approach captures the overlapping but distinct set of thematic relations conveyed by LV and BV.

(2) L\<in\>abh-**an**   [ko]   [ang   damit].
     \<PERF\>wash-**LV** 1SG.GEN   NOM   clothes
     'I washed the clothes.'

LV as raising applicative. In LV external possession constructions, the pivot is interpreted as the possessor of the theme (3) (Nie 2018); this suggests that the possessor must be base-generated in a position local to the theme (Kayne 1975, Szabolcsi 1984). I propose that a low applicative head introduces and assigns possessive semantics to the applied argument much like goals in double object constructions (Pylkkänen 2008). However, the possessor cannot be licensed in the LowAppl position and must move to the specifier of LV for licensing (4).

(3) B\<in\>asag-**an**   [ko]   [ng   plorera] kahapon   [ang   bata].
     \<PERF\>shatter-**LV** 1SG.GEN   GEN   vase   yesterday NOM   child
     'I shattered the child's vase yesterday.'

(4) [AGENT Voice [POSS$_i$ LV [V [__$_i$ LowAppl THEME]]]]

This analysis accords with Deal's (2013) approach to external possessors in Nez Perce as case-driven movement to an non-thematic applicative position. Since external possessors pattern syntactically like goal and source arguments in Tagalog, the analysis predicts that goals and sources would be similarly subject to the thematic + raising applicative analysis. Indeed, raising applicatives were originally proposed for goals in double object constructions (Georgala 2012).

BV as raising applicative. <u>Instruments</u>. While BV pivots can receive a range of thematic inter-pretations, the addition of the verbal prefix *pang-* explicitly indicates that the pivot is an instrument (5). This suggests that it is not BV that introduces the instrument, but the syntactic head associ-ated with *pang-*. However, the BV affix is obligatory when the instrument is the pivot, suggesting that *pang-* is not involved in licensing. Thus it appears that *pang-* spells out a high applicative head which introduces an instrument; BV then does the job of licensing it (6). I assume that BV constructions without *pang-* have the same derivation, but with a silent HighAppl.

(5) {**I-p**<in>**unas** / **I-p**<in>**am**-punas} [ko] [ng silya] [ang trapo].
    BV-<PERF>wipe **BV**-<PERF>**pang**-wipe 1SG.GEN GEN chair NOM rag
    'I wiped a chair with the rag.'

(6) [AGENT Voice [INSTR$_i$ BV [__$_i$ HighAppl [V THEME]]]]

<u>Causatives</u>. In causatives of transitives, theme pivots generally occur in the BV construction (7). BV is an option even for verbs that usually take LV themes, such as *laba* 'wash' (8), showing that BV marking does not depend on the idiosyncractic properties of the verb. I assume that causatives involve a Voice over Voice configuration, where the causer and causee are both introduced by Voice heads (9). The BV prefix occurs outside and therefore is projected higher than the causative prefix *pa-*, which I take to spell out the lower Voice head. For the theme to become the pivot, it must move from its base position as sister to the verb to the specifier of BV for licensing.

(7) **I-p**<in>a-basa [ko] [sa bata] [ang libro].
    BV-<PERF>CAUS-read 1SG.GEN OBL child NOM book
    'I made the child read the book.'

(8) **I-p**<in>a-laba [ko] [sa bata] [ang damit].
    BV-<PERF>CAUS-wash 1SG.GEN OBL child NOM clothes
    'I made the child wash the clothes.'

(9) [CAUSER Voice [THEME$_i$ BV [CAUSEE Voice [V __$_i$]]]]

Discussion. In each case discussed, an argument is introduced in a thematic position but raises to a non-thematic position for licensing, which recalls AgrO approaches to direct objects (Bobaljik 1995). The thematic component is required to distinguish potential LV pivots, which are introduced within the domain of the VP, from potential BV pivots, which can be introduced outside the VP. The raising/licensing component is required to unify the set of pivots possible for each voice. What is meant by 'licensing' here? Deal (2013) shows that raised external possessors in Nez Perce get object case and control object agreement on the verb. I similarly propose that LV/BV pivot marking in Tagalog relies on a kind of abstract ϕ-agreement between the argument and raising applicative that allows the pivot to undergo extraction. This accords with Aldridge's (2016) account of the Austronesian extraction restriction as ϕ-feature competition. My approach also provides a new perspective on other voice languages, such as Tsou, for which LV and BV have been claimed to both behave like high applicatives (Chang 2015) but may be better captured as raising applicatives.

Selected references. CHANG (2015). Extractions in Tsou causative applicatives. *Lingua Sinica*. CHEN (2017). A reexamination of the Philippine-type voice system and its implications for Aus-tronesian primary-level subgrouping. U Hawai'i PhD. DEAL (2013). Possessor raising. *LI*. GEOR-GALA (2012). Applicatives in their structural and thematic function: A minimalist account of mul-titransitivity. Cornell PhD. NIE (2018). Possessor raising and adversity in Tagalog. *AFLA 25*.