

*Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the  
Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA)*

**Ileana Paul**  
(ed.)



**AFLA XXVI**  
**The Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the**  
**Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association**

University of Western Ontario  
May 24-26, 2019

---

**ON THE STRUCTURE OF  
TAGALOG NON-DP EXTRACTION**

Henrison Hsieh  
McGill University

**Table of Contents**

Paul, Ileana	<i>Preface</i>	i
Baclawski, Kenneth, Jr.	<i>Optional wh-movement and topicalization in Eastern Cham</i>	1-17
Chang, Henry Y.	<i>Tsou Exclamatives in comparative syntax</i>	18-35
Chen, Tingchun	<i>Raising-to-object in Amis</i>	36-53
Collins, James N. and Peter Schuelke	<i>Roviana fronting and the relationship between syntactic and morphological ergativity</i>	54-70
Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka, Theodore Levin and Coppe van Urk	<i>The typology of nominal licensing in Austronesian voice system languages</i>	71-87
Finer, Daniel and Hasan Basri	<i>Clause truncation in South Sulawesi: Restructuring and nominalization</i>	88-105
Hopperdietzel, Jens	<i>Pseudo noun incorporation and differential object marking: object licensing in Daakaka</i>	106-123
Hsieh, Henrison	<i>On the structure of Tagalog non-DP extraction</i>	124-141
Kroeger, Paul	<i>Marking accessible information in Kimaragang</i>	142-158
Kroeger, Paul and Kristen Frazier	<i>Crossed-control in Malay/Indonesian aslong-distance passivization</i>	159-174
Macaulay, Benjamin	<i>The prosodic structure of Paze</i>	175-191
Ono, Hajime, Koichi Otaki, Manami Sato, 'Ana Heti Veikune, Peseti Vea, Yuko Otsuka and Masatoshi Koizumi	<i>Relative clause processing in Tongan: an effect of syntactic ergativity on the object preference</i>	192-208
Paillé, Mathieu	<i>V=nya in colloquial Malay</i>	209-226
Tollan, Rebecca	<i>Subjecthood and unmarkedness in Niuean</i>	227-247
Travis, Lisa DeMena and Diane Massam	<i>What moves, why, and how: the contribution of Austronesian</i>	248-264

## PREFACE

The 26th Annual Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA 26) was held on May 24-26, 2019 at the University of Western Ontario (Canada). The programme consisted of 24 presentations in addition to four plenary talks by Juliette Blevins, Vera Hohaus, Marian Klamer and Becky Tollan. This volume includes 13 papers from the conference.

As conference organizer, I received generous support from a variety of sources. Financial support came from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), Research Western, the Joint Fund (Research Western, SOGS, SGPS), the Theoretical and Applied Linguistics Lab, the Canadian Linguistic Association, the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, the Graduate Program in Linguistics and three departments (French Studies, Modern Languages and Literatures, and Anthropology). The conference would not have been possible without the student volunteers (Sonia Masi, William Tran, Caylen Walker and Kang Xu), plus several others who helped out at the registration desk. Finally, I am grateful to the Department of French Studies for administrative support.

Many thanks to the abstract reviewers, to all those who attended, and to Mitcho Erlewine, who helped develop the current stylesheet.

Ileana Paul  
University of Western Ontario

## ON THE STRUCTURE OF TAGALOG NON-DP EXTRACTION\*

Henrison Hsieh  
McGill University  
henrison.hsieh@mail.mcgill.ca

A'-dependencies of non-DPs in Tagalog stand out from their DP counterparts in a few significant ways: the two types are structurally distinct from each other, and non-DP dependencies are not subject to the well-known nominative-only restriction found with A'-extraction of DPs. Given that comparatively little research has been undertaken on Tagalog non-DP dependencies, this paper investigates their syntactic structure by using clitics as a diagnostic. A preliminary analysis of the data couched in Rizzi's (1997) Extended Left Periphery is then proposed with the goal of providing a framework for future research into this topic.

### 1. Introduction

Tagalog allows A'-extraction of non-DPs. For example as (1) shows, the oblique-marked locative argument of *nakatira* 'lives' in (1a) can be focused as in (1b), questioned as in (1c), or relativized as in (1d).<sup>1</sup>

- (1) a. *Naka-tira si Kim sa Naga.*  
STAT-reside NOM.P Kim OBL Naga  
'Kim lives in Naga.' Baseline
- b. *Sa Naga [naka-tira si Kim] (hindi sa Dumaguete).*  
OBL Naga STAT-reside NOM.P Kim NEG OBL Dumaguete  
'It's in Naga that Kim lives (not in Dumaguete).' Non-DP Focus
- c. *Saan [naka-tira si Kim]?*  
where STAT-reside NOM.P Kim  
'Where does Kim live?' Non-DP Wh-Question

---

\*Many thanks to Lisa Travis, Junko Shimoyama, and Jessica Coon for their guidance and advice on this project, as well as the audience at AFLA 26 for their comments and suggestions. Thanks to Lizette Charmagne Lising and Zharmaine Ante for their time, patience, and detailed comments and judgements on the Tagalog data. All data presented comes from the author's own judgements as well as from elicitation work with native Tagalog speaker consultants living in Montreal (mentioned previously).

<sup>1</sup>Abbreviations used in this handout follow the Leipzig Glossing Conventions with the following additions: AV = Agent Voice, CV = Conveyance Voice,  $\exists$  = Existential verb, LK = Linker, LV = Locative Voice, NVOL = Nonvolitional Form, PV = Patient Voice, P = Personal noun marker, STAT = Stative prefix. All Tagalog examples in this paper are written in conventional Tagalog orthography, which does not indicate lexical stress/vowel length contrasts, and spells the common noun genitive marker, pronounced /naŋ/, as *ng*.

- d. lungsod *kung saan* [naka-tira si Kim]  
city if where STAT-reside NOM.P Kim  
'city where Kim lives' Non-DP Relative Clause

These constructions are interesting in the larger context of Tagalog A'-dependencies for two major reasons. First, A'-dependencies of non-DPs have a different structure from those of DPs. A striking manifestation of this difference is the fact that non-DP relative clauses like (1d) exhibit an overt *wh*-pronoun, whereas DP relative clauses do not. Second, non-DP extraction does not interact with the Tagalog voice system. That is, it appears to ignore the well-known nominative-only restriction on A'-extraction of DPs.

These properties of non-DP A'-dependencies just described can potentially inform our understanding of Tagalog phrase structure and extraction more generally. Despite this fact, these constructions have not been as well-studied as their DP counterparts. Furthermore, most of the existing work on this topic (e.g., Nakamura 1996; Richards 1998; Aldridge 2002, 2003; Mercado 2004) has so far focused only on *wh*-questions and focus (but see Otsuka and Tanaka 2016).

The goal of this paper is thus to address this gap in our understanding of Tagalog non-DP dependencies, particularly of non-DP relative clauses. I will show that DP and non-DP A'-dependencies have fundamentally distinct structures from each other, expanding on the previous research on this topic that has focused on *wh*-questions and focus. Furthermore, I show that despite surface similarity, non-DP relative clauses and non-DP *wh*-questions/focus have structures that are themselves distinct from each other. Finally, I propose an analysis of the types of non-DP A'-dependencies under discussion using Rizzi's (1997) extended left periphery proposal.

## 2. Background: Differences Between A'-dependencies

Tagalog employs distinct strategies for forming A'-dependencies conditioned on whether the target is a DP (nominative- or genitive-marked) or not (oblique or other), resulting in non-overlapping distributions. These strategies can be readily distinguished based on their surface structures, as we will see in this section.

### 2.1. Surface Structure

#### 2.1.1. Relative Clauses

Relative clauses of DPs and non-DPs differ in what material intervenes between the head and modifier, as schematized in (2) (see also Otsuka and Tanaka 2016). For DP relative clauses like (3), we find the linker morpheme *na/=ng*, whose form is phonologically conditioned. For non-DP relative clauses like those in (4), no clear linker morpheme surfaces. Instead, we find the complementizer *kung* and a *wh*-expression that covaries with the target.

- (2) *Differences in relative clause structure*
- |    |                                  |                        |
|----|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| a. | HEAD <i>na/=ng</i> [ MODIFIER ]  | DP Relative Clause     |
| b. | HEAD <i>kung</i> WH [ MODIFIER ] | Non-DP Relative Clause |
- (3) {doktor *na*/babae=*ng* } [naka-tira sa Naga]  
 doctor LK woman=LK STAT-reside OBL Naga  
 ‘{doctor/woman} who lives in Naga’
- (4) a. lugar *kung saan* [naka-tira si Kim]  
 place if where STAT-reside NOM.P Kim  
 ‘place where Kim lives’
- b. dahilan *kung bakit* [naka-tira si Kim sa Naga]  
 reason if why STAT-reside NOM.P Kim OBL Naga  
 ‘reason why Kim lives in Naga’
- c. araw *kung kailan* [pu~punta si Juan sa London]  
 day if when FUT~go[AV] NOM.P Juan OBL London  
 ‘day when Juan is going to London’

The linker and *kung* both have wider distributions, which prominently includes complementizer-like functions. In this regard, the two morphemes introduce different kinds of clauses. *Kung* introduces embedded questions and conditional antecedents, as shown in (5).<sup>2</sup> In contrast to *kung*, the linker appears in a wider range of contexts (see Schachter and Otnes 1972), one of which is introducing declarative clause complements. The examples in (6) show this behavior for a regular clause-embedding verb and an emotive factive verb.

- (5) a. T<in>anong nila sa akin *kung* [may pagkain sa party].  
 <PFV>ask[PV] 3PL.GEN OBL 1SG.OBL if ∃ food OBL party  
 ‘They asked me if [there was food at the party].’
- b. *Kung* [may pagkain sa party], pu~punta sila.  
 if ∃ food OBL party FUT~go[AV] 3PL.NOM  
 ‘If [there’s food at the party], they will go.’
- (6) a. S<in>abi nila sa akin *na* [may pagkain sa party].  
 <PFV>say[PV] 3PL.GEN OBL 1SG.OBL LK ∃ food OBL party  
 ‘They told me that [there is food at the party].’
- b. Na-gulat sila *na* [may pagkain sa party].  
 PFV-surprise 3PL.NOM LK ∃ food OBL party  
 ‘They were surprised that [there was food at the party].’

<sup>2</sup>Drawing on the resemblance with the English complementizer, I gloss *kung* as *if* throughout this paper, as an aid to the reader.

2.2. *Wh*-Questions and Focus

I now turn to focus constructions and *wh*-questions, which have been argued to be structurally parallel (Aldridge 2002; Mercado 2004; Gerassimova and Sells 2008). The differences between DP and non-DP questions/focus are schematized in (7). For both types of constructions, the questioned or focused constituent appears clause-initially. If the constituent is a DP, a nominative determiner follows this clause-initial constituent, preceding the presuppositional statement. The determiner is typically *ang*, but may also be the referential determiner *yung* (see Nagaya 2011). For non-DP constituents, the determiner is ungrammatical.

(7) *Differences in focus/question structure*

- |    |                                       |                       |
|----|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| a. | {WH/FOC} <i>ang/yung</i> [CP PRESUP ] | DP Question/Focus     |
| b. | {FOC/HW} [CP PRESUP ]                 | Non-DP Question/Focus |
- 
- |        |  |             |
|--------|--|-------------|
| (8) a. | Sino *({ <i>ang/yung</i> }) [naka-tira sa Naga]?<br>who.NOM NOM NOM STAT-reside OBL Naga<br>'Who lives in Naga?'                   | DP Question |
| b.     | Si Kim *({ <i>ang/yung</i> }) [naka-tira sa Naga].<br>NOM.P Kim NOM NOM STAT-reside OBL Naga<br>'The one who live in Naga is Kim.' | DP Focus    |
- 
- |        |   |                 |
|--------|---|-----------------|
| (9) a. | Saan *({ <i>ang/yung</i> }) [naka-tira si Kim]<br>where NOM NOM STAT-reside NOM.P Kim<br>'Where does Kim live?'               | Non-DP Question |
| b.     | Sa Naga *({ <i>ang/yung</i> }) [naka-tira si Kim]<br>OBL Naga NOM NOM STAT-reside NOM.P Kim<br>'It's in Naga that Kim lives.' | Non-DP Focus    |

2.3. Distribution

With regards to distribution, a well-established generalization in the literature is that that DP A'-dependencies are restricted by the Tagalog voice system: the only possible dependency targets are nominative positions, which in turn covary with the voice-marking in a clause.<sup>3</sup> Thus, for the pair of sentences in (10) which differ in voice morphology, a different argument—here, the agent *mag-aaral* 'student' or the theme *lapis* 'pencil'—is marked nominative. Consequently, to target the theme, the AV form of the verb *lagay* 'put' cannot be used, as (11) illustrates; instead its CV form must be used, as in (12).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup>Although we will later see some (more) examples that do not conform to this restriction.

<sup>4</sup>For space reasons, I occasionally give only a question or a focus construction as an example. Following previous work, I assume that these two kinds of constructions are parallel.

- (10) *Sample voice alternation in Tagalog*
- a. Nag-lagay ang mag-aaral ng lapis sa lamesa.  
 AV.PFV-put NOM student GEN pencil OBL table  
 ‘The student put a pencil on the table.’ AV → Agent NOM
- b. I-ni-lagay ng mag-aaral ang lapis sa lamesa.  
 CV-PFV-put GEN student NOM pencil OBL table  
 ‘The student put the pencil on the table.’ CV → Theme NOM

- (11) *Theme dependencies are ill-formed with AV*
- a.\*lapis na [*nag-lagay ang mag-aaral sa lamesa*]  
 pencil LK AV.PFV-put NOM student OBL table  
 Intended: ‘pencil that the student put on the table’ Relative Clause
- b.\*Ano ang [*nag-lagay ang mag-aaral sa lamesa*]?  
 what[NOM] NOM AV.PFV-put NOM student OBL table  
 Intended: ‘What did the student put on the table?’ Question

- (12) *Theme dependencies require CV*
- a. lapis na [*i-ni-lagay ng mag-aaral sa lamesa*]  
 pencil LK CV-PFV-put GEN student OBL table  
 ‘pencil that the student put on the table’ Relative Clause
- b. Ano ang [*i-ni-lagay ng mag-aaral sa lamesa*]?  
 what[NOM] NOM CV-PFV-put GEN student OBL table  
 ‘What did the student put on the table?’ Question

In comparison, non-DP A'-dependencies are more free. Both the AV and CV forms of *lagay* ‘put’ are compatible with extraction of the oblique-marked goal, as shown in (13-14).<sup>5</sup> In particular, compare grammatical (13) to ungrammatical (11), which both use AV, but differ in the argument extracted.

- (13) *Non-DP extraction is compatible with AV*
- a. lamesa kung saan [*nag-lagay ang mag-aaral ng lapis*]  
 table if where AV.PFV-put NOM student GEN pencil  
 ‘table where the student put a pencil’ Relative Clause
- b. Saan [*nag-lagay ang mag-aaral ng lapis*]?  
 where AV.PFV-put NOM student GEN pencil  
 ‘Where did the student put a pencil?’ Question

<sup>5</sup>The freedom of non-DP extraction has been argued to be due to the relative structural height of the target constituents as adjuncts (e.g. Kaufman 2009), but this explanation does not account for the accessibility of the low goal argument of *lagay* ‘put’ as shown here in (13).

(14) *Non-DP extraction is compatible with CV*

- a. lamesa kung saan [i-ni-lagay ng mag-aaral ang lapis]  
 table if where CV-PFV-put GEN student NOM pencil  
 ‘table where the student put the pencil’ Relative Clause
- b. Saan [i-ni-lagay ng mag-aaral ang lapis]?  
 where CV-PFV-put GEN student NOM pencil  
 ‘Where did the student put the pencil?’ Question

It is important to point out here that the difference in grammaticality between (11) and (13) is not simply because the non-DP structures—the *kung* relative clause and the *ang*-less question—have an inherently freer distribution. Concretely, we cannot use the non-DP structures to extract the theme out of an AV clause, as the attempts in (15) with *naglagay* ‘put.AV’ show. Note that both examples are ungrammatical regardless of the form used for the *wh*-pronoun (nominative *ano* or genitive *ng ano*), so the ungrammaticality cannot be attributed to simply having used the wrong *wh*-expression.<sup>6</sup>

(15) *AV Theme dependencies are ungrammatical with non-DP structures*

- a. \*lapis kung (ng) ano [nag-lagay ang mag-aaral sa lamesa]  
 pencil if GEN what AV.PFV-put NOM student OBL table  
 Intended: ‘pencil that the student put on the table’ Relative Clause
- b. \*(Ng) Ano [nag-lagay ang mag-aaral sa lamesa]?  
 GEN what AV.PFV-put NOM student OBL table  
 Intended: ‘What did the student put on the table?’ Question

In fact, as mentioned at the beginning of this section, this DP/non-DP split is robust. For example, under the Tagalog voice system, arguments with non-core theta-roles can also appear as the nominative argument, as with the goal argument of *lagay* ‘put’ in (16). As (17) illustrates, this goal argument must extract like a DP, relativizing with the linker and forming questions with *ang* (see also Rackowski 2002; Otsuka and Tanaka 2016). For completeness, I show in (18) that non-DP goals cannot extract like DPs either.

(16) *Nominative goal argument with LV verb*

- Ni-lagay-an ng mag-aaral ng lapis ang lamesa.  
 PFV-put-LV GEN student GEN pencil NOM table  
 ‘The student put a pencil on the table.’ (cf. 10)

<sup>6</sup>The reader may have also noticed that the non-DP relative clause appears simply to be a non-DP question introduced by *kung*. A valid concern following such an observation would be that the attempted relative clause (15a) is ungrammatical because the “question” marked by *kung* has the wrong structure (i.e., there is no *ang* immediately after the *wh*-pronoun). However, adding this *ang* does not ameliorate the ungrammaticality.

- (17) *Nominative goal extracts like a DP*
- a. lamesa{=ng/\*kung ano} [ni-lagy-an ng mag-aaral ng lapis]  
 table =LK if what[NOM] PFV-put-LV GEN student GEN pencil  
 ‘table the student put a pencil on’ Relative Clause
- b. Ano \*(ang) [ni-lagy-an ng mag-aaral ng lapis]?  
 what[NOM] NOM PFV-put-LV GEN student GEN pencil  
 ‘What did the student put a pencil on?’ Question
- (18) *Oblique goal cannot extract like a DP*
- a. lamesa{\*=ng/kung saan} [nag-lagay ang mag-aaral ng lapis]  
 table =LK if what[NOM] AV.PFV-put NOM student GEN pencil  
 ‘table the student put a pencil on’ Relative Clause
- b. Saan (\*ang) [nag-lagay ang mag-aaral ng lapis]?  
 where NOM AV.PFV-put NOM student GEN pencil  
 ‘What did the student put a pencil on?’ Question

### 3. Clitics as a Diagnostic for Structure

The class of second position clitics in Tagalog is useful for teasing apart the structural attributes of the various types of A'-dependencies under discussion here. As a first approximation, these particles encliticize onto the first element within their base CP.<sup>7</sup> I schematize the clitic placement patterns in (19). Throughout the paper, I use the notation {●} and {\*●} to indicate grammatical and ungrammatical positions for the clitics and other strings, respectively.

- (19) *General clitic placement schematic (first approximation)*  
 [<sub>CP</sub> Y(P){\*=Cl<sub>1</sub>=Cl<sub>2</sub>} [<sub>CP</sub> X(P){=Cl<sub>1</sub>=Cl<sub>2</sub>} ... t<sub>1/2</sub> ... t<sub>1/2</sub> ... ] ]

Given their placement behavior, clitics can be a useful indicator for the position of elements in the left periphery. Some concrete examples are given in (20): (20a) shows the basic post-verbal position; (20b) shows that negation, which appears clause-initially, serves as a clitic host; and (20c) shows that the clitic pronouns cannot escape a relative clause.

- (20) *Clitic placement examples*
- a. Na-kita {niyo ako} kanina {\*niyo ako} sa parke.  
 NVOL.PFV-see[PV] 2PL.GEN 1SG.NOM earlier OBL park  
 ‘Y’all saw me in the park.’
- b. Hindi {niyo ako} na-kita {\*niyo ako} sa parke.  
 NEG 2PL.GEN 1SG.NOM NVOL.PFV-see[PV] OBL park  
 ‘Y’all didn’t see me in the park.’

<sup>7</sup>See Kaufman 2010 for more detailed discussion on the behavior of clitics in Tagalog.

- c. <Um>uwi                    {\*niyo} na ang bata=ng [{\*niyo} na-kita  
 <AV>go.home(PFV)                    now NOM child=LK                    NVOL.PFV-see[PV]  
 {niyo} sa parke.  
 2PL.GEN OBL park  
 ‘The child that [y’ all saw in the park] has gone home.’

Let us now turn to the different *wh*-expression-containing A'-dependencies under discussion here, and see how they interact with these clitics.

### 3.1. *Wh*-Questions and Focus: DP vs Non-DP

The claim that questions and focus constructions of DPs are structurally different from those of non-DPs in Tagalog is not a new one. Previous work on this topic has argued for this position, and one important piece of evidence is the fact that clitic placement differs between the DP and non-DP constructions (Richards 1991; Aldridge 2002). We see this difference in (21).

Given the baseline declarative sentence in (21a), we can question either the nominative-marked theme or the oblique-marked goal, which are questioned using the DP and non-DP strategies, respectively. With the goal non-DP question in (21b), we see that the clitic pronoun cannot cliticize onto the verb, but must instead cliticize to the *wh*-pronoun. This behavior is parallel to what we saw with negation in (20b). On the other hand, with the theme DP question in (21c), the clitic pronoun *must* cliticize to the verb, and no further, parallel to the relative clause in (20c).

- (21)a. I-ni-lagay {ko} ang lapis sa lamesa.  
 CV-PFV-put 1SG.GEN NOM pencil OBL table  
 ‘I put the pencil on the table.’ Baseline
- b. Saan {ko} i-ni-lagay {\*ko} ang lapis?  
 where 1SG.GEN CV-PFV-put NOM pencil  
 ‘Where did I put the pencil?’ Non-DP Question (cf. 20b)
- c. Ano {\*ko} ang i-ni-lagay {ko} sa lamesa.  
 what NOM CV-PFV-put 1SG.GEN OBL table  
 ‘The one I put on the table is what?’ DP Question (cf. 20c)

These clitic placement facts have implications for the structural position of the *wh*-/focus constituent. In non-DP questions/focus, post-*wh*/focus cliticization, as in (21b), suggests that the *wh*-/focus constituent is within the same clitic placement domain as the base position of the pronoun. In DP questions/focus, on the other hand, post-verbal<sup>8</sup> cliticization, as in (21c), suggests that the *wh*-/focus constituent lies outside said clitic placement domain.

<sup>8</sup>I use “post-verbal” here as a shorthand for the more accurate characterization of attachment after the first element in the predicate.

Based on these observations, Aldridge (2002) concludes that DP and non-DP questions and focus take on different structures. She argues that the non-DP strategy is monoclausal, and is derived by fronting the *wh*-/focus constituent to a clause-peripheral position that is still within the CP. In contrast, the DP strategy has a biclausal pseudocleft structure, where the *wh*-/focus constituent is the predicate of a larger clause, and the remaining presuppositional statement is a (headless) relative clause subject. These structures, as well as the relevant cliticization sites, are schematized in (22).

(22) *Schematic Structures for Questions and Focus*

- a. [CP [DP FOC/WH ] [ ang [CP X(P)=CL ... ] ] ]                      DPs = Pseudoclefts  
 b. [CP [ FOC/WH ]=CL [TP ... t ... ] ]                      Non-DPs = Monoclausal fronting

3.2. Non-DP Dependencies: Relative Clauses vs *Wh*-Questions and Focus

We can also use clitics to distinguish the structures of non-DP relative clauses from non-DP questions/focus. At first glance, these two constructions seem closely related, as they both have overt *wh*-expressions in similar pre-verbal positions, as (23) illustrates. Even further similarity can be seen with the embedded question and the free relative in (24), which both take the form of a *wh*-question introduced by *kung*.<sup>9</sup>

- (23)a. *Saan* [naka-tira si Kim]?  
 where STAT-reside NOM.P Kim  
 ‘Where does Kim live?’                      Non-DP Question
- b. *lungsod kung saan* [naka-tira si Kim]  
 city if where STAT-reside NOM.P Kim  
 ‘city where Kim lives’                      Non-DP Relative Clause
- (24)a. T<in>anong ni Vicky *kung saan* [naka-tira si Kim].  
 <PFV>ask[PV] GEN.P Vicky if where STAT-reside NOM.P Kim  
 ‘Vicky asked where Kim lives’                      Non-DP Embedded Question
- b. P<um>unta ang bata *kung saan* [naka-tira si Kim].  
 <AV>go(PFV) NOM child if where STAT-reside NOM.P Kim  
 ‘The child went where Kim lives’                      Non-DP Free Relative

Here, I argue that despite surface similarity, non-DP relative clauses have a different structure from the others described in (23-24). Again, the difference in structure can be identified using clitic placement. Embedded non-DP questions behave identically to what we saw with matrix non-DP questions in (21b): cliticization is post-*wh*/focus, as we see in (25b). Contrast this with the non-DP relative clause

<sup>9</sup>I make a distinction between free relatives, shown here, and headless relative clauses, which are DP relative clauses that lack both the linker and the relative clause head. A crucial difference between the two is that the latter, but not the former, bears an overt case marker.

in (25c), which allows optionality in clitic placement: either post-verbal or post-*wh*/focus cliticization is possible. The baseline declarative is repeated here as well.

(25) *Clitic placement facts for non-DP extraction*

- a. I-ni-lagay {*ko*} ang lapis sa lamesa.  
 CV-PFV-put 1SG.GEN NOM pencil OBL table  
 ‘I put the pencil on the table.’ Baseline
- b. T<in>anong nila kung saan {*ko*} i-ni-lagay {*\*ko*} ang  
 <PFV>ask[PV] 3PL.GEN if where 1SG.GEN CV-PFV-put NOM  
 lapis.  
 pencil  
 ‘They asked where I put the pencil.’ Embedded Non-DP Question
- c. ang lamesa kung saan {*ko*} i-ni-lagay {*ko*} ang lapis  
 NOM table if where 1SG.GEN CV-PFV-put 1SG.GEN NOM pencil  
 ‘the table where I put the pencil’ Non-DP Relative Clause

Following the same line of reasoning for the previous set of data, we conclude that non-DP relatives must have two possible surface positions for the *wh*-element: one that lies within the clitic placement domain and one that lies outside of it. The relevant data discussed so far in this section is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Clitic placement in *wh*-expression containing constructions

	V=Cl (Higher <i>wh</i> )	Wh=Cl (Lower <i>wh</i> )
DP <i>Wh</i> -Question	✓	*
Non-DP Relative Clause	✓	✓
Non-DP <i>Wh</i> -Question	*	✓

3.3. Corroborating Evidence: Recent Perfective

We can find corroborating evidence for the conclusions reached in the previous parts of this section in the way that the Recent Perfective form behaves with respect to the constructions under discussion. As (26) shows, this verb form is used to denote the recent completion of a past action. For our purposes, the key property of this form is that it is morphosyntactically reduced in a number of ways when compared to a more typical verb form, given in (27) for comparison.

- (26) {Kabi~bili /Kaka-bili } lang ni Tina ng diyaryo sa tindahan.  
 RPFV~buy RPFV-buy only GEN.P Tina GEN newspaper OBL store  
 ‘Tina has just bought a newspaper at the store.’ Recent Perfective Verb

- (27) Bi~bilh-in ni Tina ang diyaryo sa tindahan.  
 FUT~buy-PV GEN.P Tina NOM newspaper OBL store  
 ‘Tina will buy the newspaper at the store.’ Typical Verb Form

First, the Recent Perfective form is marked with a combination of *ka-* and CV reduplication, with some variability as to whether reduplication targets the stem or *ka-*. Crucially, none of the voice morphemes cognate with Proto-Austronesian voice morphology—<um>/mag-, -in, -an, and *i-* in Tagalog (Starosta et al. 1982)—appear on this form. Similarly, this form is not marked with aspect either. While CV reduplication does appear in the Tagalog aspectual paradigm, its semantic contribution there is to mark non-completedness, which contradicts the semantics of the Recent Perfective form. Second, and perhaps rather strikingly given the behavior of a typical Tagalog clause, no argument is marked nominative.

This form has been independently studied because it allows A'-dependencies targeting DPs despite lacking a nominative argument (McGinn 1988; Schachter 1996), as (28) illustrates.

- (28) *DP Dependencies with Recent Perfective*
- a. Ano ang [kabi~bili lang ni Tina sa tindahan]?  
 what NOM RPFV~buy only GEN.P Tina OBL store  
 ‘What has Tina just bought at the store?’ DP Question
- b. diyaryo=ng [kabi~bili lang ni Tina sa tindahan]  
 newspaper=LK RPFV~buy only GEN.P Tina OBL store  
 ‘newspaper that Tina has just bought at the store’ DP Relative Clause

The picture is slightly more complicated when it comes to A'-dependencies targeting *non-DPs*. As (29) shows, non-DP questions are ill-formed, while relative clauses are possible. Note, however, the position of the second position clitic *lang* ‘only’ in (29b). In a non-DP relative clause constructed from the Recent Perfective, only post-verbal cliticization is possible.

- (29) *Non-DP Dependencies with Recent Perfective*
- a. \*Saan {lang} kabi~bili {lang} ni Tina ng diyaryo?  
 where only RPFV~buy only GEN.P Tina GEN newspaper  
 Intended: ‘Where has Tina just bought a newspaper?’ Non-DP Question
- b. tindahan kung saan {\*lang} kabi~bili {lang} ni Tina ng  
 store if where RPFV~buy only GEN.P Tina GEN  
 diyaryo  
 newspaper  
 ‘store where Tina has just bought a newspaper’ Non-DP Relative Clause

This cliticization pattern can also be seen in (30), where the agent is the pronoun *ko*, which in turn must precede *lang* in clitic ordering; we see that *ko* must also cliticize post-verbally. Furthermore, we see in (31) that embedded non-DP questions are also ungrammatical like (29a). This is evidence that something inherent to non-DP questions is at the root of the ungrammaticality. From the data in this section, we can observe the correlation stated in (32).

- (30) *tindahan kung saan* {*\*ko lang*} *kabi~bili* {*ko lang*} *ng*  
 store if where RPFV~buy 1SG.GEN only GEN  
*diyaryo*  
 newspaper  
 ‘store where I have just bought a newspaper’

- (31) \**T<in>anong ko kung saan* {*lang*} *kabi~bili* {*lang*} *ni*  
 <PFV>ask[PV] 1SG.GEN if where only RPFV~buy only GEN.P  
*Tina ng diyaryo.*  
 Tina GEN newspaper  
 Intended: ‘I asked where Tina has just bought a newspaper.’

- (32) *Correlation*: An A'-dependency is possible with Recent Perfective if and only if clitics can surface post-verbally with that A'-dependency.

Another way of framing this correlation, drawing on the previous discussion, is the following. The *lower position* for the *wh*-expression, which I associated with post-*wh*/focus cliticization, is unavailable. This unavailability prevents non-DP question formation, and affects non-DP relative clauses in removing the optionality of clitic placement we find in other contexts. The *higher position*, which I proposed to lie outside of the clitic placement domain (thus correlating with post-verbal cliticization), remains available. This in turn means that DP questions (and relative clauses) as well as non-DP relative clauses (with post-verbal cliticization) remain possible.<sup>10</sup>

Furthermore, it is also worth pointing out the behavior of *bakit* ‘why’, as it gives us an exception to the ill-formedness of non-DP questions that nevertheless conforms to the correlation in (32). Questions with *bakit*, like (33), take the form of

<sup>10</sup>Some authors such as McGinn (1988) note that non-DPs can extract out of Recent Perfective clauses using the DP strategy. However, this is not what I have found with my consultants, and in my own judgements. Thus, (i-ii) are ungrammatical.

- (i) \*{*Ano/Saan*} *ang kabi~bili lang ni Tina ng diyaryo?*  
 what where NOM RPFV~buy only GEN.P Tina GEN newspaper  
 Intended: ‘Where has Tina just bought a newspaper?’ *WhQ* (DP structure)
- (ii) \**tindahan=ng kabi~bili lang ni Tina ng diyaryo*  
 store=LK RPFV~buy only GEN.P Tina GEN newspaper  
 Intended: ‘store where Tina has just bought a newspaper’ *RC* (DP structure)

non-DP questions, in that they do not have *ang* following the *wh*-pronoun. However, they exhibit optional clitic placement, like non-DP relative clauses, as (34) shows.

- (33) Bakit (\*ang) naglu~luto si Kiko ng adobo?  
 why NOM AV.IMPF~cook NOM.P Kiko GEN adobo  
 ‘Why is Kiko cooking adobo?’
- (34) Bakit {sila} naglu~luto {sila} ng adobo?  
 why 3PL.NOM AV.IMPF~cook 3PL.NOM GEN adobo  
 ‘Why are they cooking adobo?’

Given this optional clitic placement, we expect *bakit* questions to be possible with Recent Perfective, allowing only the post-verbal cliticization position. As (35) shows, this expectation is borne out. Table 2 extends Table 1 and summarizes the discussion in this section.

- (35) Bakit {\*lang nila} kalu~luto {lang nila} ng adobo?  
 why RPFV~cook only 3PL.GEN GEN adobo  
 ‘Why have they just cooked adobo?’  
 ‘Why is it that they have just (only now) cooked adobo?’<sup>11</sup>

Table 2: Clitic placement in *wh*-expression containing constructions

	V=Cl (Higher <i>wh</i> )	<i>Wh</i> =Cl (Lower <i>wh</i> )	Compatible with RPFV
DP <i>Wh</i> -Question	✓	*	✓
Non-DP Relative Clause	✓	✓	✓
Non-DP <i>Wh</i> -Questions:			
<i>Bakit</i> ‘why’	✓	✓	✓
Other	*	✓	*

#### 4. Analysis

To account for the range of behavior discussed so far with respect to the range of clitic placement behavior and its implications for the position of *wh*-expressions, I propose a preliminary analysis adopting the extended left periphery proposal from

<sup>11</sup>Some speakers I have worked with report that questions of this form ask something very specific. That is, they do not ask about the reason for the action, but rather the reason that the action was completed only recently. The second free translation in (35) attempts to convey this specific meaning. The fact that this reading exists may be informative for our understanding of Recent Perfective, but I leave this issue for future work.

Rizzi 1997. Rizzi proposes that the CP projection of a clause can be broken down into multiple functional projections that have different functions and a hierarchical structure as summarized in (36).

(36) *Extended Left Periphery* (Rizzi 1997)

ForceP > TopP\* > FocP > TopP\* > FinP

- a. Force<sup>0</sup> encodes clause type (declarative, interrogative, etc.)
- b. TopP hosts topicalized constituents in its specifier, and can occur recursively
- c. FocP hosts information-structurally focused constituents (including *wh*-phrases) as well as relative pronouns in its specifier
- d. Fin<sup>0</sup> is associated with finiteness properties of the complement TP/IP

Before turning to *wh*-expressions, let us first briefly discuss *kung*. I account for *kung* as an instantiation of Force<sup>0</sup>. As we have seen previously, *kung* introduces subordinate clauses of various types in addition to non-DP relative clauses (see also Hsieh and Nie 2018). Some non-relative clause examples are given in (37). Since *kung* consistently appears clause-initially, clearly preceding any *wh*-expressions, I assume that nothing moves to the specifier of ForceP in Tagalog.<sup>12</sup>

(37) *Distribution of Kung*

- a. *Kung* [<um>u~ulan], mag-da~dala ako ng payong.  
if AV.IMPF~rain AV-FUT~bring 1SG.NOM GEN umbrella  
'If it's raining, I'll bring an umbrella.' Conditional Clause
- b. T<in>anong ni Vicky *kung* [sino ang naka-tira doon].  
<PFV>ask[PV] GEN.P Vicky if who[NOM] NOM STAT-reside there  
'Vicky asked who lives there.' Embedded Question
- c. P<um>unta ako *kung* [saan naka-tira si Kim].  
<AV>go(PFV) 1SG.NOM if where STAT-reside NOM.P Kim  
'I went where Kim lives' Free Relative

Turning now to the clitic placement facts, I propose the following changes to Rizzi's (1997) original analysis. First, I propose a dedicated RelP situated between ForceP and TopP. I also propose that Foc<sup>0</sup> and Fin<sup>0</sup> are fused as a single head, which I label F<sup>0</sup>. This results in the hierarchy of projections in (38).

(38) *Extended Left Periphery for Tagalog*

ForceP > RelP > TopP\* > FP

Following this structure, I propose that relative pronouns optionally move to Spec-FP (recall that Rizzi proposes Spec-FocP as the surface position of relative pronouns) or to Spec-RelP. If we assume that FP is the domain of clitic placement, we can account for the variable clitic placement we find in non-DP relative clauses.

<sup>12</sup>Although see Sabbagh 2013 for an alternative account of this particular word order behavior.

Spec-RelP is the higher landing site corresponding to post-verbal cliticization, as in (39a), while Spec-FP is the lower landing site corresponding to post-*wh*/focus cliticization, as in (39b).

- (39)a. lungsod kung [<sub>RelP</sub> saan [<sub>FP</sub> naka-tira {*siya*}]]  
 city if where STAT-reside 3SG.NOM  
 ‘city where she lives’ Spec-RelP → Post-verbal Cl
- b. lungsod kung [<sub>FP</sub> saan {*siya*} naka-tira]  
 city if where 3SG.NOM STAT-reside  
 ‘city where she lives’ Spec-FP → Post-*wh* Cl

In contrast to relative pronouns, I assume that interrogative pronouns (except for *bakit* ‘why’) can only move to Spec-FP, deriving obligatory post-*wh*/focus cliticization, as shown in (40a). On the other hand, we can understand the relative-clause-like behavior observed with *bakit* questions as stemming from the possibility of base-generating this particular *wh*-pronoun as a high adjunct, as shown in (40b).

- (40)a. [<sub>FP</sub>Saan {*siya*} naka-tira]?  
 where 3SG.NOM STAT-reside  
 ‘Where does she live?’ Spec-FP → Post-*wh* Cl
- b. [Bakit [<sub>FP</sub> naka-tira {*siya*} sa Naga]]?  
 why STAT-reside 3SG.NOM OBL Naga  
 ‘Why does she live in Naga?’ High adjunct position → Post-verbal Cl

With respect to Recent Perfective, I claimed that the reduced nature of this type of clause is responsible for the different A'-dependency and clitic placement facts we saw. I formalize this by proposing that Recent Perfective clauses are akin to a non-finite clause, and thus have a reduced F<sup>0</sup>, which cannot host a specifier. This eliminates the sole landing site for interrogative pronouns, but leaves Spec-RelP available for relative pronouns, as well as similarly high positions for *bakit* ‘why’.

## 5. Discussion: On the Extendedness of the Left Periphery

The analysis presented in the previous section makes a number of predictions for other components of the left periphery in Tagalog. Here, I explore some of the predictions relating to topics. We will see that some of these predictions are borne out, but others are not. This suggests that more work carefully teasing apart the interactions of different processes in the left periphery is needed.

A consequence of fusing Foc<sup>0</sup> and Fin<sup>0</sup> (which I proposed to account for the behavior we found with Recent Perfective clauses) is that the lower TopP field proposed by Rizzi (1997) should be absent in Tagalog. Some evidence that this is the case can be found with *ay*-inversion, which is a kind of topic fronting construction (see Kroeger 1993 for discussion). An example is given in (41). I assume that the

particle *ay* spells out (one variant of) Top<sup>0</sup>.

- (41) *Ang mapa ay* b<in>ili ni Kiko sa gasolinahan.  
 NOM map *ay* <PFV>buy[PV] GEN.P Kiko OBL gas.station  
 ‘As for the map, Kiko bought it at the gas station.’

*Ay*-inversion can co-occur with non-DP focus, resulting in two fronted constituents, but crucially, their order is fixed: the focus constituent must follow the topic constituent, as shown in (42a).<sup>13</sup> If the lower TopP field were available in Tagalog, we would expect either order of focus and topic to be possible. We also see in (42b) that parallel behavior can be observed with matrix non-DP questions, although the example as a whole is a little more marked.

- (42)a. {*Ang mapa ay*} sa gasolinahan {\**ang mapa ay*} b<in>ili ni  
 NOM map *ay* OBL gas.station <PFV>buy[PV] GEN.P  
 Kiko. (*Ang gatas naman ay sa supermarket.*)  
 Kiko NOM milk *naman ay* OBL supermarket  
 ‘As for the map, it’s at the gas station that Kiko bought it. (As for the milk, it was at the supermarket.)’ TopP > FP
- b. {?*Ang mapa ay*} saan {\**ang mapa ay*} b<in>ili ni Kiko?  
 NOM map *ay* where <PFV>buy[PV] GEN.P Kiko  
 ‘As for the map, where did Kiko buy it?’ TopP > FP

However, with the *kung*-marked constructions (i.e., non-DP relative clauses and embedded non-DP questions), the same *ay*-inversion topics *must* follow the relative pronouns, as in (43).<sup>14</sup> The relative clause in (43a) is problematic because the variable position of the relative pronoun (in Spec-RelP or Spec-FP) in this proposal predicts that either order of the topic and relative pronoun should be grammatical, whereas we only see one order attested. Even more problematic is the behavior of the embedded question in (43b), which suggests either that the interrogative pronoun is in a higher position (Spec-RelP or higher) or that Tagalog does indeed have a lower TopP layer.

- (43)a. Malayo ang gasolinahan kung {\**ang mapa ay*} saan {*ang mapa*  
 far NOM gas.station if where NOM map  
*ay*} b<in>ili ni Kiko.  
*ay* <PFV>buy[PV] GEN.P Kiko  
 ‘The gas station where, the map, Kiko bought (it) is far.’ RelP > TopP

<sup>13</sup>Examples like (42a) tend to be better in a kind of pair-list context, likely due to the complexity of the construction. Also, similar data is reported by Kroeger (1993), although to my knowledge, he does not specifically mention the interaction of *ay*-inversion and focus.

<sup>14</sup>Thanks to Norvin Richards for pointing this out.

- b. T<in>anong ko kung {*\*ang mapa ay*} saan {*?ang mapa ay*}  
 <PFV>ask[PV] 1SG.GEN if where NOM map ay  
 b<in>ili ni Kiko.  
 <PFV>buy[PV] GEN.P Kiko  
 ‘I asked, as for the map, where Kiko bought it.’ FP > TopP?

Further exploration of this issue is left for future work, but as a first step, the problem in (43) seems to be *kung* must be adjacent to the *wh*-pronoun. By comparison, (44) shows that the topic must still precede the focus in a declarative embedding.

- (44) S<in>abi ni Charlie na {*ang mapa ay*} sa gasolinahan  
 <PFV>say[PV] GEN.P Charlie LK NOM map ay OBL gas.station  
 {*\*ang mapa ay*} b<in>ili ni Kiko.  
 <PFV>buy[PV] GEN.P Kiko  
 ‘Charlie said that as for the map, it’s at the gas station that Kiko bought it.’

## 6. Conclusion

I have discussed the behavior of non-DP A'-extraction in Tagalog, providing a diagnostic to tease apart their structures using clitics. I have also argued for a particular interpretation of the data from clitics through the lens of Rizzi's (1997) Extended Left Periphery proposal, where *wh*-pronouns have different landing sites within the expanded CP domain. Ultimately, more work needs to be done to map out the left periphery, as I discussed in the preceding section.

Finally, I note that the analysis I provided here does not account for the DP dependencies discussed initially. We have seen evidence that these are structurally different from non-DP dependencies, and in other work (Hsieh in prep), I propose an analysis that is guided by this observation. In particular, I formalize the observation that DP focus is a periphrastically formed pseudocleft construction (see also Aldridge 2002, 2003), and propose a non-movement approach for deriving DP relativization.

## References

- Aldridge, Edith. 2002. Nominalization and *Wh*-movement in Seediq and Tagalog. *Language and Linguistics* 3:393–426.  
 Aldridge, Edith. 2003. *Wh*-movement in Seediq and Tagalog. In *Proceedings of AFLA 8*, ed. Andrea Rackowski and Norvin Richards, 1–28.  
 Gerassimova, Veronica, and Peter Sells. 2008. Long-distance dependencies in Tagalog: The case for raising. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 26*, ed. Charles B. Chang and Hannah J. Haynie, 190–198. Cascadilla Proceedings Project.  
 Hsieh, Henrison. in prep. Beyond nominative: A broader view of A-bar dependencies in Tagalog. Doctoral Dissertation, McGill U.  
 Hsieh, Henrison, and Yining Nie. 2018. Where (and what) the Tagalog *kung*-CPs

- are. In *Heading in the right direction: Linguistic treats for Lisa Travis*, ed. Francesco Gentile, Jeffrey Lamontagne, Laura Kalin, Ileana Paul, and Jozina Vander Kloek, 171–178. McGill Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2009. Austronesian nominalism and its consequences: A Tagalog case study. *Theoretical Linguistics* 35:1–49.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2010. The morphosyntax of Tagalog clitics: A typologically driven approach. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell U.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Dissertations in Linguistics. Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- McGinn, Richard. 1988. Government and Case in Tagalog. In *Studies in Austronesian linguistics*, ed. Richard McGinn, 275–293. Athens, Ohio: Ohio U.
- Mercado, Raphael. 2004. Focus constructions and WH-questions in Tagalog: A unified analysis. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 23:95–118.
- Nagaya, Naonori. 2011. Rise and fall of referentiality: Articles in Philippine languages. In *Nominalization in Asian languages: Diachronic and typological perspectives*, ed. Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta, and Janick Wrona, 589–625. John Benjamins.
- Nakamura, Masanori. 1996. Economy of chain formation. Doctoral Dissertation, McGill U.
- Otsuka, Yuko, and Nozomi Tanaka. 2016. Tagalog oblique relative clauses. Paper presented at AFLA 23, Tokyo U of Foreign Studies.
- Rackowski, Andrea. 2002. The structure of Tagalog: Specificity, voice, and the distribution of arguments. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Richards, Norvin. 1991. Wh-extraction in Tagalog. Ms., Cornell U, Ithaca, NY.
- Richards, Norvin. 1998. Syntax vs. semantics in Tagalog wh-extraction. In *Recent papers in Austronesian linguistics*, ed. Matthew Pearson, 259–275. Los Angeles: UCLA.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. Liliane Haegeman. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Sabbagh, Joseph. 2013. Word order and prosodic-structure constraints in Tagalog. *Syntax* 17:40–89.
- Schachter, Paul. 1996. The subject in Tagalog: Still none of the above. *UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 15:1–61.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe Otones. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. University of California Press.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew Pawley, and Lawrence Reid. 1982. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. Amran Halim, Lois Carrington, and Stephen Wurm, 145–170. Canberra: Australian National University.