

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).

- (1) Saan (*ang) [nakatira sa Naga]?
 where NOM NOM lives OBL Naga
 `Who lives in Naga?' WhQ
- (4) doktor na [nakatira sa Naga]
 doctor LK lives OBL Naga
 `doctor who lives in Naga' RC

that at least some of these distinctions—these distinctions (Aldridge 2002)—with the latter taking the form of the focus structure for question given the current state of research is how the non-DP relative clause is derived.

I argue 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 the use of wh-expressions). Specifically, it will be shown that the wh-expression can appear on the clausal spine in non-DP relative clauses, but is restricted to a lower position. Furthermore, I follow Aldridge (2002, 2004) in analyzing non-DP relative clauses as the result of wh-movement, but propose that non-DP relative clauses are the result of wh-expression. This analysis is supported by two major types of data.

The placement of the second position clitics in Tagalog is known to be sensitive to clause boundaries, and can be used as a diagnostic for structure. Previous work has shown that non-DP questions are monoclausal, due to the fact that clitics obligatory appear after the first clause (Aldridge 1993, Aldridge 2002). This is shown in (5), with brackets indicating

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

(7) Sino {* mo} ang binigyan {mo} ng regalo?
who you NOM gaveLV 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