On the Structure of Tagalog Non-DP Extraction

Henrison Hsieh

henrison.hsieh@mail.mcgill.ca

AFLA 26, Western University; 24-26 May 2019

1 Overview

- Tagalog allows A′-dependency formation over non-DPs

(1) *Non-DP A′-dependencies in Tagalog*

   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].
      OBL Naga   STAT-reside NOM.P Kim

      'It's in Naga that Kim lives.'   Non-DP Focus

   c. **Saan** [naka-tira si   Kim]?
      where STAT-reside NOM.P Kim

      'Where does Kim live?'   Non-DP *Wh*-Question

   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 are interesting for a number of reasons

  - Structurally distinct from DP A′-dependencies

  - No interaction with the Tagalog voice system (i.e., no Extraction Restriction)

  - For RCs: Overt *wh*-pronoun is observed

- Not as heavily studied as DP dependencies – Potential to inform our understanding of Tagalog phrase structure

- Previous work exists (e.g., Nakamura 1996; Richards 1998; Aldridge 2002, 2003; Mercado 2004), but mostly focuses on *wh*-questions and focus (but see Otsuka and Tanaka 2016)

Goals

- Address the gap in our understanding of Tagalog non-DP dependencies, in particular non-DP relative clauses

- Show that DP and non-DP A′-dependencies have fundamentally distinct structures form each other, expanding on previous research on this topic

- Show that non-DP relative clauses have a structure that is also distinct from non-DP questions/focus

- Propose a preliminary analysis accounting for the properties of the two types of non-DP A′-dependencies using Rizzi's (1997) extended left periphery proposal

2 Background: A′-dependencies

Tagalog employs distinct strategies conditioned on whether the target is a DP (NOM-/GEN-marked position) or not. These can be readily distinguished based on their surface structures, and have different distributions.

2.1 Surface Structure

Relative Clauses

- Different material appears between HEAD and MODIFIER

- DP Target → LINKER *na/=ng* (3a)

- Non-DP Target → Complementizer *kung* + *wh*-expression (3b), which covaries with the target (4)

(2) Naka-tira si Kim sa Naga.
STAT-reside NOM.P Kim OBL Naga

'Kim lives in Naga.' Baseline

(3) a. doktor **na** [naka-tira sa Naga]
doctor LK STAT-reside OBL Naga

'doctor who lives in Naga' DP RC

b. lugar **kung saan** [naka-tira si Kim]
place if where STAT-reside NOM.P Kim

'place where Kim lives' Non-DP RC

(4) *Other possible wh-expressions*

a. 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'

b. 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'

Wh-Questions and Focus

- Focus and Questions are structurally parallel (Aldridge 2002; Mercado 2004; Gerassimova and Sells 2008)

- Targeted constituent appears clause-initially and...

- DP Target → *ang* appears between *wh*/focus and presuppositional statement (5a)

- Non-DP Target → *ang* is ungrammatical (5b)

(5) a. {Sino/Si Kim} *(**ang**) [naka-tira sa Naga]
who NOM.P Kim NOM STAT-reside OBL Naga

'Who lives in Naga?' DP *Wh*Q
'The one who live in Naga is Kim.' DP Focus

b. {Saan /Sa Naga} (***ang**) [naka-tira si Kim]
where OBL Naga NOM STAT-reside NOM.P Kim

'Where does Kim live?' Non-DP *Wh*Q
'It's in Naga that Kim lives.' Non-DP Focus

2.2 Distribution

- DP A′-dependencies are restricted by the voice system

  - Voice covaries with the NOM argument in a clause (6)

  - Generally speaking, only NOM positions are valid targets (7)

(6) *Sample voice alternation in Tagalog*

    a. **Nag-lagay** <u>ang</u> <u>mag-aaral</u> nang lapis sa lamesa.
       av.pfv-put NOM student GEN pencil OBL table

       '<u>The student</u> put a pencil on the table.'   AV → Agent NOM

    b. **I-ni-lagay** nang mag-aaral <u>ang</u> <u>lapis</u> sa lamesa.
       cv-pfv-put GEN student NOM pencil OBL table

       'The student put <u>the pencil</u> on the table.'   CV → Theme NOM

(7) *DP A′-dependencies are restricted by voice*

    a. *lapis na [**nag-lagay** <u>ang</u> <u>mag-aaral</u> sa lamesa]
       pencil LK av.pfv-put NOM student OBL table

       Intended: 'pencil that <u>the student</u> put on the table'
                                *AV + Theme RC

    b. lapis na [**i-ni-lagay** nang mag-aaral sa lamesa]
       pencil LK cv-pfv-put GEN student OBL table

       'pencil that the student put on the table'   ✓CV + Theme RC

    • In contrast, non-DP A′-dependencies **ignore** voice (8)[1]

(8) a. lamesa kung saan [**nag-lagay** <u>ang</u> <u>mag-aaral</u> nang lapis]
       table if where av.pfv-put NOM student GEN pencil

       'table where <u>the student</u> put a pencil'   ✓AV + Oblique RC

    b. lamesa kung saan [**i-ni-lagay** nang mag-aaral <u>ang</u> <u>lapis</u>]
       table if where cv-pfv-put GEN student NOM pencil

       'table where the student put <u>the pencil</u>'   ✓CV + Oblique RC

    • N.B.: non-DPs can be "promoted" to the NOM argument, in which case they form dependencies as DPs (9)

---

[1]This has been argued to be due to the relative structural height of the target constituents as adjuncts (Kaufman 2009), but this explanation does not account for the accessibility of the low goal argument of *lagay* 'put' as shown here in (8).

(9) *Promoted location relativizes like a DP*

    a. **Ni-lagy-an** nang mag-aaral nang lapis <u>ang</u> <u>lamesa</u>.
       pfv-put-lv GEN student GEN pencil NOM table

       'The student put a pencil <u>on the table</u>.'
                         Baseline: LV → Location NOM

    b. lamesa=ng [**ni-lagy-an** nang mag-aaral nang lapis]
       table=LK pfv-put-lv GEN student GEN pencil

       'table the student put a pencil on'   ✓LV + Location DP RC

    c. *lamesa kung {saan /ano } [**ni-lagy-an** nang mag-aaral nang
       table if where what pfv-put-lv GEN student GEN
       lapis]
       pencil

       'table where the student put a pencil'
                      *LV + Location non-DP RC

3 Clitics as a diagnostic for structure

We can use second position clitics to tease apart differences in structure between the different constructions.

- Second position clitics in Tagalog encliticize onto the first element within their base **CP** (to be revised)[2]

- This class includes mostly pronouns and certain adverbial particles

- I use the notation {•} and {*•} to indicate grammatical and ungrammatical positions for the clitics, respectively

(10) *General clitic placement schematic*
    $[_{CP}$ **Y(P)**{*=Cl$_1$=Cl$_2$} $[_{CP}$ **X(P)**{=Cl$_1$=Cl$_2$} ... $t_{1/2}$ ... $t_{1/2}$ ...]]

---

[2]See Kaufman 2010 for more detailed discussion.

(11)   *Clitic placement (Monoclausal)*

    a. Na-kita   {**niyo**   **ako**}   sa parke.
        NVOL.PFV-see[PV] 2PL.GEN 1SG.NOM OBL park
        'Y'all saw me in the park.'

    b. Hindi {**niyo**   **ako**}   na-kita   {***niyo ako**} sa
        NEG   2PL.GEN 1SG.NOM NVOL.PFV-see[PV]   OBL

        parke.
        park
        'Y'all didn't see me in the park.'

(12)   *Clitic placement (Embedded clause)*

    a. Sinabi {***niyo ako**} ni   Kiko na [CP na-kita
        said   GEN.P Kiko LK   NVOL.PFV-see[PV]

        {**niyo**   **ako**}   sa parke].
         2PL.GEN 1SG.NOM OBL park
        'Kiko said that y'all saw me in the park.'

    b. Sinabi {***niyo ako**} ni   Kiko na [CP hindi {**niyo**   **ako**}
        said   GEN.P Kiko LK   NEG   2PL.GEN 1SG.NOM

        na-kita   {***niyo ako**} sa parke].
        NVOL.PFV-see[PV]   OBL park
        'Kiko said that y'all didn't see me in the park.'

Question: In what position does the *wh*-expression surface?

3.1   *Wh*Q and Focus: DP vs non-DP

Previous work   *Wh*-questions and focus constructions of DPs are structurally distinct from those of non-DPs (Richards 1991; Aldridge 2002; Mercado 2004).

    Clitic placement differs between DP and non-DP *wh*-questions/focus constructions (Richards 1991; Aldridge 2002)

(13)   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 declarative

      b. 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 *Wh*-Question

      c. Saan {**ko**}   i-ni-lagay {***ko**} ang lapis?
          where 1SG.GEN CV-PFV-put   NOM pencil
          'Where did I put the pencil?'   Non-DP *Wh*-Question

(14)   *Implications of clitic placement*

    a. Post-verbal[3] → *Wh*/Foc is <u>outside</u> the clitic placement domain

    b. Post-*wh* → *Wh*/Foc is <u>inside</u> the clitic placement domain

- Based on these observations, Aldridge (2002) concludes that DP and non-DP *Wh*Qs/Focus take on different structures:

- **For DPs**:

    – Biclausal (copular) pseudo-cleft structure

    – Predicate is the *wh*/focus

    – Subject is a headless relative clause

    – No (overt) copula

- **For non-DPs**:

    – Monoclausal fronting structure

    – *Wh*/Focus occupies a clause-peripheral position (e.g., Spec-FocP, Spec-TopP)

---

[3]I use the term "post-verbal" here as a shorthand for the more accurate characterization of attachment after the first element in the predicate. This element is usually the verb, but could also be negation, for example, as in (11b).

(15) *Schematic structures for WhQ/Focus*

   a. [$_{CP}$ [$_{DP,Pred}$ **Wh/Foc**] [$_{Subj}$ *ang* [$_{CP}$ X(P)=Cl ...]]]

                                DPs = Pseudoclefts

   b. [$_{CP}$ [**Wh/Foc**]=Cl [$_{TP}$ ... *t* ...]]

                         Non-DPs = Monoclausal fronting

3.2   Non-DP dependencies: RC vs *Wh*Q/Focus

- Non-DP relative clauses are superficially similar to non-DP questions in that they both have overt *wh*-expressions

(16) a. **Saan** [naka-tira si   Kim]?
     where STAT-reside NOM.P Kim

     'Where does Kim live?'   Non-DP *Wh*-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

- Further similarity can be seen with embedded questions and free relatives, which are introduced by *kung*[4]

(17) a. T\<in\>anong ni   Vicky **kung saan** [naka-tira si
     \<PFV\>ask[PV] GEN.P Vicky if   where STAT-reside NOM.P

     Kim].
     Kim

     'Vicky asked where Kim lives'

               Non-DP Embedded Question

   b. P\<um\>unta ang mga bata **kung saan** [naka-tira si
     \<AV\>go(PFV) NOM PL   child if   where STAT-reside NOM.P

     Kim].
     Kim

     'The children went where Kim lives'   Non-DP Free Relative

---

[4]I assume that free relatives are different from supposed headless non-DP relatives in that latter, but not the former, bears an overt case marker.

- I argue that despite surface similarity, non-DP relative clauses have a different structure from the others described in (16-17)

- As with *wh*-questions of DPs and non-DPs, the difference in structure can be identified using clitic placement

   – In relative clauses: ✓Post-*wh*, ✓Post-verbal (19)

   – In (embedded and matrix) *wh*Q: ✓Post-*wh*, *Post-verbal (20)

(18) 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

(19) 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'   Relative Clause

(20) T\<in\>anong nila   kung saan {**ko**}   i-ni-lagay {*****ko**}   ang
    \<PFV\>ask[PV] 3PL.GEN if   where 1SG.GEN CV-PFV-put 1SG.GEN NOM

    lapis.
    pencil

    'They asked where I put the pencil.'   *Wh*-Question

Implications   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

Table 1: Clitic placement in *wh*-bearing constructions

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

3.3 Corroborating evidence: Recent Perfective

- Recent perfective is reduced/defective in some way

    - No voice or (easily identifiable) aspect morphology: Uniformly marked with *ka*+RED- and clitic adverb *lang* 'only'

    - No nominative argument

    - Cannot be negated (22)

(21)   Kabi~bili lang ni   Tina nang diyaryo   sa   tindahan.
      RPFV~buy only GEN.P Tina GEN   newspaper OBL store
      'Tina has just bought a newspaper at the store.'

(22) *Hindi {lang} kabi~bili {lang} ni   Tina nang diyaryo   sa
      NEG   only RPFV~buy only GEN.P Tina GEN   newspaper OBL
      tindahan.
      store
      Intended: 'Tina has not just bought a newspaper at the store.'

- Independently studied because it allows *A′-dependencies over DPs* (McGinn 1988; Schachter 1996)

(23)   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 *Wh*-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 with *A′-dependencies over non-DPs*

    - Questions are ungrammatical

    - Relative clauses are possible (but note clitic position)

(24)   *Recent Perfective Non-DP dependencies*

     a.   *Saan   {**lang**} kabi~bili {**lang**} ni   Tina nang diyaryo?
          where only   RPFV~buy only   GEN.P Tina GEN   newspaper
          Intended: 'Where has Tina just bought a newspaper?'
                                     Non-DP *Wh*-Question

     b.   tindahan kung saan   {***lang**} kabi~bili {**lang**} ni   Tina
          store   if   where   only   RPFV~buy only   GEN.P Tina
          nang diyaryo
          GEN   newspaper
          'store where Tina has just bought a newspaper'
                                     Non-DP Relative Clause

(25)   *Correlation*
     An A′-dependency is possible with Recent Perfective if and only if the clitic can surface post-verbally

     a.   The **lower position** for the *wh*-expression is unavailable (affecting both non-DP RCs and *Wh*Qs)

     b.   The **higher position**, outside the clitic placement domain, remains available (allowing non-DP RCs and DP *Wh*Qs)

- N.B.: As with other clause types, non-DP dependencies involving recent perfective clauses cannot be formed using the DP dependency structures (26)

- Contra previous observations about extraction out of Recent Perfective (McGinn 1988)

(26)   a. *{Ano /Saan} ang kabi~bili lang ni   Tina nang diyaryo?
       what where NOM RPFV~buy only GEN.P Tina GEN   newspaper

      Intended: 'Where has Tina just bought a newspaper?'
                                                *Wh*Q (DP structure)

   b. *tindahan=ng kabi~bili lang ni   Tina nang diyaryo
       store=LK   RPFV~buy only GEN.P Tina GEN   newspaper

      Intended: 'store where Tina has just bought a newspaper'
                                              RC (DP structure)

4   Analysis

4.1   Extended Left Periphery

Rizzi (1997) proposes that the left periphery of a clause can be broken down into multiple functional projections that have different functions.

(27)   *Extended Left Periphery* (Rizzi 1997)
ForceP > TopP* > FocP > TopP* > FinP

   a. **Force⁰** encodes clause type (declarative, interrogative, etc.)

   b. **TopP** hosts topicalized (i.e., given) constituents in its specifier, and can occur recursively

   c. **FocP** hosts information-structurally focalized constituents, including *wh*-phrases, in its specifier

   d. **Fin⁰** is associated with finiteness properties of the complement TP/IP

4.2   Application to Tagalog (non-DP) A′-dependencies

Kung   I propose that *kung* instantiates Force⁰, as it introduces subordinate clauses of various types in addition to non-DP relative clauses (Hsieh and Nie 2018)

(28)   *Distribution of Kung*

   a. **Kung** <um>u~ulan, mag-da~dala ako   nang 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 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

- Nothing moves to the Specifier of ForceP in Tagalog

- *Kung* consistently appears clause initially, clearly preceding any *wh*-expressions[5]

Clitic placement and positions for A′-dependencies   I depart from Rizzi (1997) in the following:

- I propose a dedicated **RelP** situated between ForceP and TopP.

- I also propose that Foc⁰ and Fin⁰ are fused as a single head **F⁰**. Consequently, no TopP projections can intervene between these two heads.

---

[5]Although see Sabbagh 2013 for an alternative account of this particular word ordering behavior.

(29) *Extended Left Periphery for Tagalog*
ForceP > RelP > TopP* > FP

  a. **FP** is the domain of clitic placement

  b. **Recent Perfective** clauses have a reduced F^0_{RP}, which does not have a specifier

  c. **Relative pronouns** optionally move to Spec-FP or to Spec-RelP, accounting for the variable clitic placement in non-DP RCs

  d. **Interrogative pronouns** can only move up to the lower Spec-FP position

5 Consequences, Observations, Discussion

5.1 Topics

- I assume the particle *ay* spells out (one flavor of) Top⁰, as it is involved in topic fronting (30a); (see e.g., Kroeger 1993, for evidence)

- *Ay*-topics must <u>precede</u> interrogative pronouns (30b)...

- ... but they must <u>follow</u> relative pronouns (30c)

(30) *Relative position of Ay-topics*

  a. **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.'   Baseline

  b. {**Ang mapa ay**} <u>saan</u>   {*ang mapa ay} b<in>ili   ni
      NOM map   *ay* where   <PFV>buy[PV] GEN.P
       Kiko?
       Kiko

      'As for the map, where did Kiko buy it?'   TopP > FP

  c. Malayo ang gasolinahan kung {*ang mapa ay} <u>saan</u>   {**ang**
      far   NOM gas.station if   where   NOM
       mapa ay} b<in>ili   ni   Kiko.
       map   *ay* <PFV>buy[PV] GEN.P Kiko

      'The gas station where, the map, Kiko bought (it) is far.'
                                                     RelP > TopP

5.2 What about DP dependencies??

The proposed analysis does not account for DP dependencies. Recall, for example, that DP questions have different clitic placement facts from non-DP questions.

(31) a. 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 *Wh*-Question

      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 *Wh*-Question

I adopt Aldridge's (2002; 2003) analysis of the structure of focus constructions and *wh*-questions. Particularly:

- DP *wh*-questions and focus are formed *periphrastically* as pseudo-clefts =

  - Copular clause where...
  - Predicate = Focus constituent
  - Subject = Headless relative clause / Presuppositional statement

- In ongoing work, I propose a non-movement approach for deriving DP relativization (Hsieh in prep)

- **So:** Only non-DPs can front to Spec-FocP and Spec-RelP

5.3 Parting Thoughts

- Tagalog non-DP dependencies have structures that are generally consistent with A′-dependencies generally in more well-studied languages

- More needs to be said about DP dependencies, but they clearly have different structures that behave very differently from non-DP dependencies

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, volume 44 of *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 1–28.

Gerassimova, Veronica, and Peter Sells. 2008. Long-distance dependencies in Tagalog: The case for raising. In *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 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 University.

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 Klok, 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 fo Tagalog clitics: A typologically driven approach. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University.

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, number 76 in Monographs in International Studies Southeast Asia Series, chapter 9, 275–293. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University.

Mercado, Raphael. 2004. Focus constructions and WH-questions in Tagalog: A unified analysis. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 23:95–118. URL `https://twpl.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/twpl/issue/view/472`.

Nakamura, Masanori. 1996. Economy of chain formation. Doctoral Dissertation, McGill University.

Otsuka, Yuko, and Nozomi Tanaka. 2016. Tagalog oblique relative clauses. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA 23), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Richards, Norvin. 1991. Wh-extraction in Tagalog. Ms., Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

Richards, Norvin. 1998. Syntax vs. semantics in Tagalog wh-extraction. In *Recent papers in Austronesian linguistics*, ed. Matthew Pearson, volume 21 of *UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, 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.