

Right Node Raising and Extraction in Tagalog

Joseph Sabbagh

[accepted for publication, *Linguistic Inquiry* (Squibs and Discussion)]

The analysis of *Right Node Raising* (RNR) constructions, exemplified for English in (1), remains controversial.

- (1) Many people support __, but some others do not approve of __, *that particular amendment*.

Classic analyses of this construction assume a derivation involving Across-the-Board rightward movement (Ross 1967; Postal 1974; Abbott 1976; Grosu 1976). According to this analysis, the shared constituent in (1) (henceforth, the *pivot*) moves out of each conjunct and right-adjoins to a position external to the coordinate structure.

Since the work of Wexler and Culicover (1980), this analysis has been subject to extensive criticism. In particular, Wexler and Culicover and much of the work on RNR that has followed since then has focused on providing evidence that the ‘gaps’ in RNR constructions like (1) do not behave like ordinary gaps either of rightward movement in particular, or gaps of extraction (Wh-movement, Relativization, etc.) more generally (see McCawley 1982; Levine 1985; McCloskey 1986; Wilder 1997; Hartmann 2000). To mention just one argument, rightward movement in English cannot strand prepositions, as the ungrammaticality of (2a) shows (cf. *Whose office were you looking for __ all day?*). Preposition stranding is unexceptional with RNR, on the other hand, as (2b) illustrates.¹

- (2) a. *We were looking for __ all day, *the Dean’s office*.
b. We were looking for __, and never found __, *the Dean’s office*.

Based on observations like these, alternative, *in-situ*, analyses of Right Node Raising have been proposed. One approach claims, for instance, that the gap(s) present within an RNR construction are derived by an operation of Deletion that operates backwards (Kayne 1994; Wilder 1997; Hartmann 2000). According to this approach, the shared element in (1) is crucially located *in-situ* within the final conjunct but deleted within the non-final conjunct. Another *in-situ* approach, on the other hand, claims that there is just one occurrence of the RNR pivot, which is multiply dominated from a position within each conjunct of the coordinate structure (McCawley 1982; Levine 1985; McCloskey 1986; Phillips 1986; Wilder 1999).

I argue in this squib that with respect to at least one language, Tagalog (Western Austronesian), the classic analysis of RNR as across-the-board extraction is correct. The argument is based on the celebrated restriction—common place to many Western Austronesian languages—that only subjects and certain oblique arguments in addition to various types of adverbs may be extracted by Wh-movement.² In addition to restricting Wh-movement, this restriction also seems to restrict the range of possible Right Node

¹ This argument has been made even more dramatically on the basis of languages such as Irish (McCloskey 1986), where preposition stranding is systematically prohibited for both leftward and rightward extractions. Just as in English, preposition stranding in Right Node Raising constructions in Irish are grammatical. Note also that Right Node Raising in English seems to be impervious to Island Constraints:

(i) Max knows [someone who sells __], and Kate knows [someone who wants to buy __],
antique books.

² Other types of A-bar movements are affected by this constraint, including Relative Clause formation and Topicalization. The examples provided in the main text involve constituent questions.

Raising constructions in Tagalog, a fact which I will argue in what follows provides a strong argument for the extraction analysis of RNR in Tagalog.

1 The Subject Restriction

Like many Phillipine languages, Tagalog observes a ‘Subject Only’ restriction on constructions involving extraction. It will suffice for our present purposes to define the subject as the argument that controls the particular choice of voice morphology on the verb, and which bears the case marker *ang* (*si*, with proper names) (see Schacter 1976; Keenan 1976 for further discussion). In (3a), for instance, the subject is *si Juan* (‘Juan’), while in (3b) the subject is *ang aklat* (‘the book’). Observe the change in agreement morphology on the verb corresponding to the different choice of subject.³

- (3) a. *Humahawak ng aklat si Juan.*
 AGR.ASP.hold NS book S Juan
 ‘Juan is holding a book.’
 b. *Hinahawak-an ni Juan ang aklat.*
 ASP.hold-AGR NS Juan S book
 ‘The book is being held by Juan.’

In extraction constructions, extraction of non-oblique and non-subject arguments is systematically prohibited. This is illustrated by the contrast between the (a) and (b) examples in (4) (from Rackowski 2002) and (5). *Ang kotse mo* (‘your car’) is the subject of the clause in (4b), and *si Pedro* is the subject of the clause in (5b). The ungrammaticality of both (4b) and (5b) is the result of extracting the non-subject argument of the clause.⁴

- (4) a. *Sino ang nag-nakaw ng kotse mo?*
 Who S ACT.PERF.steal NS car you(NS)
 ‘Who stole your car?’
 b. **Sino ang n-in-akaw ang kotse mo?*
 Who S PASS.PERF.steal S car you(NS)
 (‘Who stole your car?’)

³ Tagalog is a verb initial language, which permits V-S-XP as well as V-XP-S orders quite freely. Space limitations here prevent me from providing a fuller discussion of the derivation of the various word orders. The following abbreviations have been used to gloss the examples: AGR = Agreement, ASP = Aspect, OBL = Oblique case, NS = Non-Subject case, S = Subject case, L = Linker, PL = Plural

⁴ Constituent questions involving non-oblique arguments take the form of a pseudo-cleft in Tagalog. Thus, for a basic Wh-question like (4a)—the phrase *ang nagnakaw ng kotse mo* is a headless relative clause (see (i)) which is the subject of the predicate *Sino*. Thus, a more literal translation for (4a) would be: ‘(The one) who stole the car is who?’

(i) [_{PredP} sino][_{DP} ang [_{NP} e [_{CP} [_{Op} _i [_{nagnakaw} _{t_i} ng kotse mo]]]]]
 who S stole NS car you(NS)

- (5) a. Ano ang n-in-akaw ni Pedro?
 What S PASS.PERF.steal NS Pedro
 ‘What was stolen by Pedro?’
 b. *Ano ang nag-nakaw si Pedro?
 What S ACT.PERF.steal S Pedro
 (‘What was stolen by Pedro?’)

In addition to subjects, oblique arguments as well as various types of adverbs can be extracted regardless of the agreement morphology on the verb (examples (6a,b) and (7a) from Rackowski and Richards 2005).

- (6) a. Sa ali-ng kalabaw i-binigay ng lalaki ang bulaklak?
 OBL which-L water-buffalo AGR-ASP.give NS man S flower
 ‘To which water buffalo did the man give the flower?’
 b. Sa ali-ng kalabaw n-agbigay ang lalaki ng bulaklak?
 OBL which-L water-buffalo AGR.ASP.give S man NS flower
 (7) a. Kailan n-agbigay ang lalaki ng bulaklak sa kalabaw?
 when AGR.ASP.give s man NS flower OBL water-buffalo
 ‘When did the main give a flower to the water-buffalo?’
 b. Gaano-ng kabilis tumakbo si Juan?
 how-L fast AGR.ASP.run S Juan
 ‘How fast does Juan run?’ (SO 515)

There have been various proposals put forward to account for this restriction. Chung (1998) attributes the failure of non-subject arguments to extract to the ECP. Pearson (2000, 2005), on the other hand, argues (on the basis of Malagasy) that subjects in Tagalog occupy an A-bar position, and that extraction of a non-subject argument therefore gives rise to a Relativized Minimality violation (Rizzi 1990). Finally, Rackowski and Richards (2005), as well as Sabbagh (2005), attempt to account for the restriction in terms of different formalizations of Chomsky’s Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky 1999, 2000). For our limited purposes, it will not be necessary for us to choose among these possible accounts.

In addition to the paradigm of extraction possibilities given above, we can add the observation that preposition stranding is strictly prohibited, as the examples in (8) show.

- (8) a. Para kanino bumili si Pedro ng pagkain?
 for who(OBL) AGR.ASP.buy S Pedro NS food
 ‘For who(m) did Pedro buy food?’
 b. *Kanino bumili si Pedro ng pagkain [para ___]?
 who(OBL) AGR.ASP.buy S Pedro NS food for
 (For who(m) did Pedro buy food?)

Significantly, it is not the case that Wh-phrase like *kanino* (‘who’) resist extraction in general. As the source argument of *bumili* (‘buy’), for instance, it may be extracted. In this case, there is no preposition to be stranded.

- (9) Kanino bumili si Pedro ng pagkain ____?
 Who(OBL) AGR.ASP.buy S Pedro NS food
 ‘Who did Pedro buy food from?’

With this paradigm representing the range of possible extractions in place, we can now turn our attention to Right Node Raising constructions.

2 Right Node Raising

In Tagalog, it is possible for an argument that belongs to more than one conjunct to surface at the far right periphery of a coordinate structure. I assume that such constructions instantiate the Tagalog equivalent of the Right Node Raising construction common to the other languages where this construction has been identified. The example in (10) involves a Right Node Raising construction with a subject pivot, while the examples in (11) each have an oblique PP argument pivot.⁵

- (10) a. [Hindi n-agluto’ ng bigas ____] at [hindi kumain ng isda ____]
 not AGR.ASP.cook NS rice and not AGR.ASP.ate NS fish
ang pareho-ng babae.
 S same L woman
 ‘The same woman did not cook rice and did not eat fish.’
- b. [Kung hindi maingat ____] at [wala’-ng hinala ____]
 if not careful and not.have-L suspicion
ang mangkukulam...
 S sorcerer
 ‘If the sorcerer is not careful and has no suspicion...’ (B 40)

⁵ Negation is used in one or both conjuncts in (10) so as to ensure that the examples involve sentential (TP) coordination rather than, say, VP-coordination. Negation in Tagalog is situated somewhere below C (as shown by the example in (i)), but higher than the verb, which I assume to raises to T. For present purposes, it is sufficient to assume that Negation is its own projection—NegP—which lies between CP and TP, as schematized in (ii).

- (i) Sinabi ko -ng hindi ako nag-tagumpay
 PSV.PERF.say I(NS) COMP NEG I(S) ACT.PERF.succeed
 ‘I said that I didn’t succeed.’
- (ii) [_{CP} C [_{NegP} Neg [_{TP} T+V

- (11) a. [*Linuto*-' ni Pedro ang pagkain ____] at [*hinugas-an* ni Juan
 ASP.buy-AGR NS Pedro S food and ASP.wash-AGR NS Juan
 ang mga pinggan ____] *para kay Maria*.
 S PL dish for OBL Maria
 'Pedro bought the food, and Juan washed the dishes—for *Maria*.'
- b. [*N-agbigay* ng regalo si Maria ____] at [*n-agpadala* ng liham
 AGR.ASP.give NS gift S Maria and AGR.ASP.send NS letter
 ang mga bata ____] *kay Juan*.
 S PL children OBL Juan
 'Maria gave a gift, and the children sent a letter—to *Juan*.'

Crucially, other arguments—namely, non-oblique internal arguments—can never function as the pivot of an RNR construction ((12b) is from Kroeger 1993:35).

- (12) a. *[*N-agbara* si Juan ____] at [*n-agbukas* si Pedro ____] *ng pintuan*.
 AGR.ASP.close S Juan and AGR.ASP.open S Pedro NS door
 'Juan closed, and Pedro opened—a door (=the same door).'
- b. *[*N-anghuhuli* ang ama ko ____] at [*n-agtitinda*
 AGR.ASP.catch S father my(NS) and AGR.ASP.sell
 ang ina ko ____] *ng isda*.
 S mother my(NS) NS fish
 'My father catches, and my mother sells—fish.'
- c. *[*Niluto*' ang pagkain ____] at [*hinugas-an*
 AGR.ASP.buy S food and ASP.wash-AGR
 ang mga pinggan ____] *ni Josie*.
 S PL dish NS Josie
 'Josie bought the food and washed the dishes.'

Finally, preposition stranding is also prohibited in RNR constructions:

- (13) *[*Linuto*-' ni Pedro a ng pagkain [*para* ____] at [*hinugas-an*
 ASP.cook-AGR NS Pedro S food for and ASP.wash-AGR
 ni Juan ang mga pinggan [*para* ____] *kay Maria*.
 NS Juan S PL dish for OBL Maria
 'Pedro cooked food for, and Juan washed dishes for—*Maria*.'

Overall then, Right Node Raising constructions in Tagalog seem to have the same basic profile as other construction in the language that involve extraction. Exactly those arguments that may be extracted by Wh-movement formation can occur as the target of a Right Node Raising construction. Furthermore, just those elements that cannot be extracted by Wh-movement cannot occur as the pivot of a Right Node Raising construction. These observations lend strong support in favor of an extraction analysis of Right Node Raising constructions in Tagalog.

3 An alternative interpretation

A possible alternative interpretation of these facts would be to claim that the subject-restriction on extraction as well as the ban on preposition stranding hold of empty categories more generally, and not just of empty categories derived by movement. If so, the facts discussed above would not necessarily be telling us that extraction is involved in the derivation of Right Node Raising constructions.

This alternative interpretation of the data is untenable. First of all, some of the arguments that are impossible as pivots in Right Node Raising constructions can be null in other environments. For instance, if an argument contained in a conjunct has a co-referent antecedent in a preceding conjunct, it may be realized as null. Let us refer to this process descriptively as *Forward Argument Drop* (FAD). FAD appears to be possible not only for subjects, but also—crucially—for some of the types of argument that cannot be pivots of Right Node Raising. In (14b), for instance, the non-subject agent argument of the clause in the second conjunct has been dropped (cf. (12c)). In (14c), the non-subject theme argument of the clause has been dropped from the second conjunct under identity with an identical argument in the first conjunct (cf. (12b)).

- (14) a. N-agluto' ng pagkain *si Maria*, at saka n-aghugas
 AGR.ASP-cook NS food S Maria and then AGR.ASP-wash
 ng mga pinggan *pro*.
 NS PL dish (Maria)
 'Maria cooked food, and then (she) washed dishes.'
- b. *Linuto*-' *ni Pedro* ang pagkain at saka hinugas-an
 ASP.cook-AGR NS Pedro S food and then ASP.wash-AGR
 pro ang mga pinggan.
 (Predo) S PL dish
 'Pedro cooked the food, and then (he) washed the dishes.'
- c. N-anghuhuli si Maria *ng daga* at n-agbibili
 AGR.ASP-catch S Maria NS rat and AGR.ASP-sell
 pro si Marco.
 (rats) S Marco
 'Maria catches rats, and Marco sells (them).'

A second significant fact is that FAD does not seem to be possible for oblique arguments. Consider the examples in (15) below. In both examples, the oblique argument (italicized) cannot be construed as an argument of the verb in second conjunct.⁶ Compare these facts with the examples in (11) above, where the same oblique argument occurring at the far right periphery is obligatorily construed as belonging to both conjuncts of the coordinate structure.

⁶ The translation of (15b) seems to show that while it is marginally possible to omit the oblique from the second conjunct, the interpretation of this argument cannot be supplied by the antecedent oblique in the first conjunct.

- (15) a. *Linuto-* ni Pedro ang pagkain para kay Maria
 ASP.cook-AGR NS Pedro S food for OBL Maria
 at hinugas-an niya ang mga pinggan.
 and ASP.wash-AGR he(NS) S PL dish
 ‘Pedro bought food for Maria and washed the dishes.’
 ≠ ‘Pedro bought food for Maria, and he washed dishes for her.’
- b. ?N-agbigay ng regalo si Maria kay Juan
 AGR.ASP-give NS present S Maria OBL Juan
 at n-agpadala ng liham ang mga bata’.
 and AGR.ASP-send NS letter S PL child
 ‘Maria gave a present to Juan, and the children sent a letter (somewhere).’
 ≠ ‘Maria gave a present to Juan, and the children sent a letter (to him).’

To summarize, arguments that cannot occur as the target of a Right Node Raising construction can be null by FAD. Furthermore, arguments that can function as the pivot of a Right Node Raising construction cannot be null under FAD. Overall then, it seems quite unlikely that the extraction restriction can be generalized as a restriction on all empty categories. This supports the original conclusion concerning Right Node Raising. The fact that Right Node Raising and constructions like Wh-movement are subject to the same restriction is attributed to the fact that the same mechanism—extraction—is involved.

4 Conclusion

It has been a straightforward task to demonstrate that the restrictions on possible Right Node Raising constructions in Tagalog parallel the restrictions on other extraction dependencies in the language (e.g., Wh-movement).

Drawing larger cross-linguistics conclusions about this is a more challenging exercise, however. On the one hand, we could conclude that—whereas Right Node Raising constructions are derived by extraction in Tagalog—they are not so derived in languages like English where whatever process derives the construction in these languages seems to be impervious to extraction restrictions. On the other hand, it has been argued that Right Node Raising even in English is derived by (across-the-board) extraction (Postal 1998; Sabbagh 2005). If so, this leaves us with the more difficult job—though arguably the more exciting one—of understanding what make Tagalog apparently unique in its respect for the extraction restrictions even in Right Node Raising. There seem to be two possible approaches to addressing this question—neither being mutually exclusive.

One possible direction to take here would be to ask whether there is something different about the types of movement involved in deriving RNR in the two languages. It is often assumed that in English, RNR constructions involve rightward movement that applies across-the-board. This rightward movement, moreover, is typically assumed to be the same type of movement involved in Extraposition constructions and so-called ‘Heavy NP-Shift’ constructions. The properties of this operation are notoriously ill-understood. Some authors have claimed it to be a (post-syntactic) ‘stylistic’ rule, while others assume

it to be in the category of the better understood A-bar constructions. In any event, there is little evidence as yet to show that RNR constructions are derived by a movement rule of exactly the same type, a fact that potentially gives us some room to work in uncovering the different properties of the movements involved relating to their island respecting properties.

A second direction to take would be to examine the exact nature of the Tagalog extraction restriction so that a better understanding of its ‘inviolability’ of this restriction for Right Node Raising emerges naturally. The extant analyses of this restriction (see references above) all attempt, for good reason, to relate the Subject restriction to familiar types of constraints on movement—namely, the ECP, Relativized Minimality, and Phase Impenetrability, etc. By relating the Subject only constraint to these familiar types of constraints, however, we are possibly missing something, since it is constraints of exactly this type that can apparently be violated by Right Node Raising in the context of languages such as English.

References

- Abbot, Barbara. 1976. Right node raising as a test for constituenthood. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7:639-642
- Chung, Sandra. 1993. On proper head government in Chamorro. In *CLS 27-I: Papers from the Twenty-Seventh Regional Meeting*, ed. Lise Dobrenin, Lynn Nichols, and Rosa M. Rodriguez, 60-84. Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Ill.
- _____. 1998. *The Design of Agreement: Evidence from Chamorro*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Grosu, Alexander. 1976. A note on subject raising to object and right node raising. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7:642-645
- Hartmann, Katherine. 2000. *Right node raising and gapping: Interface conditions on prosodic deletion*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.:MIT Press
- Keenan, Edward. L., 1972. Relative clause formation in Malagasy. In *The Chicago which hunt: Papers from the relative clause festival*, ed. Paul M. Peranteau, Judith N. Levi, and Gloria C. Phares, 169-189. Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Ill.
- _____. 1976. Remarkable subjects in Malagasy. In *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles N. Li, 247-301
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI Publications
- Levine, Robert.D. 1985. Right node (non-)raising. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:492-497
- McCawley, James. D. 1982. Parentheticals and discontinuous constituent structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:91-106
- McCloskey, James. 1986. Right node raising and preposition stranding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:183-186
- Pearson, Matt. 2003. The Malagasy subject/topic as an A'-element. To appear, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*
- Postal, Paul M. 1998. *Three investigations of extraction*. Cambridge, Mass.:MIT Press

- Rackowski, Andrea. 2002. *The structure of Tagalog: Specificity, voice, and the distribution of arguments*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, MIT. Cambridge, Mass.
- Rackowski, Andrea. and N. Richards. 2003. Phase edge and extraction: A Tagalog case study. Ms., MIT
- Ross, John. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass. Published as *Infinite Syntax!*, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex (1986)
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Phillipine languages: Topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above? In *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles N. Li, 491-518
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe. T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wexler, Kenneth. & P.W. Culicover. 1980. *Formal principles of language acquisition*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press
- Wilder, Chris. 1997. Some properties of ellipsis in coordination. In Alexiadou, A. and T. A. Hall (eds.), *Studies on universal grammar and typological variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins