

# Squibs and Discussion

REMNANT MOVEMENT IN  
TAGALOG RELATIVE CLAUSE  
FORMATION  
*Edith Aldridge*  
*Cornell University*

## 1 Introduction

There is considerable controversy surrounding Kayne's (1994) proposal for the derivation of head-final relative clauses, where the head nominal moves from inside the clause to Spec,CP, and the remnant clause then fronts to Spec,DP.

$$(1) [_{DP}[_{TP} \dots t_{NP} \dots ] [_{D'}[_{CP} NP [_{C'} t_{TP}]]]]$$

Much skepticism has been voiced regarding the empirical support for these movements from languages that have head-final relative clauses. Murasugi (2000) and Fukui and Takano (2000), among others, cite evidence against movement of the head NP in the derivation of head-final relative clauses in Japanese. One argument they invoke (citing Kuno 1973) is that Japanese relative clauses do not exhibit island effects, as shown in (2). Movement of the head nominal from the gap inside the more deeply embedded relative clause would violate the Complex NP Constraint. The grammaticality of this example suggests that this movement has not taken place.<sup>1</sup>

$$(2) [_{DP}[[_{DP}[e_i e_j \text{ kiteiru}] \quad [\text{yoohuku}_j]]\text{-ga yogoreteiru}]$$

wearing-is suit-NOM dirty-is

[sinsi<sub>i</sub>]]

gentleman

'the gentleman who [the suit that he is wearing] is dirty'

This does not, however, rule out an antisymmetric analysis for head-final relative clause derivation entirely. Honda (2002) proposes an analysis of Japanese relative clauses in which the head NP is base-generated in a topic position to the left of TP and coreferential with a null pronominal inside the clause. This TP then fronts to Spec,DP to derive the head-final word order.

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations are used in the glosses in this squib: ABS = absolutive, AP = antipassive, APP = applicative, CAUS = causative, ERG = ergative, LK = linker, NOM = nominative, OBL = oblique, P = preposition, PERF = perfective, RED = reduplication.

- (3) [DP[TP Taroo-ga tabeta *pro*<sub>i</sub>] [D[<sub>TOP</sub>P ringo *t*<sub>TP</sub>]]]  
 Taro-NOM ate apple  
 ‘the apple that Taro ate’

Left open at this point is the question of whether the relative TP attains its prehead position by fronting. What I will explore in this squib is empirical evidence in favor of such a fronting analysis. Material from inside the clause stranded after the relative head could constitute such evidence, acting as a flag to indicate the original position of the fronted clause. Unfortunately, such evidence is not available for Japanese. The relative head must follow all material in the clause.

- (4) \*tabeta *ringo* Taroo(-ga)  
 ate apple Taro-NOM  
 ‘the apple that Taro ate’

There are languages, however, that do allow this type of stranding in head-final relative clauses. Among them is the Austronesian language Tagalog. I will argue in this squib that stranding in Tagalog relative clause formation constitutes evidence that TP-fronting is involved in the derivation.

## 2 Relative Clauses in Tagalog

Tagalog has both head-initial and head-final relative clauses.<sup>2</sup>

- (5) *libro*-ng b-in-ili ni Maria  
 book-LK -PERF-buy ERG Maria  
 ‘the book Maria bought’
- (6) b-in-ili ni Maria-ng *libro*  
 -PERF-buy ERG Maria-LK book  
 ‘the book Maria bought’

Under the antisymmetric analysis, derivation of the head-initial type would simply require moving the head NP to Spec,CP. (For simplicity, representations use English rather than Tagalog words.)

- (7) [DP[CP book [TP Maria bought *t*<sub>book</sub>]]]

Derivation of the head-final type additionally involves fronting of the remnant TP to Spec,DP.

- (8) [DP[TP Maria bought *t*<sub>book</sub>] [D[CP book [C' *t*<sub>TP</sub>]]]]

<sup>2</sup>This squib focuses on the structural properties of Tagalog relative clauses. One anonymous reviewer has expressed an interest in the pragmatic differences among the various word orders taken up here. Unfortunately, discussion of this topic is beyond the scope of the current study. I will only mention in passing that one native-speaker consultant has suggested that there might be a difference in information structure. Leftmost material in a Tagalog phrase or clause tends to receive a focus interpretation, while rightward material tends to be backgrounded.

The traditional adjunct analysis of relative clauses (Chomsky 1977, Safir 1986, among many others) can also derive the correct word orders for (5) and (6), if two distinct structures are posited, one with the clause adjoined to the right of the relative head and one with the clause adjoined to the left.

(9) [<sub>NP</sub> book<sub>i</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> Op<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> Maria bought *t*<sub>Op</sub>]]]

(10) [<sub>NP</sub>[<sub>CP</sub> Op<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> Maria bought *t*<sub>Op</sub>]]] book<sub>i</sub>

However, there is empirical evidence that favors the TP-fronting analysis. The primary evidence I discuss in this squib is the stranding of material from inside TP before it moves to Spec,DP. Specifically, a PP can be stranded to the right of the head nominal in a Tagalog head-final relative clause.

(11) i-b-in-igay ng babae-ng kendi sa bata  
 APP-PERF-give ERG woman-LK candy P child  
 'the candy the woman gave to the child'

The adjunct analysis would have difficulty accounting for this word order, since the relative head, not the PP, would be predicted to be in final position. The TP-fronting analysis, on the other hand, can provide a straightforward account of the word order. First the PP can be scrambled. Then the head NP can move into Spec,CP and the remnant TP can front to Spec,DP.

(12) [<sub>XP</sub>[<sub>PP</sub> to child] [<sub>TP</sub> woman gave candy *t*<sub>PP</sub>]]

(13) [<sub>CP</sub>[<sub>NP</sub> candy] [<sub>XP</sub>[<sub>PP</sub> to child] [<sub>TP</sub> gave woman *t*<sub>NP</sub> *t*<sub>PP</sub>]]]

(14) [<sub>DP</sub>[<sub>TP</sub> gave woman *t*<sub>NP</sub> *t*<sub>PP</sub>] [<sub>CP</sub>[<sub>NP</sub> candy] [<sub>XP</sub>[<sub>PP</sub> to child] *t*<sub>TP</sub>]]]

In what follows, I show that this type of stranding is possible just when scrambling is possible, strongly supporting the TP-fronting analysis of prehead relative clauses.

### 3 Constraint on XP-Stranding in Tagalog Relative Clauses

Ā-movement in Tagalog is highly constrained, as it is in a great number of Austronesian languages (Nakamura 1994, Pensalfini 1995, Chung 1998, among many others). Only absolutes are eligible to undergo relativization, topicalization, clefting, and *wh*-question formation.<sup>3</sup> Hence, (15), a relative clause formed on the theme of a transitive clause, is grammatical; but (16), formed on the agent of the same transitive clause, is not.

<sup>3</sup> By those who take these languages to be accusative, the grammatical role "absolute" is generally referred to as "subject." Following my earlier work (Aldridge 1999, 2001, 2002b), I treat Tagalog as an ergative language. Earlier ergative analyses of Philippine languages include those by De Guzman (1988), Gerds (1988), Payne (1982).

- (15) *libro-ng b-in-ili ni Maria*  
book-LK -PERF-buy ERG Maria  
'the book Maria bought'
- (16) \**tao-ng b-in-ili ang libro*  
person-LK -PERF-buy ABS book  
'the person who bought the book'

Aside from this restriction, PPs are allowed to move to preverbal position in Tagalog, where they typically receive a focus interpretation.

- (17) *I-b-in-igay ng babae ang kendi sa bata.*  
APP-PERF-give ERG woman ABS candy P child  
'The woman gave candy to the child.'
- (18) *Sa bata i-b-in-igay ng babae ang kendi.*  
P child APP-PERF-give ERG woman ABS candy  
'The woman gave the candy to the child.'

Other nonabsolute arguments, in contrast, are not able to undergo scrambling. In the ditransitive in (19), the goal is licensed as absolute of the clause by the applicative affix on the verb. The theme is demoted to oblique status. This nonabsolute theme cannot be scrambled, as shown in (20).

- (19) *B-in-igy-an ng babae ng kendi ang bata.*  
-PERF-give-APP ERG woman OBL candy ABS child  
'The woman gave the child candy.'
- (20) \**Ng kendi b-in-igy-an ng babae ang bata.*  
OBL candy -PERF-give-APP ERG woman ABS child

The same pattern can be observed in stranding in relative clauses. As mentioned above, only the absolute can be the head NP. But a PP originating in the prehead clause can also appear to the right of the head nominal.

- (21) *i-b-in-igay ng babae-ng kendi sa bata*  
APP-PERF-give ERG woman-LK candy P child  
'the candy the woman gave to the child'

As explained above, this can be analyzed as follows. After the PP scrambles out of TP, the remnant TP can front to Spec,DP, leaving the PP behind.

- (22) [<sub>DP</sub>[<sub>TP</sub> gave woman *t*<sub>NP</sub> *t*<sub>PP</sub>] [<sub>CP</sub>[<sub>NP</sub> candy] [<sub>XP</sub>[<sub>PP</sub> to child] *t*<sub>TP</sub>]]]

In contrast, oblique objects cannot be stranded in a relative clause.

- (23) \**b-in-igy-an ng babae-ng bata ng kendi*  
-PERF-give-APP ERG woman-LK child OBL candy  
'the child to whom the woman gave candy'

The derivation of (23) is nearly identical to that of (22). The relative

head is, correctly, the absolutive nominal of the clause, the goal *bata* ‘child’ being licensed by the applicative suffix on the verb. The only difference is that in (23) the scrambled XP is the oblique object *kendi* ‘candy’ and not a PP. The inability of obliques to undergo scrambling can straightforwardly account for the ungrammaticality.

- (24) \* $[_{DP}[_{TP} \text{ gave woman } t_{NP} t_{DP}] [_{CP}[_{NP} \text{ child}] [_{XP}[_{DP} \text{ candy}] t_{TP}]]]$

Interestingly, head-initial relative clauses formed on goal absolutes with oblique objects in situ are perfectly grammatical. The head-initial version of (23) is shown in (25), where the oblique object appears in situ inside the clause. This is completely consistent with the analysis being developed here. The oblique nominal need not move, and therefore no ungrammaticality results.

- (25) *bata-ng [b-in-igy-an ng babae ng kendi]*  
 child-LK -PERF-give-APP ERG woman OBL candy  
 ‘the child to whom the woman gave candy’

This section has shown a correlation between scrambling in declarative clauses and stranding in relative clauses. This correlation is explained naturally by analyzing stranding as the result of scrambling followed by remnant movement, as proposed in the remnant TP-fronting analysis of head-final relative clause derivation developed in this squib.

#### 4 Remnant Embedded TP-Movement in Tagalog

In addition to relative clauses, Tagalog exhibits other cases of PP-scrambling followed by remnant TP-fronting. A nonfinite complement clause in Tagalog may appear in its base position clause-finally or may move to a position in the matrix clause between the matrix verb and the agent.

- (26) *Nag-ba-balak si Maria-ng mag-aral sa UP.*  
 PERF.AP-RED-plan ABS Maria-LK AP-study P UP  
 ‘Maria is planning to study at the University of the Philippines.’
- (27) *Nag-ba-balak na mag-aral sa UP si Maria.*  
 PERF.AP-RED-plan LK AP-study P UP ABS Maria  
 ‘Maria is planning to study at the University of the Philippines.’

I analyze this as movement of the embedded clause to a position above the matrix agent.

- (28)  $[_{TP} \text{ plan } [_{XP}[_{TP} \text{ study at UP}] [_{vP} \text{ Maria } [_{vP} t_{plan} t_{TP}]]]]]$

Just as a PP can be scrambled inside the matrix clause, an embedded PP can be scrambled inside the complement clause.

- (29) I-p-in-asiya                    ni Maria-ng [mag-hanap ng  
 APP-CAUS-PERF-decide ERG Maria-LK AP-seek    OBL  
 trabaho *sa Amerika*].  
 job            P US  
 ‘Maria decided to look for a job in the US.’
- (30) I-p-in-asiya                    ni Maria-ng [*sa Amerika*  
 APP-CAUS-PERF-decide ERG Maria-LK P US  
 mag-hanap ng trabaho].  
 AP-seek    OBL job  
 ‘Maria decided to look for a job in the US.’

The PP can also be stranded when the TP moves to the matrix clause.

- (31) I-p-in-asiya-ng                    [TP mag-hanap ng trabaho *t<sub>PP</sub>*]  
 APP-CAUS-PERF-decide-LK    AP-seek    OBL job  
 ni Maria [*PP sa Amerika*] *t<sub>TP</sub>*.  
 ERG Maria    P US  
 ‘Maria decided to look for a job in the US.’

PP-scrambling and remnant TP-fronting in complex clauses thus seem to be parallel to PP-stranding in the derivation of head-final relative clauses.

### 5 Head-Final Relatives versus Head-Internal Relatives

At this point, an objection might be raised that what I call head-final relatives are actually head-internal relatives. Coincidentally, the head NP in (32) appears in the same position it would occupy in the corresponding declarative clause, shown in (33).

- (32) i-b-in-igay    ng babae-ng *kendi* sa bata  
 APP-PERF-give ERG woman-LK candy P child  
 ‘the candy the woman gave to the child’
- (33) I-b-in-igay    ng babae *ang kendi* sa bata.  
 APP-PERF-give ERG woman ABS candy P child  
 ‘The woman gave the candy to the child.’

However, if movement were not involved in the derivation of (32), it would be difficult to account for the constraint discussed in section 3. As argued in section 3, remnant movement offers an explanation for the differences in grammaticality between (34) and (35).

- (34) i-b-in-igay    ng babae-ng *kendi sa bata*  
 APP-PERF-give ERG woman-LK candy P child  
 ‘the candy the woman gave to the child’
- (35) \*b-in-igy-an    ng babae-ng bata *ng kendi*  
 -PERF-give-APP ERG woman-LK child OBL candy  
 ‘the child to whom the woman gave candy’

An internal head analysis would predict (35) to be a possible relative clause, since the corresponding declarative clause is grammatical.

- (36) B-in-igy-an ng babae ang bata ng kendi.  
 -PERF-give-APP ERG woman ABS child OBL candy  
 'The woman gave the child candy.'

This indicates that relative clauses like (34) should not be analyzed as head-internal relative clauses, since a nonmovement analysis cannot account for the grammaticality distinctions in the different cases of stranding.

A further point to be made here is that Tagalog does, in fact, have internally headed relative clauses, and they differ structurally from head-final relatives. First, the head occupies a different position, appearing between the verb and the agent.

- (37) b-in-ili-ng libro ni Maria  
 -PERF-buy-LK book ERG Maria  
 'the book Maria bought'

Second, "stranding" evidence indicates that the internal relative head does not move outside the clause. For example, the internally headed version of (35) is grammatical, where the relative head appears in immediate postverbal position and is followed by the ergative and oblique nominals.<sup>4</sup>

- (38) b-in-igy-an na bata ng babae ng kendi  
 -PERF-give-APP LK child ERG woman OBL candy  
 'the child to whom the woman gave candy'

I have shown in section 3 that oblique objects cannot be scrambled. Ergative agents are also unable to undergo scrambling in declarative clauses.

- (39) B-in-ili ni Maria ang libro.  
 -PERF-buy ERG Maria ABS book  
 'Maria bought the book.'
- (40) \*Ni Maria b-in-ili ang libro.  
 ERG Maria -PERF-buy ABS book  
 'Maria bought the book.'

The fact that internally headed relative clauses like (37) and (38) are grammatical indicates that TP-fronting is not involved in their derivation. This is because the TP-fronting analysis would force the ergative and oblique arguments to scramble out of the clause, which would result in ungrammaticality. Elsewhere (Aldridge 2002a), I have

<sup>4</sup> An anonymous reviewer has questioned the use of separate glosses *ERG* and *OBL* for the case marker *ng* (pronounced "nang"). The two markers in Tagalog are homophonous; the glosses I use here reflect the differences in function. For discussion of the different functions, see Schachter 1976, De Guzman 1988, Kroeger 1993, and Maclachlan and Nakamura 1997, among others. It may also be worth mentioning that these case markers are not homophonous in many other Austronesian languages, including the Philippine languages Cebuano and Ilokano.

proposed that internally headed relative clauses in Tagalog are not derived through remnant TP-fronting. Rather, the head remains inside the clause and receives its interpretation by being bound by an external operator.<sup>5</sup>

(41) [<sub>CP</sub> Op<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> bought [<sub>FP</sub> book<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Maria [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>bought</sub> *t*<sub>book</sub>]]]]]

To recapitulate, the discussion in preceding sections has shown that head-final relative clauses involving stranding are grammatical only in those cases where the stranding is the result of licit scrambling (i.e., PP-scrambling), and are ungrammatical in cases involving illicit scrambling. The discussion in section 3 focused on oblique object stranding. For the sake of completeness, let me point out that stranding of ergative agents is also not permitted. (42) is a variant of (35) where the agent is stranded instead of the oblique object. Not surprisingly, it is ungrammatical and provides further evidence that stranding in head-final relative clauses correlates with the possibilities for scrambling.

(42) \*b-in-igy-an ng kendi-ng bata ng babae  
 -PERF-give-APP OBL candy-LK child ERG woman  
 'the child to whom the woman gave candy'

Head-internal relative clauses, on the other hand, do not exhibit such movement constraints. Oblique objects and ergative agents, which are unable to scramble in declarative clauses, can both appear to the right of the relative head in an internally headed relative clause. It should be clear from this fact that internally headed relative clauses are not derived through movement and are therefore structurally distinct from head-final relatives.

## 6 Conclusion

In this squib, I have argued for a TP-fronting derivation of head-final relative clauses. Chief evidence for this analysis comes from stranding in relative clause formation in the Austronesian language Tagalog. I have shown a clear correlation between stranding and scrambling in this language, on the basis of which I conclude that stranding in relative clauses is also a case of scrambling, followed by fronting of the remnant clause.

## References

Aldridge, Edith. 1999. Leftward movement and Case-checking: Evidence from Atayalic languages. Paper presented at the Austro-

<sup>5</sup> This analysis is inspired primarily by Basilico (1996), who proposes that internally headed relative clauses are quantificational, the head functioning as a variable bound by an external operator. For concrete discussion of the variable status of the internal relative head in Tagalog, see Aldridge 2002a.

- nesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA) Conference 6, University of Toronto, Canada.
- Aldridge, Edith. 2001. *Wh*-movement in Seediq and Tagalog. Paper presented at the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA) Conference 8, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Aldridge, Edith. 2002a. Internally headed relative clauses in Austronesian languages. Paper presented at GLOW in Asia, Tsing Hua University, Taiwan.
- Aldridge, Edith. 2002b. Nominalization and *wh*-movement in Seediq and Tagalog. *Language and Linguistics* 3:393–427.
- Basilico, David. 1996. Head position and internally headed relative clauses. *Language* 72:498–532.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On *wh*-movement. In *Formal syntax*, ed. by Peter W. Culicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian, 71–132. New York: Academic Press.
- Chung, Sandra. 1998. *The design of agreement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- De Guzman, Videia P. 1988. Ergative analysis for Philippine languages: An analysis. In *Studies in Austronesian linguistics*, ed. by Richard McGinn, 323–345. Monographs in International Studies, Southeast Asia Series, No. 76. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Center for International Studies, Center for Southeast Asian Studies.
- Fukui, Naoki, and Yuji Takano. 2000. Nominal structure: An extension of the Symmetry Principle. In *The derivation of VO and OV*, ed. by Peter Svenonius, 219–254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gerds, Donna B. 1988. Antipassives and causatives in Ilokana: Evidence for an ergative analysis. In *Studies in Austronesian linguistics*, ed. by Richard McGinn, 295–321. Monographs in International Studies, Southeast Asia Series, No. 76. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Center for International Studies, Center for Southeast Asian Studies.
- Honda, Kensuke. 2002. Hantaishoosei kasetu kara mita nihongo too-goron (An antisymmetric approach to Japanese syntax). In *Jisedai no gengo kenkyu I* (Linguistic research in the next generation I), ed. by Tsukuba Daigaku Gendai Gengogaku Kenkyukai (Tsukuba University Association for Modern Linguistic Research), 175–224. Tsukuba, Japan: University of Tsukuba.
- Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Maclachlan, Anna, and Masanori Nakamura. 1997. Case-checking and specificity in Tagalog. *The Linguistic Review* 14:307–333.
- Murasugi, Keiko S. 2000. Japanese complex noun phrases and the antisymmetry theory. In *Step by step*, ed. by Roger Martin,

- David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 211–234. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Nakamura, Masanori. 1994. An economy account of *wh*-extraction in Tagalog. In *The Proceedings of the Twelfth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Erin Duncan, Donna Farkas, and Philip Spaelti, 405–420. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Payne, Thomas E. 1982. Role and reference related subject properties and ergativity in Yup'ik Eskimo and Tagalog. *Studies in Language* 6:75–106.
- Pensalfini, Robert. 1995. Malagasy phrase structure and the LCA. In *Papers from the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asia Linguistics Society*, ed. by Shobhana L. Chellian and Willem J. De Reuse, 245–261. Tempe: Arizona State University, Program for Southeast Asian Studies.
- Safir, Ken. 1986. Relative clauses in a theory of binding and levels. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:663–689.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above. In *Subject and topic*, ed. by Charles Li, 491–518. New York: Academic Press.

NOTES ON LONG ADVERBIAL  
FRONTING IN ENGLISH AND THE  
LEFT PERIPHERY

Liliane Haegeman

Université Charles de  
Gaulle–Lille III

UMR 8258 SILEX du CNRS

The purpose of this squib is to show that in addition to the generally accepted distinction between fronted adjuncts and fronted arguments, we need to introduce a further distinction between fronted adjuncts resulting from long-distance movement and those resulting from short-distance movement (hereafter, short and long fronted adjuncts). It turns out that, distributionally, long fronted adjuncts are in many respects more like fronted arguments than like short fronted adjuncts. I will first show the need for making this distinction on the basis of English data and then provide some comparative data in support.

### 1 Adjunct Fronting versus Argument Fronting

In the literature on what is commonly referred to as the ‘‘left periphery of the clause,’’ a principled distinction is usually made between fronted

Versions of this squib were presented at the Linguistics Department of SOAS and at the Linguistics Department of the University of Reading. I thank both audiences for comments. Thanks are also due for generous help with data and for discussion of specific points to David Adger, Guglielmo Cinque, Siobhan Cottell, Eric Haeberli, Caroline Heycock, Ruth Huart, Harry van der Koot, Joan Maling, Jim McCloskey, Philip Miller, Bernadette Plunkett, Andrew Simpson, and Neil Smith. I thank two anonymous reviewers for *Linguistic Inquiry* for their very useful comments.