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Baker et al. (2012)

- Establish a continuum of embedded clause types in Lubukusu (Bantu) ranging from *fully nominal* to *fully clausal*
- Provide a number of diagnostics as evidence for this continuum
This Talk

- Apply some diagnostics in the vein of Baker & Safir to clausal arguments in Tagalog (Austronesian)
- Show that this language exhibits some interestingly divergent behavior from what we might expect from Bantu
- Speculate on some possible connections to other crosslinguistic phenomena
Case Marking

- Tagalog marks three cases morphologically with prenominal determiners
- Note: Disagreement exists regarding their analysis
Tagalog marks three cases morphologically with prenominal determiners:

- **Nominative** (*ang*)
  - Marks the syntactically prominent clausal dependent, which varies depending on the “voice” marking on the verb
  - ≈ Subject marking

Note: Disagreement exists regarding their analysis.
Case Marking

- Tagalog marks three cases morphologically with prenominal determiners
- Note: Disagreement exists regarding their analysis
  - **Nominative** (\textit{ang})
    - Marks the syntactically prominent clausal dependent, which varies depending on the “voice” marking on the verb
    - \(\approx\) Subject marking
  - **Genitive** (\textit{ng} [\textipa{ŋ}])
    - Marks core arguments not marked nominative
    - Also marks possessors
Case Marking

- Tagalog marks three cases morphologically with prenominal determiners
- Note: Disagreement exists regarding their analysis

**Nominative** (*ang*)
- Marks the syntactically prominent clausal dependent, which varies depending on the “voice” marking on the verb
- ≈ Subject marking

**Genitive** (*ng [naŋ]*)
- Marks core arguments not marked nominative
- Also marks possessors

**Oblique** (*sa*)
- Preposition-like case marking e.g., locations, sources, goals, etc.
- Also marks complements of contentful prepositions
(1) Nag-bigay ako ng pera sa bata.
   ‘I gave money to the child.’
(2) I-b<in>igay ko ang pera sa bata.
   ‘I gave the money to the child.’
(3) B<in>igy-an ko ng pera ang bata.
   ‘I gave money to the child.’
Diagnostics for DPs vs CPs

- Prototypical DPs (R-expressions) are overtly marked for case
- Prototypical CPs (declarative complement clauses) are ungrammatical with case, and are instead marked with the “linker” morpheme

(4) Ikinagulat ni Gina [ang katahimikan ng bata].
surprise.PFV GEN Gina NOM quietness GEN child
‘Gina was surprised by the child’s quietness.’

(5) Ikinagulat ni Gina [na t<um>ahimik ang bata].
surprise.PFV GEN Gina LK <AV.PFV>quiet NOM child
‘Gina was surprised that the child quieted down.’
Despite the difference in marking, it appears that both DPs and CPs can serve as subjects of intransitive clauses

(6) Nakakagulat [ang katahimikan ng bata].
surprising NOM quietness GEN child
‘The child’s quietness is surprising.’

(7) Nakakagulat [na t<um>ahimik ang bata].
surprising LK <AV.PFV>quiet NOM child
‘It is surprising that the child quieted down.’
Diagnostics for DPs vs CPs

- DPs can undergo **A’-movement**
- (Declarative complement) CPs cannot

(8)  [Ang katahimikan ng bata] ang nakakagulat.  
NOM quietness GEN child NOM surprising  
‘What is surprising is the child’s quietness.’

(9)  *[Na t<um>ahimik ang bata] ang nakakagulat.  
LK <AV.PFV>quiet NOM child NOM surprising  
‘What is surprising is that the child quieted down.’
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A number of constructions with clause-like structure have the distribution of DPs:

- Headed Relative Clauses
- Headless Relative Clauses
- Gerunds
Relative Clauses

- Relative clauses have the form **Head LK Gap-Clause**
- Gap-Clause is a declarative clause with an *ang*-marked (NOM) gap

(10) B<in>ili ni Gina ang isda.
    <PFV>buy GEN Gina NOM fish
    ‘Gina bought the fish.’

(11) idsa=ng [b<in>ili ni Gina ang isda]
    fish=LK <PFV>buy GEN Gina NOM fish
    ‘fish that Gina bought’
Relative Clauses

▶ Relative clauses with nominal heads behave like DPs with respect to the diagnostics

(12) K<in>ain ni Fe ang [isda=ng b<in>ili ni Gina].  
    <PFV>eat GEN Fe NOM fish=LK <PFV>buy GEN Gina  
    ‘Fe ate the fish that Gina bought.’  

(13) Nakakagulat ang [isda=ng b<in>ili ni Gina].  
    surprising NOM fish=LK <PFV>buy GEN Gina  
    ‘The fish Gina bought is startling.’  

(14) Ang [isda=ng b<in>ili ni Gina] ang nakakagulat.  
    NOM fish=LK <PFV>buy GEN Gina NOM surprising  
    ‘What is startling is the fish that Gina bought.’  

Case marking
Intr. subj.  
A’-movement
Relative Clauses

- RCs may also appear headless (and linker-less)
- Same distribution as headed relative clause

(15)  \( K \text{in} \text{ain ni } \text{Fe } \text{ang [isda=ng b}<\text{in}>\text{ili ni Gina].} \)  
\( <\text{PFV}>\text{eat GEN Fe NOM fish=LK } <\text{PFV}>\text{buy GEN Gina} \)

‘Fe ate the one that Gina bought.’

Case marking

(16)  \( \text{Nakakagulat ang [isda=ng b}<\text{in}>\text{ili ni Gina].} \)  
\( \text{surprising NOM fish=LK } <\text{PFV}>\text{buy GEN Gina} \)

‘The one Gina bought is startling.’

Intr. subj.

(17)  \( \text{Ang [isda=ng b}<\text{in}>\text{ili ni Gina] ang nakakagulat.} \)  
\( \text{NOM fish=LK } <\text{PFV}>\text{buy GEN Gina NOM surprising} \)

‘What’s startling is the one that Gina bought.’

\( A'\)-movement
Gerunds

- Appear to have some clause-like internal structure
- Reduced verb form; no voice or aspect morphology

(18) B<in>ili ni Gina ang isda.
<PFV>buy GEN Gina NOM fish
‘Gina bought the fish.’

(19) pag-bili ni Gina ng isda.
GER-buy GEN Gina GEN fish
‘Gina’s buying of the fish.’
Gerunds

- Like relative clauses, these behave like DPs with respect to the diagnostics

(20) Nagulat si Fe sa [pag-bili ni Gina ng isda].
surprised NOM Fe OBL GER-buy GEN Gina GEN fish
‘Fe was surprised by Gina’s buying of the fish.’ Case

(21) Nakakagulat ang [pag-bili ni Gina ng isda].
surprising NOM GER-buy GEN Gina GEN fish
‘Gina’s buying of the fish is surprising.’ Intr. subj.

(22) Ang [pag-bili ni Gina ng isda] ang nakakagulat.
NOM GER-buy GEN Gina GEN fish NOM surprising
‘What’s surprising is Gina’s buying of the fish.’ A’-movement
Table: Summary of diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case marking</th>
<th>Intr. Subj.</th>
<th>A’-movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RelC</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerund</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decl. CP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Demonstrative-CPs

- Demonstrative-CPs have the form demonstrative pronoun (*yung* ‘NOM.DIST’, *nung* ‘GEN.DIST’) + CP (Nagaya, 2014)
- Demonstratives take can the place of *ang* and *ng* for regular DPs

(23) B<in>ili ni Dionisia *{yung / ang}* kotse. 
<PFV>buy(PV) GEN Dionisia NOM.DIST NOM car
‘Dionisia bought the car.’

(24) Na-alala ni Dionisia [{yung / *ang}*] 
PFV-remember GEN Dionisia NOM.DIST NOM 
<um>iyak si Manny]. 
<AV.PFV>cry NOM Manny
‘Dionisia remembered (that time) when Manny cried.’
Demonstrative-CPs

- Can take NOM and GEN marking, but not OBL marking

(25) Na-alala ni Dionisia [yung <um>iyak PFV-remember GEN Dionisia NOM.DIST <AV.PFV>cry si Manny].

NOM Manny

‘Dionisia remembered (that time) when Manny cried.’

(26) * Si Dionisia ang naka-alala [doon (sa) NOM Dionisia NOM PFV-remember OBL.DIST OBL <um>iyak si Manny].

<AV.PFV>cry NOM Manny

‘It was Dionisia who remembered (that time) when Manny cried’
Demonstrative-CPs

- Behave like DPs under subjecthood and A′-movement

(27) Nakakatuwa [yung <um>iyak si Manny].
    amusing NOM.DIST <AV.PFV>cry NOM Manny
    ‘That time when Manny cried was amusing.’ *Intr. Subj.*

(28) [Yung <um>iyak si Manny] yung
    NOM.DIST <AV.PFV>cry NOM Manny NOM.DIST
    nakakatuwa.
    amusing
    ‘What’s amusing is that time when Manny cried.’
    *A′-movement*
Demonstrative-CPs have a DP layer, reminiscent of factive complements in languages like Hebrew (Kastner, 2015).

Similar to contentful nouns (Moulton, 2015), except Demonstrative-CPs are “headless”.

(29) \[\text{\{yung } / *\text{ang}\} <\text{um}>\text{iyak si Manny.} \]
\[\text{NOM.DIST NOM } <\text{AV.PFV}>\text{cry NOM Manny} \]
‘...(that time) when Manny cried’

(30) \[\text{\{yung } / \text{ang}\} \text{balita=ng } <\text{um}>\text{iyak si Manny.} \]
\[\text{NOM.DIST NOM news=LK } <\text{AV.PFV}>\text{cry NOM Manny} \]
‘...the news that Manny cried’
**Table: Summary of diagnostics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NOM/GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>Intr. Subj.</th>
<th>A’-movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RelC</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerund</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem-CP</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decl. CP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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If-CPs

- If-CPs have the form *kung* ‘if’ + WH-question
- Identical in form to an embedded question

(31) Alam ko [na nag-nakaw siya ng pera].
know 1SG.GEN LK AV.PFV-steal 3SG.NOM GEN money
‘I know that he stole the money.’

(32) Alam ko [kung sino ang nag-nakaw ng pera].
know 1SG.GEN if who NOM AV.PFV-steal GEN money
‘I know who stole the money.’

(33) T<in>anong ko [kung sino ang nag-nakaw ng pera].
<PFV>ask 1SG.GEN if who NOM AV.PFV-steal GEN money
‘I asked who stole the money.’
If-CPs denote something more complex than single individuals

(34) **Alam ko kung sino ang nag-nakaw ng pera.**

‘I know (the identity of the person) who stole the money.’

(35) **Kilala ko kung sino ang nag-nakaw ng pera.**

Intended: ‘I’m acquainted with the person who stole the money.’
If-CPs do not bear case marking...

(36) Alam ko [(ang) kung sino ang nag-nakaw know 1SG GEN NOM if who NOM AV PFV steal pera].
GEN money
'I know who stole the money.'

(37) Alam ko [ang sagot].
know 1SG GEN NOM answer
'I know the answer.'
... except when they are marked OBL

(38) Alam ko [(ang) kung sino ang nag-nakaw
know 1SG.GEN NOM if who NOM AV.PFV-steal
ng pera].
gen money
‘I know who stole the money.’

(39) Nagulat ako [(sa) kung sino ang
surprise.PFV 1SG.GEN OBL if who NOM
nag-nakaw ng pera].
AV.PFV-steal GEN money
‘I was surprised at who stole the money.’
If-CPs exhibit properties of (un)conditionals (Rawlins, 2013)

(40) [Kung nag-nakaw si Juan ng pera], dapat
if AV.PFV-steal NOM Juan GEN money should
siya=ng ikulong.
3SG.NOM=LK lock.up
‘If Juan stole the money, he should go to jail.’

(41) [Kung sino ang nag-nakaw ng pera], dapat
if who NOM AV.PFV-steal GEN money should
siya=ng ikulong.
3SG.NOM=LK lock.up
‘Whoever stole the money, he should go to jail.’
If-CPs exhibit properties of (un)conditionals (Rawlins, 2013)

- Sensitivity to modality

(42) {Ha~halik-an / *H<in>alik-an} ko kung sino FUT~kiss-LV / <PFV>kiss-LV 1SG.GEN if who ang nag-nakaw ng pera. NOM AV.PFV-steal GEN money ‘I {will kiss, *kissed} whoever stole the money.’
If-CPs

► Distinct from free relatives, which are DPs of the form WH + man (e.g. sinuman ‘whoever’, anuman ‘whatever’)

► If-CPs cannot occur in subject position

(43) Masarap ang anu-ma=ng nilu∼luto ni Juan. delicious NOM what-man=LK IMPF∼cook GEN Juan ‘Whatever Juan cooks is delicious.’

(44) Masarap [(*kung ano) ang nilu∼luto ni Juan]. delicious if what NOM IMPF∼cook GEN Juan ‘What Juan is cooking is delicious.’

(45) * Dapat ikulong [kung sino ang nag-nakaw ng should lock.up if who NOM AV.PFV-steal GEN pera]. money ‘Whoever stole the money should go to jail.’
If-CPs may not undergo A’-movement

(46)  * [Kung sino ang nag-nakaw ng pera] ang if who NOM AV.PFV-steal GEN money NOM alam ko. know 1SG.GEN

Intended: ‘What I know is who stole the money.’
## Table: Summary of diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NOM/GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>Intr. Subj.</th>
<th>A’-movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RelC</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerund</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem-CP</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If-CP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decl. CP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Table: Summary of diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM/GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>Intr. Subj.</th>
<th>A’-movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RelC</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerund</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem-CP</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decl. CP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Initial evidence for a nominal–clausal continuum in Tagalog
- Diagnostics show the need for different or finer-grained distinctions in Tagalog
  - Behavior of oblique marking with Dem-CP and *if*-CP
  - What allows Declarative CPs to be subjects but not *if*-CPs?


