Case and Extraction in the Tagalog Recent Past

Introduction. This project investigates data from the Tagalog recent past: an understudied clause type where there are no voice infixes and ang case is not assigned but unexpectedly, certain restrictions on scrambling, extraction and specificity are still active. On the basis of these data, I argue for a structure with both v and Voice, where v introduces the external argument and Voice attracts specific arguments, thus generating the extraction restriction through object shift to spec Voice (Rackowski 2002, Rackowski and Richards 2005, Sabbagh 2016 for similar approaches). In this way, canonical properties of Tagalog voice (case marking, specificity, and extraction) are not reduced to properties of a single head in the verbal domain, such as Voice or v. Rather, they emerge from the interaction of specificity-driven movement in the Voice domain (evidenced by differential object marking in the recent past) and high ang case assignment in the TP domain (evidenced by reemergence of ang in recent past clauses with extraction).

Data. Recent past objects show case alternations based on specificity in a pattern of differential object marking (DOM) as in (1). Notably, this pattern of DOM applies to an object that is the pivot, which differs from the DOM previously seen in the literature, which applies to an object that is a non-pivot (Sabbagh 2016). While ang case is not assigned to arguments in canonical (postverbal) positions, ang case resurfaces when an argument extracts as in (2), which suggests that the domain for ang-case assignment is higher than Voice or v.

1 Specific objects show DAT case

(1) Specific objects show DAT case

a. Recent Past (Non-Specific Object)
   kaka-bili lang ng=lalaki
   RECPST-buy just OBL=man
   ng=isda OBL=fish
   ‘The man just bought (a) fish.’

b. Recent Past (Specific Object)
   kaka-bili lang ng=lalaki
   RECPST-buy just OBL=man
   sa=isda DAT=fish
   ‘The man just bought the fish.’

(2) Topicalized Objects are Specific

a. Topicalized Agent (Non-Specific Object)
   ang=lalaki ay kaka-bili ng=isda
   NOM=man TOP RECPST-buy OBL=fish
   ‘It was the man who just bought a/the fish.’

b. Topicalized Object (Specific Object)
   ang=isda ay kaka-bili ng=lalaki
   NOM=fish TOP RECPST-buy OBL=man
   ‘It was the/a fish that the man just bought.’

In (3), agent extraction is impossible in clauses with a specific object, closely mirroring the facts for patient voice (Aldridge 2012). This shows that even in clauses without the <um> or <in> voice morphemes, the extraction restriction is still active and correlates with object specificity.

(3) No Agent Extraction from Recent Past Clauses with DOM

a. ang=lalaki ay kaka-bili ng=isda
   NOM=man TOP RECPST-buy OBL=fish
   ‘It was the man who just bought a/the fish.’

1This data is from a dialect of Tagalog in contact with Bikol, spoken in Iriga City, Philippines. This dialect shows slightly different patterns in differential object marking than standard Tagalog.

2Abbreviations used: AV = agent voice, PV = patient voice, RECPST = recent past, NOM = nominative, OBL = oblique, DAT = dative, TOP = topic, DOM = differential object marking
b. *ang=lalaki ay kaka-bili \textit{sa}=isda  \\
NOM=man \hspace{1em} TOP \hspace{1em} RECPST-buy \hspace{1em} DAT=fish

Furthermore, DOM interacts with word-order possibilities: in recent past clauses without DOM, only VSO and SVO word order is available as in (4), but with DOM, VSO, VOS, and OVS are available as in (5). This supports an object-shift analysis of these facts.

(4) a. VSO\textsubscript{DOM} \\
kaka-bili lang ng=lalaki ng=isda \\
RECPST-buy just OBL=man OBL=fish \\
‘The man just bought fish.’

b. *VO\textsubscript{DOM} \\
*kaka-bili lang ng=isda ng=lalaki \\
RECPST-buy just OBL=fish OBL=man

(5) a. VSO\textsubscript{DOM} \\
kaka-bili lang ng=lalaki \textit{sa}=isda \\
RECPST-buy just OBL=man DAT=fish \\
‘The man just bought the fish.’

b. VO\textsubscript{DOM} \\
kaka-bili lang \textit{sa}=isda ng=lalaki \\
RECPST-buy just DAT=fish OBL=man \\
‘The man just bought the fish.’

\textbf{Analysis.} In order to account for these facts, I propose Tagalog has two main flavors of Voice: Voice\textsubscript{D} (which attracts one DP specifier), and Voice\textsubscript{D,D} (which attracts two DP specifiers). In ordinary voice-inflected clauses, Voice\textsubscript{D} is spelled out as agent voice, and Voice\textsubscript{D,D} is patient voice. In the recent past these two Voice heads are syncretic. In cases of object shift (such as the patient voice or recent past with DOM), Voice\textsubscript{D,D} attracts first the agent, and then the object, which receives a specific interpretation in spec Voice (Figure 1). I also rule out an analysis where Voice introduces the external argument on the basis of agent-oriented plural agreement in the recent past, which I place on $v$. I conclude with a uniform analysis of \textit{ang}-case assignment, located in the TP domain, which is interrupted for postverbal arguments in the recent past.

\textbf{Implications.} This analysis concludes the following: (i) the subjects-only extraction restriction is not a case-sensitive probe, but rather derivable from basic locality restrictions on movement, (ii) there are two types of DOM in Tagalog, one with DOM-object as pivot (as in the recent past), and one with DOM-object as non-pivot (as in Sabbagh 2016), (iii) specific arguments are in spec Voice\textsubscript{P}, making these effects localizable to a particular syntactic domain (as proposed for Germanic in Diesing 1996), and (iv) Voice and $v$ should be analyzed as separate heads that have separate syntactic functions: $v$ introduces the external argument, and Voice triggers movement that feeds case assignment and later extraction.