The constituency and command paradox in Philippine languages

1.0 Command

• Basic evidence for Gen/Erg > Nom/Abs
  – Reflexive anaphors (Schachter 1976 inter alia)

(1) T<in>ign-an ni=Juan ang=sarili=niya <BEG>see-LV P.GEN=Juan NOM=self=3S.GEN
   ‘Juan looked at himself.’

(2) *T<in>ign-an ng=sarili=niya si=Juan <BEG>see-LV GEN=self=3S.GEN P.NOM=Juan

(3) ?*T<in>ign-an si=Juan ng=sarili=niya <BEG>see-LV P.NOM=Juan GEN=self=3S.GEN

• Evidence for V > Nom/Abs
  – NPI licensing

(4) Wala=ng b<in>ili-∅=ng libro ang=sinuman
   NEG.EXT=LNK <BEG>buy-PV=LNK book NOM=anyone

(5) *May b<in>ili-∅=ng libro ang=sinuman
   EXT <BEG>buy-PV=LNK book NOM=anyone

This suggests the single-spine structure with V-movement (ala Aldridge, Richards, Rackowski)
2.0 Constituency

• Philippine type coordination is not expected in a single spine structure. (Keenan 1976, Pearson 2007 fn.10, Travis 2005)

(6) a. [I-ni-hatid ni=Paolo] at [s<in>undo-∅ ni=Pedro] si=Juan
   CV-BEG-escort GEN=P. and <BEG>pick_up-PV GEN=P. NOM=Juan
   ‘Paolo escorted and Pedro picked Juan up.’

   b. *[I-ni-hatid si=Paolo] at [s<in>undo-∅ si=Pedro] ni=Juan
      ?[I-ni-hatid si=Paolo] at [s<in>undo-∅ si=Pedro] || ni=Juan
      CV-BEG-escort NOM=P. and <BEG>pick_up-PV NOM=P. GEN=Juan
   ‘Juan escorted Paolo and picked up Pedro.’

(7) a. [Manuhor baoang] jala [mangolompa mangga] halak i
   Toba Batak AV:buy onions and AV:cook mangos man DET
   ‘The man buys onions and cooks mangos’

   b. [Di-tuhor si=Ore] jala [di-lompa si Ruli] mangga
      PV-buy ART=Ore and PV-cook ART Ruli mangos
      ‘Ore buys and Ruli cooks mangos’

   – Emmorey (1984) offers prosodic evidence for the same constituency in
     Toba Batak. There, the nuclear pitch accent falls on the stressed syllable of
     the last lexical item in the Predicate Phrase.

• No Philippine-type language shows evidence as that found in Celtic languages
  for VO constituency, i.e. SVO order and VO constituency when V movement is
  blocked.

(8) a. Y mae’r dyn [wedi gweld y ci]
   Welsh PRT COP.3SG.PROG:the man PERF see(VN) the dog
   ‘The man has seen the dog.’

   b. [Wedi gweld y ci] y mae’r dyn
      PERF see(VN) the dog PRT COP.3SG.PROG:the man
      ‘The man has seen the dog.’ (Sproat 1985:178, Aldridge 2003:166)

(9) a. *[Adügü-tu Maria] luma [aluguraha-ti John] fein
    Garifuna make-3SF Maria and sell-3SM John bread
    (Can only mean, ‘Maria makes (something) and John sells bread’)

   b. *[Adügü t-umu-ti Maria] luma [aluguraha l-umu-ti John] fein
      make 3SF-TR-3SM Maria and sell 3SM-TR-3SM John bread
      (Can only mean, ‘Maria makes (it) and John sells bread’)
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(10) Constituency tree:

```
XP
   VP
      NP
         V
         NP
```

3.0 Other command & constituency paradoxes

• Coordination groups adjuncts with low arguments and adjuncts with adjuncts:

(11) John met [Susan on Friday] and [Maria on Saturday]
(12) John sings [here on Sundays] and [there on Saturdays]

• But such constituents for coordination are not constituents for movement

(13) Who, did John meet t₁ on Friday?
(14) *[Who on Friday] did John meet?

• Also, outer adjuncts scope over inner adjuncts on the right edge

• Pesetsky (1995): The Dual System hypothesis

  \textit{Layered Syntax}: XP-movement island conditions on XP movement, XP-ellipsis, interpretation of modification relations

  \textit{Cascade syntax}: everything else \hspace{1cm} (Pesetsky 1995:248)

• But Tagalog does not pattern like English in allowing (almost) any two final constituents to group together for the purposes of coordination:

(15) *T<in>ign-an [ni=Maria si=Paul] at [ni=Pedro si=Paula]
  \texttt{<BEG>look-LV GEN=M. NOM=P. and GEN=P. NOM=P.}
  (For, Maria looked at Paul and Pedro looked at Paula.)

  \hspace{1cm} – Cascade structure cannot be responsible for the coordination pattern in Tagalog

4.0 The copular analysis and its predictions

• The difference is that Philippine languages use aspect marked thematic nominalizations for canonical transitive predications
• One motivation of the copular nominal analysis of Philippine predications is that it provides a cross-linguistically commonplace analogue to the Austronesian extraction restriction:

(16) *Ni=Ronaldo ay p<in>ili-∅ si=Juan
    GEN=Ronaldo TOP <BEG>choose-∅ NOM=Juan

(17) Si=Juan ay p<in>ili-∅ ni=Ronaldo
    NOM=Juan TOP <BEG>choose-∅ GEN=Ronaldo
    ‘Juan was chosen by Ronaldo.’

(18) *Ni=Ronaldo, ang=kaibigan si=Juan
    GEN=Ronaldo NOM=friend NOM=Juan

(19) *Of Ronaldo, John is the employee.

• The relation between the ergative and absolutive DPs is that between a possessor of a nominal predicate and its subject

(20)

TP
  /\  n+Asp\i
AspP  nP
  /\  NP\i
  |   n'  T
  |   \   |
  |   t_i  Cop
  |   \  NP\i
  |    |  NP\i

• No c-command relation at all between the genitive and nominative argument at any point in the derivation.

• So how do we get asymmetric licensing of reflexive anaphora in event predications? The same way we get it between a possessor of a nominal predicate and the nominative.

(21) a. Kaawa ni=Tyson ang=sarili=niya
    enemy GEN=Tyson NOM=self=3S.GEN
    ‘Tyson’s enemy is himself.’

    b. ?*Kaaway nang=sarili=niya si=Tyson
    enemy GEN=self=3S.GEN NOM=Tyson
    ‘Tyson’s enemy is himself.’  (Kaufman 2009)

• The pay-off is a unified account for reflexive anaphora in nominal and verbal predicate pairs:
(22) a. Ampon=niya ang=sarili=niya adoptee=3.S.GEN NOM=self=3.S.GEN
   ‘He is his own adoptee.’
   b. in-ampon-∅=niya ang=sarili=niya BEG-adoptee-PV=3.S.GEN NOM=self=3.S.GEN
   ‘He adopted himself.’

4.1 Tagalog command relations revisited

• When there is no structure to determine binding relations, anaphora must rely on extra-structural factors:

   Affectedness relations
   Possessor > Possessee
   Agent > Patient

• The fact that binding is not structurally determined also allows it to be reversible when affectedness is equivocal, as with relations.

(23) Si=Hesus ay Ama, pero hindi pwedeng ama=siya ng=sarili=niya
   NOM=Jesus TOP father but NEG can:LNK father=3.S.GEN GEN=self=3.S.GEN
   ‘Jesus is the father but he can’t be the father of himself.’ (from web)

(24) hindi=po=kasi tamang sabi-hin na Ama=niya ang=kanyang sarili
   NEG=POL=because correct:LNK say-PV LNK father=3.S.GEN GEN=3.S.GEN:LNK self
   ‘It’s not correct to say that his father is himself.’ (from web)

• Note that these two naturally occurring examples both involve locative voice predicates, whose “underlying object” is less effected than that of patient voice predicates.

(25) Kaya siya ay na-ta~takot kapag
   REAS 3.S.NOM TOP NVL.BEG=IMPRF~fear when
   in-udyuk-an=siya ng=kanyang sarili
   BEG-tempt-LV=3.S.NOM GEN=3.S.GEN self
   ‘That’s why he was scared when he was tempted by himself’ (from web)

(26) su~sumbat-an=siya ni=Dardo at su~sumbat-an=siya
   IMPRF~reproach-LV=3.S.NOM GEN=D. and IMPRF~reproach-LV=3.S.NOM
   ng=kanyang sarili
   GEN=3.S.GEN self
   ‘Dardo will reproach him and himself will reproach him.’ (from web)
• That the semantics of the predicate head in a copular sentence should effect binding is not unusual, cf. representational nouns vs. non-representational nouns

(27) a. John is a caricature of himself  b. *John is an employee of himself

• Condition C

  – It’s been noted that clitic movement seems to feed Condition C:

(28) *M<in>a~mahal-∅=siya₉ [ng=mga=kaibigan ni=Juan₉]
   <BEG>IMPRF~love-PV=3S.NOM GEN=PL=friend GEN=Juan
   ‘John’s friends loves John.’

  – It hasn’t been noted that the same violation is also present with two proper names and the nominative in final position:

(29) *?M<in>a~mahal-∅ [ng=mga=kaibigan ni=Juan₉] [si=Juan₉]
   <BEG>IMPRF~love-PV GEN=PL=friend GEN=Juan NOM=Juan
   ‘John’s friends love John.’

   This is not what we expect, cf.

(30) a. John’s mother called John b. *John called John’s mother

• It’s also been noted that bound variable readings suggest mutual c-command between the transitive A and P arguments (Richards 1993):

(31) M<in>a~mahal-∅ [ng=kanyang₉ anak] [ang=bawat nanay₉]
   <BEG>IMPRF~love-PV GEN=3S.GEN:LNK child NOM=each mother
   ‘Her child loves every mother.’

(32) M<in>a~mahal-∅ [ng=bawat anak] [ang=kanyang nanay₉]
   <BEG>IMPRF~love-PV GEN=each child NOM=3S.GEN:LNK mother
   ‘Every child loves her mother.’

• Suspiciously similar to the binding without c-command we find in copular clauses (Higgins 1973):

(34) a. [The person everyone; loves the most] is his; mother.
b. What [everyone; hates most] is to have his; mother insulted.
5.0 Conclusion

• There are still many unexpected binding facts for all present structural accounts

• Some of these find a similarity to binding in copular sentences which have also been analyzed as the result of "extra-structural" factors

• On the empirical side, we need is an unbiased survey of binding relations in Tagalog obtained under controlled/experimental conditions.
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