

Zero or One? Adjunct Extraction and the Fine Structure of Pseudo-Clefts in Tagalog

It is well-known that Tagalog *wh*-interrogatives formally distinguish between argument (or "term") extraction and adjunct extraction, the former being amenable to a pseudo-cleft analysis (Aldridge 2002; Kroeger 1993; Richards 1998), the latter derivable via direct fronting. The fine structure of Tagalog pseudo-clefts, however, is less clear, although there is some agreement that it should involve a headless relative.

In this presentation I will defend the following two claims about Tagalog pseudo clefts:

(A) Given a choice between (1a) and (1b), the latter, differing from the former by projecting an NP-layer containing a silent (zero) counterpart of English *one*, Ω , the Ω -less variant (1a) is preferred. (B) Contra Paul's (2001) suggestions for Malagasy, Tagalog headless-relatives should not be rendered as definite descriptions but allow for quantificational variability.

A) Against zero one

The crucial motivation for arguing against (1b) comes from attempting an account for the absence of adjunct pseudo-clefts in Tagalog. Thus consider the ungrammaticality of (2a) and (2b). Assuming structure (1a), this could be derived directly by restricting the types of predicate the determiner of the headless relative can combine with. Suppose the *Op* involved in a pseudo-cleft analysis of (2) binds a special variable \bar{t} ranging over time intervals, (3), so that the relativized CP is of type $\langle \bar{t}, t \rangle$. The necessary restriction could then be derived from assuming the determiner of the headless relative to be of the standard type $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, \langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle \rangle$.

Things are different for headed relatives involving a noun like *araw* ("day"), as shown in (4). (4) is not a pseudo-cleft construction but a "standard" declarative involving *kailan* as a "pseudo-predicate" (Schachter and Otnes 1972:448ff) roughly meaning "OCCUR_WHEN."

Assume that *araw* can be shifted to a function of type $\langle \langle \bar{t}, t \rangle, \langle e, t \rangle \rangle$ from sets of time intervals to sets of (event-like) individuals. The (rough) meaning of (4) is given in (5).

Now, the problem with assuming (1b) instead of (1a) is that one has to make sure that Ω cannot do the job of *araw*. Otherwise (2a) could be given a meaning closely related to (5) modulo replacing DAY(x) by $\Omega(x)$. A look at English *one*, however, reveals the danger of postulating Ω . Thus, *one* seems to be able to receive the value (and thus type) of *day* contextually, as shown in (6). Yet, Tagalog counterparts of (6) are impossible, as demonstrated in (7). This is easiest to explain if there is no Ω in the first place, i.e. if (1a) is the correct structure of Tagalog headless relatives.

B) Tagalog headless relatives aren't definite descriptions

There is evidence that Tagalog headless relatives should not generally be rendered as definite descriptions. Instead they should allow for quantificational variability. Thus, in a context where it is clear that Maria gave Pedro three books as presents, Alice in Wonderland, Grimm's Fairytales, and Don Quijote, it is possible to felicitously use (8a) or (8b). This suggests that headless relatives in Tagalog can receive existential readings instead of inducing the maximality effect expected under an analysis as definite descriptions.

An important rationale of Paul (2001) for assuming an analysis of Malagasy pseudo-clefts as definite descriptions lies in the possibility of deriving the existence presupposition of *wh*-questions from the one induced by the description. On my (weaker) account of Tagalog headless relatives I will have to follow Groenendijk & Stokhof (1997) in taking *wh*-questions to carry an existential implicature instead.

C) Extensions

The remainder of the presentation will be devoted to discussing other adjunct types (place, manner, reason) as well as pointing out potential problems for pseudo-cleft analyses in the area of long extraction.

- (1) a. [_{PredP} Ano [_{DP} ang [_{CP} *Op*_i [_{IP} binili ni Maria *t*_i]]]]
 b. [_{PredP} Ano [_{DP} ang [_{NP} [_{N°} Ω] [_{CP} *Op*_i [_{IP} binili ni Maria *t*_i]]]]]
 "What is (the thing) such that Maria bought it?"
- (2) a. * Kailan ang bumili/binili si/ni Juan ng/ang tela
when T bought.AT/ThT T/A Juan Th/T cloth
 "When did Juan buy the cloth?"
 b. * Aling araw ang bumili/binili si/ni Juan ng/ang tela
which day T bought.AT/ThT T/A Juan Th/T cloth
 "(On) which day did Juan buy the cloth?"
- (3) CP₍₂₎ >> λ*t*.∃*e*[BUY(*e*) ∧ AG(*e*, JUAN) ∧ TH(*e*, CLOTH) ∧ AT_{temp}(*e*, *t*)]
- (4) Kailan ang araw na bumili si Juan ng tela
when T time LNK bought.AT T Juan Th cloth
 "When was the time that Juan bought (some) cloth"
- (5) (4) >> ?*t*[OCCUR_AT(*t*, λ*x*.DAY(*x*) ∧ ∃*e*[BUY(*e*) ∧ AG(*e*, JUAN) ∧ TH(*e*, CLOTH) ∧ AT_{temp}(*e*, *t*) ∧ INSTANTIATE(*t*, *x*)])]]
- (6) a. A: Which day do you remember most vividly?
 b. B: The one (when) we arrived in Los Angeles
- (7) a. A: Aling araw natandaan mong mabuti
which day ThT.remember you.LNK best
 "Which day do you remember best?"
 b. B: * ang bumili/binili si/ni Juan ng/ang tela
T bought.AT/ThT T/A Juan Th/T cloth
 "The one (when) Juan bought some/the cloth"
- (8) a. Nagbasa si Pedro ng ibinigay sa kaniya ni Maria, yung Don Quijote
AT.read T Pedro Th ThT-gave T him A Maria namely D.Q.
 b. Binasa ni Pedro ang ibinigay sa kaniya ni Maria, yung Don Quijote
ThT.read A Pedro T ThT-gave T him A Maria namely D.Q.
 "Pedro read something Maria gave him, namely 'Don Quijote'"

References

- Aldridge, Edith. 2002. "Wh-Movement in Seediq and Tagalog." *Proceedings of AFLA* 8:1-16.
- Groenendijk, Jeroen, and Martin Stokhof. 1997. "Questions." Pp. 1055-1124 in *Handbook of Logic and Language*, edited by Johan van Bentham and Alice ter Meulen. North Holland: Elsevier Science.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. Stanford CA: CSLI-Publications.
- Paul, Ileana. 2001. "Concealed Pseudo-Clefts." *Lingua* 111:707-727.
- Richards, Norvin. 1998. "Syntax vs. Semantics in Tagalog Wh-Extraction." *UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 21.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.