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Tagalog has two kinds of focus constructions and two kinds of WH-questions. DP-foci and WH-DPs are predicates and appear in copular constructions whereas PP-foci and WH-PPs are not predicates and do not appear in copular constructions. In this paper, I present a unified analysis for these two different constructions. Contrary to Rizzi’s (1997, 2002) Expanded CP analysis of Italian, and following Zubizarreta’s (1998) Generalised TP analysis of Italian and Spanish, I argue that I° bears features that attract foci and WH-words. I assume, following Massam & Smallwood (1997), that the EPP feature in Tagalog is predicative and can only be checked when a predicate moves into the IP-domain. Spec-IP, in this system, is an A-bar position that can host these foci and WH-words; subjects in Tagalog remain at the edge of vP.

0 Introduction

The existing literature on focus constructions defines identificational focus as representing an individual that is uniquely and exhaustively identified out of a set of individuals and for whom the presuppositional statement holds true (Kiss 1998; Kidwai 1999 on ‘narrow focus’; Vallduví and Vilkuna 1998 on ‘kontrast’). Here are some examples of identificational foci in English:

(1) a. It is **Raph** who is giving the talk on Tagalog focus at AFLA.
   b. It is **at AFLA** that Raph is giving the talk on Tagalog focus.

The phrases in **underlined bold** are the foci, while the clauses in italics are the
presuppositional statements. DP-foci and PP-foci in English are found in the same construction: cleft sentences.

English WH-questions also all bear a similar structure to each other. In other words, WH-DPs appear in the same structure as WH-PPs.

(2)  a. Who gave the talk on Tagalog focus at AFLA?
   b. Where did Raph give the talk on Tagalog focus?

WH-movement is traditionally assumed to take a WH-word and raise it to a position at the left periphery of the sentence. This position is standardly understood to be Spec-CP.

Turning now to Tagalog (Austronesian; Philippines), it is evident that DP-foci and PP-foci in this language appear in constructions different from each other. Below in (3) are examples of the DP-focus construction.¹ Note the obligatory presence of the subject marker ang between the focalised element and the presuppositional statement. On the other hand, in the PP-focus construction in (4), the subject marker ang is obligatorily absent between the focus and the presuppositional statement.

(3)  a. **Si Juan** [*(ang) [pumunta sa Boracay]].
   SBJ Juan     SBJ go.AT.PRF. OBL Boracay
   ‘It was Juan who went to Boracay.’

   b. **Ang holen** [*(ang) [ibinigay ni Maria kay Pedro]].
   SBJ marble   SBJ give.TT.PRF. CS Maria OBL Pedro
   ‘It was the marble that Maria gave to Pedro.’

(4)  a. **Sa Boracay** [*(ang) [pumunta si Juan]].
   OBL Boracay   SBJ go.AT.PRF SBJ Juan
   ‘It was to Boracay that Juan went.’

   b. **Kay Pedro** [*(ang) [ibinigay ni Maria ang holen]].
   OBL Pedro    SBJ give.TT.PRF. CS Maria SBJ marble
   ‘It was to Pedro that Maria gave the marble.’

The presence of the ang particle in (3) and its absence in (4) suggest that the presuppositional statements in (3) and (4) bear different grammatical functions. I assume that, in (3), the presuppositional statements are headless relative clauses in subject position, whereas in (4), the presuppositional statements are regular declarative clauses.

The focalised phrases in (3) and (4) also bear different grammatical functions. In (3) these phrases are predicates, while in (4), they are not. In sections 2 and 3 I use the facts from the ay-inversion construction to show that this is so.

Tagalog WH-questions also exhibit the same split in construction. WH-DPs, as in

¹ The following is a list of the abbreviations I use in the glosses: 2 second person; 3 third person; AT agent topic; AUX auxiliary; BT benefactive topic; CAUS causative; CL clitic; CO copular oblique marker; COMP complementiser; CONT contemplated aspect; CS default case; EXCL exclusive; IMPRF imperfective aspect; OBL oblique marker; PL plural marker; PRF perfective aspect; PST past; SBJ subject marker; SG singular; TT theme topic.
(5), also require the subject marker ang between the WH-question and the interrogative, whereas WH-PPs, as in (6), do not.

(5) a. Sino [(ang) [pumunta sa Boracay]]? who SBJ go.AT.PRF. OBL Boracay ‘Who went to Boracay?’

b. Ano [(ang) [ibinigay ni Maria kay Pedro]]? what SBJ give.TT.PRF. CS Maria OBL Pedro ‘What did Maria give to Pedro?’

(6) a. Saan [(ang) [pumunta si Juan]]? where SBJ go.AT.PRF SBJ Juan ‘Where did Juan go?’

b. Kanino [(ang) [ibinigay ni Maria ang holen]]? who.OBL SBJ give.TT.PRF. CS Maria SBJ marble ‘To whom did Maria give the marble?’

Just as in (3), the WH-words in (5) are predicates and the rest of the question is a headless relative clause in subject position. In contrast, the WH-words in (6), like the foci in (4), are not predicates and the rest of the question is a regular interrogative clause.

In this paper, I provide a unified analysis for focus constructions and WH-questions in Tagalog. I propose a structure similar to the one in (7) for both DP-foci/WH-DP and PP-foci/WH-PP. In focus constructions, there is a [focus] feature in I° and focalised phrases move to Spec-IP to check this feature. Likewise, in WH-questions, there is a [WH] feature in I° and WH-words move to Spec-IP to check it (following Alboiu 2002, 2003 on Romanian; Massam 2003 on Niuean ‘long WH’; Oda 2002, to appear on Irish WH; Zubizarreta 1998 on Spanish and Italian; contra Aldridge 2002 on Tagalog and Seediq WH; Aldridge 2003 on Tagalog WH; Paul 2001, 2003 on Malagasy; Richards 1998 on Tagalog WH; Rizzi 1997, 2002 on Italian Left Periphery).

(7)                     IP
                        /  \   
Focus/WH   I’         
                        /  \   
                     I   vP
[ EPPpred ]     [ focus/WH ]
                  △
ti

In the next section I discuss simple declarative sentences and copular constructions in Tagalog. In sections 2 and 3, I talk about the properties of DP-foci and PP-foci. I present a unified analysis for these focus constructions in section 4 and extend

2 For consistency, I use the labels ‘IP’, ‘Spec-IP’ and ‘I°’ throughout this paper, even though some of the works cited use the labels ‘TP’, ‘Spec-TP’ and ‘T°’ to refer to the same functional domain.
it to WH-questions in section 5. I consider and present evidence against a counter-
analysis in section 6. In section 7, I briefly discuss some implications. In section 8, I
conclude the paper.

1 Simple declaratives and copular sentences

Tagalog is a predicate-initial language (Aldridge 2002, 2003; Billings to appear;
Rackowski 2002; Richards 2000; Schachter and Otanes 1972; Sityar 1989; among
others). The sentences in (8) are examples of simple declarative sentences in Tagalog.
The predicate is the first element in each sentence.

(8)  a. Tumatawa  si Diego.
      laugh.AT.IMPRF SBJ Diego
      ‘Diego is laughing.’

     b. Kakainin  ni Juan  ang saging sa bahay.
      eat.TT.CONT CS Juan  SBJ banana OBL house
      ‘Juan will eat the banana at home.’

Turning to copular constructions in Tagalog, there is no equivalent to the English
copula be. Given this fact, the element in sentence-initial position in a Tagalog copular
construction can arguably be considered some sort of predicate on its own, since it is
found in the same position as the predicate of the non-copular constructions found in (8).
Here are some examples of copular sentences (the predicates are underlined):

(9)  a. Doktor ni Alejandro  si Juan.
      doctor CS Alejandro SBJ Juan
      ‘Juan is Alejandro’s doctor.’

     b. Matangkad at malusog na bata ang babae -ng iyon.
      tall  and healthy COMP child SBJ girl COMP  that
      ‘That girl is a tall and healthy child.’

In all of the copular constructions above, none of the predicates seem to be verbal. They
do not bear the voice and aspect morphology that verbs typically bear. Also, there does
not seem to be any derivational morphology that would make them verbal.

I assume Massam and Smallwood’s (1997) Predicative EPP. They argue that, in
Niuean, a Polynesian language, an [EPPpred] feature housed in I° is satisfied when a
predicate moves into the IP domain. There are two ways of satisfying this [EPPpred] in
Niuean (and also, as I assume, in Tagalog): (i) if the predicate is an X°, as in (8), it raises
to I° and checks the [EPPpred] feature via head-movement; (ii) if the predicate is an XP,
as in (9), it raises to Spec-IP and checks the [EPPpred] feature via Spec-Head agreement.

For sentences in which the predicate is an X°, as in (8), the tree structure that I
adopt is shown below:
The tree in (10) is a slightly modified version of the tree proposed in Rackowski’s (2002) account of verb-subject agreement in Tagalog. As shown above, the verb raises from V° to v° to I° in order to satisfy the [EPPpred] feature.

Rackowski argues that I° enters into two Agree relations with the arguments in the sentence. The first Agree relation involves I° and the external argument for the purposes of nominative case assignment. The second is verb-subject agreement between the verb and the structurally closest DP to I° in the tree. This Agree relation is spelled out as the agreement morphology on the verb and the structurally closest DP to I° is marked as the subject. Note that this entails that Spec-IP is not necessarily generated.

Unlike (10), the tree in (11), in which the predicate is an XP and is non-verbal, does not exhibit head-movement to I°, but rather, phrasal-movement to Spec-IP.

---

3 In the original account, the functional projection, VoiceP, dominates vP and is the daughter of IP. According to Rackowski, it is at the edge of VoiceP that subjects are found in Tagalog. The presence or absence of VoiceP is not crucial to the analysis presented here. Thus, for the purposes of this paper, I ignore VoiceP and assume that the daughter of IP is vP.

4 An external argument becomes the structurally closest DP to I° by virtue of merging at Spec-vP. Internal arguments become the structurally closest DP to I° through specificity shift which raises these external arguments to the edge of vP. See Rackowski (2002) for further discussion.

5 According to Massam (to appear), these XPs belong to the lexical category of Universal and are characterised as unspecified for the feature [pred]. This underspecification allows universals to act like predicates and non-predicates. Their function within a sentence depends solely on their syntactic position. Assumedly, in this approach, verbs in English are specified as [+pred], while nouns are [-pred].
Working also on predicates in Niuean, Massam (to appear) suggests that the absence of head-movement is caused by the non-verbal nature of these predicates in copular sentences and by their lack of inflectional features like agreement and finiteness. Thus, unlike verbal predicates, non-verbal predicates in Tagalog cannot enter into any Agree relations with any higher functional projections like I° and take part in the head system of the language. Instead of head-movement, there is raising to Spec-IP of the XP-predicate to satisfy the [EPPpred] housed in I°.

2 Properties of DP-foci

Having laid out my assumptions regarding Tagalog phrase structure, I now direct the discussion to an examination of the properties of DP-foci. I show that what I call DP-foci are indeed cases of identificational focus and that these DP-foci are the predicates of their sentences.

First, to ensure that I am indeed dealing with identificational focus, I use Szabolcsi’s (1981) Exhaustivity Test, which is a comparison of two sentences. The first sentence has an element consisting of a pair of conjoined phrases. In the second, the second phrase of the conjoined pair has been dropped. If the second sentence contradicts the first, i.e. the first does not entail the second, the element in question is exhaustively identified. Consider the following examples from English:

(12)  a. It was to Paris and Venice that Raph went two winters ago.
    b. It was to Paris that Raph went two winters ago.

The sentence in (12a) does not entail (12b); they contradict each other. Therefore, the bolded elements above must be exhaustively identified. And because they are exhaustively identified, they must be identificational foci.

I now apply Szabolcsi’s test to the sentences in (13).

(13)  a. Sina Juan at Diego ang pumunta sa Boracay.
      SBJ.PL. Juan and Diego SBJ go.AT.PRF. OBL Boracay
      ‘It was Juan and Diego who went to Boracay.’

      b. Si Juan ang pumunta sa Boracay.
         SBJ Juan SBJ go.AT.PRF. OBL Boracay
         ‘It was Juan who went to Boracay.’

Just as in (12), there is a contradiction between (13a) and (13b). Therefore, the bolded elements must be identificational foci.

DP-focus constructions look like copular constructions. Consider the copular sentence in (9b), repeated below in (14). Note the presence of the ang particle between matangkad at malusog na bata ‘tall and healthy child’ and babaeng iyon ‘that girl’.
(14) Matangkad at malusog na bata ang babaeng iyon.
tall and healthy COMP child SBJ girl COMP that
‘That girl is a tall and healthy child.’

As mentioned before, *matangkad at malusog na bata* ‘tall and healthy child’ is a predicate. I assume that *ang babaeng iyon* ‘that girl’ is the subject because it is marked by the *ang* particle. To test this, I use the *ay*-inversion facts of Tagalog.

*Ay*-inversion is a common phenomenon (Kroeger 1993; MacLachlan 1996; Schachter and Otanes 1972; among others). It causes inversion between the verb/predicate and some non-predicate element within the clause, usually the subject. The particle *ay* appears between the fronted element and the verb.

Below is an example adapted from Schachter and Otanes (1972). The sentence in (15a) shows the non-*ay*-inversion sentence, whereas (15b) shows the same sentence, but with *ay*-inversion.

(15) a. Tinanggap ko ang sulat kahapon.
receive.TT.PRF. 1SG.CS. SBJ letter yesterday
‘I received the letter yesterday.’

b. [Ang sulat] i ay tinanggap ko t i kahapon.
SBJ letter AY receive.TT.PRF. 1SG.CS. yesterday
‘I received the letter yesterday.’

In (15b), the fronted element, *ang sulat* ‘the letter’, appears before the *ay* particle, which is followed by the predicate.

Copular constructions can also undergo *ay*-inversion, as in (16).

(16) [Ang babaeng iyon] i ay matangkad at malusog na bata t i.
SBJ girl COMP that AY tall and healthy COMP child
‘That girl is a tall and healthy child.’

The sentence in (16) is the same copular sentence in (14) except with *ay*-inversion. Note that the predicate, *matangkad at malusog na bata* ‘tall and healthy child’, appears directly to the right of the *ay* particle just like the verb in (15b).

---

6 It is possible for a non-subject to be fronted in an *ay*-inversion sentence. However, these non-subjects must be adjuncts and can never be DPs marked with *ni* or *ng*. (Schachter and Otanes 1972).

(i) Adjunct fronted in an *ay*-inversion sentence. (adapted from Schachter and Otanes 1972, p.488)

[Noong Lunes], ay ipinagbili ng mama ang kalabaw niya l i.
Last Monday AY buy.BT.CAUS.PRF CS man SBJ water buffalo 3SG.CS.CL
‘The man sold his water buffalo last Monday.’

(ii) Ng-marked DP fronted in an *ay*-inversion sentence.

* [Ng mama], ay ipinagbili t i ang kalabaw niya noong Lunes.
CS man AY buy.BT.CAUS.PRF SBJ water buffalo 3SG.CS.CL last Monday
For: ‘The man sold his water buffalo last Monday.’
As with other copular constructions, DP-focus constructions can also undergo *ay*-inversion. Consider (3a), repeated below as (17a).

(17)  

a. **Si Juan [ang [pumunta sa Boracay]]**  
   SBJ Juan SBJ go.AT.PRF. OBL Boracay  
   ‘It was Juan who went to Boracay.’

b. *[Ang [pumunta sa Boracay]], ay si Juan ti.*  
   SBJ go.AT.PRF. OBL Boracay AY SBJ Juan  
   'It was Juan who went to Boracay.'

In (17a), there is no *ay*-inversion. In (17b) is the same sentence but with *ay*-inversion.

In all the cases of *ay*-inversion that have been examined thus far, barring the examples in footnote 6, the element to the left of the *ay* particle is the subject, while the element to the right of it is the predicate. Extending this observation to the data in (17), it can only be concluded that the presuppositional statement, *ang pumunta sa Boracay* ‘the one that went to Boracay’, is the subject and the DP-focus, *si Juan*, is the predicate.

3 Properties of PP-foci

What about PP-foci? I show in this section that they too are instances of identificational focus and that, unlike the DP-foci, they are not the predicates of their sentences.

When Szabolcsi’s (1981) Exhaustivity Test is applied, the same contradiction found in (13) obtains. Consider the sentences in (18).

(18)  

a. **Sa Boracay at sa Baguio pumunta si Juan.**  
   OBL Boracay and OBL Baguio go.AT.PRF. SBJ Juan  
   ‘It was to Boracay and Baguio that Juan went.’

b. **Sa Boracay pumunta si Juan.**  
   OBL Boracay go.AT.PRF. SBJ Juan  
   ‘It was to Boracay that Juan went.’

The sentence in (18b) contradicts (18a). In other words, (18a) does not entail (18b). Therefore, the bolded elements above are identificationally focused, like the DP-foci.

However, unlike the DP-focus construction, the PP-focus construction does not look like a copular construction. There is a special copular form of the oblique marker, *nasa*. In (19a), the phrase marked with a plain oblique cannot appear as the predicate of a stative copular construction. Instead, only the copular oblique marker can appear in

---

7 Daniel Kaufman (p.c.) has pointed out that a plain oblique can be the predicate of a copular construction as long as it is benefactive or directional. (i) is an example of a predicative benefactive plain oblique.

(i) Kay Macapagal-Arroyo ang mga estudyante.  
   OBL Macapagal-Arroyo SBJ PL student  
   ‘The students are for Macapagal-Arroyo.’

The copular constructions of interest in this paper are stative.
predicate position, as in (19b). (NB: The examples in (19) are not PP-focus constructions, but are simple copula constructions).

(19)  

a. *Sa Maynila si Juan.  
     OBL Manila SBJ Juan  
     For: ‘Juan is in Manila.’  

b. *Nasa Maynila si Juan.  
     CO Manila SBJ Juan.  
     ‘Juan is in Manila.’

This copular oblique marker does not occur in the PP-focus construction. In the example in (20a), the use of the plain oblique marker results in a grammatical sentence. However, the use of the copular oblique in (20b) results in ungrammaticality. This suggests that the PP-focus is not a predicate, unlike the DP-focus.

(20)  

a. Sa Boracay [pumunta si Juan].
     OBL Boracay go.AT.PRF. SBJ Juan  
     ‘It was to Boracay that Juan went.’

b. *Nasa Boracay [pumunta si Juan].
     CO Boracay go.AT.PRF. SBJ Juan  
     For: ‘It was to Boracay that Juan went.’

As expected, ay-inversion is possible with the copular oblique but not with the plain oblique. Consider the following sentences in (21), which are the ay-inversion versions of the sentences in (19).

(21)  

a. *[Si Juan]i ay sa Maynila ti.
     SBJ Juan AY OBL Manila  
     For: ‘Juan is in Manila.’

b. [Si Juan]i ay nasa Maynila ti.
     SBJ Juan AY CO Manila  
     ‘Juan is in Manila.’

In (21a), ay-inversion with the plain oblique results in ungrammaticality. However, ay-inversion is fine with the copular oblique in (21b).

Since the PP-focus appears with the plain oblique, the presuppositional statement of a PP-focus unsurprisingly cannot undergo ay-inversion. The sentence in (22a) is a normal PP-focus construction. Its ay-inversion counterpart in (22b) is ungrammatical. This is further evidence that the PP-focus is not a predicate.

---

8 While the plain oblique in (20a) is indeed directional, this sentence is not a copular construction. Sa Maynila ‘to Manila’ is an argument of the verb pumunta ‘went’, which is the predicate in this sentence.
(22)  a. **Sa** **Boracay** pumunta si Juan.
    OBL Boracay go.AT.PRF. SBJ Juan
    ‘It was to Boracay that Juan went.’

    b. *[Pumunta si Juan] ay sa **Boracay** ti.
       go.AT.PRF. SBJ Juan AY OBL Boracay
    ‘It was to Boracay that Juan went.’

Furthermore, the data in (22) also show that the presuppositional statement in the PP-focus construction is not the subject of the sentence, unlike the presuppositional statement of the DP-focus. Therefore, it is not surprising that the presuppositional statement for the PP-focus is not marked with *ang*, the subject marker.

Finally, here is one more property of the PP-focus construction: there is a word-order variation available only to this construction and not the DP-focus construction. Compare (22a) above to (23) below. I refer to the *si Juan* in preverbal position in (23) as the Tagalog bodyguard, which can only occur with the PP-focus. (See Keenan 1976 and Paul 2003 for discussion on the Malagasy bodyguard).9

(23) **Sa** **Boracay** [si Juan]i [pumunta ti].
    OBL Boracay SBJ Juan go.AT.PRF.
    ‘It was to Boracay that Juan went.’

The bodyguard does not occur with the DP-focus. Consider the following alternation.

(24)  a. **Ang lapis mo** [ang [hiniram ni Juan kahapon]].
    SBJ pencil 2SG.CS.CL. SBJ borrow.TT.PRF. CS Juan yesterday
    ‘It was your pencil that Juan borrowed yesterday.’

    b. *[Ang lapis mo] [ni Juan]i [ang [hiniram ti kahapon]].
       SBJ pencil 2SG.CS.CL CS Juan SBJ borrow.TT.PRF. yesterday
    For: ‘It was your pencil that Juan borrowed yesterday.’

In the DP-focus construction in (24a), there is no bodyguard. Assuming that bodyguards raise to their surface positions, when one is extracted from the presuppositional statement as in (24b), the sentence becomes ungrammatical. The relevance of the bodyguard to the focus constructions will be explained in the following section.

9 It is not at all clear what the function of the bodyguard is in Tagalog. Paul (2003) claims that it is some sort of possessor of the headless relative clause (presuppositional statement) in subject position in adjunct focus constructions in Malagasy. Such an analysis cannot be extended to Tagalog since the presuppositional statement of a Tagalog PP-focus construction is not a headless relative clause in subject position. I leave the function of the bodyguard in Tagalog for further research. For a short discussion of its syntax, however, see fn. 14 and fn. 15.
4  A unified account of Tagalog focus constructions

I present here a unified account of the DP-focus and PP-focus constructions. But, is a unified account necessary, given that these two constructions are so different? In the previous sections, I have shown that DP-foci are predicates and appear in a copular construction whereas PP-foci are not predicates and do not appear in a copular construction. The answer is simple: yes, because focus is semantically uniform.

As pointed out earlier, Tagalog is a predicate-initial language, with a predicative EPP feature. In non-copular constructions, this [EPPpred] feature is satisfied through V°-to-I° movement. Verb-subject agreement occurs between the verb and the subject (Rackowski 2002). This is shown below in (25), where the verb, kumain ‘ate’, moves to I° to satisfy the predicative EPP. I° enters into two Agree relations with the external argument, si Juan: one for nominative case assignment; the other for verb-subject agreement. Note that Spec-IP is not merged.

(25)  a. Kumain si Juan ng pansit.
    eat.AT.PRF. SBJ Juan CS noodles
    ‘Juan ate some noodles.’

   b.  
        IP
           \[EPPpred\]
        vP
            Kumain
                ate
                \[NOM\]
                si Juan
                Juan
            v
                V
                    VP
                        ti
                        ng pansit
                        some noodles

In copular constructions, however, this [EPPpred] is satisfied by movement of the complement of v° to Spec-IP.

    tall COMP child SBJ girl COMP that
    ‘That girl is a tall child.’
Following Massam’s (to appear) analysis of Niuean predicates, in (26b), the predicate nominal, *matangkad na bata* ‘tall child’, which is base-generated as the complement of *v°*, raises to Spec-IP, satisfying the predicative EPP feature. As mentioned before, no head-movement to I° occurs because the predicate nominal cannot enter into any Agree relation with I°, thus barring it from participating in the head system of Tagalog.

Now, the DP-focus construction is a copular construction. The DP-focus is a predicate, and the presuppositional statement is a headless relative clause in subject position (see Aldridge 2002 on Tagalog and Seediq WH; Massam 2003 on Niuean ‘long WH’; Oda 2002, to appear on Irish WH; Paul 2001, 2003 on Malagasy focus constructions; Rackowski and Richards 2003 on Tagalog WH; Richards 1998 on Tagalog WH; contra Kroeger 1993 who assumes the headless relative to be the predicate). Following Zubizarreta’s (1998) Generalised TP Analysis, in which features like [topic] and [focus] parasitically incorporate onto I° and where topics and foci move to Spec-IP to check these parasitic features, I assume that the DP-focus moves to Spec-IP to check a parasitic [focus] feature in I°. The DP-focus, being a predicate, also moves to Spec-IP in order to satisfy the [EPPpred] feature. It must be noted that Kroeger (1993) assumes that Spec-IP in Tagalog is an A-bar position in which elements like WH-words, topics and foci can be found. This can be seen in the tree in (27b).

(27) a. **Ang pansit ang [kinain ni Juan sa kusina]].**
   SBJ noodles SBJ eat.TT.PRF. CS Juan OBL kitchen
   ‘It was the noodles that Juan ate in the kitchen.’

   b.   IP  
   ───────────────────>
   ─────────►
   DP_{1}^10
   ───>
   I'
   ───>
   [EPPpred]
   ───>
   vP
   ───>
   v'
   ───>
   DP
   ───>
   v
   ───>
   t_i
   ───>
   ang [kinain ni Juan sa kusina]
   ───>
   that girl
   ───>
   the (thing that) Juan ate in the kitchen

---

10 Note that this DP is really a UnivP, a *universal phrase*, which, according to Massam (to appear), is underspecified for the feature [pred]. See fn. 4. I only use the traditional label of DP for the sake of clarity.
Like the predicate in (26b) the DP-focus, *ang pansit ‘the noodles’, raises to Spec-IP where it satisfies the requirements of the predicative EPP. Also, because it is a focalised phrase, it checks the parasitic [focus] feature in I°. The presuppositional statement, *ang kinain ni Juan sa kusina ‘the (thing that) Juan ate in the kitchen’, is a headless relative clause in subject position and is base-generated in Spec-vP.

This tree structure provides a straightforward explanation for why there is no bodyguard in the DP-focus construction. As shown in the tree in (28b), the presuppositional statement is a complex DP in subject position. It forms an island out of which the bodyguard ni Juan cannot be extracted.

(28) a. *Ang pansit [ni Juan], [ang [kinain ti sa kusina]].
   SBJ noodles CS Juan SBJ eat.TT.PRF. OBL kitchen.
   For: ‘It was the noodles that Juan ate in the kitchen.’

   b.  
   IP
   |      |
   |      |
   |      |
   |      |
   DP_i
   \     \        \        \        \  
   \       \        \        \        \ 
   Ang pansit the noodles
   \       \      \      \      \ 
   \         \    \    \    \  
   ni Juan Juan
   \                     \   \     \ 
   \                        \    \    
   \                    DP
   \                     \   \  
   \   ang kinain ti sa kusina
   \   \   \   \   \   \   \   \ 
   \      \      \      \      \      
   \     the (thing that) ti ate in the kitchen
   \    ti

   Turning now to the PP-focus construction: it is not a copular construction. The PP-focus is not a predicate and the presuppositional statement is a simple declarative sentence from which the PP-focus has been extracted. The [EPPpred] feature is checked by head-movement of the verb to I°, which also bears a parasitic [focus] feature. The PP-focus raises to Spec-IP to check this parasitic feature.

   Consider (29) below. In the tree, the verb, *kumain ‘ate’, raises from its base position at V° and lands in I° to satisfy the [EPPpred] feature. The PP, sa kusina ‘in the kitchen’, because it is a focalised phrase, raises to Spec-IP from some position within the VP in order to check the parasitic [focus] feature in I°.

(29) a. Sa kusina [kumain si Juan ng pansit].
   OBL kitchen eat.AT.PRF. SBJ Juan CS noodles
   ‘It was in the kitchen that Juan ate some noodles.’
The structure in (29b) also gives a simple account for why the bodyguard appears in the PP-focus construction: the presuppositional statement in (29) is not a DP-island.

(30)  a.  **Sa kusina** [si Juan] x [kumain t x ng pansit].
     OBL kitchen SBJ Juan eat.AT.PRF.CS noodles
     ‘It was in the kitchen that Juan ate some noodles.’

b.  The bodyguard, *si Juan*, can raise from its merge position and tuck-in between the PP-focus, *sa kusina* ‘in the kitchen’, and the verb, *kumain* ‘ate’, as shown in (30b) above.

5  Extending the account to WH-questions

The analysis presented in the previous section can be easily extended to Tagalog WH-questions because the same kinds of facts regarding DP-foci and PP-foci are found with WH-DPs and WH-PPs. For example, as mentioned earlier, the WH-DP in (31a) requires the particle, *ang*, just like the DP-focus in (31b).
FOCUS CONSTRUCTIONS AND WH-QUESTIONS IN TAGALOG

(31)  a. Ano [*ang] [binili ni Juan sa Maynila]?  
    what SBJ BUY.TT.PRF. CS Juan OBL Manila 
    ‘What did Juan buy in Manila?’

   b. Ang laruan [*ang] [binili ni Juan sa Maynila].  
      SBJ toy SBJ buy.TT.PRF. CS Juan OBL Manila 
      ‘It was the toy that Juan bought in Manila.’

And, just like the PP-focus in (32b), the WH-PP in (32a) does not need the *ang particle. As a matter of fact, the *ang particle is ungrammatical in both of these contexts.

(32)  a. Saan [*ang] [binili ni Juan ang laruan]?  
    where SBJ buy.TT.PRF. CS Juan SBJ toy 
    ‘Where did Juan buy the toy?’

   b. Sa Maynila [*ang] [binili ni Juan ang laruan].  
      OBL Manila SBJ buy.TT.PRF. CS Juan SBJ toy 
      ‘It was in Manila that Juan bought the toy.’

The similarities between the DP-focus and WH-DP and between the PP-focus and the WH-PP imply the following: in WH-DP questions, the WH-word is a predicate and the rest of the question is a headless relative clause in subject position of a copular sentence, whereas, in WH-PP questions, the WH-word is not a predicate and the rest of the question is a normal interrogative sentence from which the WH-PP has been extracted. (For a more detailed discussion on Tagalog WH-questions see Aldridge 2002, 2003; Kroeger 1993; Rackowski and Richards 2003; Richards 1998).

Consider the sentences below, which are the ay-inversion counterparts to the sentences in (31a) and (32a).

(33)  a. ?[Ang binili ni Juan sa Maynila], ay ano ti?  
      SBJ buy.TT.PRF. CS Juan OBL Manila AY what 
      ‘What did Juan buy in Manila?’

   b. *[Binili ni Juan ang laruan], ay saan ti?  
       buy.TT.PRF. CS Juan SBJ toy AY where 
       For: ‘Where did Juan buy the toy?’

Note that, while the grammaticality of the ay-inversion counterpart in (33a) of the WH-DP construction in (31a) has degraded, it is not as bad as the ay-inversion counterpart in (33b) of the WH-PP construction in (32a). The ay-inversion counterpart of the WH-PP construction is completely ungrammatical. Thus, the ay-inversion facts also give (partial) evidence that WH-DPs are predicates and that WH-PPs are not predicates.

Given the above facts, WH-questions in Tagalog have a similar tree structure to focus constructions. Here is a tree for WH-DP questions (compare to (27)).
(34) a. Ano [ang kinain ni Juan sa kusina]]?  
what SBJ eat.TT.PRF. CS Juan OBL kitchen  
‘What did Juan eat in the kitchen?’

b. 

```
  IP
     DP
        I'
  [EPPpred] [WH]
     what
```

In the tree above, the verb, *kumain* ‘ate’, raises to I° to satisfy the [EPPpred] feature. The WH-word, *saan* ‘where’, raises from its merge position to Spec-IP to check the parasitic [WH] feature in I°.

In the literature, Kroeger (1993), who works within the LFG framework, places WH-words in Spec-IP. Alboiu (2002, 2003) makes use of a parasitic [WH] feature in I°. Thus, in her system, Romanian WH-words move to Spec-IP to check this feature.
Furthermore, Massam (2003) and Oda (2002, to appear) propose a similar structure for WH-questions in Niuean and Irish respectively. The analysis presented here lends more support to these proposals.

Bodyguards can only appear in WH-PP questions. Again, with the structures proposed above, this is not surprising.

(36) 

a. *Ano [ni Juan], [ang [kinain ti sa kusina]]?
   what CS Juan SBJ eat.TT.PRF. OBL kitchen
   For: ‘What did Juan eat in the kitchen?’

b. Saan [si Juan], [kumain ti ng pansit]?
   where SBJ Juan eat.AT.PRF. CS noodles
   ‘Where did Juan eat noodles?’

In the WH-DP question in (36a), the bodyguard, ni Juan, has been extracted from a DP-island in subject position, causing ungrammaticality. There is no such DP-island in the WH-PP question in (36b). The bodyguard, si Juan, can be raised from its merge position and be easily tucked-in between the WH-word, saan ‘where’, and the verb, kumain ‘ate’.

6 Entertaining a possible counter-analysis

In this section, I entertain a possible counter-analysis to the account put forth in sections 4 and 5. Using facts from Tagalog clitic placement, I present reasons why the unified account is the correct way of analysing focus constructions and WH-questions in Tagalog.

Instead of raising to Spec-IP, it is possible to analyse the WH-DPs/WH-PPs and DP-foci/ PP-foci as all moving to specifiers of different functional projections above IP. These functional projections can be from the set of functional projections proposed in Rizzi’s (1997, 2002) Expanded CP domain.

(37) Rizzi’s expanded CP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force°</th>
<th>Top°</th>
<th>Int°</th>
<th>Top°</th>
<th>Focus°</th>
<th>Top°</th>
<th>Mod°</th>
<th>Top°</th>
<th>Fin°</th>
<th>I°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Expanded CP approach is capable of giving a unified analysis. For example, the DP-focus, as a predicate, would move to Spec-IP to satisfy the [EPPpred] feature, then move to Spec-FocusP. The PP-focus, on the other hand, would move from its merge position directly to Spec-FocusP. But this is the wrong analysis.

Let us look at Tagalog pronominal clitics. According to the literature, these clitics are second position clitics (Kroeger 1993; Schachter and Otanes 1972; Sityar 1989; contra Billings and Konopasky 2003 who assume that these clitics are verb-adjacent). So, in (38) below, the clitic, ka ‘you (sg)’, always appears directly after the phrase in first position. The clitic cannot appear in any other position in the sentence.
(38) a. Kumakain *ka* ng pansit (*ka) kahapon (*ka).
    ‘You were eating some noodles yesterday.’

    ‘You were not eating some noodles yesterday.’

    ‘It was yesterday that you were not eating some noodles.’

But, what is meant exactly by ‘second position’? Second position in what domain? From the facts in (38), this domain seems to be the clause; pronominal clitics in Tagalog must appear in second position in this domain. This is not correct.

Compare Tagalog to Croatian/Serbian. Croatian/Serbian has second position clitics, as shown in (39).

(39) (adapted from Dyck, Koskinen and Schütze 1993).
    Taj čovek joj ga je poklonio.
    that man her it 3SG.PST. presented
    ‘That man presented her with it.’

The clitics, *joj, ga* and *je*, appear in second position in the matrix clause. In the embedded clause in (40), the clitic, *su*, appears in second position, after the complementiser, *da*.

(40) (adapted from Dyck, Koskinen and Schütze 1993).
    Rečeno je [CP da\textsuperscript{11} *su* naši uvaženi članovi (*su)
    been.said 3SG.AUX. that 3PL.AUX. our respected members
    postavili jedno pitanje],
    posed one question
    ‘It has been said that our respected members posed one question.’

Thus, clitics in Croatian/Serbian are in second position in the matrix and embedded clauses.

Now, Tagalog clitics are in second position in the matrix clause, as shown in (38), but not in the embedded clause. In (41) below, the clitic, *mo* ‘you (sg)’, cannot appear after the complementiser. It must appear after the verb. If Tagalog second position clitics were in the second position of the clause, like the second position clitics in Croatian/Serbian, they should be found after the complementiser, *na* ‘that’. But, they are not. Instead, they appear after the embedded verb, *binili* ‘bought’. Therefore, the domain in which Tagalog clitics find their host must be IP. Kroeger (1993) also suggests that the

\textsuperscript{11} Dyck, Koskinen and Schütze (1993) point out that *da* ‘that’ has to be stressed in order to host the clitic. Otherwise, it cannot act as a host.
IP is the domain of cliticisation in Tagalog.

(41) Sinabi ni Isabel [CP na (*mo) [IP binili mo say.TT.PR. CS Isabel COMP buy.TT.PR. 2SG.CS.CL. ang laruan para sa bata sa Maynila]].

‘Isabel said that you bought the toy for the child in Manila.’

Given the analysis proposed in this paper, it is not surprising that focalised phrases, as in (42), and WH-words, as in (43), are possible hosts for second position clitics. The clitic, mo ‘you’, does not appear after the complementisers, na ‘that’ and kung ‘if’, but after the focalised phrase, sa Maynila ‘in Manila’, in (42), and after the WH-word, saan ‘where’, in (43).

(42) Sinabi ni Isabel [CP na (*mo) [IP [sa Maynila]i mo ask.TT.PR. CS Isabel COMP OBL Manila 2SG.CS.CL. binili ang laruan para sa bata ti]].

‘Isabel said that it was in Manila that you bought the toy for the child.’

(43) Itinanong ni Isabel [CP kung (*mo) [IP [saan]i mo ask.TT.PR. CS Isabel if where 2SG.CS.CL. binili ang laruan para sa bata ti]].

‘Isabel asked where you bought the toy for the child.’

If the clause were the domain in which ‘second position’ was defined and if foci and WH-words in Tagalog were found in the specifier of different functional projections in Rizzi’s (1997, 2002) Expanded CP, the data in (42) and (43) would be unexpected: How would the clitic know that it can attach to foci and WH-words but not complementisers? In other words, why does the clitic not attach to the complementiser? Therefore, the facts in (42) and (43) provide further proof that focalised phrases and WH-words do indeed surface in Spec-IP in Tagalog.

7 Implications and remaining issues

Thus far, I have said that both WH-words and foci go to Spec-IP to check parasitic features in $I^o$. But, what about sentences like (44) below, where a WH-word and a focalised phrase are both present in the sentence?

---

12 Only PP-foci can host clitics in Tagalog. This is not surprising given the analysis proposed here: DP-foci cannot host clitics because the pronominal clitic cannot leave the DP-island that is the presuppositional statement. I assume, following Billings and Konopasky (2003), that Tagalog pronominal clitics merge in their argumental positions.

13 Only WH-PPs can host clitics in Tagalog. WH-DPs cannot host clitics for the same reasons that DP-foci cannot host clitics. See the preceding footnote.
(44) a. Bakit **sa** *Maynila* [pumunta *si* Juan]?
why OBL Manila go.AT.PRF. SBJ Juan
‘Why was it to Manila that Juan went?’

b. Kailan **kay** *Pedro* [ibinigay *ni* Maria ang bola]?
when OBL Pedro give.TT.PRF.CS Maria SBJ ball
‘When was it to Pedro that Maria gave the ball?’

It seems that different features are checked by different phrases in multiple specifiers of the same projection. Recall, that, for similar reasons, the WH-word and the focus phrase have been shown to occupy Spec-IP. In the last section, Tagalog pronominal clitics have been demonstrated to find their host in the IP domain and that WH-words and focus phrases can each host clitics.

The tree in (45) on the following page is the tree for the sentence in (44a). The verb, *pumunta* ‘went’, undergoes head-movement from its merge position at V° to I°, where it checks the [EPPpred] feature. *Si Juan*, the subject of the sentence, is merged in Spec-vP and enters into two Agree relations with I° from that position: one for nominative case assignment; the other for verb-subject agreement.

Two parasitic features, [WH] and [focus], are housed in I°. The [WH] feature is checked by the WH-word, *bakit* ‘why’, which raises to Spec-IP from some adjunct position within VP. The [focus] feature is then checked by the focalised phrase, *sa Maynila* ‘to Manila’, which raises from its base position to tuck-in underneath the WH-word in Spec-IP.

(45)                      IP
           AdvPₙ  
            PPₙ  
           △  
            Bakit why
             sa *Maynila* to Manila 
          I [EPPpred] [WH] [focus]
               PPₙ  
              I°  
               vP  
               v'  
               DP  
               v  
               VP  
               vₕ  
               tₜ  
               tₕ  
            VP  
               AdvP  
               tₜ  
               tₕ

Now, if bodyguards¹⁴ were to move to check features, the result would be a tree

¹⁴ Unlike Malagasy bodyguards (Keenan 1976, Paul 2003), Tagalog bodyguards do not have to agree with the verb, i.e. they do not have to be subjects, but they must be agents. Thus, in (i), *ni Maria* is the agent, does not agree with the verb, and is the bodyguard. The sentence is grammatically correct.

(i) Kay Pedro *ni Maria* iniwan *ang* pera.
OBL Pedro CS Maria leave.TT.PRF. SBJ money
‘It was with Pedro that Maria left the money.’
similar to that in (45). Consider the tree in (46b), where the PP-focus, *sa kusina* ‘in the kitchen’, raises to Spec-IP to check the parasitic [focus] feature in I°. The bodyguard, *ni Juan*, which is base-generated at Spec-vP, also raises to Spec-IP, checking some parasitic [bodyguard] feature. Note that it tucks-in underneath the PP-focus.

(46)  a.  **Sa kusina** [ni Juan]i  [kinain  ang pansit t1]  
    OBL  kitchen  CS  Juan  eat.TT.PRF.  SBJ  noodles  
    ‘It was in the kitchen that Juan ate the noodles.’

    b.  
    \[
    \text{IP}
    \]
    \[
    \text{PP}
    \]
    \[
    \text{Sa kusina}
    \]
    \[
    \text{in the kitchen}
    \]
    \[
    \text{ni Juan}
    \]
    \[
    \text{I'}
    \]
    \[
    \text{vP}
    \]
    \[
    \text{kinain}
    \]
    \[
    \text{ate}
    \]
    \[
    \text{ang pansit}
    \]
    \[
    \text{the noodles}
    \]
    \[
    \text{t1}
    \]

The elements that can potentially be found in Spec-IP are WH-words, foci, bodyguards and negators, which I ignore. These elements can occur in these orders: 15

In contrast, in the sentence in (ii), *ang pera* ‘the money’ is the bodyguard. Although, it is the subject of the sentence (it is marked with *ang*, the subject marker) it is not the agent. As a result, the sentence is ungrammatical.

(ii)  * Kay Pedro *ang pera* iniwan ni Maria.  
    OBL  Pedro  SBJ  money  leave.TT.PRF.  CS  Maria  
    For:  ‘It was with Pedro that Maria left the money.’

Tagalog bodyguards must also be proper names. In (iii), *ng ale* ‘the woman’, which is the agent, functions as the bodyguard. However, the sentence is still ungrammatical because *ng ale* ‘the woman’ is not a proper name, but a common noun.

(iii)  * Kay Pedro *ng ale* iniwan ang pera.  
    OBL  Pedro  CS  woman  leave.TT.PRF.  SBJ  money  
    For:  ‘It was with Pedro that the woman left the money.’

15 It is not clear why foci and bodyguards do not scramble when there is no WH-word in the sentence. Foci always come first in the absence of a WH-word, as in (i.a).

(i)  a.  [Sa Maynila]foci  [si Alejandro]bodyguard  bumili  ng laruan.  
    OBL  Manila  SBJ  Alejandro  buy.AT.PRF.  CS  toy  
    ‘It was in Manila that Alejandro bought a toy.’


Interestingly, bodyguards and clitics seem to appear in similar positions. Billings (to appear) considers the Tagalog bodyguard as instances of optional elision of non-pronouns. Compare the sentences in (ii) to those in (47a/b). The clitic, *siya* ‘he’, is found in the same position as the bodyguard, *si Juan*.
(47)  a. WH-word > focus > bodyguard.
   [Bakit]\textsubscript{WH} [sa Maynila]\textsubscript{focus} [si Juan]\textsubscript{bodyguard} pumunta?
   why OBL Manila SBJ Juan go.AT.PRF.
   ‘Why was it to Manila that Juan went?’

   b. WH-word > bodyguard > focus.
   [Bakit]\textsubscript{WH} [si Juan]\textsubscript{bodyguard} [sa Maynila]\textsubscript{focus} pumunta?
   why SBJ Juan OBL Manila go.AT.PRF
   ‘Why was it to Manila that Juan went?’

Any other order is ungrammatical. These orders are shown in (48).

(48)  a. *[Si Juan]\textsubscript{bodyguard} [bakit]\textsubscript{WH} [sa Maynila]\textsubscript{focus} pumunta?
   b. * Sa Maynila bakit si Juan
   c. * Sa Maynila si Juan bakit
   d. *Si Juan sa Maynila bakit

   For: ‘Why was it to Manila that Juan went?’

The WH-word must always be first because it bears illocutionary force. The focus and bodyguard must tuck-in underneath the WH-word. This is so that there is no obstruction of intervening specifiers during feature checking. Also, if, of the three, a WH-word were the last to raise to Spec-IP and check its feature, how does it know that it is the last? In other words, how would the WH-word know that nothing else needs to move to Spec-IP?

8 Conclusion

In this paper, I have proposed a unified analysis of DP-foci and PP-foci, and of WH-DP and WH-PP, taking into account their differences. DP-foci/WH-DPs are predicates, whereas PP-foci/WH-PPs are not. The former appear in a copular construction while the latter do not. Spec-IP is an A-bar position to which foci and WH-words go to check parasitic [focus] and [WH] features in $I^\circ$. This is schematised in the tree in (49).

As mentioned earlier, more research is needed on the bodyguard in Tagalog.

16 Thanks to Gabriela Alboiu (p.c.) for suggesting this.
Drawing from the second position clitic facts of Tagalog, I have shown how the analysis of the Tagalog Left Periphery presented in this paper brings into doubt the universality of Rizzi’s (1997, 2002) Expanded CP domain and provides support for Zubizarreta’s (1998) Generalised TP hypothesis. Crucially, I have demonstrated that the domain of cliticisation in Tagalog is IP. This explains why Tagalog second position clitics can take WH-words and focalised phrases as hosts but not complementisers.

I have briefly discussed the possibility of different features checking elements in different specifiers of the same projection. And I have also touched upon some word order issues that arise when there is a WH-word, a focalised phrase and a bodyguard all in the same sentence.
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