

The licensing conditions for PF-deletion: Evidence from null clausal arguments in Tagalog  
 Shuki Otani  
 Western University and Osaka University

**Introduction:** There are two main approaches to null arguments: LF-copying and PF-deletion. The LF-copying analysis<sup>[6,8,9,12]</sup> assumes that null arguments do not include internal structure in overt syntax and the structure is copied onto a relevant position from its antecedent at LF. The PF-deletion analysis<sup>[1,5,7,11]</sup> assumes that there is structure in overt syntax and the structure is deleted at PF. A widely accepted way to distinguish between them is extraction from null arguments. The LF-copying predicts overt extraction from null arguments should be impossible, while such extraction should be allowed under PF-deletion. This paper shows that extraction from null arguments is possible in Tagalog if the extracted phrase is contrastively focused. Based on the data, I argue that PF-deletion is licensed by (contrastively) focused phrases.

**Core Data:** An embedded CP in Tagalog can be dropped as illustrated in (1b).

- (1) a. p<in>aniwala-an ni Bob kahapon [<sub>CP</sub> na d<um>ating si Fred ].  
 paN.<Pfv>-believe-LV Gen Bob yesterday C <AV.Pfv>come Nom Fred  
 ‘Yesterday, Bob believed that Fred came.’  
 b. p<in>aniwala-an rin ni Tom kahapon [<sub>CP</sub> Δ ].  
 paN.<Pfv>-believe-LV also Gen Tom yesterday  
 ‘Yesterday, Tom also believed that Fred came.’

To examine whether overt extraction from null arguments is possible, Raising constructions<sup>[2-4,10]</sup> like (2a) are used in this paper. In (2a), an NP (here, ‘si Fred’) that is semantically an argument of the predicate in the embedded clause can appear in the matrix clause. The crucial contrast here is that (2b) is acceptable only when the raised NP is contrastively focused. Following previous studies on Raising<sup>[2,3,10]</sup>, I assume that ‘SI MARY’ is overtly extracted from the null clausal argument.

- (2) a. p<in>aniwala-an ni Bob si Fred kahapon [<sub>CP</sub> na d<um>ating ].  
 paN.<Pfv>-believe-LV Gen Bob Nom Fred yesterday C <AV>come  
 ‘Yesterday, Bob believed Fred to come.’  
 b. p<in>aniwala-an ni Tom { \*si Fred<sub>1</sub> / **SI MARY**<sub>1</sub> } kahapon [<sub>CP</sub> Δ ].  
 paN.<Pfv>-believe-LV Gen Tom Nom Fred Nom Mary yesterday  
 Lit. ‘Yesterday, Tom believed { \*Fred / Mary } to come.’

**Proposal:** To explain the above extraction patterns from null arguments, I propose the condition on overt extraction from null arguments as in (3).

- (3) Extracted phrases can license PF-deletion if they are (contrastively) focused.

Since ‘si Fred’ in (2b) is not focused, it cannot license PF-deletion and the sentence is unacceptable. On the other hand, since ‘si Mary’ is focused, it licenses PF-deletion and extraction is allowed. Following previous research<sup>[6,8,9]</sup>, I assume that the null argument in (1b) is derived by LF-copying as there is no licenser for PF-deletion. This current proposal can apply not only to Tagalog but also to other languages such as Japanese, which permits null clausal arguments like (1b). Although Japanese does not allow overt extraction from null arguments generally, such extraction becomes possible only when extracted phrases are focused.

**Conclusion:** This paper investigates the environments that allow overt extraction from null arguments, showing that null arguments are created by PF-deletion in some contexts. If the above

analysis is plausible, this paper can contribute to the discussion of the licensing conditions for the application of PF-deletion<sup>[1,5,11]</sup>.

## References

- 1 Aelbrecht, Lobke. 2010. *The syntactic licensing of ellipsis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 2 Gerassimova, Veronica, and Peter Sells. 2008. Long-distance dependencies in Tagalog: the case for raising. In *The proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Charles B. Chang and Hannah J. Haynie, 190-198. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- 3 Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford, Calif: CSLI Publications.
- 4 Law, Paul. 2011. Raising in Tagalog. In *Proceedings of the 28th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Mary Byram Washburn, Katherine McKinney-Bock, Erika Varis, Ann Sawyer, and Barbara Tomaszewicz, 142-151. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- 5 Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 6 Oku, Satoshi. 1998. *A theory of selection and reconstruction in the minimalist perspective*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- 7 Sag, Ivan. 1976. *Deletion and Logical Form*. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- 8 Saito, Mamoru. 2007. Notes on East Asian argument ellipsis. *Language Research* 43: 203-227.
- 9 Sakamoto, Yuta. 2019. Overtly empty but covertly complex. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50: 105-136.
- 10 Sells, Peter. 2000. Raising and the order of clausal constituents in the Philippine languages. In *Formal issues in austronesian linguistics*, ed. Ileana Paul, Vivian Philips, and Lisa Travis, 117-144. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.
- 11 Takahashi, Daiko. 2020. Derivational argument ellipsis. *The Linguistic Review* 37: 47-74.
- 12 Williams, Edwin. 1977. Discourse and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 101-139.